

Thomas Hare and Political Representation in Victorian Britain

F. D. Parsons

Studies in Modern History General Editor: J. C. D. Clark



Studies in Modern History

General Editor: **J.C.D. Clark**, Joyce and Elizabeth Hall Distinguished Professor of British History, University of Kansas

Titles include:

James B. Bell
A WAR ON RELIGION
Dissenters, Anglicans and the American Revolution

James B. Bell
THE IMPERIAL ORIGINS OF THE KING'S CHURCH IN EARLY AMERICA
1607–1783

Joe Bord
SCIENCE AND WHIG MANNERS
Science and Political Style in Britain, c.1790–1850

Jonathan Clark and Howard Erskine-Hill (*editors*)
SAMUEL JOHNSON IN HISTORICAL CONTEXT

Edward Corp
THE JACOBITES AT URBINO
An Exiled Court in Transition

Eveline Cruickshanks and Howard Erskine-Hill
THE ATTERBURY PLOT

Diana Donald and Frank O'Gorman (*editors*)
ORDERING THE WORLD IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

Richard D. Floyd
CHURCH, CHAPEL AND PARTY
Religious Dissent and Political Modernization in Nineteenth-Century England

Richard R. Follett
EVANGELICALISM, PENAL THEORY AND THE POLITICS OF CRIMINAL LAW REFORM
IN ENGLAND, 1808–30

Andrew Godley
JEWISH IMMIGRANT ENTREPRENEURSHIP IN NEW YORK AND LONDON 1880–1914

William Anthony Hay
THE WHIG REVIVAL
1808–1830

Mark Keay
WILLIAM WORDSWORTH'S GOLDEN AGE THEORIES DURING THE
INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION IN ENGLAND, 1750–1850

Kim Lawes
PATERNALISM AND POLITICS
The Revival of Paternalism in Early Nineteenth-Century Britain

Marisa Linton
THE POLITICS OF VIRTUE IN ENLIGHTENMENT FRANCE

Karin J. MacHardy
WAR, RELIGION AND COURT PATRONAGE IN HABSBURG AUSTRIA
The Social and Cultural Dimensions of Political Interaction, 1521–1622

James Mackintosh
VINDICIÆ GALLICÆ
Defence of the French Revolution: A Critical Edition

Robert J. Mayhew
LANDSCAPE, LITERATURE AND ENGLISH RELIGIOUS CULTURE, 1660–1800
Samuel Johnson and Languages of Natural Description

Jeremy C. Mitchell
THE ORGANIZATION OF OPINION
Open Voting in England, 1832–68

Marjorie Morgan
NATIONAL IDENTITIES AND TRAVEL IN VICTORIAN BRITAIN

James Muldoon
EMPIRE AND ORDER
The Concept of Empire, 800–1800

F.D. Parsons
THOMAS HARE AND POLITICAL REPRESENTATION IN VICTORIAN BRITAIN

Julia Rudolph
WHIG POLITICAL THOUGHT AND THE GLORIOUS REVOLUTION
James Tyrrell and the Theory of Resistance

Lisa Steffen
TREASON AND NATIONAL IDENTITY
Defining a British State, 1608–1820

Lynne Taylor
BETWEEN RESISTANCE AND COLLABORATION
Popular Protest in Northern France, 1940–45

Anthony Waterman
POLITICAL ECONOMY AND CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY SINCE THE ENLIGHTENMENT
Essays in Intellectual History

Doron Zimmerman
THE JACOBITE MOVEMENT IN SCOTLAND AND IN EXILE, 1746–1759

Studies in Modern History

Series Standing Order ISBN 978-0-333-79328-2 (Hardback)

978-0-333-80346-2 (Paperback)

(outside North America only)

You can receive future titles in this series as they are published by placing a standing order. Please contact your bookseller or, in case of difficulty, write to us at the address below with your name and address, the title of the series and the ISBN quoted above.

Customer Services Department, Macmillan Distribution Ltd, Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire RG21 6XS, England

Thomas Hare and Political Representation in Victorian Britain

F.D. Parsons

Professor of History, Franklin College Switzerland

palgrave
macmillan



© F.D. Parsons 2009

All rights reserved. No reproduction, copy or transmission of this publication may be made without written permission.

No portion of this publication may be reproduced, copied or transmitted save with written permission or in accordance with the provisions of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988, or under the terms of any licence permitting limited copying issued by the Copyright Licensing Agency, Saffron House, 6-10 Kirby Street, London EC1N 8TS.

Any person who does any unauthorized act in relation to this publication may be liable to criminal prosecution and civil claims for damages.

The author has asserted his right to be identified as the author of this work in accordance with the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

First published 2009 by
PALGRAVE MACMILLAN

Palgrave Macmillan in the UK is an imprint of Macmillan Publishers Limited, registered in England, company number 785998, of Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire RG21 6XS.

Palgrave Macmillan in the US is a division of St Martin's Press LLC, 175 Fifth Avenue, New York, NY 10010.

Palgrave Macmillan is the global academic imprint of the above companies and has companies and representatives throughout the world.

Palgrave® and Macmillan® are registered trademarks in the United States, the United Kingdom, Europe and other countries.

ISBN-13: 978-0-230-22199-4 hardback

This book is printed on paper suitable for recycling and made from fully managed and sustained forest sources. Logging, pulping and manufacturing processes are expected to conform to the environmental regulations of the country of origin.

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

A catalog record for this book is available from the Library of Congress.

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
18 17 16 15 14 13 12 11 10 09

Printed and bound in Great Britain by
CPI Antony Rowe, Chippenham and Eastbourne

In Memory of Henry Pelling

This page intentionally left blank

Contents

<i>Preface and Acknowledgements</i>	viii
Introduction	1
Part I	
1 The Life and Work of Thomas Hare, 1806–1891	9
Part II	
2 Personal Representation and the Clerisy, 1857–1859	43
3 Personal Representation and the Second Reform Act, 1859–1867	76
4 The Representative Reform Association, 1867–1874	111
5 Proportional Representation and the Caucus, 1874–1884	137
6 The Proportional Representation Society and the Third Reform Act, 1884–1888	161
Conclusion	186
<i>Notes</i>	191
<i>Bibliography</i>	244
<i>Index</i>	274

Preface and Acknowledgements

This work is a revised and expanded version of a Cambridge Ph.D. thesis on Thomas Hare and the Victorian proportional representation movement from 1857 to 1888, which was written under the supervision of the late Henry Pelling at St John's College. The initial research was undertaken in 1976 at his suggestion in connection with my interest in the political career of Sir John Lubbock, 1st Baron Avebury, a member of Parliament from 1870 to 1900. Various sources related to Lubbock and his participation in the Proportional Representation Society between 1884 and 1888 gradually led me to the political writings of Thomas Hare which began in 1857 with *The Machinery of Representation* followed in 1859 by *A Treatise on the Election of Representatives, Parliamentary and Municipal* and to his leadership of the Representative Reform Association between 1868 and 1874, subsequently leading me back to Lubbock and his association with Hare in 1884. As Hare increasingly became the focus of attention, my perspective gradually shifted from political history to intellectual history with an emphasis on the relationship between political theory and party politics in Victorian Britain. Consequently, this work has little in common with the works of Henry Pelling other than his *America and the British Left: From Bright to Bevan*. His practice of history as an empirical discipline, however, has remained an example for me amid the turns of theory in recent decades, and his advice and support over many years in the past are reasons for the present dedication.

Others to whom I am grateful are Peter Clarke and the late Colin Matthew, who as examiners of the thesis in 1990 offered observations and suggestions for correction and improvement. Jonathan Steinberg more recently read a draft of the work in progress, and his incisive critique was a bracing stimulus. Others whose writings and comments over the years have contributed to my understanding of Victorian ideas and institutions include Derek Beales, Eugenio Biagini, Jonathan Parry, and Miles Taylor who also encouraged publication. My concern with high politics has been in response to the works of the late Maurice Cowling, and my interpretation of political texts has been influenced by those of Quentin Skinner. Remembered are conversations about Lubbock and prehistory with the late Glyn Daniel in his rooms at St John's College

in Cambridge, and likewise I have fond memories of the late Adelaide Lubbock, a daughter-in-law of Sir John Lubbock, who was gracious and helpful at her home in High Elms, where I first saw the Lubbock diaries now in the British Library. In London, the late Enid Lakeman welcomed me to the library of the Electoral Reform Society which now bears her name. David Roberts, a great-grandson of Thomas Hare, invited me into his home in Old Windsor and made available to me family memoirs containing significant information about the life and work of Hare.

Much of the research for this work has been pursued in the Cambridge University Library where the efficient assistance of the staff in the Rare Books Room and the West Room in particular has been greatly appreciated, and I have continued to benefit from the use of the St John's College Library in Cambridge for which I am most grateful. The British Library when located in Bloomsbury and the Newspaper Library at Colindale provided access to important sources.

I would like to acknowledge the following for granting permission to cite and quote manuscript sources as listed in the bibliography of this work: the British Library for the Papers of Sir John Lubbock, 1st Baron Avebury, the Papers of William Gladstone, Letters to Thomas Hare, and the Papers of William Huskisson; James Lloyd for a letter from Joseph Chamberlain to Sir John Lubbock in the Avebury Papers in the British Library; the University of Birmingham Library for the Papers of Joseph Chamberlain; Rev. Sir Charles Dilke for a letter from Charles Dilke to Joseph Chamberlain in the Chamberlain Papers in the University of Birmingham Library; the British Library of Political and Economic Science for the Papers of Leonard Courtney and Kate Courtney and the Papers of John Stuart Mill; the Tyne and Wear Archives Service for the Papers of Joseph Cowen; the University of Durham Library and Lord Howick for the Papers of Henry, 3rd Earl Grey and Albert, 4th Earl Grey; the St John's College Library, Oxford, for Letters to Thomas Hare; the Bishopsgate Institute for the Papers of George Howell; the Electoral Reform Society for the Proportional Representation Society Papers; and Lord Salisbury for a letter from Henry Sidgwick to Arthur Balfour in the Salisbury Papers at Hatfield House transcribed for me by Robin Harcourt Williams. Photocopies of the manuscript memoir by Katherine Clayton and the typescript memoir by Katherine Esdaile made available to me by David Roberts are in my possession.

I would also like to acknowledge the following publishers for granting permission to cite and quote printed primary and secondary sources as listed in the bibliography of this work: the University of Toronto Press for *The Later Letters of John Stuart Mill, 1848–1873*, edited by Francis E.

Minkea and Dwight N. Lindley, in *The Collected Works of John Stuart Mill*, Vols XIV–XVII (1972), and the Belknap Press of Harvard University Press for *English Philanthropy, 1660–1960* by David Owen (1960). Thanks are due also to the Edinburgh University Press for permission to use material in my article, ‘*Ignis Fatuus* vs. *Pons Asinorum*: William Gladstone and Proportional Representation’, published in *Parliamentary History*, Vol. 21 (2002).

Every effort has been made to trace holders of copyrights as required. I apologize if any have been inadvertently overlooked or unintentionally infringed, and the publishers would be pleased to make the necessary arrangements at the first opportunity.

As a member of the faculty of Franklin College Switzerland since 1981, I have been encouraged as well as tolerated by numerous colleagues with whom I have shared the pleasures and frustrations of academic life and its institutional demands. Over a number of years financial assistance for research and conference purposes has been provided by the Franklin Faculty Development Fund and the Paul and Ursula Lowerre Fund for Academic Excellence which I can repay only with my gratitude.

Thanks are due to Jonathan Clark and Michael Strang for the publication of this work in the Studies in Modern History series and also to Ruth Ireland at Palgrave Macmillan for her advice and assistance. Errors in the text of fact and interpretation are my own responsibility.

I am indebted most of all to my wife Luzia who has endured most of all. Without her the joys and sorrows of my life and work would be without meaning.

F.D.P.
Massagno, Switzerland

Introduction

Thomas Hare was an eminent Victorian who has been relatively neglected by historians of nineteenth-century Britain. He has attracted no biographer, and infrequent mention of him commonly has been with reference to his association with John Stuart Mill, as in biographies of Mill by Michael St John Packe, Nicholas Capaldi, and Richard Reeves and studies of his thought by John M. Robson, Bruce L. Kinzer, and Dennis F. Thompson.¹ Among exceptions is the attention devoted to Hare in *Proportional Representation: Critics of the British Electoral System, 1820–1945* by Jenifer Hart, but her work has a narrow focus on the history of electoral reform.² Related to her approach are works by advocates of electoral reform who have discussed Hare within the context of the debate over proportional representation in twentieth-century Britain, such as John H. Humphreys, J.F.S. Ross, and Enid Lakeman.³ Likewise, studies of electoral systems such as works by Vernon Bogdanor, Michael Steed, and Stein Rokkan have recognized Hare but with a limited historical perspective.⁴

Another exception which has a wider focus is *Whigs and Liberals: Continuity and Change in English Political Thought* by J.W. Burrow who devotes serious attention to Hare within the context of the history of political thought from the mid-eighteenth century to the late-nineteenth century, thereby providing a more accurate historical perspective.⁵ Of a similar nature are studies of Victorian liberalism by Christopher Harvie, Ian Bradley, and Stefan Collini,⁶ but these have continued to subordinate Hare to Mill, as have surveys of nineteenth-century political thought by Mark Francis and John Morrow, Jon Roper, and Iain Hampsher-Monk.⁷ Related to such works are studies of the concept of political representation in which regard Hare has been recognized by Hanna Fenichel Pitkin, A.H. Birch, and Iain McLean.⁸

Among historians of Victorian Britain, K. Theodore Hoppen has included Hare in his survey of the period from 1848 to 1886,⁹ and Lawrence Goldman has discussed him in his study of the Social Science Association between 1857 and 1886.¹⁰ Works on Henry Fawcett and George Howell have referred to Hare,¹¹ David Owen has commented on him in *English Philanthropy, 1660–1960*,¹² and Henry Pelling has noted him in *America and the British Left: From Bright to Bevan*.¹³ Other works of relevance to Hare are studies of Victorian party politics by Miles Taylor, Jonathan Parry, T.A. Jenkins, and Eugenio Biagini,¹⁴ among others, as are studies of the Second Reform Act of 1867 by both F.B. Smith and Maurice Cowling and of the Third Reform Act of 1884 and the Redistribution Act of 1885 by both Andrew Jones and William A. Hayes.¹⁵ As the theory of political representation formulated and expounded by Hare concerned elections, also of relevance is the study of electoral politics by H.J. Hanham.¹⁶

This work is not focused on party politics, or the reform acts, or elections, however, such concerns herein being of importance but peripheral rather than central. Nor is it a biography, although the approach is biographical.¹⁷ Rather, it is a work on Hare as a political theorist with emphasis on his principle of personal representation in opposition to virtual representation which was the objective of his system of election by the single transferable vote which he proposed and advocated during the public debate over franchise reform from the late 1850s to the early 1880s. The theory of Hare regarding political representation was related to the nature and function of political parties during the period of the gradual emergence of a democratic polity in Victorian Britain, and attention is devoted to the rhetoric of public debate over these issues.¹⁸ In so doing, books, articles in periodicals and newspapers, speeches in and out of Parliament, and letters by Hare and his contemporaries are analysed within the context of the political language of their time in an attempt to clarify their terminology and arguments.¹⁹ Although Hare was never a member of Parliament, such contextual analysis of political language in this work is related to high politics rather than to popular politics.²⁰ Thus the political ideas of Hare and his associates are treated as having been of serious concern to political leaders, thereby relating the history of ideas to the history of party politics.²¹ Without turning to sociological or cultural theoretical discourse, this work is a study of the relationship between Victorian political and intellectual history.

The work is in two parts, the first being a chapter devoted to a survey of the life and work of Hare from his birth in Dorset in 1806 to his death in London in 1891, devoting attention to his writings and activities

concerning economic and social reform. Discussed are his advocacy of free trade in 1827, criticism of the East India Company in 1830, proposals for the reform of charitable endowments while in the employ of the Charity Commission between 1853 and 1887, related proposals for the reform of land tenure and urban housing, and observations on land and law in India. Included are his contributions to the deliberations of the Social Science Association as of its founding in 1857, in which year he wrote *The Machinery of Representation*, his first work on political reform. His membership of political and economic clubs and societies is recognized as is his position in the intellectual aristocracy, his devout religious belief as a high-church Anglican is observed, and the chapter concludes with a brief account of his family up to his death.

The second part begins with a chapter devoted to *The Machinery of Representation* which Hare wrote in 1857 in response to the results of the general election of that year in which free traders and high churchmen were defeated. His criticism of territorial constituencies within which minorities were subordinated to majorities and his rejection of virtual representation according to which principle electors were represented by the members of Parliament for whom they had not voted is discussed, thereby clarifying his proposal of a national constituency and the principle of personal representation whereby minorities as well as majorities were to be represented by representatives for whom they had voted by means of the single transferable vote. His proposal is compared with the limited vote and the cumulative vote, two other electoral systems for the representation of minorities as well as majorities likewise proposed during the period of political diffusion between the repeal of the Corn Laws in 1846 and the formation of the Liberal party in 1859. The arguments of Hare that personal representation would be in accordance with pluralism by accommodating diversity of opinion within political parties and would be conducive to public virtue by contributing to increased participation of electors and greater independence of representatives are treated with reference to Whig rather than radical political theory. Emphasis is placed on his advocacy of personal representation as necessary for the representation of the educated elite, or clerisy, associated with the political thought of Samuel Taylor Coleridge, an aspect of minority representation which attracted the interest of John Stuart Mill in his concern with the 'tyranny of the majority' in a democratic polity, a concern raised by Alexis de Tocqueville in his account of American political society and subsequently reiterated by Mill. The chapter concludes with the publication of *A Treatise on the Election of Representatives, Parliamentary and Municipal* in 1859 in which Hare further developed

at some length his arguments for personal representation by the single transferable vote, attracting the support of Mill.

The third chapter concerns the discussion of personal representation from the publication of Hare's *Treatise* in 1859 to the passage of the Second Reform Act in 1867, during which period Hare's electoral system was supported by Henry Fawcett as well as by Mill, the latter advocating personal representation in his *Considerations on Representative Government* in 1861. The second edition of Hare's *Treatise* published in the same year was followed by a third edition in 1865 in which Hare drew attention to the mathematical contribution of Henry Richmond Droop and to the discussion of personal representation in Australia, the United States, and Europe. The election of Mill and Fawcett to the House of Commons in the general election in 1865 is considered to be of significance, as is the death of Palmerston in the same year and his replacement as Prime Minister by Lord John Russell, leading to a Liberal reform bill and further discussion of Hare's electoral system, including by opponents such as Richard Cobden and Walter Bagehot in his series of articles on *The English Constitution*. The formation of the Conservative ministry by Derby following upon the defeat of the Liberal reform bill introduced by William Gladstone in 1866 was followed by a Conservative reform bill introduced by Benjamin Disraeli in 1867. The parliamentary debate over the reform bill is discussed with reference to an amendment moved by Mill for personal representation by the single transferable vote and an amendment for the cumulative vote moved by Robert Lowe, a Liberal opponent of reform, both without success. The subsequent amendment for the limited vote, or minority clause, moved in the House of Lords by Cairns, a Conservative, and opposed in the House of Commons by John Bright, a Liberal supporter of reform, as well as by Gladstone, who defended the principle of virtual representation, is emphasized as the operation of the minority clause in multi-member constituencies led to further discussion of personal representation by the single transferable vote.

Following the passage of the Second Reform Act in 1867, the focus of the fourth chapter is on the Representative Reform Association led by Hare from 1868 to 1874. With the financial support of Walter Morrison, a Liberal member of Parliament, and the secretarial assistance of George Howell, a working-class politician, the Representative Reform Association disseminated information about Hare's electoral system. Hare's further writings and continued participation in the Social Science Association are discussed as are the writings of Droop, among others, adapting to the development of political party organization by

defining proportional representation, as distinct from personal representation, as the representation of political parties and advocating the introduction of the single transferable vote in multi-member constituencies. The Representative Reform Association was contemporaneous with the first Disraeli ministry formed in early 1868 and the first Gladstone ministry formed after the general election in late 1868, and during this period discussion of Hare's electoral system was related to debate over the operation of the minority clause in parliamentary elections and the application of the cumulative vote to the election of school boards introduced by the Education Act in 1870. Emphasis is placed on defence of the cumulative vote by Hare and the Representative Reform Association in opposition to attacks on the cumulative vote by the National Education League led by Liberals in Birmingham such as Joseph Chamberlain who likewise opposed proportional representation. The chapter concludes with the publication of the fourth and final edition of Hare's *Treatise* in 1873 and the dissolution of the Representative Reform Association in 1874 following the general election of that year which resulted in the formation of a second ministry by Disraeli.

Continued debate over proportional representation and Hare's electoral system from 1874 to 1884 is discussed in the fifth chapter which focuses on the opposition to both the minority clause and the cumulative vote as well as to the single transferable vote by the National Liberal Federation, or caucus, a party organization founded in Birmingham in 1877 and led by Chamberlain, who entered Parliament in 1876. Further writings and speeches by Hare and his supporters such as Leonard Courtney, a Liberal in Parliament as of 1876, and by his opponents such as Chamberlain and Bright are treated with reference to the principles of personal and virtual representation. Debate in Parliament following the general election in 1880 which resulted in the formation of a second ministry by Gladstone is examined with reference to consideration of further franchise reform, in which regard Courtney, Fawcett, and others who favoured proportional representation were joined by Sir John Lubbock, a Liberal in Parliament as of 1870, leading to the formation of the Proportional Representation Society in 1884.

The sixth chapter concerns the Proportional Representation Society from 1884 to 1888 with emphasis on the activities of Lubbock, Courtney, and Albert Grey, a Liberal in Parliament as of 1880, with the support of Hare, Morrison, and Fawcett. Writings by Hare as well as by Lubbock, Courtney, and others in support of the single transferable vote in multi-member constituencies and in opposition to virtual representation are discussed, as are attacks on proportional representation

by Chamberlain and other Liberals who advocated single-member constituencies and defended virtual representation. Opposition to proportional representation by Gladstone, also defending virtual representation, is treated with reference to the Liberal reform bill introduced in 1884 and the bill for redistribution of seats required by the Conservatives as a condition for the passage of the Third Reform Act. Support for single-member constituencies by Lord Salisbury, the leader of the Conservatives in the House of Lords following the death of Disraeli in 1881, is treated with reference to his negotiations with Gladstone, which resulted in their agreement on single-member constituencies and abolition of the minority clause. The parliamentary debate over the Liberal redistribution bill during which Lubbock with the support of Courtney moved an amendment for the single transferable vote in multi-member constituencies and the campaign for Hare's electoral system conducted by the Proportional Representation Society in 1885 are examined, followed by the passage of the Redistribution Act which precluded proportional representation and sustained virtual representation. The chapter concludes with an attempt by Lubbock and Courtney, again opposed by Chamberlain, to apply Hare's electoral system to local government during the Conservative ministry formed by Salisbury in 1886, the dissolution of the society in 1888, and the death of Hare in 1891.

Part I

This page intentionally left blank

1

The Life and Work of Thomas Hare, 1806–1891

‘I was at the graveside of my brother-in-law, that grand and great-hearted old man Thomas Hare’, wrote Edward White Benson, the Archbishop of Canterbury, in his diary on 9 May 1891 when Hare was buried at Hook in Surrey. ‘He was the sort of man who is getting scarce, most modern but most believing.’¹

Eighty-five years had passed since Thomas Hare had been born at Leigh in Dorset on 28 March 1806. Thus, as were many of his eminent Victorian contemporaries such as Benjamin Disraeli, William Gladstone, and John Stuart Mill, Hare was born during the reign of George III. Hanoverian Britain then was at war with Napoleonic France and was in the midst of economic and social transformation. Population was rapidly growing and cities were steadily expanding, although more workers continued to be employed in agriculture than in manufacture. The enclosure of open fields was proceeding for the extension of cultivation, threatening and radicalizing yeomen farmers, and the construction of textile factories was increasing for the mechanization of spinning if not of weaving, more hand-loom continuings in operation than power-loom. No railways yet linked the mills of Manchester to the docks of Liverpool or to London, the centre of commerce and finance as well as of administration and legislation for the nation and the empire. In the unreformed Parliament which assembled in London, the landed aristocracy remained dominant in the House of Commons as well as in the House of Lords. Likewise, the Anglican clergy maintained the authority of the Church of England which extended to monopoly of university education at Oxford and Cambridge and reinforced the power of the landed aristocracy. Such was the old order of Britain in 1806.² Benjamin Disraeli then was but two years of age, and William Gladstone was to be born not for

another three years. John Stuart Mill was to be born two months after Thomas Hare.

The origins and early years of Thomas Hare were more obscure than those of Disraeli, Gladstone, and Mill, unlike whom Hare was illegitimate. His father was a yeoman farmer named Thomas King, and his mother was named Anne Hare.³ In old age, as related by Katherine Esdaile, a niece who during her childhood lived in his home, Hare recalled his youth on the farm and 'retained many traces of his Dorset origin, not only in his speech...but also in his taste for such old-fashioned country dishes as black puddings, sucking pigs, and other such eighteenth-century delicacies'. He remembered, according to Esdaile, that in 1815, at the age of nine, he 'had cheered the coach hung with laurels which brought the news of Waterloo to Dorchester'.⁴ Nothing is known of his elementary education, but his subsequent endeavours suggest that at an early age he was intelligent and ambitious.

During the years after 1815, Hare left the farm in Dorset and made his way to London where he lived amid the Inns of Court and worked as a clerk in the office of a solicitor. Katherine Esdaile was told that 'after his long hours he would go out into Clare Market and buy himself two or three pennyworth of meat, cook it himself, and then set himself to the study of the Law'.⁵ He not only studied the law but also directed his attention to the issue of free trade in opposition to mercantile protection by the Navigation Acts. Originally directed against Holland in the seventeenth century, the Navigation Acts were commercial regulations restricting trade in British colonies to British or colonial ships and limiting enumerated British colonial goods to the British market. Frederick Robinson, a liberal Tory President of the Board of Trade from 1818 to 1823 in the Tory ministry of Lord Liverpool, Prime Minister as of 1812, introduced legislation to modify the Navigation Acts, a policy which was extended by his liberal Tory successor William Huskisson, reducing commercial restrictions while maintaining colonial preference and adopting reciprocity for European and American ships. This gradual but definite move towards a policy of free trade had Whig support, but it was attacked by high Tories and those in the British shipping industry who had an interest in continuing protection against foreign competition.⁶

Hare agreed with the policy of Huskisson, and at one time in Liverpool, for which city Huskisson was a member of Parliament as of 1823, he engaged in research in the library of the Athenaeum for the purpose of writing a defence of the modification of the Navigation Acts. His manuscript was brought to the attention of Huskisson, who encouraged its publication in Liverpool in 1827 as a pamphlet, *The Maritime*

*Policy of Great Britain, Or, An Inquiry into the Real Merits of the Late, and the Objections to the Present, Navigation System.*⁷ Therein Hare attacked the critics of free trade such as David Robinson, a high Tory economist who had denounced reciprocity in *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* in September 1826.⁸ Hare rejected their argument that regulations such as the Navigation Acts had been exclusively responsible for the commercial development of Britain. 'To ascribe it to any particular cause, or any particular routine of causes', he argued, 'is manifestly and irrationally wrong; yet this has been, and is, done: it is the favourite position of the advocates of the exploded system.'⁹ Such was a prejudice, he added, 'doomed to vanish before an enlightened and analytical investigation'.¹⁰ Likewise mistaken was the position that the naval power of Britain was dependent upon the Navigation Acts, which confused cause and effect, he claimed, commenting that 'it is about as reasonable to ascribe the victories of Nelson or Duncan, to the navigation laws, as it would be to attribute those of a Wellington or a Marlborough, to the legislative protections afforded to the woollen or cotton manufacture'.¹¹

It was, Hare suggested, 'unfortunate for those who argue that the maritime power of this country is owing to the restrictive navigation laws, that England should have been successful at sea before such laws were introduced', indicating that 'English ships begun to extend their voyages in the fourteenth century' whereas 'the principle of the late navigation laws was first introduced in 1381'.¹² Subsequent regulation had a negative impact on British commerce during the fifteenth century, he observed:

These circumstances operated at a particular and peculiarly interesting period; when commerce was diverging from the courses to which it had been confined for a series of centuries; and was diffusing itself over every part of Europe: when the interchange of goods was beginning to require an entrepôt where northern and southern commodities could be deposited, and from whence the largely-increasing demands of the rest of Europe could be supplied. This was the time chosen to restrain the trade of England, by raising an insuperable obstacle to any rapid expansion of import and export. The tide of commerce, thus shut out from hence, flowed to the Scheldt. Antwerp began to advance in commercial importance, at the same period that Hayluyt is lamenting the insignificant state of the English marine.¹³

'Although the effect of the restriction had been so remote from its object, and helped to depress what it was intended to foster and

encourage', he continued, 'other circumstances, in some degree, counteracted it. Manufactures increased; wealth multiplied; and trade gradually advanced.'¹⁴ Of particular significance was the building of the royal navy in the sixteenth century during the reign of Henry VIII, which Hare considered 'the first and greatest step towards maritime power, which the Government of England ever made'.¹⁵ Various circumstances in Britain and continental Europe other than maritime regulation further contributed to commercial development during the reign of Elizabeth I and in the seventeenth century, according to Hare. The Civil War, however, 'interfered and interrupted the progress of British industry, deranging all the relations of society, and suspending all peaceful occupation', resulting in the diversion of capital to Holland, which 'went to enrich, and give increased vigour to the commerce and resources of our rivals; who were not slow to avail themselves of the advantages which our situation presented, but seized with avidity on every branch of British trade, which the inattention to foreign affairs on the part of the divided authorities in this country permitted with impunity'.¹⁶ The consequence was the introduction of the Navigation Act of 1651, which further aggravated the adverse situation, he argued:

The regulations of 1651, doubtless, augmented the commercial shipping of England; they acted as an antidote to an evil that ought not to have been suffered to exist. The restraints, inconveniences, and oppressions, to which trade was subjected, had driven it, in a great measure, from our shores and our shipping; an additional restriction was therefore necessary to exclude foreign vessels, as far as possible, from that portion of trade which *could not* be alienated. Our commerce was thus bound up and delivered, as a sacrifice, not to the *real* interests of shipping, but to the rigid exaction of a *revenue*, by imposts on every foreign article, on the misconceived, short sighted, or obstinate adherence to early notions of national policy. It will not be said that the wisdom of legislation is evinced by an undeviating continuance in any particular system, but by devising the attainment of the greatest attainable good. The previously existing difficulties in the way of foreign trade were not diminished, but, on the contrary, increased, and the meed of applause must, in justice, be denied to the framers of this celebrated and much lauded system.¹⁷

'It is universally admitted', he added with reference to the American Revolution in opposition to mercantile regulations in the eighteenth century, 'that, as a free and divided people, the United States of America

have been of more commercial advantage to Great Britain than they ever could have been under the operation of the previous existing trade laws and exclusions'.¹⁸

Meanwhile, Hare emphasized, the removal of the regulations of guilds, charters, monopolies, and companies had been beneficial to the development of British commerce:

This state of commercial oppression was no sooner ameliorated than the commerce of the country rose, from its inherent buoyancy, to a triumphant eminence, and carried with it the means to maintain the rank to which it arrived. The British empire was extended far and wide. Territories lost in the west were more than regained, at least in extent, in the east. The sphere of British industry was enlarged; new channels for our manufactures appeared; and prosperity was diffused through every public interest. Is this to be attributed to the *navigation laws*? Surely not. Its source is to be found in the activity, the industry, the perseverance of the British people, – to the free institutions of the country, by which these qualities are encouraged and rewarded.¹⁹

'As eloquently expressed by Burke', Hare noted, quoting from the speech *On Conciliation with America* delivered by the Whig philosopher in Parliament in 1775, '“It is the spirit of the English constitution, which, infused through the mighty mass, pervades, feeds, unites, invigorates, vivifies, every part of the empire, even down to the minutest member.”'²⁰ Drawing on the reports of the Select Committees of the House of Commons on Foreign Trade from 1820 to 1822, Hare examined the consequences of the changes in regulations for fisheries, coasting trade, colonial trade, and European, American, African, and Asiatic trade, and concluded that 'all the changes adopted were not only justifiable, but indispensable, and that there is no foundation on which to charge the Government with inattention to the public welfare as concerned in the “shipping interest”'.²¹

The Maritime Policy of Great Britain reflected the influence of Whigs rather than of radicals, although Hare made no reference to the defence of free trade by the Whig philosopher Adam Smith in *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations* in 1776. Smith had considered the Navigation Acts to be justified for defence but not for commerce,²² however, and likewise Hare was in agreement with Smith that free trade was in conformity with natural law, as he indicated in *The Maritime Policy of Great Britain*: 'It is impossible to consider the commercial revolutions that have taken place in modern times without feeling how

insignificant are all internal or international regulations, when adverse to the laws of nature: – laws which are not, indeed, within the puny grasp of human legislators.²³ Hare was in agreement with Smith also in that he was an empiricist, as he emphasized in *The Maritime Policy of Great Britain*: ‘Evidence must be founded on observation or experiment, and to the degree that observation or experiment includes all the points and circumstances comprehended in a question, and gives to each its due weight, – is the evidence bearing on the question more or less perfect.’²⁴

The radical economist David Ricardo likewise had defended free trade in *On the Principles of Political Economy and Taxation* in 1817 but unlike Smith had been a rationalist rather than an empiricist.²⁵ So had been James Mill, the radical disciple of the utilitarian philosopher Jeremy Bentham, who had urged Ricardo to write his work on political economy. In his *Essay on Government* in 1820, a reply to an attack by the Whig philosopher Sir James Mackintosh in the *Edinburgh Review* in 1818 on the defence of universal suffrage by Bentham in his *Plan of Parliamentary Reform, in the Form of a Catechism* in 1817,²⁶ Mill had argued that a system of government and a programme of reform could be deduced from abstract principles of human nature.²⁷ In opposition to Mill, the Whig essayist Thomas Babington Macaulay was to reply in the *Edinburgh Review* in 1829 that a system of government and a programme of reform should be induced from concrete examples of human experience.²⁸ Such empiricism was the methodology employed by Hare in his defence of the liberal Tory economic policy of Huskisson in *The Maritime Policy of Great Britain* in 1827.

In the same year in which Hare wrote *The Maritime Policy of Great Britain*, Liverpool suffered a stroke and was replaced as Prime Minister by the liberal Tory Foreign Secretary George Canning, a political ally of Huskisson. Canning died within months, however, and in a brief Tory ministry formed by Frederick Robinson as Viscount Goderich, Huskisson moved from the office of President of the Board of Trade to that of Secretary of State for War and the Colonies, but he resigned shortly after the high Tory Duke of Wellington became Prime Minister in January 1828. Hare, admitted to the Inner Temple in November 1828,²⁹ wrote to Huskisson in January 1830 a long letter intended for publication in which he returned to the issue of free trade and attacked the East India Company.³⁰ Incorporated by charter under Elizabeth I in 1600, the company had lost its trade in the East Indies to the Dutch East India Company in 1623, and during the seventeenth century it had exported textiles from India. As the Mughal Empire fell during the

eighteenth century, the company rose to dominance in India, establishing its supremacy by force of arms with the defeat of the French East India Company and consolidating its control of Bengal in 1765. As the company grew, however, it fell into debt and was accused of corruption, and by legislation in 1778, 1784, and 1793 Parliament introduced a system of dual control whereby the authority of its directors was subordinated to a Board of Control appointed by the government. When its charter was renewed in 1813, the company lost its monopoly of trade in India but not of its trade in China. Its charter was due to be renewed again in 1833, after which its monopoly of the China trade was to be ended in 1834.³¹

In his letter to Huskisson in 1830, Hare likened the East India Company to 'an overgrown plant' which was 'noxious to the surrounding verdure' and suggested that 'whatever obstacles may oppose the total abolition of the present incorporated India Company, they are much less formidable than the other difficulties which stand in the way of its entire, or even partial continuance'.³² Removing restrictions on trade with China as well as with India, he predicted, would result 'in increasing the exportations from these countries, and consequently the importations therefrom, thereby greatly diminishing the sale price of tea and other articles, and augmenting their consumption, from which a considerable addition to the revenue may be reasonably expected', contributing to 'some improvement in the aggregate amount of the public income'.³³ He emphasized that there were other considerations of equal if not greater significance, however, such as the 'effectual administration of justice which has so large a share in the internal polity of every civilized nation', in which regard he contended that 'the Company's government in India is lamentably deficient. The number and constitution of the courts and judges which are distributed throughout that country, as compared with the number and character of the people, is of itself enough to demonstrate the utter insufficiency of the judicial system'.³⁴ With regard to 'the improvement of the people', he continued, 'the government of the East India Company is repugnant, for the direct effect of such improvement must be to qualify the natives of India for responsible offices, and at the same time, to awake them to a just resentment for their exclusion'. Such exclusion he considered to be 'tyrannical', observing that 'after so prolonged a struggle to eradicate it from our domestic policy, it is proper to look with great suspicion on every argument urged to justify its continuance in more distant British dominions'.³⁵ The interests of the East India Company were 'adverse to that melioration of character which is the foundation of happiness and

prosperity in a people', he asserted. 'The duty of Great Britain is therefore to extend the means of instruction and improvement to the natives of India, in order to inspire them with that moral elevation which is the highest qualification for public functions, and by means of which the people of the former country may be relieved from the fear of ministerial influence, not unreasonably entertained.'³⁶

Accordingly, Hare advocated abolition of the system of dual control and unification of the directors of the East India Company and the Board of Control, such a unified India Board to have responsibility for 'all those duties and powers at present entrusted to its two constituent parts separately' and to have 'power of appointment to all offices in India'.³⁷ Europeans could be appointed to such offices, he suggested, as should be the natives of India. Referring to 'the testimony of eminent men that the people of India are highly capable of improvement', he claimed 'we are therefore justified in entertaining a hope that as knowledge and intellectual and moral improvements advance in that country the place of the India Board may be supplied by legislative councils at the respective seats of government, and who may possess modified powers, and be composed of the chief Europeans and most distinguished natives in conjunction'.³⁸ Such 'introduction of the natives to responsible civil authority and to the functions connected with the administration of internal government, must have the effect of promoting the diffusion of those civil virtues, on which all our hopes of their improvement are necessarily founded'.³⁹ 'To rule these territories through the medium of a company of merchants is to promulgate to the world that our institutions are too weak to sustain the weight which time has imposed upon them', he concluded. 'Another system of policy and of government is demanded: – one that is more consistent with the prosperity of commerce, the welfare of the people, and the dignity of the crown.'⁴⁰

This attack on the East India Company by Hare was consistent with his defence of free trade in *The Maritime Policy of Great Britain*, but his views were in opposition to those of James Mill, who had been employed by the East India Company as assistant examiner in 1819 and was appointed as chief examiner in 1830. In his *The History of British India* published in three volumes in 1817, Mill had denigrated Hindu society and culture as primitive and inferior and had proposed subordination of the native population to utilitarian law and administration.⁴¹ This radical rather than Whig means of reform was rejected by Hare, who in his letter to Huskisson in 1830 emphasized recognition of civic virtue and participation of the native population in the governance of

India. His letter was not published, however, and what hope Hare may have entertained of employment by Huskisson was dashed in September 1830 when Huskisson was killed in an accident at the opening of the Liverpool and Manchester railway.⁴²

After the death of Huskisson, Hare intended to become a barrister, an increasingly significant route to professional status in the early nineteenth century,⁴³ and he was called to the bar in November 1833.⁴⁴ Between 1833 and 1841, during which period Victoria succeeded to the throne in 1837, Hare practiced in the Court of Chancery which, under the jurisdiction of the Lord Chancellor and Vice-Chancellors, applied the principle of equity to the execution of common law in cases such as those of trusts and estates.⁴⁵ As a Chancery lawyer, Hare wrote *A Treatise on the Discovery of Evidence by Bill and Answer in Equity*, which was published in London in 1836 and was praised by James Wigram, a Chancery lawyer and bencher of Lincoln's Inn, in his *Points in the Law of Discovery* which also was published in 1836.⁴⁶ From 1841, when Wigram became a Vice-Chancellor, to 1853, Hare reported in the courts of Wigram and Vice-Chancellors George James Turner and William Page Wood. Meanwhile, in collaboration with Henry Iltid Nicholl and John Monson Carrow, Hare edited two volumes of *Cases Relating to Railways and Canals Argued and Adjudged in the Courts of Law and Equity* which were published in 1840 and 1843, reflecting the transportation revolution, some 6000 miles of railways being opened in Britain between 1830 and 1850. Between 1843 and 1858, eleven volumes by Hare of *Reports of Cases Adjudged in the High Court of Chancery* were published and gained an authoritative reputation among equity lawyers.⁴⁷

When in 1853 the Charity Commission was created by the Charitable Trusts Act, establishing a board of commissioners under the jurisdiction of the Court of Chancery for the purpose of inquiring into the administration of endowed charities,⁴⁸ Hare quit the bar and took a post as a charity inspector,⁴⁹ his occupation for some 20 years thereafter. In 1872, in which year he became a bencher of the Inner Temple, he was appointed as an assistant charity commissioner with a seat on the board, and he remained in that position until he retired in 1887.⁵⁰ As a charity inspector, Hare submitted to the board of commissioners numerous extensive reports. Those from the 1850s to the 1870s on the parochial charities of the City of London provided a foundation for the work of the Royal City Parochial Charities Commission chaired by the Duke of Northumberland which reported in 1880 and led to the Parochial Charities Act of 1883,⁵¹ and those in the 1860s on the charities administered by the twelve 'Great Companies' provided a foundation for the

work of the Royal Commission on the City of London Livery Companies chaired by Lord Derby before which Hare gave evidence in 1882 and which reported in 1884.⁵² According to David Owen, Hare was 'a marvelously capable and acute investigator' who 'combined the qualifications of sound legal training, industry, and judgment with a much rarer speculative gift. He could dig out and arrange the facts on a group of charities as ably as any other investigator, but that was never the end. . . . Unlike others whose profession is inquiry, Hare did not hesitate to criticize and generalize.'⁵³ Owen observes that 'in his imaginative outlook and his understanding of the worth of private philanthropy in an increasingly complex and democratic society, Hare was an exceedingly persuasive advocate of a more flexible charity policy'.⁵⁴

During the 1850s, Hare undertook a campaign for the reform of endowed charities. He often encountered resistance to his suggestions for the improvement of the application of endowments, in particular for the purpose of the education of the poor, such improvement in many cases necessitating the diversion of endowments from their original purposes. This was the case in 1855, when he drafted a scheme for the reform of charities in the city and parishes of Salisbury, as he later explained, 'for combining and appropriating them to what appeared to me better objects, and those chiefly educational'.⁵⁵ His scheme 'met with objections from several of the parochial clergy and others', he added, being 'described even as an improper and unjust diversion of funds from purposes to which the founders had dedicated them'.⁵⁶

In a public letter to the Mayor of Salisbury in 1856, in which he quoted from *The Christian and Civic Economy of Large Towns* published in three volumes between 1819 and 1826 by Thomas Chalmers, a Church of Scotland minister and reformer who had combined evangelicalism and political economy,⁵⁷ and from the utilitarian *Principles of Political Economy with Some of Their Applications to Social Philosophy* published in two volumes in 1848 by John Stuart Mill,⁵⁸ Hare wrote in defence of a revision of his scheme that whereas certain charities in Salisbury were 'applied to a considerable extent in aid of the rates, and therefore for the benefit of the rich rather than of the poor', his scheme would 'apply them in future in the education of the children of the poor and in preparing them for a career in life above the state of pauperism into which their parents have fallen'.⁵⁹ 'The result of the facts I have been able to gather is', he observed, 'that notwithstanding all the charities, the great mass of the poor in Salisbury are not in a better condition either physically or morally, than in other places where the endowed charities, if any such exist, are insignificant in amount'.⁶⁰ He argued

that 'if the poor are to be raised from this condition of misery, it must be by the application of some remedy which shall not feed but cure the political or social disease from which they suffer'.⁶¹ It was necessary to 'distinguish alms from charity', he insisted, 'that which consists in merely following the directions of deceased persons with respect to property of which the State has permitted them after their deaths to regulate the disposition, from that which is really charity or the fruit of a sacrifice made by one for the good of another'.⁶² He asserted:

Reason and experience teach that the more we multiply standing and permanent foundations for supplying the poor with the ordinary necessities of life, without that labour which is the lot of man, the more we relax exertion and perpetuate indigence and its attendant evils; and, on the other hand, that the more we leave the supply of such necessities to the operations of industry, and apply our permanent endowments for purposes which cannot have corrupting tendencies, such for example as those which fit the poor man better for the duties and rational enjoyments of life, and encourage and enable him to improve his condition, so much the more are we likely to raise him in the scale of being and promote his truer welfare and happiness.⁶³

Drawing attention to an account of continental technical education by the chemist Lyon Playfair published in 1852,⁶⁴ Hare proposed a scheme of education whereby charities would contribute to the funding of schools for the poor, the effect of which would be, he explained,

that at least the number of fifty boys, the most acute and intelligent of the children of the poor, of the ages of twelve and upwards, shall be constantly under instruction of a much higher kind than that which is commonly given in any elementary school, – instruction enabling them ultimately to enter on employments as assistants to engineers, builders, architects, machinists, artificers on railways, and public works, or in manufactories and workshops of all kinds, – with a degree of preparation and a knowledge of the principles of science which will not only render it easy for them to obtain engagements, but will also most materially facilitate their progress towards the position and advantages of artificers. It is not in the city of Salisbury alone that there are grounds for hoping that schools of this kind may be established. Institutions of a like nature connected with each other will, there is little doubt, arise in

other parts of England, all of which may be associated with some metropolitan institution, which may again be in communication with the conductors of public and private works in all parts of the world.⁶⁵

His scheme, he argued, not only would satisfy 'the intention of the founders of the charities, which was to better the condition of the poor' but also would relieve 'the anxiety of the middle classes to avail themselves of all thoroughly valuable educational establishments, when they are brought within a reasonable cost', meanwhile further serving the interests of the city as 'weekly or quarterly boarders from the surrounding country may become a source of profit for many families in Salisbury'.⁶⁶ The presence of children of the middle classes, he added, might 'inspire the poor with an emulation which will tend to relieve the classes immediately above them of an oppressive burden by attacking pauperism at its source'.⁶⁷ The method of selection of the trustees of charities was also a concern, Hare indicated, for

even if it were certain that no political bias would ever interpose, the very ragged to political impartiality is most likely to lead to the selection of trustees not because they are persons in all respects best suited for the office, but because they fairly balance and represent the political parties into which a borough may happen to be divided. A member of the body who knows that he has been elected on party considerations or as the representative of certain opinions may not unnaturally think himself bound to attend to party considerations or claims in the distribution of the charities, and this there is every reason to fear is frequently the case. . . . The possession of the qualities of sound judgment, enlightened intelligence, adequate leisure and active benevolence should be the ground of the appointment, and the question of whether their possessor be a Whig, Tory, or Radical is a foreign and disturbing element in the consideration.⁶⁸

Although charities would be combined by his scheme, the trustees would be selected at the local level, he emphasized, for 'the inhabitants of Salisbury must be the most capable of judging of the merits of their own townsmen, and therefore the appointment should be made by them. I can see no necessity for resorting to any central or other authority; in fact, the proposal . . . is the reverse of centralization.'⁶⁹

Hare observed that parliamentary legislation was necessary for the implementation of his scheme, but he was not optimistic about the

prospect, he indicated, for 'Parliament can only be expected to act at the instance of and upon arguments addressed to it by a minister or public functionary', and given the diversity of the various charities and the extent of the vested interests, 'however future generations may do justice to the statesman who shall direct his labours to this subject, he will probably gain little or no present popularity'.⁷⁰ 'The adversaries of a better system of administering charitable trusts take comfort at the difficulties which stand in its way', he complained, but he concluded that 'it may be hoped that any who desire to see such improvement will not relax their exertions, or be wholly discouraged in their endeavours to obtain it, although it has nothing but reason and the public good in its favour'.⁷¹

In the following year, at a conference on the education of the children of the working class held in London in June 1857, presided over by Prince Albert, Hare proposed that endowed charities for the apprenticeship of children be reformed to make funds available for their education in schools. During the previous 50 years there had been changes 'in the state of society, and in the manner of life of the trading classes', he indicated. 'The apprentice in most trades was formerly taken into his master's house, and became a member of the family', but 'this custom has almost ceased to exist', narrowing 'the range of choice of employment' and placing the apprentice 'in such a situation as will enable him to live with his parents or relations'. Consequently, he observed, the apprentice was 'under the control of the master only during the hours of employment, and too often partially liberated from that of his parents', circumstances in which he was 'apt to abuse the freedom, and misemploy the leisure which he has not learnt how to use'.⁷² Further, he found 'in many trades, and with the most respectable masters, that a tolerably instructed boy will be taken and immediately employed at wages, when no premium will be accepted, and that a boy who has had less elementary teaching will not be taken on any terms'.⁷³ 'In the agricultural parishes especially, there is an extremely narrow range of trades', he commented: 'Little security exists that the boy shall be taught his trade. In great numbers of cases the business is given up; the master and apprentice separate, or the boy runs away, and no efforts are made to compel him to serve out his term of apprenticeship, and for any useful purpose to the child the premium is lost.'⁷⁴ He added that he entertained 'personally strong opinions' on 'the right of the state to modify the uses of its charitable endowments',⁷⁵ and in his conclusion he referred the members of the conference to the reform of charities proposed in his letter to the Mayor of Salisbury.⁷⁶

In October 1857, Hare went to Birmingham for the inaugural congress of the British National Association for the Promotion of Social Science, also known as the Social Science Association. Modelled on the British Association for the Advancement of Science, which had been founded in 1831, the Social Science Association held annual week-long congresses and special meetings in various cities throughout Britain from 1857 to 1886, providing a national forum for public discussion of social issues and publishing the papers read thereat in annual volumes of *Transactions* and *Sessional Proceedings*. Most of the members of the Social Science Association were also associated with the Liberal party founded in 1859, and many were members of Parliament.⁷⁷

At the congress in Birmingham in 1857, Hare read a paper, 'On the Application of Endowed Charities in the Improvement of the Education and Condition of the Poor', in which he commented on 'selected examples of endowments metropolitan, provincial, and rural, which exist, and have either been productive of evil or are barren of good, and yet which stand in the face of great social wants and miseries, which they might contribute to supply or ameliorate'.⁷⁸ He attacked the *cy près* doctrine of strictly adhering to the original intention of the founder of a charity as 'wholly delusive as a principle of jurisprudence, and without any value as a principle of social economy', advocating that 'as a judicial principle' it be 'authoritatively abolished'.⁷⁹ He argued:

In order to ascertain the method of rendering these charities the most useful, we stand in need not of technical rules such as those of the *cy près* doctrine which the Court of Chancery professes to observe, but of principles which can only be elicited after profound and careful examination, and which this society may perhaps succeed in eliciting. They can only be the result of slow and cautious experiment.⁸⁰

He argued further that 'the very excellence of our political institutions for their chief purpose, the protection of individual rights' was an obstacle to 'placing the community, and especially the poor, in possession of the advantages which these charitable endowments might afford', observing that 'the just, but necessarily narrow, principles which govern private rights are often inapplicable to communities the conditions of which are constantly undergoing change'.⁸¹ Those 'alarmed' at 'centralization', he commented, would do well to 'consider the nature of the objection, and where the danger in each case truly lies'.⁸² Such

reform was a political concern, Hare emphasized. For there to be ‘any improvement in the law on this subject’, he indicated, it was necessary for Parliament to give to it ‘more deliberate consideration than it has hitherto done’.⁸³ That Parliament did not devote sufficient attention to the subject was in his opinion a demonstration of the necessity for the reform of political representation.⁸⁴

Meanwhile, following the general election in April 1857 in which the supporters of the Whig ministry of Viscount Palmerston had increased their majority in the House of Commons, Hare had written a pamphlet, *The Machinery of Representation*, published shortly thereafter, in which he had criticized the election results and had proposed the reform of political representation by adoption of an alternative electoral system of the single transferable vote for provision of personal representation. During the following year, he further developed his proposed reform at greater length in a book, *A Treatise on the Election of Representatives, Parliamentary and Municipal*, which was published in January 1859.⁸⁵ In so doing, Hare initiated a campaign for proportional representation which he conducted from the 1860s to the 1880s within the context of the debates over the extension of the parliamentary franchise to the urban working class by the Second Reform Act in 1867 and to the rural working class by the Third Reform Act in 1884.⁸⁶

Hare continued to address the issue of the reform of endowed charities as well as the issue of the reform of political representation during the 1860s and 1870s. During these years, he continued to participate in the deliberations of the Social Science Association, serving as a member of the executive committee,⁸⁷ and membership of the Athenaeum in London placed him in contact with leading men of letters.⁸⁸ In 1865, he was elected a member of the Political Economy Club at a meeting attended by William Gladstone,⁸⁹ and in 1870 when the Radical Club was founded by Liberal members of Parliament and the intelligentsia such as John Stuart Mill, Hare was elected a member at the first meeting.⁹⁰ Meanwhile, further editions of his *Treatise* were published in 1861, 1865, and 1873, and while a member of the London committee of the London National Society for Women’s Suffrage,⁹¹ from 1868 to 1874 he was the President of the Representative Reform Association founded to propagate his proposed reform of political representation.⁹²

That the reform of political representation was related to the reform of endowed charities was emphasized by Hare when he gave evidence before the Commission on Popular Education chaired by the Duke of Newcastle in April 1860.⁹³ An obstacle to the reform of endowed

charities for the purpose of the provision of popular education, Hare indicated in his evidence, was the 'present state of political institutions. You would never get the authority of Parliament to enable it to be done'.⁹⁴ He observed that 'if a bill is brought in, it must be brought in by the Government', and when asked by Newcastle if 'in matters possessing but little general public interest, local interests prevail, and either prevents the introduction of a bill for effecting those schemes or defeat the bill if introduced', Hare replied 'certainly'.⁹⁵

When the Law Amendment Society, founded in 1844 and absorbed by the Social Science Association in 1863,⁹⁶ appointed a committee to inquire into the functioning of the charitable trusts in 1861, Hare was a member of the committee and wrote the report which reflected his views.⁹⁷ One of the recommendations in the report was that 'the purposes and administration of all charitable trusts should be liable to revision, and to a dedication to new charitable objects at the end of a definite period', suggesting a period of 30 years.⁹⁸ Another of the recommendations was 'to transfer the present powers of the Charity Commission to a Committee of the Privy Council, and confer upon it such powers as shall be necessary for the proper government and periodical supervision of charities...as the exigencies of society may require'.⁹⁹ 'Such a Committee', Hare wrote, 'may be expected to take a larger view of the general as well as the particular interest concerned', giving to a charity 'such a new direction as shall appear most for the general good'.¹⁰⁰

Hare reiterated his views at the congress of the Social Science Association held in London in June 1862 when he read a paper, 'The Laws Controlling or Regulating the Perpetual Dedication of Property for Public or Charitable Purposes', incorporating quotations from John Stuart Mill's two-volume *A System of Logic* published in 1843 and from the third volume of Edward Gibbon's *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* published in 1781, both with regard to a need to elevate human character. 'A revision of charitable objects, from time to time, according to the opinions and wants of society, is not a novel principle', Hare argued, referring to the suppression of religious houses for the foundations of All Souls College in Oxford in the fifteenth century and St John's College in Cambridge in the sixteenth century, among others, 'not to speak of the houses suppressed some years later by Wolsey'.¹⁰¹ Hare had 'no respect' for the Mortmain Act of 1736 which restricted devises of land to charitable trusts, however, commenting that it was from 'almost before the dawn of that economic science which

has disclosed the several functions and operation of the selfish and sympathetic principles in the order of Divine Providence...when the political world had neither the deep sense of personal and national duty which animated the age of Hooker, nor the calm and philosophical appreciation of results taught by Adam Smith'.¹⁰² 'The law of England, as it present stands', he concluded, 'is inconsistent and incongruous, and a reproach to the jurisprudence of an enlightened nation'.¹⁰³

At the Social Science Association congress held in Edinburgh in October 1863, in which year a proposal by William Gladstone as the Chancellor of the Exchequer in the Liberal ministry of Palmerston for the taxation of endowed charities had been defeated in the House of Commons in May,¹⁰⁴ Hare read a paper, 'The Injustice and Impolicy of Exempting the Income of Property, on the Ground of Its Charitable or Meritorious Employment, from the Taxation to Which Other Like Property is Subject'. Charities had been exempted when the income tax had been introduced from 1799 to 1816 and reintroduced in 1842. Then, Hare observed, 'the annual grants for the education of the poor were still insignificant compared to what they now are', whereas 'we have now arrived at a more accurate knowledge of the extent of these estates, of their rapidly increasing value, and of the place which they really fill in the true educational and eleemosynary institutions of the empire'.¹⁰⁵ Therefore, he indicated: 'With the statistics now at its disposal, it is not possible that Parliament in the conscientious performance of its duties, as the guardian of the public from unnecessary and improper taxation, can escape the deliberate consideration of this important subject'.¹⁰⁶ The exemption of charities from taxation, which involved 'taking money compulsorily from the people at large',¹⁰⁷ was 'impolitic and unjust', he argued:

It is the constitutional policy of the country that the expenditure of the public money, the produce of general taxation, shall be under the control of Parliament. But here we have a vast and constantly increasing sum annually withdrawn from the public purse, not only without the control of Parliament, but without any revision of control whatever, and governed by the arbitrary will of an indefinite number of private persons. Except to a comparatively small extent, it is applied to objects which may have been useful in past generations, but are not those to which the voluntary bounty of the present day chiefly directs itself.¹⁰⁸

Hare was likewise critical in his report on Christ's Hospital in the City of London submitted to the board of the Charity Commission in 1864, in which he commented:

An inquiry made by a Department of the State into the results of this great endowment cannot, it appears to me, be properly confined to the mere consideration of the amount of benefit which it confers upon any individual or special objects, but should also endeavour to ascertain whether it be to any and what extent beneficial to the nation at large. It is the recognized duty or policy of the State to provide means for the education of the destitute classes, and to assist, and to some extent, as in factories, enforce, that of the children of the poor. . . . The object of the State is to dispel that ignorance which it justly regards, not only as a public evil but as a public danger.¹⁰⁹

He claimed that Christ's Hospital, which had been founded by Edward VI in 1552, 'has long ceased in any degree to supply this public exigency',¹¹⁰ and he concluded:

Whether the estates of Christ's Hospital shall be administered for the benefit of a small number of favoured persons, or for the poorest classes and the common weal, is a question which the Governors themselves cannot authoritatively determine, which cannot be decided by any Court of Justice having jurisdiction over trusts, or by the opinion or recommendation of any executive department. It must depend upon the action of the legislature, prompted by the public judgment and conscience.¹¹¹

Two years later, in evidence given before the Schools Inquiry Commission chaired by Lord Taunton in February 1866,¹¹² Hare expressed his opinion with reference to endowed schools 'that our present mode of dealing with them is very imperfect and very inefficient',¹¹³ and he further attacked the *cy près* doctrine as 'really perfectly arbitrary and unmeaning'.¹¹⁴ He repeated his criticism of Christ's Hospital, claiming that its funds had been diverted from the education of the 'destitute classes' for which they were intended to the education of the 'middle classes',¹¹⁵ and in conclusion he remarked that 'as far as concerns charity, power is given to every age to do its own duties, and it is better that it should itself do them. There is, however, scope enough for the employment of the present endowments to bring up the long arrears of neglect.'¹¹⁶

Later in the same year at the Social Science Association congress held in Manchester in October 1866, Hare read a paper, 'What Conditions or Limitations Ought to be Imposed upon the Power of Disposing in Perpetuity of Property, Real or Personal, for Charitable or Other Purposes?', reiterating his opposition to the *cy près* doctrine and advocating that the state have the power 'to change and modify the disposition of all endowments at the end of a certain period after their foundation' in the interest of the 'public welfare'.¹¹⁷ His principle was, he explained, that 'every man, woman, and child in the kingdom is, in relation to the state, entitled to an equal share of its production and its benefits; and in the framing of impartial laws, must be regarded with equal respect and tenderness',¹¹⁸ adding:

I look upon it as radically unjust in the state to set aside or reserve a part of the permanent wealth of the country to the special benefit and maintenance of particular classes, or the objects of special patronage and favour, with the purpose of giving them an advantage over others less happily situated or connected. Private property and private beneficence may be bestowed according to the prejudices and partialities of the giver; but the state has no prejudices or partialities. The inequalities of hereditary fortune, the varieties of natural endowment of mind and body, the more or less perfect education and culture by parents and teachers, create infinite diversities in the condition of mankind. The great multitude of every people must begin and pursue the race and toils of life with slender powers and resources, and must accept its more painful labours and lower rewards. But it seems to me cruel for the state to permit the establishment and maintenance of permanent endowments, that increase the pressure with which fortune, and nature, and accident, bear upon the masses of the people, aggravating their difficulties by diminishing their chances of emerging from them, in the degree in which exceptional advantages are given to the favoured classes.¹¹⁹

In the following year, in 'Charitable Endowments in Their Relation to the State and to Public Taxation' in the *Fortnightly Review* in August 1867, Hare argued that there was 'little hope of any legislation really useful on the subject of charitable endowments, unless the national conscience can be awakened, and a healthy sense of public duty aroused'.¹²⁰ Two years later, he further emphasized the public responsibility of endowed charities and the need for action by the state in 'Public and Private Property Considered as to Its Legal Conditions' in two parts in the *Fortnightly*

Review in March and June 1869, arguing that 'new social combinations and difficulties, and new necessities of rule and organisation, are constantly arising, for which it is the business of those who watch over the public welfare – if there be any authority charged with that duty – to provide'.¹²¹ Such was the duty of the legislature rather than the judiciary, he claimed, referring to an observation by the jurist Sir Henry Maine in his *Ancient Law: Its Connection with the Early History of Society and Its Relation to Modern Ideas* in 1861 that 'the causes of change in the laws of property are to be explained by the history of jurisprudence, and not by its philosophy; and that in progressive societies "social necessities and social opinion are always more or less in advance of law"'.¹²² Hare complained that

it is a grave reproach to a government and legislature, possessing all that accurate information which statistics on every subject afford, with their eyes open to the lamentable condition of vast masses of the population, that session after session should be allowed to pass, not only without making, but without any substantial step or effort towards making, the vast public property of the kingdom applicable to the improvement of the condition of its necessitous classes, and that it should all be left in its present chaotic condition, to be dealt with in innumerable fragments, by the trifling and futile proceedings of separate suits, in the absence of any rational principle of appropriation, or any principle which even pretends to regard as its first and main object the true and only central idea of all endowments, the public good.¹²³

'The right and power of the state to resume and alter the destination of all public property, whoever may be its administrators', he added, 'carries with it the duty of exercising this power when the public welfare demands it'.¹²⁴ Quoting Edmund Burke in his *Reflections on the Revolution in France* in 1790 that 'endowments are the products of enthusiasm; they are the instruments of wisdom', Hare argued that 'there can be no endowment which may not be made to contribute, directly or indirectly, to the moral or physical amelioration of the condition of the people'.¹²⁵

Later in the same year at the congress of the Social Science Association held in Bristol in October 1869, Hare read a paper, 'What Limits Ought to be Placed by Law to Charitable Endowments?', which David Owen considers to have been 'an impressive and prophetic statement of the role of charitable trusts in social advance'.¹²⁶ With reference to discussion of the reform of the endowments of charities by charity

commissioner Arthur Hobhouse, Robert Lowe, the Chancellor of the Exchequer in the Liberal ministry of William Gladstone, and John Stuart Mill, Hare observed that 'there seems to be a general concurrence of nearly all who have considered the subject, that whatever their value or utility at the time of their creation, the watchful eye of some independent authority is always necessary to prevent their mischief and abuse'.¹²⁷ Indicating that the congress itself was 'a proof that to arrive at something like a science of the causes of the miseries and evils that modern civilization appears either to bring with it or to fail in removing, is not regarded as desperate or hopeless',¹²⁸ he suggested that the Endowed Schools Act of that year, which under the Gladstone ministry in response to the Taunton Schools Inquiry Commission created a commission responsible for the reform of endowed schools, 'hampered though it may be by restrictions on its operations, we may yet hope is an important initiative of a rational system'.¹²⁹

In the *Fortnightly Review* in March 1870, in which year the Education Act under the Gladstone ministry established universal elementary education in England and Wales and introduced elected school boards with taxation authority for the provision of schools where necessary,¹³⁰ Hare further discussed the relationship between public and private property in 'Estates of Endowments as Instruments of Industrial and Political Education, Co-operative Labour, and Economical Improvement'. 'It does not seem to have occurred to any one that in dealing with public estates, such as endowments, whatever the purposes may be for which the net produce is designed', he claimed, 'the method of deriving that produce should be so regulated by the State as to be made of the greatest possible benefit to the greatest number of people'.¹³¹ For the purposes of 'qualifying the people for the work and the duties which new conditions of society impose upon them, or for leading to a reconciliation of the interests of those who hold in their hands the accumulations of the past, and of those to whose labour must be owing the productions of the future', he advocated 'the creation of co-operative associations and industrial partnerships, that give the labourer a direct and perceptible interest in the result of his work'.¹³² Public property was available for these purposes, he argued, but the state should provide the public with 'knowledge of the estates and property which it possesses, where they are to be found, and their value and capacity of improvement, together with access to such estates, in the opportunity of competing on fair terms for their occupation'.¹³³ Such would provide a useful subject of study in schools, he suggested: 'We have here a method of technical education of incalculable value, increasing

the practical knowledge, cultivating the taste, and raising the aspirations of the youthful labourer.¹³⁴ 'Such an education will prepare the way for the establishment of co-operative associations for every kind of productive work', he concluded: 'To be leaders and pioneers in such a movement in the great work of the world is an ambition worthy of the *elite* of our working men; and if the opportunity for such a career be offered, there is no reason to doubt that in every class such men will be found.'¹³⁵ He reiterated his argument in a paper, 'On the Study of the Condition and Capacity of the Lands of Endowments and Other Public Estates, as Means of Teaching History, Topography, and Political and Social Economy, and of Introducing Technical Instruction', which he read at the Social Science Association congress held in Newcastle in September 1870.¹³⁶

Meanwhile the views of Hare in this regard led him to participate in the co-operative movement led by Christian Socialists such as J.M. Ludlow and Edward Vansittart Neale, and Hare was a member of the arrangement committee of the first Co-operative Congress held in London in June 1869,¹³⁷ at which he read a paper, 'The Claims of Co-operative Societies to the Use of Public Land for Agricultural and Building Purposes'. 'It is not too much to say that there are hundreds of thousands of acres of land adapted to Co-operative farming', he observed, 'which would open an entirely new sphere to agricultural labourers, if they were afforded a fair chance of occupying it on the same terms on which it is now let to capitalists',¹³⁸ and he suggested: 'It seems obvious that nothing is more important to the progress of Co-operative labour, than obtaining for it an equal right of competition for the occupation, both for building and agricultural purposes, of all the lands in the kingdom dedicated to public uses.'¹³⁹

Subsequently, Hare became a member of the Land Tenure Reform Association founded by John Stuart Mill in 1871 with the objectives of the abolition of 'remains of feudality' such as primogeniture and the provision of public land for co-operative agriculture.¹⁴⁰ Addressing these issues, Hare read a paper, 'On Lands Held by Corporations, and on the Policy Either of Their Alienation or of Providing for Their Management with Regard to Public Utility', at a meeting of the Social Science Association held in London in January 1873 in which he commented, with reference to land laws such as the Mortmain Act, 'It must be clearly seen that they have been produced and governed by considerations entirely political or social, and in no respect economical. In their political aspects they have always taken the shape which expressed the

sentiments of the governing classes.¹⁴¹ Political considerations continued to be significant, he claimed, as were protected local vested interests. With reference to 'the mass of the people', he observed, 'so little is known in most parishes or districts, except by the actual holders, of the terms on which the land in and around them is held, that there is scarcely any opportunity for competition, and no encouragement for association or for co-operative effort', for which reason he advocated the establishment of 'some means of knowing what lands in their neighbourhood they can have any chance of renting. . . . The district agent, or overseer, might be an officer of the local government, avoiding thus all objection of centralization, and he would act under the eye of the institutions to which he is accountable, as well as of the public.'¹⁴²

Related to the issues of the reform of endowed charities and land tenure reform were the issues of the reform of urban housing and local government reform which Hare addressed during the 1860s and 1870s. Unlike when Hare was born, Britain during these years was more urban than rural, more workers being employed in manufacture than in agriculture. In central London, the population had doubled between the 1820s and the 1850s, but had not been accommodated by corresponding construction of housing for the working class. Rather, housing was demolished to make land available for the construction of railways, docks, and buildings for commerce, finance, and administration. Consequently, the working class was displaced while remaining dependent on residence in central London for employment, thereby resulting in overcrowding and deteriorating conditions.¹⁴³ As of the 1860s the problem was severe, and various solutions were proposed including the regulation of sanitation, the provision of transportation between central London and the suburbs, and the construction of model dwellings such as undertaken by the Metropolitan Association for the Improvement of the Dwellings of the Industrious Classes, which had been founded in 1842, and the Peabody Trust, a philanthropic foundation of the American financier George Peabody who had settled in London in 1837. Sanitary regulation was inefficient and suburban transportation was impractical, however, and the rents of the Peabody Dwellings were beyond the resources of the poor.¹⁴⁴

Hare addressed the issue in 1862 in a series of six letters published in *The Times* which were collected in a pamphlet, *Usque ad Coelum: Thoughts on the Dwellings of the People, Charitable Estates, Improvement, and Local Government of the Metropolis*, which was published in the same year. 'The wretched dwellings of the lower classes of the metropolis,

owing mainly to the insufficiency of the number of dwellings for the working population and decent poor, which forces whole families to content themselves with a single room', he asserted, 'are the sources of demoralization and misery beyond human calculation'.¹⁴⁵ Charities in London were numerous, and their endowments were increasing in value, he observed, but 'the classes for which they were designed for the most part live elsewhere, and the ingenuity of lawyers has been ransacked to discover a *cy près* method of extending funds for which lawful claimants were daily diminishing'.¹⁴⁶ He recognized the contribution of the Peabody Trust,¹⁴⁷ but he acknowledged that investment in model dwellings such as those built by the Metropolitan Association was 'no temptation for capitalists'.¹⁴⁸ Also he dismissed 'schemes for covering the environs of London with villages of workmen, from which they are to be carried in and out of town by workmen's trains' as 'it would be the way to perpetuate the fatal divisions of class which are already our misfortune and reproach'.¹⁴⁹ The Apostle, he commented, 'exhorts Christians, as brethren and members of the same body, to a mutuality and care for one another',¹⁵⁰ whereas 'hundreds of thousands of our people, for generation after generation, must be victims of the evil before the principle of demand and supply could work out a remedy'.¹⁵¹

Hare argued that it was possible to provide adequate housing 'even to three or four times its present extent' and to enable 'every family and person earning an average livelihood, and desirous of having a decent home, to obtain one within the compass of their pecuniary means'.¹⁵² Such homes, he continued, 'may be so constructed as to give them light, air, ventilation, and freedom from everything offensive or noisome', and their inhabitants would have 'the benefit of every contrivance by which invention has been able to husband or lessen domestic labour; whilst the division and arrangement of the rooms would afford to every one some opportunity of retirement and of mental culture'.¹⁵³ Space 'for such vast constructions as would be necessary', he indicated, was available in London 'mile after mile, on a level with the roofs of the low and squalid houses that cover the ground on every side', space which 'belongs to the owners of the ground beneath'.¹⁵⁴ Among such owners were charities, 'much of the accumulated and growing wealth of the old endowments' of which 'have lost their immediate and specific objects',¹⁵⁵ he claimed, and he calculated that 'it would, perhaps, be no exaggerated estimate to compute the property in such trusts and in mortmain at a fourth of the whole area'.¹⁵⁶ 'In dealing with estates so dedicated to public and charitable purposes', he emphasized,

it is not too much to require an attention to the general welfare, which, in the case of private owners, must be left to their individual conscience. The principle of an enlightened policy or jurisprudence may step in and supply that moral responsibility which it is difficult to attach to, or divide amongst, bodies of persons where the individual will may be overruled by the will of a majority. In such cases the first question should be, not how to snatch the greatest profit from the estate, without regard to the effect on the public or on the neighbourhood, but how the greatest amount of general good can be obtained consistently with a proper and reasonable regard to the specific good which the donor of the estate has pointed out. This is nothing more than a principle on which individual conduct should be governed.¹⁵⁷

Accordingly, he proposed that the estates of such charities be appropriated for the provision of housing for the poor, housing which would have 'commodious shops' on the ground floor, above which on the first and second floors would be 'the residences of the tradesmen', above which on the third floor would be 'handsome apartments with all the accommodation and privacy of separate houses, for the educated portion of the less wealthy classes', and above which on the fourth, fifth, and sixth floors would be 'dwellings of more or less accommodation, each floor separately approached by two convenient staircases at opposite extremities of the block, and leading to convenient passages or galleries, upon which the apartments open'. The corridors would be lighted and ventilated 'through openings front and back, and partly from above', and there would be 'joint and ready access to wash-houses and baths, and in the summer to a kitchen which may be used in common by several families, to store-rooms for furniture on occasions of removal to a distance, and other advantages'.¹⁵⁸ That the occupiers should 'become the proprietors of their own dwellings, however small they may be', he added, 'the new buildings should be sold in separate tenements, or chambers, like the property of the inns of court, with all legal facilities to render them readily marketable and transferable'.¹⁵⁹

The authority necessary to appropriate the property of charitable estates for this purpose was inadequate under the indirectly elected Metropolitan Board of Works created by the Metropolis Local Management Act of 1855, Hare argued, and he proposed that the jurisdiction of the City of London be extended to include metropolitan London and that the legislative authority of the municipal government be expanded. The reconstituted municipal government would consist of the Lord

Mayor and a Council of 150 members directly elected, half by the proprietors and half by the occupiers according to the system of the single transferable vote proposed in his *Treatise*.¹⁶⁰

Hare addressed the issue further in 'Ideal of a Local Government for the Metropolis' in *Macmillan's Magazine* in April 1863 in which he argued that 'the million of the poorer labouring classes should be enabled to obtain decent, healthful, and cheerful dwellings, in the place of the dens of squalor and filth in which they are now for the most part forced to live – the natural haunts of intemperance and vice, among which are the "guilt gardens," and the nurseries of crime'.¹⁶¹ Members of Parliament were limited in their ability to come to terms with the complexity of interests at the local level, he claimed, while the metropolitan government was a 'chaos of powers':

Every parish struggles to exclude every other from participation in its endowments – every set of trustees is jealous and antagonistic to every other set.... This want of community of feeling and object is the greatest obstacle to progress in improving the condition of the labouring classes in our great towns; and the only remedy seems to be the strengthening and expansion of local government by uniting directly, through a system of real representation, all these sectional bodies, and thus giving them an interest in harmonious action which shall rouse and cultivate the feeling of common duty and common sympathy for their entire city and all its people.¹⁶²

With reference to his proposed London municipal government, he suggested that in the Council

scope might be found for the employment of all the varied talents and genius of a large body of public-spirited men, in which the acquirements of science, of study, and of travel, and the knowledge and experience of practical life, may be enlisted and employed in promoting the public welfare. The Council would be an admirable school of preparation for the business of the Imperial Legislature.¹⁶³

Such municipal councils in cities other than London, he added, 'shall everywhere evoke the highest intelligence and public spirit, and, possessing the public confidence, shall be powerful agents in all works of social amelioration'.¹⁶⁴

The issue was addressed by Hare also at sessions of the Social Science Association. At a session held in London in February 1866, he read

a paper, 'An Improved Constitution of Local Governing Bodies, and on the Legislation on Local Subjects which may be Safely and Beneficially Transferred to Them', which incorporated a draft bill 'for the election of the Lord Mayor and the council of London, and for vesting in them the local government of the metropolis'.¹⁶⁵ Observing that 'the more closely the condition and wants of society are examined, the more clearly it will be seen to be necessary that our cities and towns should be everywhere entrusted with the most comprehensive powers for public improvement, and for the promotion of every beneficent object, educational, moral, and physical, within their boundaries',¹⁶⁶ he emphasized: 'Nothing perhaps at this moment more seriously affects the educational and moral condition of the great masses of the population in our cities and towns than the state of their dwellings.'¹⁶⁷ Among those who participated in the discussion of his paper were James Beale,¹⁶⁸ a radical who in the same year founded the Metropolitan Municipal Reform Association,¹⁶⁹ and John Stuart Mill,¹⁷⁰ who as a Liberal member of Parliament for Westminster as of 1865 was a member of the Select Committee on Metropolitan Local Government before which Hare appeared in May 1866 when he gave evidence primarily concerning the single transferable vote.¹⁷¹ Four years later, he addressed the issue again at a session of the Social Science Association held in London in June 1870 when he read a paper, 'On the Constitution of Municipalities and Local Governing Bodies for London and Other Towns and Districts', in which he summarized the evidence he had given before the Select Committee on Metropolitan Local Government.¹⁷² After another four years, at a session of the Social Science Association held in London in November 1874, he read a paper, 'The Construction of a Municipality for the Metropolis', commenting on a bill 'for creating a comprehensive governing body for the metropolis' drafted by the Metropolitan Municipal Reform Association. 'The stronger and more efficient all our local municipalities and local governing bodies can be made', he stated, 'the more perfect will be the reign of law, and the submission of all classes to its just and impartial rule',¹⁷³ and 'the noble work of providing fit habitations for the labouring population', he argued, 'would be greatly facilitated by such a consolidation of municipal power'.¹⁷⁴

Other issues which Hare addressed during the 1860s concerned imperial affairs, contributing 'On the Development of the Wealth of India' to *Macmillan's Magazine* in April 1861. In Bengal in 1859, peasants had revolted against British planters who were forcing them to cultivate indigo against their interests, and a commission appointed by

the Viceroy, Lord Canning, in 1860 had reported in support of the peasants against the planters.¹⁷⁵ In *Macmillan's Magazine* in 1861, Hare wrote that the government discouraged the investment of British capital and expertise which he considered essential for the economic development of India. 'The factories of Europe wait with impatience for the raw materials of India', he observed. 'A deficiency in the supply of cotton might imperil the industry, and almost the existence, of multitudes.'¹⁷⁶ He advocated the abolition of the covenanted system of the civil service, which excluded 'all those whose parents are unable to afford them an expensive education, and all self-taught men',¹⁷⁷ and the admission of those with 'knowledge of India and of the special duties required, and acquaintance with native languages'.¹⁷⁸ Further, he advocated the elimination of central authority, the establishment of local authority, and the provision of separate Indian and British courts: 'The native magistrates being elected by the native communities, and no longer appointed by the Government, there ceases to be anything invidious or unjust in reserving the decision of every case in which the person or property of the European is concerned to European judges.'¹⁷⁹ 'Little will probably be done until the whole Indian service shall be placed on a different footing, and the legislative body shall have a representative character', he concluded. 'Ruinous as the late acts of the Bengal Government have been to individuals, if they should, by attracting public attention to the system, sound its knell, there will be a national gain.'¹⁸⁰

The larger issue of the relations between Britain and the empire was addressed at the congress of the Social Science Association held in Bristol in 1869, responsible self-government having been extended to Australia, New Zealand, and Canada. In a paper read by Hare, 'What Ought To Be the Legal and Constitutional Relations between England and Her Colonies', he asserted that 'I yield to no one in a desire to preserve the integrity of the empire' and emphasized that 'the principle with which I set out is that the basis of the Imperial Union must be one of entire equality'.¹⁸¹ He considered the proposal by Adam Smith in 1776 that the colonies be represented in Parliament to be 'impractical, as involving constitutional changes, the recasting of our representative system, its constant adaptation to the new growth of colonial population, and other changes of vast importance for which the public mind is wholly unprepared', but adding that 'I will not venture to say the time will not come when even this vast change may be accomplished'.¹⁸² Meanwhile, as of 1869, Hare proposed that the colonies be represented in the cabinet:

Let it be immediately open to every one of the self-governed communities, through its constituted ministry, to present to the Crown any member of such ministry, to be nominated by Her Majesty as her Secretary of State for the affairs of that country; the minister thus appointed would reside in London, and form a constituent part of the British cabinet. He would be present at the discussion of all imperial questions, be one of the Privy Council, and be in all respects on an equality of rank with other members of the cabinet.¹⁸³

Likewise, he added: 'The maturity of condition thus recognized involves the selection by each colony of the representative of the Crown within it.'¹⁸⁴ Further, he proposed that the constitution of the legislatures, including 'the abolition of a second chamber altogether', and the judiciaries of the colonies be 'according to their discretion'.¹⁸⁵ 'The solitary exception to perfect equality', he indicated, 'will be the fact that the seat of the sovereign and the supreme government will be in England'.¹⁸⁶

During the 1880s until his retirement in 1887, Hare continued to address issues of political and social reform.¹⁸⁷ During these years, his earlier writings on the reform of London municipal government were collected and reprinted as a pamphlet in 1882,¹⁸⁸ and in March of the same year, he gave evidence before the Royal Commission on the City of London Livery Companies chaired by Lord Derby.¹⁸⁹ In June 1884, before the Royal Commission on Housing of the Working Classes chaired by Sir Charles Dilke, a Liberal member of Parliament for Chelsea, Hare gave evidence and discussed *Usque ad Coelum*.¹⁹⁰ Meanwhile, amid debate over parliamentary franchise reform, Hare attended a private meeting held in London in January 1884, which resulted in the formation of the Proportional Representation Society. Subsequently, under the leadership of Sir John Lubbock and Leonard Courtney, Liberal members of Parliament for the University of London and for Liskeard, the Proportional Representation Society advocated the adoption of the single transferable vote, in defence of which the last writings by Hare were published in 1885.¹⁹¹ In that year, he summarized the objectives of his public career in his response to an enquiry published as *Why I am a Liberal*:

Because I desire to introduce into our institutions, laws, and social condition, every principle and practice which can promote – and eliminate such as impede – the profitable industry and happiness of the greatest number of the people, and at the same time scrupulously

to preserve all that can help to combine and associate together the different classes in mutual love and reverence.¹⁹²

Throughout his public career, Hare made his home at Kingston-upon-Thames in Surrey. He married his first wife, Mary Samson, in Dorset in 1837, and when she died in 1855, she left him with eight children.¹⁹³ Marian, the eldest, married William Andrews, a local clergyman, and wrote on Italian art and literature under the pseudonym 'Christopher Hare'. Sherlock followed in the footsteps of his father, being admitted to the Inner Temple and called to the bar, preparing a second edition of *A Treatise on the Discovery of Evidence by Bill and Answer in Equity* published in 1876, and writing on proportional representation.¹⁹⁴ Alice married John Westlake, later Whewell Professor of International Law at Cambridge, participated in the women's suffrage movement, advocated women's higher education, and was elected a member of the London School Board.¹⁹⁵ Katherine married Lewis Clayton, later Bishop of Leicester, and Lydia married his brother Charles Clayton. Herbert became an engineer in China, and Alfred became a farmer in New Zealand. Lancelot, the youngest, became a lieutenant governor of Eastern Bengal and Assam.

In 1872, Thomas Hare married his second wife, Eleanor Bowes Benson, and their only child, Mary Eleanor, died suddenly of meningitis at the age of eight in 1883.¹⁹⁶ As Eleanor was a sister of Archbishop Benson, Hare may be said to have been a member of the 'intellectual aristocracy' identified by Noel Annan.¹⁹⁷

Another member was Henry Sidgwick, later Knightbridge Professor of Moral Philosophy at Cambridge, whose sister Mary was the wife of Archbishop Benson and whose wife Eleanor, later Principal of Newnham College in Cambridge, was a sister of Arthur Balfour, later Conservative Prime Minister from 1902 to 1905, whose mother Lady Blanche was a sister of Lord Salisbury, thrice Conservative Prime Minister between 1885 and 1902. Thus it was within the family when Henry Sidgwick wrote to Arthur Balfour in 1888 in an unsuccessful effort to have Hare made a Companion of the Order of the Bath (CB) on the grounds of 'his influence on political thought' and 'his valuable work for 34 years as Inspector of Charities for the Charity Commission', adding: 'As regards his claim as a political thinker, Courtney writes to me that "Hare's presence in the Public Service has been an honour to it in the same way if not in the same degree as J.S. Mill's presence was."' ¹⁹⁸

A.C. Benson, a son of Archbishop Benson and later Master of Magdalene College in Cambridge, remembered Hare in the 1870s as

an extremely handsome and distinguished-looking old man, his face pale and bronzed, an aquiline nose, clean-shaven, showing a firm-lipped mouth and well-developed chin, his eyes blue and kindly, the whole face deeply-lined and furrowed, a little nervous twitch about the right eyelid, with a fine, upstanding shock of snow-white hair; the look of a man who had worked hard, thought hard, and suffered, but full of quiet kindliness.¹⁹⁹

His hands were 'rather rugged and laborious-looking' and his voice was 'rather thin and weak', Benson added. 'He was certainly a very silent figure – few words and much to the point, not intervening in talk until further abstention from speech would have been embarrassing, an omniscient man, dismissing a complicated subject with a modest definiteness.'²⁰⁰ Katherine Esdaile was to remember Hare as 'a small man with a head of a singularly noble and leonine character' who 'wore a high open collar, a black satin stock with a pearl pin in it, dark trousers strapped under the foot, and a buff waistcoat, over which his eyeglass dangled from a watered silk ribbon. I never saw a man more point-device in every way.'²⁰¹

The Hare family home at Kingston-upon-Thames was Gosbury Hill, the farmhouse of which was designed by Hare and described by A.C. Benson as 'a very curious, irregular building, at all sorts of levels, with an old front covered with wisteria, a pleasant sunk flower-garden, carved out of the rising ground, the whole overtopped by a not very dignified tower, of yellow brick with a pointed slate roof'.²⁰² The tower 'was approached by a steep ladder', he remembered, and 'the tiny sun-warmed room at the top, with its four dusty slits of windows, was fitted up with wooden shelves, a deal table, and a sink, as a little chemical laboratory for a son of his'.²⁰³ Scientific interest did not displace religious devotion, however, for unlike some contemporaries following the publication of *On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection* by Charles Darwin in 1859, Hare retained his faith. He added to Gosbury Hill a chapel for daily family prayers, and while the chapel was being built, according to Katherine Clayton, neighbours thought the family to be Roman Catholic. 'This however was not the case', she later explained. Hare was 'simply a devout Churchman who had been very much influenced by the Tractarian Movement of that time and was anxious to bring up his children in the same views'.²⁰⁴ Thus A.C. Benson characterized him as 'a devout, old-fashioned High-Churchman' whose 'general aspect' was 'of an aged and distinguished ecclesiastic. Properly arrayed, he would have made a noble and courtly prelate.'²⁰⁵ The

chapel, as Benson remembered it, 'had some quarries of grisaille glass, a reading-desk for Mr Hare, little Gothic seats down each side, encaustic tiles, and bare brick walls, with, I think, a dim religious picture or two'.²⁰⁶ Rooms were added to Gosbury Hill as the family grew, Katherine Clayton recalled, and the house was 'full of books, to which all had access, and were encouraged to use. Mr Hare took great interest in the education of his daughters and directed it, reading to them himself and being read to by them every evening, explanation and discussion always following.'²⁰⁷ Her sisters Marian and Alice, she noted, were 'sent to a very good school in Paris, from which they returned with a perfect knowledge of the French language, which they imparted to the rest of the family, to the very great advantage of them all'.²⁰⁸

Among visitors to Gosbury Hill were John Stuart Mill and Helen Taylor, his stepdaughter, who came from their home at Blackheath when in England. Although 'the household of Gosbury Hill was one brought up in an atmosphere of genuine religious feeling', Katherine Clayton remembered, 'never by one word or look did Mr Mill do anything to raise doubt or difficulty in the minds of those he met there'.²⁰⁹ In turn the Hares visited the Mills at Blackheath where they met others such as John Morley, the Liberal editor of the *Fortnightly Review*, and George Grote, the philosophic radical historian and advocate of parliamentary reform.²¹⁰ Another visitor to Gosbury Hill was Henry Fawcett, the blind political economist and Liberal member of Parliament for Brighton and then Hackney, who came from Cambridge accompanied by his wife Millicent Garrett. Emily Davies, an advocate of women's suffrage and a founder of Girton College in Cambridge, visited as a friend of Alice Westlake, and the controversial ecclesiastic John William Colenso, Bishop of Natal, visited as a friend of John Westlake. Viscount and Lady Amberley were guests, as was the Irish historian W.E.H. Lecky. The French socialist Louis Blanc was a visitor, and an American visitor was Simon Sterne, a lawyer who in New York was an advocate of personal representation by the single transferable vote.²¹¹

Thomas Hare left Gosbury Hill following the death of Eleanor in 1890 and moved to London where he lived in Chelsea near to Alice and John Westlake until his death at the age of 85 on 6 May 1891. In the *Academy* on 16 May, John Westlake wrote that 'his memory will live as that of a man who strove, and not without success, to leave the world considerably better than he found it'.²¹²

Part II

This page intentionally left blank

2

Personal Representation and the Clerisy, 1857–1859

‘The avenues to the House of Commons are so constructed, that no amount of political knowledge, official experience, or public service, – no personal standing, elevation of character, or integrity of purpose, can ensure or preserve to its possessor a seat in the legislature’, Thomas Hare wrote in *The Machinery of Representation* in response to the results of the general election in April 1857, ‘and the history of a few past years teaches the further and even more mortifying lesson, that the absence of all such qualities does not exclude the man who is without them’.¹

The 1857 general election was conducted during a war between Britain and China which was pursued by the Liberal ministry of Viscount Palmerston. In March, Palmerston had been defeated in the House of Commons on a motion against the bombardment of Canton moved by Richard Cobden, a radical member for the West Riding of Yorkshire, which had been supported by Whigs including Lord John Russell, member for the City of London, Tories including Benjamin Disraeli, member for Buckinghamshire, and liberal Tories including William Gladstone, member for Oxford University, who had supported the liberal Tory Prime Minister Sir Robert Peel in the abolition of the Corn Laws in 1846 which had split the Tory party between free traders and protectionists. Palmerston was vindicated, however, when his supporters increased their majority in the general election in April.² The number of uncontested constituencies was high, 129 returning 223 members in England alone and 219 returning 333 members in the United Kingdom as a whole.³ The election was dominated not only by the issue of the war with China, however, but also by the issue of political representation. Whigs loyal to their party and deferential to their constituents were returned whether or not they supported the war, while dissident radicals were defeated. Among the Whigs, Russell faced a challenge in the City

of London, where his candidacy was repudiated by the London Liberal Registration Association, which protected the interests of the East India Company, but he defended his seat and was returned.⁴ Among the radicals, however, Cobden was defeated in Huddersfield, where he stood rather than in the West Riding of Yorkshire, and his ally John Bright, who was in Italy at the time of the poll, was defeated in Manchester.⁵ Gladstone stood unopposed as a liberal Tory and retained his seat for Oxford University,⁶ but the Peelites were reduced to insignificance in the House of Commons.⁷ High churchman as well as free traders were defeated.⁸ In 'The New Parliament and Its Work' in the *Quarterly Review* in the month of the election, Gladstone, a high churchman as well as a free trader, characterized the House of Commons as 'shorn of many intellectual ornaments and of much moral strength . . . marshalled, as to the majority of its members, under the flag of a Minister whom nobody can dislike personally or can respect politically'.⁹

In *The Machinery of Representation*, Hare, as a free trader and a high churchman, attributed the results of the 1857 general election to the electoral system, which had been reformed in 1832 when the Great Reform Act passed under the Whig ministry of the 2nd Earl Grey had extended the franchise to the middle class in industrial cities such as Birmingham and Manchester, although redistribution of seats continued to favour the landed aristocracy. The Great Reform Act had applied a £10 household franchise in boroughs throughout the United Kingdom and had extended the 40 shilling freehold franchise to £10 copyholders and long leaseholders and to £50 occupiers and short leaseholders in counties in England and Wales, other qualifications having been applied in counties in Scotland and Ireland. The reform of the franchise had doubled the electorate in England and Wales in the interest of the middle class, although registration procedures remained complex. In addition, the Great Reform Act had disfranchised 87 boroughs in England in whole or in part, or 143 seats, and had enfranchised 22 double-member boroughs in England, including Birmingham and Manchester, and 21 single-member boroughs in England and Wales, the remaining 78 seats having been redistributed among counties in England and Wales and boroughs in Scotland and Ireland. Within the United Kingdom as a whole, the consequence of the redistribution of seats had been to reduce the representation of England and to increase the representation of Wales, Scotland, and Ireland. Within England alone, the consequence had been to reduce the representation of the south and to increase the representation of the north so as to adjust to the shift of population associated with industrial expansion

but to reduce the representation of the boroughs and to increase the representation of the counties in the interest of the landed aristocracy.¹⁰

According to Hare in *The Machinery of Representation*, however, the electoral system as distinct from the franchise had remained unchanged by the Great Reform Act. After the extension of the franchise and the redistribution of seats in 1832, the 658 members of the House of Commons had continued as before to represent territorial constituencies, or places rather than persons, and to be elected within boroughs and counties by pluralities if not majorities of voters. Territorial constituencies within which minorities were subordinated to majorities originated when Parliament was formed in the late thirteenth century, he indicated with reference to the *View of the State of Europe during the Middle Ages* published in two volumes in 1818 and in three volumes in 1855 by the Whig historian Henry Hallam.¹¹ Medieval transportation was difficult and communication was limited, Hare observed, turning to *The History of England from the Accession of James II* published in four volumes between 1848 and 1855 by the Whig Thomas Babington Macaulay for examples of the extent to which both remained limited in the early eighteenth century.¹² The Great Reform Act which had preserved territorial constituencies had been passed before the considerable improvements in transportation and communication in the early nineteenth century, Hare emphasized:

The members now living of the parliament which passed the Reform Bill, would themselves probably confess that they had not then foreseen the England of 1857, with its cities and towns stretching daily farther and farther into the country; and the powers of the air converted into its servants and messengers, and almost overcoming time and space; whilst the visibly improving character of literature which is brought within reach of the poorest, shews that the general tone of thought is rising, though far more slowly than might be wished. It is no reproach to the reformers of 1832, that they did not propose a scheme of representation which has been made desirable or possible only by subsequent changes that none could then have realised, even if they had seen them dimly shadowed in the future.¹³

Boroughs and counties were 'arbitrary divisions', he claimed.¹⁴ 'They were no doubt once necessary. When the knights, citizens, and burgesses were called together, they could only be summoned from the counties, cities, and boroughs where they were to be found.' In 1857, however, 'we almost need the aid of a Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries to explain to

us what the words knight, citizen, and burgess mean. Many places have even more entirely than the persons or offices lost their distinguishing significance.¹⁵ Further, he added: 'If the political privileges of the modern boroughs are recommended by no historical associations, they seem still less deserving of regard on the ground of the moral benefits they confer on the bodies entrusted with them.'¹⁶

The results of the 1857 general election demonstrated 'not that the people fail to appreciate public virtue', Hare argued, but

that, in constructing their electoral machinery upon a model originally framed in a society wholly different from that in which we live, they have succeeded in binding together in electoral bodies those who cannot – and in separating those who could act in harmony, until they are, as individuals, prevented from following the dictates of their understanding. Doubtless, many men, deservedly high in all that entitles them to the respect of their countrymen, find their way into parliament, or the system would not have lasted until now; but let every elector, or every one who might become an elector if he valued the privilege, consider how much the fact of his being worthily represented is dependent upon accident, and how much upon his own choice.¹⁷

Within territorial constituencies, he added, choice was limited further by political organizations, pointing to

the secret strings by which the machine is pulled. A few persons, whose motives, it may at least be said, are far from being always the most worthy, meet, perhaps, in some political club, – perhaps, in this or that obscure office, and settle not indeed who the voters shall elect, but who alone they shall have the opportunity of electing.... A contest is, however, got up, and many electors are satisfied with the exercise of a power of choice between two candidates, of whom it may, perhaps, be said that the only difficulty in estimating their comparative merits is – the inappreciable quantity to be found in either. Whether those who are undeceived look on in shame or scorn, the result is the same. It would be vain to invite another competitor in a field already preoccupied.¹⁸

The 'undeceived', he continued, 'may take no part in the proceeding, but the law inexorably says that the man who happens to have the most votes, – however repugnant to them all his sympathies or opinions may

be, – is nevertheless their representative'.¹⁹ Were such electors in separate territorial constituencies to attempt to combine their votes to elect a candidate 'who shall faithfully represent them', he complained, 'the law says, – "No; the constitution would be imperilled if you and your friends outside the line were allowed to coalesce in voting. The constitution has nothing to do with your opinions or wishes. It abhors minorities."' ²⁰

As the electoral system subordinated minorities to majorities, it also encouraged an 'unhealthy antagonism' between social classes, according to Hare: 'There are two sides only, and the poorer and less taught elector, having no option but one or the other, is led to fear that he may betray the interests of his class if he do not take the side most popular with that class.'²¹ 'Both sides' were in a 'false position', he argued:

If, instead of taking up this hostile attitude, the opinions and sympathies of the elector were appealed to from many sides – for many sided all great subjects are – the lines in which the several classes are now marshalled would be broken, the ranks would mingle, and we should find the poorer and less educated elector uniting with his wealthy and intellectual neighbour in support of the same candidate with whom they on some point feel in common; an union, moreover, which would often not end there, but would serve as a nucleus of harmony and concert in other things.²²

In this regard it was of particular concern to Hare that 'in the present state of education' the majority was 'the least instructed' and was as likely as not to vote 'in a manner adverse to the public welfare'.²³ For an example he referred to Finsbury, a double-member borough in London enfranchised in 1832 which in the general election in 1857 returned Thomas Slingsby Duncombe and William Cox, both radicals and supporters of Palmerston.²⁴ Had Finsbury been a borough before 1832 and had the candidates been Adam Smith and John Wilkes, Hare suggested that

there is no doubt the latter would have been the choice of the majority. Neither the religious zeal of Islington, nor the learning of Lincoln's Inn, would have saved the former from being obliged to acknowledge as its representative a man whose life was notoriously immoral, nor the latter from a like recognition of one who had perplexed and defied the Chief Justice in open court, and had succeeded in casting ridicule upon the law itself.²⁵

It did not, he emphasized

follow that because, from the state of popular education, the majority is especially liable to error, that, therefore, it ought not to be entrusted with the franchise; but it does follow that means should be provided for giving the minority its full weight. The destiny of the nation ought not to be placed at the mercy of the majority, without that hearing to which the minority is entitled.²⁶

'To deny this', he added, 'would be to assert a principle which is surely not less than suicidal to the understanding of the nation'.²⁷

All four of the candidates who contested Finsbury in the general election in 1857 were Liberals, and that over half of the electors in Finsbury did not vote Hare attributed to the electoral system. The Finsbury electors either 'thought the senatorial talent to be gained or lost by a preference of any candidate to the others would be so small that it was not worth a visit to the polling booth', he suggested, or 'entertained opinions of which none of the candidates were the exponents; or the indifference of the absent electors might be owing to both of these reasons'.²⁸ Those who did not vote included 'vast numbers who are second to no other body of people in love for their country, and in the clearness with which they are able to comprehend its interests', he observed. 'These more and more entirely absent themselves from the elections, as the representation of their opinions becomes more and more hopeless.' He considered such electors to be 'unrepresented'.²⁹

It was implicit in *The Machinery of Representation* that Hare rejected the principle of virtual representation whereby representatives represent those by whom they have not been elected. Related to the concept of tacit consent which John Locke distinguished from the concept of express consent in the second of his *Two Treatises of Government* published in the late seventeenth century,³⁰ the principle of virtual representation was employed to justify taxation of the American colonies in the late eighteenth century. As Secretary to the Treasury in the Tory ministry of George Grenville in 1765, Thomas Whately wrote in defence of the Stamp Act that members of Parliament represented British subjects in the American colonies as well as those in Britain who did not have the franchise given that the House of Commons represented national interests. 'None are actually, all are virtually represented in Parliament', Whately argued, 'for every Member of Parliament sits in the House not as representative of his own constituents but as one of that august assembly by which all the commons of *Great Britain* are represented'.³¹

By his argument, the American colonies were represented in Parliament no less than were British cities such as Birmingham and Manchester, neither of which then was a parliamentary constituency: 'If the towns of *Manchester* and *Birmingham*, sending no Representatives to Parliament, are notwithstanding there represented, why are not the cities of *Albany* and *Boston* equally represented in that Assembly?'³² Opponents of virtual representation of the American colonies did not reject the principle itself, however. Daniel Dulaney, an American who replied to Whately in 1765, rejected it for the colonies but accepted it for Britain,³³ and John Cartwright, an English advocate of manhood suffrage, attacked virtual representation in Britain as well as in America in 1776 but accepted the principle in regard to women.³⁴ In the late eighteenth century, the practice of virtual representation was common among members of Parliament who owned property in constituencies other than those by which they were elected.³⁵ Thus the interests of both Birmingham and Manchester were represented in Parliament, and in 1783 neither Birmingham nor Manchester considered it necessary to participate in a campaign for parliamentary reform.³⁶ According to Paul Langford, such practice of virtual representation 'made it easy for Englishmen to suppose that in a somewhat mysterious but ultimately satisfying way the interest of all, at least all propertied people, was served'.³⁷

The principle of virtual representation was maintained in the organic theory of the constitution expounded by the republican Algernon Sidney in his *Discourses Concerning Government* in the late seventeenth century and by the Whig Edmund Burke in the late eighteenth century.³⁸ In his speech to the electors of Bristol in 1774, Burke emphasized that members of Parliament served the interest of the nation:

Parliament is not a congress of ambassadors from different and hostile interests, which interests each must maintain, as an agent and advocate, against other agents and advocates; but Parliament is a deliberative assembly of one nation, with one interest, that of the whole – where not local prejudices ought to guide, but the general good, resulting from the general reason of the whole. You choose a member, indeed; but when you have chosen him he is not a member of Bristol, but he is a member of Parliament.³⁹

In his letter to Sir Hercules Langrishe in 1792, Burke wrote that by virtual representation 'there is a communion of interest and sympathy in feelings and desires between those who act in the name of any description of people and the people in whose name they act, though the trustees

are not actually chosen by them'.⁴⁰ He compared the principle of virtual representation with the principle of actual representation whereby representatives represent places which are constituencies or persons who are electors, the distinguishing characteristic of actual representation being the franchise, and he argued that virtual representation was 'in many cases even better than the actual.... The people may err in their choice; but common interest and common sentiment are rarely mistaken.'⁴¹

In the early nineteenth century, the principle of virtual representation was employed by Tories in defence of the unreformed Parliament and by Whigs in defence of moderate reform. In opposition to utilitarians who maintained a mechanical theory of the constitution and advocated radical reform, Whigs sustained the emphasis by Burke on the virtual representation of interests and opinions rather than on the actual representation of communities or individuals. In response to support for manhood suffrage by the utilitarian philosopher Jeremy Bentham in his *Plan of Parliamentary Reform, in the Form of a Catechism* in 1817,⁴² Sir James Mackintosh, a Whig philosopher and member of Parliament for Nairn, defended the principle of virtual representation in the *Edinburgh Review* in 1818. Recognizing 'that the elective franchise should be exercised by large bodies of the lower classes', Mackintosh rejected manhood suffrage 'as beyond calculation more mischievous than any other uniform right'.⁴³ 'If representation be proportioned to numbers alone', he warned

every other interest in society is placed at the disposal of the multitude. No other class can be effectually represented; no other class can have a political security for justice; no other can have any weight in the deliberations of the Legislature. No talents, no attainments, but such as recommend men to the favour of the multitude, can have any admission into it. A representation so constituted, would produce the same practical effects, as if every man whose income was above a certain amount, were excluded from the right of voting. It is of little moment to the proprietors, whether they be disfranchised, or doomed, in every election, to form a hopeless minority.⁴⁴

Representation of the 'lower classes' was 'necessary to their security from oppression', he argued, 'but as their interest is everywhere the same, representatives elected by one body of them, are necessarily the guardians of the rights of all.... What we now maintain is, that, though elected by one place, they are in truth the representatives of the same sort

of people in other places.⁴⁵ Again in the *Edinburgh Review* in 1820, defending the proposal by Russell in the House of Commons in 1819 to disfranchise the corrupt borough of Grampound and to transfer its seats to an unenfranchised town, Mackintosh claimed historical precedents for representation of 'separate interests of classes and districts' but not for representation 'founded merely on numbers'.⁴⁶ Referring to sixteenth-century statutes providing for the representation of Chester and Durham, he observed that the franchise was limited to 'freeholders of the county, and freemen of the city, – who have a common interest, and fellow feeling with the whole'.⁴⁷ Admitting that 'some degree of actual election was held necessary to virtual representation', he commented: 'As these electors were likely to partake the sentiments of the rest of the inhabitants, and as every public measure must affect both classes alike, the members chosen by such a part of the people were considered as virtually representing all.'⁴⁸

This was rejected by the utilitarian philosopher James Mill in his *Essay on Government* in 1820 in which he attacked the principle of virtual representation as 'one of the shallowest by which the pretenders to political wisdom have ever exposed themselves'.⁴⁹ Whereas for Mackintosh members of Parliament represented the interests of the classes of the nation, for Mill members of Parliament represented the interests of the communities of the nation.⁵⁰ It was contrary to human nature for representatives to act in accordance with any other than their own interests, according to Mill. 'If a small number of men have the choice of the Representatives', he argued, 'such Representatives will be chosen as will promote the interests of that small number, by reducing, if possible, the rest of the community to be the abject and helpless slaves of their will'.⁵¹ The interests of the representatives should be identified with the interests not of their classes but of their communities, which he claimed would be accomplished by election of the representatives by manhood suffrage.⁵² He qualified his attack on the principle of virtual representation, however, applying it to women, 'the interest of all of whom is involved either in that of their fathers or in that of their husbands', and to children, 'whose interests are involved in those of their parents'.⁵³ In the first of two articles in the *Westminster Review* in 1824 criticizing the *Edinburgh Review*, Mill continued his argument for manhood suffrage and against the representation of classes

by which it is attempted to persuade, that they have securities enough, provided every class is represented in the House of Commons; that is to say, the landed interest represented, the mercantile

interest represented, the army, the navy, the law, the people represented; though it should appear that the people have no real, efficient control over one man in this composition; they have not the choice of so much as six, out of six hundred; and that even a bare majority, chosen and influenced by the aristocracy, would determine in the long run, and on the real balance of the account the nature of the government.⁵⁴

'These several classes, or bodies (four, five, six, or whatever be the number), to whom the important function of choosing representatives should be confided', he enquired in the *Westminster Review* in 1825 in a third article attacking the *Edinburgh Review*

have they an identity of interest with the community? or have they not? If they have, each and all of them, an identity of interest with the community, where is the use of making any distinction? We want but one body, having that identity of interest as perfect as possible, and then, of course, we have got in its perfection the organ for the choice of those who are to manage the common affairs. It is impossible there can be from any quarter any contradiction of this inference. Upon this supposition, therefore, the fancy of a class representation is mere folly.⁵⁵

A 'body' with such an 'identity' would be constituted by manhood suffrage, according to Mill, and virtual representation would be eliminated.

In opposition to Mill, Macaulay in the *Edinburgh Review* in March 1829 defended the Whig position and objected that were manhood suffrage adopted, under which 'the majority of the electors return the representatives, and the majority of the representatives make the law',⁵⁶ the poor majority might oppress the rich minority.⁵⁷ He asserted that the utilitarian argument for manhood suffrage was without foundation, for it was 'utterly impossible to deduce the science of government from the principles of human nature'.⁵⁸ Again in the *Edinburgh Review* in June 1829, Macaulay accused Mill of inconsistency in sanctioning the representation of women by men, his assumption 'that the interest of the women is identical with that of the men' invalidating 'his whole theory of human nature'.⁵⁹ In a further attack on the utilitarians in the *Edinburgh Review* in October 1829, Macaulay defended a mixed constitution which combined and balanced monarchy, aristocracy, and democracy and claimed that representation was 'only one of the many modes in which the democratic part of the community can

efficiently check the governing few'.⁶⁰ He considered representation 'a very happy contrivance for enabling large bodies of men to exert their power, with less risk than there otherwise would be' but 'no security for good government'. If a 'spirit to defend the constitution' and a 'sense to defend it in concert', he suggested, were 'diffused through a society, then, even without a representative assembly, that society will enjoy many of the blessings of good government'.⁶¹ He concluded in advocating 'such a reform of the House of Commons as may render its votes the express image of the opinion of the middle orders of Britain. A pecuniary qualification we think absolutely necessary; and in settling its amount, our object would be to draw the line in such a manner, that every decent farmer and shopkeeper might possess the elective franchise'.⁶²

Having entered Parliament as a member for Calne in 1830, Macaulay spoke in the House of Commons in defence of the reform bill introduced by Russell in March 1831, arguing that franchise extension and redistribution of seats would prevent revolution by providing direct rather than virtual representation of the middle class.⁶³ In reply to Sir Robert Inglis, a high Tory member for Oxford University who employed the principle of virtual representation in opposition to the reform bill,⁶⁴ Macaulay questioned 'how a power which is salutary when exercised virtually can be noxious when exercised directly',⁶⁵ although he did not extend his argument to the working class.⁶⁶ In Lewes, later in the same month, however, a reform petition expressed the expectation that the reform bill would eliminate virtual representation which was considered to be 'totally inadequate to the wants and wishes and interests of all classes'.⁶⁷

What for Burke was 'actual' and for Macaulay was 'direct' representation was 'real' rather than virtual representation as the terms were defined by George Cornwall Lewis when a student of Christ Church, Oxford in his *Remarks on the Use and Abuse of Some Political Terms* in 1832: 'a town or district is said to be *really* represented, when it returns a member to Parliament; to be *virtually* represented, when it does not return a member, but its interests are protected by those who really represent other places'.⁶⁸ Lewis remarked that 'the distinction between *real* and *virtual* representation appears to be founded on the... erroneous notion, that a representative is merely the delegate of his constituents' and added in Whig fashion: 'Those who propose to remedy the evil of virtual representation by changing it into real representation, frequently support the change on false grounds: for it is not more expedient that a large town should be represented rather than a small town, because its interests will be watched by its own delegate; but because it is more

likely to send a good representative to the national councils.⁶⁹ After passage of the Great Reform Act in 1832, supporters of the People's Charter between 1838 and 1848 expected that real representation of the working class would follow upon the adoption of manhood suffrage. After 1848 and the decline of Chartism, however, virtual representation of the working class was accepted by radical reformers who emphasized redistribution of seats and introduction of the ballot rather than extension of the franchise.⁷⁰

According to Hare in *The Machinery of Representation*, the distinction between real and virtual representation was not a function of the franchise, for which reason he emphasized that 'the question who should be the electors, is not here the subject of inquiry', although he recognized that it was 'of surpassing importance'.⁷¹ In this regard, he considered the assimilation of the borough and county franchise qualifications as proposed in the House of Commons by Locke King, a Liberal member for East Surrey, to be 'the most moderate and reasonable extension of the franchise'.⁷² Unlike Palmerston, who voted against a motion by Locke King before the general election in 1857,⁷³ Hare denied that 'artificial limitations' such as boroughs and counties were 'so valuable that all other considerations must be sacrificed to them'.⁷⁴ He considered extension of the franchise to be irrelevant, however, for electors whose candidates were defeated in their constituencies were denied real representation, he asserted, and their representation by candidates returned by other electors in other constituencies remained virtual. Such representation by representatives for whom electors had not voted he considered to be illegitimate, for the relationship between electors and representatives was a function of the act of voting, which he referred to as 'the most solemn political act that a million of people are throughout their lives ever called upon to perform'.⁷⁵ Redistribution of seats and introduction of the ballot he dismissed as no less irrelevant than extension of the franchise, for redistribution would not 'extend the range of individual choice, or necessarily secure a member with higher qualifications',⁷⁶ and the ballot would not 'confer political knowledge, or enable the voter to discover intuitively him who is most highly endowed with the qualifications of a legislator'.⁷⁷

The alternative to virtual representation, according to Hare, was 'to give to every elector the power of voting for any qualified candidate throughout the kingdom with whom his views are most in accordance' and 'to enable every elector – with the exception of an ultimate fractional number – to participate in the choice of some representative'.⁷⁸ Such would provide personal representation whereby electors would be

represented by representatives for whom they had voted. The obstacles to personal representation which he indicated were territorial constituencies and the plurality system of voting which he proposed to abolish and to replace with voluntary constituencies and a quota system of voting, presenting his scheme in the form of a bill of 12 clauses.⁷⁹ Rather than continue to confine electoral choice within territorial constituencies, he would permit all electors in the country to choose from among all candidates in the country and to combine their votes to form voluntary constituencies. Candidates would continue to stand in territorial constituencies, but the practical effect would be to eliminate the distinction between boroughs and counties. The corollary of voluntary constituencies was to substitute for the plurality system of voting a quota system whereby a candidate would be required to poll a certain number of votes to be elected, each elector having a single vote. The quota would be calculated on a national basis by dividing the number of electors on the register by the number of seats to be filled. As some candidates would poll more votes than required by the quota, surplus votes so as not to be wasted would be transferred to candidates with less votes than required by the quota according to preferences indicated by the electors. By this quota system of the single transferable vote, the votes of all electors would be counted, all candidates receiving the quota would be elected, all seats would be filled, and all constituencies would be voluntary, thereby providing personal representation.

In the first edition of *The Machinery of Representation*, Hare retained the use of poll books and suggested that surplus votes be transferred by means of consultations between candidates and electors and subsequent polls. He abandoned this method, however, under the influence of a motion moved in the House of Commons in June 1857 by Lord Robert Cecil, a Tory member for Stamford, for a select committee to enquire into the use of voting papers.⁸⁰ The motion was defeated, but Hare found the debate 'very suggestive', and in *A Note to the Machinery of Representation* published in the same year he proposed that electors enter the names of candidates on voting papers in the numerical sequence of their preferences to eliminate the need for subsequent consultations and polls and thereby to facilitate the transfer of surplus votes. This alternative method he incorporated in a second edition of *The Machinery of Representation* published later in 1857.⁸¹

Hare was not the first to conceive the single transferable vote, a similar system having been devised earlier by Thomas Wright Hill, a schoolmaster in Birmingham, and having been applied by his son Rowland to the election of the committee of the Birmingham Society for Literary and

Scientific Improvement in 1821.⁸² This had been of no political significance, but in 1839 when the secretary of the Colonization Commission of South Australia, Rowland Hill had suggested a modified version for municipal elections in Adelaide where it had operated from 1840 to 1843.⁸³ Evidently these developments were unknown to Hare in 1857. Frederic Hill, another son of Thomas Wright Hill, subsequently indicated that he had 'every reason to believe that Mr Hare...and my father came to the same conclusion independently of one another'.⁸⁴ Likewise evidently Hare in 1857 had no knowledge of the adoption in Denmark in 1855 of a similar system for the election of the Rigsraad, the federal legislature created by constitutional revision to accommodate Schleswig and Holstein. The Danish electoral law had been drafted by Carl Andrae, a mathematician who had been the Minister of Finance in 1855 and Prime Minister when the electoral law had been applied in 1856.⁸⁵ Within the context of British political thought as of 1857, Hare was the first to propose the single transferable vote, doing so as a means to the end of personal representation.

In *The Machinery of Representation* in 1857, Hare reflected the multi-party political diffusion which followed the split in the Tory party over the abolition of the Corn Laws in 1846 and which continued until the fusion of Peelites, Whigs, and radicals in the formation of the Liberal party in 1859.⁸⁶ Amid the public debate over parliamentary reform during the 1850s, Hare in 1857 was concerned with the diffuse party system which Gladstone had discussed in 'The Declining Efficiency of Parliament' in the *Quarterly Review* in 1856. Gladstone had observed:

We perceive, on the whole with satisfaction, that the local organization of the constituencies still remains almost everywhere in its old and simple form of dualism. This division of local parties may indeed be at present almost as much animal as intellectual, but it is dignified by traditional recollections, and it is probably the best or only way, in which the communication of ideas between representatives and constituencies can be practically maintained. We also find in it the basis upon which, in an altered posture of public affairs, we may again see the old parties once more arrayed face to face, and in something like their old condition.⁸⁷

For Gladstone, a division between two parties was a requisite for responsible legislation, but for Hare, responsible legislation required comprehensive representation which was prevented by a division between two

parties. Unlike Gladstone, Hare maintained that the party system had to accommodate pluralism rather than dualism. While he recognized in *The Machinery of Representation* that ‘a fair equality in the strength of the parties representing the two great principles which would ameliorate and preserve is, in fact, that which it is most desirable should be attained’,⁸⁸ he emphasized that ‘many sided all great subjects are’.⁸⁹ Thus for Hare, unlike for Gladstone, the party system and the system of election had to accommodate diversity of opinion. Hare applied pluralism to class as well as to party. When ‘there are two sides only’, he observed, ‘the poorer and less taught elector, having no option but one or the other, is led to fear that he may betray the interests of his class if he do not take the side most popular with that class. Both sides are, in fact, in a false position.’⁹⁰

Likewise Hare reflected the political diffusion during the 1850s in his claim in *The Machinery of Representation* that personal representation ‘would promote the independence of every member of parliament, in the largest and best sense of that expression’, meaning independence from ‘knots of agitators’ or ‘self-complacent politicians’ in the constituencies ‘who would take the administration of public affairs into their own hands, and, if it were possible, require their representatives to act under their instructions from day to day’.⁹¹ He praised Viscount Ebrington, a Whig member of Parliament for Marylebone, for resisting a demand by his constituents that he cooperate in opposition to the Poor Law Amendment Act, which in 1834 had terminated outdoor relief and had established parish workhouses, and which Hare in 1857 regarded ‘though yet, perhaps, imperfect, as one of the wisest measures which ever emanated from the legislature’.⁹² ‘The general truckling of the hustings is lamentable’, he argued: ‘Nothing is more painful to witness than a man of intellect suffering his opinions and rule of conduct to be contracted to the narrow measure of the more noisy, superficial, and unscrupulous of those who, on such terms, consent to become his adherents.’⁹³ Defending a Whig rather than a radical position, Hare regarded representatives as trustees independent of their constituents rather than as delegates subordinate to their constituents.⁹⁴ As had Burke rather than Bentham, Hare endorsed representatives who were

capable of forming their own opinions and convictions, and of sufficient energy to pursue them. One who is content to watch the straws which rise in the air, from the narrow circle of his supporters, and feebly shapes his course as they are carried by the wind, may succeed in flattering his constituents, and perhaps in preserving his seat,

but he will neither acquire nor deserve the public respect. The legislative action of a house so composed, cannot be otherwise than inconsistent and capricious. There is no institution which it may not unsettle. No government can rely on the support of men, who are themselves uncertain of their course from day to day. The weakness of the parts is almost inevitably communicated to the whole, and is felt in every department of the state. This dependence on the caprice of any particular constituency would not be felt, if it were open to every member to appeal to the entire nation. If two or three thousand electors could have returned the members of the several parties whose absence from Parliament is the subject of general regret, it is certain that none of them would have failed to be in the house. Every statesman deserving of the name, might rely on his countrymen, and would be no longer at the mercy of the petty jealousies or intrigues of which he may now at any moment be the victim.⁹⁵

Another claim made by Hare in *The Machinery of Representation* was that personal representation would serve to encourage the participation of individual electors:

A perfect freedom of action in choosing their representatives would naturally lead most men to prize, as it would render every man responsible for, his vote. There are but few who would not consider it as a matter of personal duty to be represented by one to whose character and conduct he might refer with satisfaction. His capacity and integrity would be an object of interest and pride. It has truly been observed that a vast multitude of the electors are at present absolutely indifferent to their votes, and see no utility in going to a distant polling place to effect nothing. How many, again, and those far from the lowest rank in qualification, take no pains even to be placed on the register? But once relieve every elector wholly from any extraneous control, and give him an unrestricted choice from among all his countrymen, and there will be few from whom the opportunity will not rouse and animate.⁹⁶

Further, corruption would be terminated: 'Under such a system the contemptible tactics of borough politicians, – the miserable intrigues of the blues and yellows, – the huckstering of votes, and pandering to corrupt motives in every shape, will be at an end.'⁹⁷

Such concern with independence, participation, and public virtue associated Hare with the tradition of civic humanism, less that of

the classical republican version identified with Niccoló Machiavelli as expounded by James Harrington in *The Commonwealth of Oceana* in the seventeenth century than that of the philosophic-Whig version represented by Burke in the late eighteenth century and by Macaulay in the early nineteenth century.⁹⁸ As Hare intended the single transferable vote to be a means to the end of personal representation, so he intended personal representation to be a means to the end of civic virtue, asserting in *The Machinery of Representation* that ‘all political machinery is but an instrument more or less adapted to produce good government’.⁹⁹

Good government as understood by Hare required the representation of the clerisy, or the educated elite as an endowed class, so designated and advocated by the romantic poet and philosopher Samuel Taylor Coleridge in his *On the Constitution of the Church and State, According to the Idea of Each* written during the debate over Catholic Emancipation in 1829 and published in 1830.¹⁰⁰ This ‘national church’ or ‘third estate’ was to include, according to Coleridge, the ‘learned of all denominations’ such as the ‘sages and professors of the law and jurisprudence’.¹⁰¹ Although Hare made no reference to Coleridge in *The Machinery of Representation*, the affinity between Hare and Coleridge was distinct. Hare claimed that personal representation by the single transferable vote ‘conveniently admits of the introduction of electors not combined by territorial association’, in particular ‘members of any profession or scientific body, the right of admission to which is really tested by a rigid preliminary examination’, such as ‘members of the Colleges of Physicians and Surgeons, of the Inns of Court, and of the Universities (old and new), Royal Academicians, attorneys and solicitors, and civil engineers and architects’, ‘ministers of religion, whether of the church or dissenting bodies, whose admission to their offices is conditional on a sufficient amount of learning’, ‘school-masters who have certificates of qualification’, and ‘the most intelligent workmen’.¹⁰² In advocating his electoral system, Hare employed a distinctly judicial analogy:

An election will no more be a saturnalia. The elector will vote, after deliberation, in the quiet of his chamber, and not after he has been exposed to the attempts of selfish and evil partizans to excite his prejudices and pervert his judgment. Truth and right cannot go hand in hand with prejudice and passion. In those courts where the judges are the terror of wrong doers, or the guardians of civil rights, you wisely and indignantly repress the sound either of censure or applause. The tumultuous burst of expression that betrays a state in which the mind has ceased to be calm and self-possessed, is felt to be unbecoming and

mischievous in the sanctuary of justice. Let us endeavour to protect alike the sanctuary of legislation, so that it may at least have its origin in peace, 'if it live 'mid tumult'.¹⁰³

The influence of the clerisy would be threatened by democracy, Hare anticipated, and personal representation by the single transferable vote would be imperative. In opposition to Bentham, who in his *Constitutional Code* in 1830 had maintained a plurality system in territorial constituencies,¹⁰⁴ Coleridge in his book *Table Talk*, in 1832, had opposed territorial representation and had equated the *vox populi* with the *vox diaboli*.¹⁰⁵ Hare in *The Machinery of Representation*, however, warned against resisting 'democratic progress':

It is the staff of a bruised reed on which if a man lean it will go into his hand and pierce him. Anomalies in the representation will be swept away. It will be in vain to urge again and again that by this means some Burke, or Horner, or Canning *may* find a way into parliament. The sense of mankind rejects an institution professing to do one thing, only in order that it may effect something totally different. It is not a time for shams. The aristocracy, as the natural leaders of the people, should emancipate themselves from the artificial fetters by which they are bound, and reconstruct the electoral machinery upon a principle which shall give to the mind as well as to the body entire scope and freedom.¹⁰⁶

An election by the single transferable vote, he maintained, 'would no longer be a struggle who shall be the victors in a trial of strength, but who shall best earn the love and gratitude of their country by initiating and carrying out the wisest measures for the national good',¹⁰⁷ and a House of Commons with personal representation would be 'the accurate reflection, not of some only, but of all the intelligence and virtue which tests of qualification can winnow and bring out'.¹⁰⁸ Under the plurality system of voting in territorial constituencies, extension of the franchise to the uneducated majority would have the consequence of elimination of the representation of the educated minority, according to Hare, and virtual representation would provide no protection for the clerisy as would personal representation by the single transferable vote. His primary concern was the public good, as he remarked in the final lines of *The Machinery of Representation*: 'In contemplating the future it would be happy if we might hope that more and more of our leading men – those who give their impress to the age – would come to think

and act on the belief, that there are other and better things to be desired, in the destinies of our country and people, than the triumph of any party.'¹⁰⁹

Parliamentary reform being under public debate during and after the general election in 1857,¹¹⁰ concerns similar to those of Hare were expressed by others such as jurist James Lorimer in his *Political Progress Not Necessarily Democratic, or Relative Equality the True Foundation of Liberty*, in which he acknowledged a debt to Coleridge.¹¹¹ Lorimer considered democracy to be regressive, emphasizing 'the practicality of recognizing politically that social inequality which exists among men'.¹¹² Advocating plural voting, he proposed that the franchise should account for 'those distinctions as regards the intelligence of classes (e.g. between handworkers and headworkers) which exist in all civilized societies, and which in our own have been socially recognized for ages'.¹¹³ A separate franchise for members of the clerisy in addition to the one based on property would provide, he argued, 'security from the consequences of an inevitable extension of political privileges'.¹¹⁴ He did not discuss the system of election or offer an alternative to virtual representation, but his book was praised by Hare in the second edition of *The Machinery of Representation* as one 'which treats of political progress, with ability not surpassed by anything on the subject in our language'.¹¹⁵

In a footnote in *Political Progress Not Necessarily Democratic*, Lorimer directed attention to a pamphlet by barrister George Harris, *The True Theory of Representation in a State*, published first in 1852 and in a second edition in 1857. Harris was an advocate of the representation of interests rather than numbers, each of which, he argued, 'ought to be represented in due proportion to its relative importance'.¹¹⁶ The leading interests he identified were virtue, or religion and morality, and intelligence, or 'the predominant sway of those minds of superior ability and high cultivation, and of extensive and ample knowledge'.¹¹⁷ The interests following intelligence were order, or law and justice, property, the professions, and the populace, of which he wrote: 'Although I would trust a mob never to elect a statesman who was known to be corrupt, or who was an avowed supporter of abuses, I dare not trust it with nice matters of legislation'.¹¹⁸ Intelligence, he emphasized, 'must be as important in a representative assembly as it is in an individual, and consequently ought to secure its due share of influence there'.¹¹⁹ Like Lorimer, Harris did not discuss the system of election or offer an alternative to virtual representation as did Hare, but the ideas of all three were similar in their concern with the representation of the clerisy in the House of Commons.

Likewise, the text of a memorial to Palmerston published in *The Times* on 19 December 1857 proposed 'separate territorial constituencies' for the 'distinct and separate representation' of 'those classes who have had the advantage of a liberal education' so 'their votes may not be swamped as they would if only enfranchised as units in large popular constituencies'.¹²⁰ The details of the scheme, which *The Times* considered to be worthy of a Laputan philosopher,¹²¹ were explained in an anonymous pamphlet, *The Educational Franchise*, which had been published in 1853, the same year in which Harris had joined a committee to discuss such a scheme of educational qualifications at the invitation of Augustus Stapleton, formerly private secretary to George Canning.¹²² *The Educational Franchise* contained a table of professional and institutional qualifications – religious, legal, medical, naval, military, commercial, educational, literary, scientific, and artistic – and a table of distribution, calculating a total of 92,618 electors for 70 members of Parliament.¹²³ The memorial to Palmerston was signed by over 200 of the clerisy and clergy, including Harris and Stapleton; reformers Lord Brougham and Lord Shaftsbury; H.G. Liddell, Dean of Christ Church, Oxford, and W.H. Bateson, Master of St John's College, Cambridge; historian James Anthony Froude and art critic John Ruskin; novelist Charles Kingsley and theologian Frederick Denison Maurice, the Christian Socialist founder of the Working Men's College in London.¹²⁴ Maurice, who when a student at Cambridge had been a member of the elite Cambridge Conversazione Society, or Apostles, and had been influenced by Coleridge,¹²⁵ subsequently explained to Hare that he had recognized objections to the memorial to Palmerston but had subscribed due to his belief that scholars 'should be more connected with the business of the country'.¹²⁶

Absent from the list of subscribers to the memorial to Palmerston was the name of the philosopher John Stuart Mill, a son of James Mill. He did not sign the memorial because he did not consider it to be practical rather than because he did not agree with it in principle, however, as he explained: 'I quite agree in the opinion that educated persons should count in a greater ratio than that of their mere numbers in the constituency of the country. But I have not seen any method proposed by which persons of educated minds can be sifted from the rest of the community.'¹²⁷ That he agreed with the memorial in principle was in accord with his attitude to the clerisy. Following what later in his *Autobiography* he called his 'mental crisis' in 1826, when he had experienced a depression and had questioned the utilitarianism of Bentham of whom like his father he had been a disciple, Mill had turned

to the philosophy of Coleridge and his fellow romantic poet William Wordsworth.¹²⁸ Influenced by the German philosopher Immanuel Kant, Coleridge unlike Bentham had been an idealist rather than a rationalist, emphasizing feeling over reason and subordinating calculation to imagination. In his *Biographia Literaria, or Biographical Sketches of My Literary Life and Opinions* published in two volumes in 1817, Coleridge wrote of the 'primary imagination' as being 'the living power and prime agent of all human perception, and as a repetition in the finite mind of the eternal act of creation in the infinite I AM' and of the 'secondary imagination' as being 'an echo of the former, co-existing with the conscious will, yet still as identical with the primary in the kind of its agency, and differing only in degree, and in the mode of its operation'.¹²⁹ Mill, in the process of the resolution of his 'mental crisis' after 1826, according to his *Autobiography*, 'was deriving much from Coleridge'.¹³⁰

Subsequently, Mill had attempted to reconcile the rationalism of Bentham and the idealism of Coleridge, 'the two great seminal minds of England in their age', as Mill wrote in an article on Bentham in the *London and Westminster Review* in 1838.¹³¹ 'The influence of the former has made itself felt chiefly on Movement minds, of the latter on Conservative ones', he observed, 'and the two systems of concentric circles which the shock given by them is spreading over the ocean of mind, have only just begun to meet and intersect'.¹³² Addressing himself to radicals disposed to agreement with Bentham rather than with Coleridge, Mill emphasized what he considered to be the negative aspects of the philosophy of Bentham. Regarding the individual, Mill argued, it was 'a system of ethics which does not pretend to aid individuals in the formation of their own character' and which 'overlooks the existence of about half of the whole number of mental feelings which human beings are capable of, including all those of which the direct objects are states of their own mind'.¹³³ He argued likewise regarding society: 'It will do nothing (except sometimes as an instrument in the hands of a higher principle) for the spiritual interests of society; nor does it suffice of itself even for the material interests. That which alone causes any material interests to exist, which alone enables any body of human beings to exist as a society, is national character'.¹³⁴ The philosophy of Bentham provided for the conduct of business interests, Mill recognized, but 'he committed the mistake of supposing that the business part of human affairs was the whole of them', given 'his want of imagination' and 'small experience of human feelings'.¹³⁵

In an article on Coleridge in the *London and Westminster Review* in 1840, Mill focused attention on what he considered to be the positive

aspects of his philosophy and endorsed the clerisy: 'That such a class is likely to be behind, instead of before, the progress of knowledge, is an induction erroneously drawn from the peculiar circumstances of the last two centuries, and in contradiction to all the rest of modern history', he argued. 'If we have seen much of the abuses of endowments, we have not seen what this country might be made by a proper administration of them.... On this subject we... are entirely at one with Coleridge.'¹³⁶ Mill emphasized the provision of 'permanence' and 'progression' in the political theory of Coleridge, permanence 'by a representation of the landed proprietors' in the House of Lords and progression 'by a representation of personal property and of intellectual acquirement' in the House of Commons.¹³⁷ In contrast to Bentham, Coleridge demonstrated 'that a Tory philosopher cannot be wholly a Tory, but must often be a better Liberal than Liberals themselves', Mill concluded, 'while he is the natural means of rescuing from oblivion truths which Tories have forgotten, and which the prevailing schools of Liberalism never knew'.¹³⁸

During the 1830s, the influence of Coleridge on Mill was reinforced by the influence of Alexis de Tocqueville. A young French aristocrat and junior magistrate at Versailles, Tocqueville, between 1828 and 1830, attended the lectures on the history of civilization in Europe delivered in Paris by François Guizot, the Professor of Modern History at the Sorbonne, who emphasized the decline of the aristocracy and the rise of the middle class and advocated a liberal polity of decentralized government under constitutional monarchy and representative democracy.¹³⁹ After the revolution in France in July 1830 by which the middle class consolidated power under the monarchy of Louis-Philippe, Tocqueville with his friend and fellow magistrate Gustave de Beaumont travelled to the United States where he critically scrutinized its democratic polity during the presidency of Andrew Jackson, a Democrat elected in 1828 with the support of the urban working class.¹⁴⁰ After his journey from 1831 to 1832, Tocqueville proceeded to write *De la Démocratie en Amérique*, the first volume of which was published in 1835 and the second in 1840. Therein he argued that the 'democratic revolution' in Europe was a 'social revolution' whereby the decline of the aristocracy and the rise of the middle class was a 'gradual and progressive development of equality' determined by the will of God, for which reason 'to wish to stop democracy would then appear to be to struggle against God himself'.¹⁴¹ He observed that citizens in America preferred equality to liberty, however, and warned against what he called the 'tyranny of

the majority'. 'What I most reproach in democratic government, as it has been organized in the United States', he wrote, 'is not, as many people in Europe claim, its weakness, but on the contrary its irresistible force. And what is most repugnant to me in America is not the extreme freedom that reigns there, it is the lack of a guarantee against tyranny'.¹⁴² Separation of powers in the federal and state constitutions provided no protection against the 'tyranny of the majority', he argued:

When a man or a party suffers from an injustice in the United States, whom do you want him to address? Public opinion? that is what forms the majority; the legislative body? it represents the majority and obeys it blindly; the executive power? it is named by the majority and serves as its passive instrument; the public forces? they are nothing other than the majority in arms; the jury? the jury is the majority vested with the right to pronounce decrees; in certain states, the judges themselves are elected by the majority. Therefore, however iniquitous or unreasonable the measure that strikes you, you must submit to it.¹⁴³

Such tyranny was exercised by the majority over thought, he added: 'I do not know any country where, in general, less independence of mind and genuine freedom of discussion reign than in America.'¹⁴⁴

Mill, in the *London and Westminster Review* in July 1835, praised the first volume of *De la Démocratie en Amérique* as 'the most important contribution which has been made for many years to the Philosophy of Government',¹⁴⁵ and he reviewed it in the *London and Westminster Review* in October 1835. With reservations, Mill's view was that 'Tocqueville's is, in our eyes, the true view of the position in which mankind now stand',¹⁴⁶ and he related the 'tyranny of the majority' as attacked by Tocqueville to the clerisy as advocated by Coleridge. 'The idea of a rational democracy', Mill wrote, 'is not that the people themselves govern, but that they have *security* for good government. This security they cannot have, by any other means than by retaining in their own hands the ultimate control', he acknowledged. 'In no government will the interests of the people be the object, except where the people are able to dismiss their rulers as soon as the devotion of those rulers to the interests of the people becomes questionable.' He emphasized, however, that 'this is the only purpose for which it is good to intrust power to the people'.¹⁴⁷ 'The interest of the people is', he argued,

to choose for their rulers the most instructed and the ablest persons who can be found, and having done so, to allow them to exercise their knowledge and ability for the good of the people freely, or with the least possible control – as long as it is the good of the people, and not some private end, that they are aiming at. A democracy thus administered, would unite all the good qualities ever possessed by any government. Not only would its ends be good, but its means would be as well chosen as the wisdom of the age would allow; and the omnipotence of the majority would be exercised through the agency and at the discretion of an enlightened minority, accountable to the majority in the last resort.¹⁴⁸

‘When there shall exist as near an approach to unanimity among the instructed, on all the great points of moral and political knowledge’, he suggested with reference to free trade, ‘we have no fear but that the many will not only defer to their authority, but cheerfully acknowledge them as their superiors in wisdom, and the fittest to rule’.¹⁴⁹ Another reservation about the problem of the ‘tyranny of the majority’ he expressed was that ‘it is not easy to see what sort of minority it can be, over which the majority can have any interest in tyrannizing. The only standing and organized minority which exists in any community, constituted as communities usually are, is the rich. All other communities are fluctuating’, he indicated, ‘and he who is in the majority to-day is in the minority tomorrow: each in his turn is liable to this kind of oppression; all, therefore, are interested in preventing it from having existence’.¹⁵⁰ Mill recognized that Tocqueville was concerned with ‘a tyranny exercised over opinions, more than over persons’,¹⁵¹ however, and suggested that ‘in countries where there exist endowed institutions for education, and a numerous class possessed of hereditary leisure, there is a security, far greater than has ever existed in America, against the tyranny of public opinion over the individual mind’.¹⁵² The problem remained, however, Mill argued in the *London and Westminster Review* in 1836, ‘that by the natural growth of civilization, power passes from individuals to masses, and the weight and importance of an individual, as compared with the mass, sink into greater and greater insignificance’.¹⁵³ Further concern with the problem was expressed by Mill in his article on Bentham in 1838, in which he referred to Tocqueville as ‘the Montesquieu of our own times’: ‘The power of the majority is salutary so far as it is used defensively, not offensively – as its exertion is tempered by respect for the personality of the individual, and reverence for superiority of cultivated intelligence.’¹⁵⁴

Mill returned to *De la Démocratie en Amérique* upon the publication of the second volume in 1840 when he reviewed the complete work, translated into English by Henry Reeve, in the *Edinburgh Review*, of which Reeve was the editor. Summarizing the argument of Tocqueville and characterizing democracy as ‘the government of a numerous middle class’,¹⁵⁵ Mill focused attention on democratic government as distinct from democratic society and increased emphasis on the relationship between the ‘tyranny of the majority’ and the role of the clerisy. ‘The despotism... of the majority within the limits of civil life, though a real evil, does not appear to us to be a formidable one’, he argued. ‘The tyranny which we fear... is of another kind – a tyranny not over the body but over the mind.’¹⁵⁶ In America the people deferred not to ‘the traditions of antiquity’ or ‘the dogmas of priests or philosophers’ but to ‘one another’, he observed. ‘All being nearly equal in circumstances, and all nearly alike in intelligence and knowledge, the only authority which commands an involuntary deference is that of numbers.’¹⁵⁷ The consequence was the silencing of ‘dissident voices’ and the surrender of ‘private judgment’.¹⁵⁸ ‘To sustain the higher pursuits of philosophy and art; to vindicate and protect the unfettered exercise of reason, and the moral freedom of the individual’, he asserted, ‘these are purposes to which, under a democracy, the superior spirits, and the government so far as it is permitted, should devote their utmost energies’.¹⁵⁹ Such was in accord with Coleridge rather than with Bentham. In Britain as in America, Mill emphasized, the dominant middle class was the ‘commercial class’, and in a democracy its influence needed to be balanced by the ‘agricultural class’, a ‘leisured class’, or the aristocracy, and a ‘learned class’, or the clerisy.¹⁶⁰ ‘If the middle class are left to the mere habits and instincts of a commercial community’, he concluded that

we shall have a ‘tyranny of the majority,’ not the less irksome because most of the tyrants may not be manual labourers. For it is a chimerical hope to overbear or outnumber the middle class; whatever modes of voting, whatever redistribution of the constituencies, are really necessary for placing the government in their hands – those, whether we like it or not, they will assuredly obtain.¹⁶¹

During the 1850s, therefore, Mill was advocating the election of members of Parliament by universal suffrage qualified by an educational qualification and plural voting, rejecting the ballot and seeking a system of election to protect the clerisy from the ‘tyranny of the majority’, representative government requiring both participation and competence.¹⁶²

Thus in 1853, he responded positively to a proposal contained in a paper sent to him by Lord Monteagle, the father-in-law of its author, James Garth Marshall, a Liberal member of Parliament for Leeds from 1847 to 1852 when he stood down to devote more time to the family textile firm. In his paper, Marshall proposed that an elector in a multi-member constituency be allowed to give the same number of votes as seats to a single candidate, which he pointed out 'would enable him to vote for one or for more as he pleased, without the loss entailed by the present mode of voting, where a plumper counts only as one vote'.¹⁶³ As he acknowledged, this system had been recommended for the election of the Cape of Good Hope legislative council by the Committee of the Privy Council for Trade and Plantations in 1850 when the 3rd Earl Grey had been the Secretary of State for War and the Colonies.¹⁶⁴ When Marshall proposed the system for elections in Britain in 1853 he called it the cumulative vote. Mill thought the proposal valuable, as he wrote to Lord Monteagle in March:

The suggestion in the paper you sent me is intended to meet a difficulty which has always appeared to me one of the chief stumbling blocks of representative government. Whoever could devise a means of preventing minorities from being, as they are now, swamped, and enabling them to obtain a share of the representation proportional to their numbers and not more than proportional, would render a great service. Whether the plan proposed would do this, and to what objections it may be liable, I should be sorry to be obliged to say without more consideration than I have yet given it.¹⁶⁵

Observing that the system would function best in constituencies returning more than two members, Mill added that

the cumulative vote would be one of the best ways which occur to me of enabling quality of support to count as well as quantity. The candidates most likely to benefit by it would be those who were too good for the mass of the constituency; those, for example, whose election was endangered by some honest but unpopular vote or opinion, and who for that very reason would probably be supported with redoubled zeal by the better minority.¹⁶⁶

After further consideration, Mill proceeded to incorporate the cumulative vote in a pamphlet he was writing, *Thoughts on Parliamentary Reform*.¹⁶⁷

In agreement with Mill was William Rathbone Greg, a Manchester mill owner who considered himself liberal but ‘decidedly conservative in all that relates to the further infusion of the democratic element into our constitution’.¹⁶⁸ In 1852, he had argued in the *Edinburgh Review* that exclusive majority representation was ‘the chief defect in the existing representative system. . . . At present, it is only by a happy accident that the minority is ever represented at all’.¹⁶⁹ Evidently he had access to the letter from Mill to Lord Monteagle in 1853, for without reference to Marshall he proposed the cumulative vote in identical language in the *Edinburgh Review* in October.¹⁷⁰

In December 1853, the paper by Marshall was published as a pamphlet *Minorities and Majorities: Their Relative Rights: A Letter to the Lord John Russell on Parliamentary Reform*, in which he advocated the cumulative vote as a ‘balance and regulator to the prevailing democratic tendencies of the age’, commenting:

I would not be understood as wishing to do more than balance and regulate democratic tendencies, for with these I fully sympathise. I believe them to be appointed to work out good, not evil; – but we must take care that our progress shall tend to the elevation of the masses, by raising the intellectual and moral standard of the whole; and not by grinding down whatever individual force and elevation of character may rise above the common level.¹⁷¹

In January 1854, Mill wrote to Marshall that he hoped his pamphlet would be widely read,¹⁷² and in 1857, he recommended the cumulative vote as an alternative to the educational franchise in his response to the memorial to Palmerston. ‘I regard it as an indispensable part of a just representative constitution’, Mill explained, ‘that minorities be not swamped but that every considerable minority be represented in a fair proportion to its numbers. This would be secured by the simple plan proposed some years ago by Mr Marshall, of allowing a voter if he pleases to give all his votes to the same candidate’.¹⁷³

Mill did not refer to Hare in 1857 nor did Hare refer to Marshall in *The Machinery of Representation*, but Hare did refer to a system of election for the representation of minorities that had been proposed by Russell in the reform bill introduced in the House of Commons in 1854, called the limited vote, by which an elector in a multi-member constituency would be required to cast one vote less than the number of seats. This had been proposed as an amendment to the reform bill of 1831 by Winthrop Mackworth Praed, a Tory member for St Germans,

to restrict electors to two votes in the seven county constituencies to have three seats so as to contain the agricultural influence,¹⁷⁴ and a similar system had been recommended for municipal council elections in Ireland by the 2nd Earl Grey in Parliament in 1836.¹⁷⁵ Praed had been forced to withdraw his amendment in 1831, and likewise Russell had been defeated in 1854 when he had proposed that the system be adopted for boroughs as well as for counties 'so that when the minority exceeds two-fifths of the whole number of electors, they should be enabled to have one representative out of the three who are returned'.¹⁷⁶ In a review of Marshall's pamphlet in the *Edinburgh Review* in 1854, George Cornwall Lewis had commented that the proposal by Russell imparted to the question 'practical importance':

If, in order to avoid the evils inseparable from small constituencies, large constituencies with three or four members are created, and if the present system of allowing each elector to vote for as many candidates as there are members be universally introduced, then the result will be, that large local minorities will go permanently unrepresented, that coalitions of three or four candidates will produce unfair contests, and that the reflexion of the opinions and feelings of the people at large in their representative assembly will be less complete and faithful than it would be under a different system.¹⁷⁷

In *The Machinery of Representation* in 1857, Hare expressed his opinion that the limited vote had been proposed by Russell 'in the spirit of true political philosophy' and that 'nothing, perhaps, more remarkably exhibits the tyranny which inveterate habit exercises over thought, than the coldness approaching to contempt with which the suggestion was apparently received'.¹⁷⁸ Unlike the single transferable vote, however, the limited vote like the cumulative vote, although intended for the representation of minorities, was a modification of the electoral system then in operation, retaining the plurality system in territorial constituencies and providing virtual rather than personal representation.

The response to *The Machinery of Representation* in 1857 was limited. In July, the *Economist* referred to it as 'the production of an able man', but while in sympathy with the ends, it was sceptical about the means, observing that the single transferable vote would not reduce the electoral leverage of the majority under an extended franchise: 'It leaves the difficulty as to the omnivorous political power of the lowest classes exactly where it was.'¹⁷⁹ In the same month, in an article on representative reform in the *Edinburgh Review*, William Rathbone Greg alluded to

Hare's electoral system but endorsed Russell's proposal as it was 'a provision in accordance with Mr Marshall's principle', although he admitted that it was 'too novel and unpractical' to be adopted.¹⁸⁰ Hare was not mentioned by the philosopher Herbert Spencer in an article on representative government in the *Westminster Review* in October¹⁸¹ or by the radical Francis Newman in an article on party government in the *Westminster Review* in April 1858.¹⁸² Likewise Hare was not mentioned by the 3rd Earl Grey in his *Parliamentary Government Considered with Reference to a Reform of Parliament* published in 1858¹⁸³ or by Henry Reeve in his review of Grey in the *Edinburgh Review* in July.¹⁸⁴ In 'The Theories of Parliamentary Reform' in a volume of *Oxford Essays* in 1858, Lord Robert Cecil observed that geographical constituencies magnified the influence of small groups, but he dismissed the proposals of 'educational' and 'symmetrical' reformers, the 'mania' of the latter being 'to introduce the accuracy of a machine and the proportions of a geometrical figure into the institutions which are to secure the happiness and carry out the wishes of capricious, inconsistent, illogical mankind'.¹⁸⁵

During 1858, Hare devoted time at Gosbury Hill to writing *A Treatise on the Election of Representatives, Parliamentary and Municipal* which was published in January 1859 with a dedication to his former legal mentor James Wigram. Although considerably longer than *The Machinery of Representation*, the *Treatise* was essentially identical in its argument, for as Hare indicated in the introduction, his proposal 'was generally considered to stand in need of development more in the way of showing its practicability, than of proving the value of the objects it was directed to attain'.¹⁸⁶ Now he presented his electoral system in the form of a bill of 33 clauses and explained each in turn.¹⁸⁷ The text of the *Treatise* was embellished throughout with extensive quotations from, among others, Burke, Guizot, and the American statesman and political philosopher John C. Calhoun, a southern Democrat who prior to his death in 1850 had defended slavery and had attacked northern legislation as the 'tyranny of the majority', his *Disquisition on Government* having been published in 1851.¹⁸⁸ In his *Treatise*, Hare later explained, he 'quoted largely from authors of various sympathies' because he 'was anxious to address every class of mind'.¹⁸⁹

Hare reiterated the principle of personal representation in his *Treatise* and was more explicit than before in attacking the principle of virtual representation:

If liberalism be triumphant in one constituency, conservatism, it is answered, is triumphant in another. The argument is as untenable,

as the principle is dangerous. It is not the fact that the opinions suppressed by the electoral voice at one place are expressed in those of another. . . . This supposed system of balances and counteractions is the *ignis fatuus* of the politicians of this century.¹⁹⁰

The limited vote as proposed by Russell in 1854 was considered by Hare in 1859 to be inadequate as territorial constituencies would be retained and it would not be applied in all, and 'many minorities . . . would still be omitted'.¹⁹¹ He observed, however, that 'some measure of this nature is evidently demanded by political justice and prudence, if the electoral arrangements of the kingdom are to remain in their present shape. The way in which the proposal has been received', he added, 'and the form which the opposition to it has assumed, is most instructive, as showing the arbitrary and intolerant character of majorities'.¹⁹² The single transferable vote, he claimed, would give 'full weight' to the 'educated classes'.¹⁹³

Further, Hare in his *Treatise* claimed also that personal representation by the single transferable vote would decrease the emphasis on party government, which he attacked as a 'contrivance',¹⁹⁴ and increase the influence of public opinion in Parliament. Parliament was a forum of public opinion, he argued, and it 'should be registered there with an accuracy resembling that of a thermometer',¹⁹⁵ whereas party government constrained and subordinated public opinion. 'In the vast field of modern legislation', he observed, 'a multitude of political and social problems come to be solved with which party has nothing to do, and into which the introduction of party elements and considerations is not only useless, but is absolutely pernicious', adding: 'The tendency of a system of government founded on numerical majorities alone is to absorb all differences into one issue – a contest for power.'¹⁹⁶ Majority rule was not the issue, he claimed, for it was separate from the issue of the representation of minorities:

The majority *must* necessarily decide; but in the formation of a representative body, the purpose is that the body thus to be created, and not the constituent body, is to be intrusted with the power of decision. If that were the function of the constituent body, there would be no necessity for appointing the representative. It is, consequently, by the majority of the representative body that the decision must be pronounced.¹⁹⁷

Thus he considered minority representation to be the prerequisite of majority rule, advocating the adoption of his electoral system at the local as well as at the national level.¹⁹⁸

With reference to the franchise, Hare claimed that the £10 qualification was reasonable, providing that it be applied to residents of counties as well as boroughs as proposed by Locke King. 'The principle is equality of the suffrage,' Hare commented, 'wherever the place of residence may be,'¹⁹⁹ and he advocated including all women who met the qualification: 'There is no sound reason for excluding her from the parliamentary franchise.... There would be great propriety in celebrating a reign which has been productive of so much moral benefit, by the abolition of an anomaly which is so entirely without any justifiable foundation.'²⁰⁰ He emphasized that the franchise, however, was 'a matter so distinct from electoral organisation, that the legislature should deal with the two things in separate Acts. Blending them together tends to confuse and embarrass the discussion of both, and is convenient only to those who would divert the public mind from true conclusions on the question of representation'.²⁰¹ Unlike the franchise, the ballot was a central concern, and he rejected it as ineffective against bribery and retained open voting in his electoral system.²⁰²

Hare's *Treatise* received more attention than had *The Machinery of Representation*. In the *Edinburgh Review* in January 1859, George Cornewall Lewis discussed it with James Lorimer's *Political Progress Not Necessarily Democratic*, defending democratic reform against Lorimer and attacking Hare. Lewis advocated the representation of minorities by 'multiplying electoral districts, and varying their size and character' rather than by 'a contrivance such as the minority clause of the Bill of 1854'.²⁰³ In the *Saturday Review* in February, Hare was identified as 'well known to the public at large as one of the Charity Commissioners, and to the legal profession as the author of one of the most valuable of the many series of Chancery Reports', but his electoral system was considered impractical. It was 'worked out with an elaborate minuteness and a technical skill which entitle it to consideration' but 'can have little value for any practical politician, apart from its extraordinary ingenuity'.²⁰⁴ Hare was not mentioned by the journalist Walter Bagehot in the *National Review* in January when he discussed parliamentary reform and representation of minorities,²⁰⁵ nor in April when he reviewed Mill's *Thoughts on Parliamentary Reform* which had just been published. Bagehot dismissed the proposition 'that it is possible for a provident legislator to measure the social influence of particular interests, and to apportion to them an exact *quantum* of corresponding representation', a 'doctrine of Class

Representation' which he associated with Coleridge's *On the Constitution of the Church and State*.²⁰⁶ Hare's *Treatise* was reviewed in the *Economist* in June, however, recommending it as 'worthy of thoughtful study' and suggesting that it manifested 'exact, thorough, and consistent thinking and lucid statement... in a degree very unusual in political writing'. The 'chief defect' was not impracticality but 'the *doctrinaire* tone which pervades it'.²⁰⁷

Meanwhile, Hare forwarded copies of his *Treatise* to various political leaders, such as John Bright, who had opposed the limited vote proposed by Russell in 1854.²⁰⁸ Bright wrote to Hare on 8 February 1859 that although he had 'not yet been able to do more than just look into it', he admitted a suspicion that 'many of the most ingenious among those who discuss it, are looking out for means of evading a real representation than of advancing it'.²⁰⁹ Gladstone, to whom Hare suggested consideration of representation by a parliamentary committee, wrote to Hare on 12 March 1859 and extended thanks for the *Treatise*, which he had not yet read, observing there was 'a great disposition in the public mind to give attention to the various thoughtful writers who have been striving to elucidate it', but indicating that 'a Committee of the House of Commons would be scarcely competent to deal with the subject of the Representation'.²¹⁰ Had Disraeli received a copy of the *Treatise* he would have been less guarded in his response. When he introduced a reform bill in the House of Commons in February 1859, he defended the principle of virtual representation, arguing that the Howard family pocket borough of Arundel served to provide a representative in Parliament not only for its own Catholic majority but also for the Catholic minority in other constituencies.²¹¹ Accordingly, in June 1859 he told the House of Commons that the representation of minorities as by the limited vote proposed by Russell was 'a proposition hostile to the very principle on which representative government is founded, and alien to the spirit of the constitution'.²¹²

Considerably more enthusiastic was Mill, whose *On Liberty* was published in February 1859 in which he reiterated his warning against the 'tyranny of the majority'.²¹³ Upon reading Hare's *Treatise*, Mill shifted his allegiance from the cumulative vote to the single transferable vote, as he wrote to Hare on 3 March 1859:

You appear to me to have exactly, and for the first time, solved the difficulty of popular representation; and by doing so, to have raised up the cloud of gloom and uncertainty which hung over the futurity of representative government and therefore of civilization. That you

are right in theory I never could have doubted, and as to practice, having begun with a great natural distrust of what seemed a very complicated set of arrangements, I ended by being convinced that the plan is workable, and effectually guarded or guardable against fraud. In the details I have as yet found only one point which, it seems to me, might be improved, and that is so minor a one as hardly to be worth mentioning.²¹⁴

He added: 'I shall henceforth be a zealous apostle.'²¹⁵

3

Personal Representation and the Second Reform Act, 1859–1867

‘Have you seen Hare’s book on Representation?’, John Stuart Mill enquired in a letter to George Cornwall Lewis on 20 March 1859. ‘I think it both a monument of intellect, and of inestimable practical importance at the present moment’, he wrote. ‘His suggestions appear to me the real basis of a reconciliation between Radicalism and Conservatism.’¹

Mill proceeded to contribute to *Fraser’s Magazine* in April 1859 ‘Recent Writers on Reform’ in which he reviewed Hare’s *Treatise* in conjunction with *Political Progress Not Necessarily Democratic* by James Lorimer and *A Plea for the Constitution* by another jurist, John Austin, a utilitarian whose *The Province of Jurisprudence Determined* had been published in 1832 based on lectures delivered as Professor of Jurisprudence and the Law of Nations at the University of London which Mill had attended.² Austin had supported the Great Reform Act in 1832, but as of 1859, the year of his death, he was opposed to further parliamentary reform, and Mill reviewed *A Plea for the Constitution* with less sympathy than he did *Political Progress Not Necessarily Democratic*.³ Hare’s *Treatise*, however, Mill praised as being ‘of far superior value: in which, for the first time, a way is really shown to that reconciliation and simultaneous recognition of the best principles and ends of rival theories, which the generality of political writers have despaired of, which Mr Lorimer aims at, but which Mr Hare actually realizes’.⁴ Mill suggested that Hare raised the principle of the representation of minorities ‘to an importance and dignity which no previous writer had ascribed to it. As conceived by him, it should be called the real, instead of nominal, representation of every individual elector.’⁵ The representation of minorities, Mill continued, ‘is a necessary consequence from all premises on which any representation at all can be defended’.⁶ He recognized that ‘in a deliberative assembly the

minority must perforce give way, because the decision must be either aye or no', but he emphasized that

it is not so in choosing those who are to form the deliberative assembly: *that* ought to be the express image of the wishes of the nation, whether divided or unanimous, in the designation of those by whose united councils it will be ruled; and any section of opinion which is unanimous within itself, ought to be able, in due proportion to the rest, to contribute its elements towards the collective deliberation.⁷

'At present', he observed,

if three-fifths of the electors vote for one person and two-fifths for another, every individual of the two-fifths is, for the purposes of that election, as if he did not exist: his intelligence, his preference, have gone for nothing in the composition of the Parliament. Whatever was the object designed by the Constitution in giving him a vote, that object, at least on the present occasion, has not been fulfilled: and if he can be reconciled to his position, it must be by the consideration that some other time he may be one of a majority, and another set of persons instead of himself may be reduced to ciphers.⁸

The limited vote and the cumulative vote were 'praiseworthy so far as they go, but they attain the object very imperfectly',⁹ he argued, whereas the single transferable vote

provides for all the difficulties involved in representation of minorities. The smallest minority obtains an influence proportioned to its numbers; the largest obtains no more. The representation becomes, what under no other system it can be, really equal. Every member of Parliament is the representative of an unanimous constituency. No one is represented, or rather misrepresented, by a member whom he has voted against.¹⁰

He explained the operation of the single transferable vote, denying that it was 'too complex and subtle to be workable' and asserting that 'Mr Hare's draft of a Bill is ten times more simple and intelligible than the Reform Act, or almost any other Act of Parliament which deals with a great subject.'¹¹

In providing personal representation, Mill maintained, the single transferable vote 'would prodigiously improve the *personnel* of the

national representation. At present, were they ever so desirous, a great majority of the most distinguished men in the country have little or no chance of being elected anywhere as members of the House of Commons', adding that the House of Commons elected by Hare's system 'would contain the *elite* of the nation'.¹² Majorities as well as minorities 'would be brought under inducements to make a more careful choice',¹³ he predicted, and party leaders

could no longer count upon bringing up the whole strength of the party, to return any professed Liberal or Conservative who would make it worth their while. An elector even of their own party, who was dissatisfied with the candidate offered him, would not then be obliged to vote for that candidate, or remain unrepresented. He would have the option of contributing to give his country, or his party, the benefit of a better representative elsewhere; and his leaders would be under the necessity of offering him some one whom he would consider creditable, to be secure of his vote.¹⁴

He asserted that the greatest benefit of Hare's electoral system would be 'in raising the tone of the whole political morality of the country',¹⁵ remarking that 'Mr Hare, when he reaches this part of his subject, rises into a noble enthusiasm, which is irresistibly attractive when combined, as it is in him, with a sober and sagacious perception of the relation between means and ends.'¹⁶

With regard to extension of the franchise, Mill emphasized that Hare's proposed electoral system was 'of the very greatest importance'.¹⁷ The 'educated class' was opposed to a 'democratic suffrage', Mill indicated, not because the 'ignorant class' would be 'the *strongest* power' in Parliament but because they would be 'the *sole* power; because in every constituency the votes of that class would swamp and politically annihilate all other members of the community taken together'.¹⁸ By Hare's electoral system, Mill insisted, 'the educated and the propertied classes could still be represented, though by a minority' and 'there would not, in the minds of many of those classes, be the same insuperable objection to the political preponderance of the majority'.¹⁹ The minority would be represented by 'the ablest heads and noblest hearts in the nation', and he added:

The cause of the minority would be likely to be supported with such consummate skill, and such a weight of moral authority, as might prove a sufficient balance to the superiority of numbers on the other

side, and enable the opinions of the higher and middle classes to prevail when they were right, even in an assembly of which the majority had been chosen by the poor.²⁰

Mill agreed with Hare that the franchise should be extended to women,²¹ but he did not agree with him that the £10 franchise qualification was sufficient or that an educational qualification was impractical.²² Although plural voting would be unnecessary, according to Mill, it would be 'perfectly compatible' with the single transferable vote due to the possibility for an elector to have more than one single transferable vote.²³ Likewise, he agreed with Hare that the ballot would be unnecessary under the operation of his electoral system and that the practice of bribery for votes would be reduced.²⁴ Mill concluded his review by evaluating Hare's *Treatise* as a 'remarkable book' which if it 'made no practical suggestions whatever, and had no value but that of the principles it enforces, it would still deserve a high rank among manuals of political thought'.²⁵ Later in 1859, the pages of 'Recent Writers on Reform' devoted to Hare's *Treatise* were reprinted as a supplement to a second edition of Mill's *Thoughts on Parliamentary Reform*.²⁶

In June 1859, the *Economist* commented that the discussion of Hare's *Treatise* by Mill in *Fraser's Magazine* had given him 'a letter of introduction to the public which ensures him respectful reception and audience'.²⁷ Such followed at the congress of the Social Science Association held in Bradford in October 1859 at which Hare read a paper, 'On the Mode of Electing Representatives in Parliament and Municipalities'.²⁸ He had been encouraged to do so by Mill, who had written to him on 6 August that 'the subject of your paper' would be 'very valuable', adding: 'The best use that can be made of the Association is to make it a means of gaining adhesions to important practical suggestions fitted for immediate adoption'.²⁹ Hare had forwarded a copy of his paper to Mill, who had replied on 24 August that he considered it to be 'excellent' but commented:

If I had a criticism to make, it would be that you suppose the persons to whom it is addressed less ignorant than, I am afraid, they are. You address them as if they were well acquainted with the subject of discussion, but were under the influence of some of the futile objections which have been brought against you. No doubt this is the case with some, but for the greater number I fear that a brief popular explanation of the plan itself and of its purposes is still required.³⁰

At the same congress another barrister, August Frederick Mayo, read a paper, 'On the Moral and Intellectual Effects of Mr Hare's Plan for Improving the Machinery of Representation'.³¹ Neither the paper by Hare nor that by Mayo were published in the *Transactions* of the Social Science Association, but Mill wrote to Hare later in October that he 'was much pleased by receiving from you so satisfactory an account of your proceedings at Bradford, and of the prospects of the cause'.³²

Among those who attended the Social Science Association congress in Bradford in 1859 was Henry Fawcett.³³ Born in 1833, his father William Fawcett had been the Mayor of Salisbury in 1832 and a supporter of the Great Reform Act and the Anti-Corn Law League. Henry Fawcett had read mathematics at Cambridge, entering Peterhouse in 1852 and moving to Trinity Hall in 1853, and had graduated with a BA in January 1856 followed by election as a Fellow of Trinity Hall in December of the same year. Meanwhile in London in November, he had begun to study the law as a member of Lincoln's Inn. Two years later in September 1858, however, he had been permanently blinded by his father in a shooting accident after which he had returned to Trinity Hall where he directed his attention to political economy and was influenced by the writings of John Stuart Mill.³⁴ At the Social Science Association congress in Bradford in 1859, Fawcett read two papers, 'The Theory and Tendency of Strikes' and 'The Protection of Labour against Immigration',³⁵ and there he met Hare who wrote to Mill about him. 'I was very much impressed by your account of Mr Fawcett', Mill replied to Hare in October: 'So active an interest in progress in a man early afflicted with such a misfortune as blindness, is very rare and meritorious.... It is very desirable that the friends of real representation should be in communication, in order to combine their efforts in forcing the idea on the attention of careless people, since want of familiarity with it is the chief obstacle it has to encounter'.³⁶

In December 1859, Fawcett invited both Hare and Mill to Cambridge, writing to Mill that he was 'personally a stranger to you' but that 'for the last three years your books have been the chief education of my mind'.³⁷ Mill, then in France, declined the invitation, but Hare accepted and visited Fawcett at Trinity Hall at Christmas.³⁸ According to Leslie Stephen, at that time also a Fellow of Trinity Hall and a close friend of Fawcett, Hare's electoral system became a topic of common-room conversation.³⁹ Subsequently, many of the Victorian academics who were attracted to Hare's proposal were associated with Cambridge.⁴⁰

Fawcett like Mill was a radical who considered democracy to be inevitable but who, as Stephen related, was 'strongly convinced that

democracy had a very evil side'.⁴¹ Fearing the 'tyranny of the majority', Fawcett supported Hare's proposal because, according to Stephen, 'in the adoption of that principle in some form lay the only remedy against the great danger of an oppression of minorities'.⁴² Accordingly, Fawcett like Mill became an advocate of Hare's proposal. In January 1860, Fawcett sent a copy of the second edition of *Thoughts on Parliamentary Reform* to the 3rd Earl Grey 'in case Mr Mill's remarks upon Mr Hare's Bill should have escaped you'.⁴³ This was approved by Mill who, again in England, wrote to Hare on 4 February that Grey was the most likely member of the House of Lords to support his electoral system but warned that 'it would be most undesirable that he should identify himself with it *early*, as he has got so confirmed a character for being crotchety and impractical, that is (being interpreted) for *having no following*, that people think they may dismiss anything at once of which *he* is the most prominent supporter'. Mill advised that 'any public move should, I am convinced, go to the Commons first, and should turn the Liberal side of the scheme outwards, shewing the other side afterwards'.⁴⁴ At the same time, he encouraged Fawcett, to whom he wrote on 5 February:

We can never do enough in pressing forward Mr Hare's plan, which, in my deliberate belief, contains the true solution of the political difficulties of the future. It is an uphill race, and a race against time, for if the American form of democracy overtakes us first, the majority will no more relax their despotism than a single despot would. But our only chance is to come forward as Liberals, carrying out the Democratic idea, not as Conservatives, resisting it. To become identified with Toryism would be fatal to the plan, for the Conservative is not only the least powerful, but the silliest party. ... It will be, as it has been through all my lifetime, that in every real pinch, Radicals have had to do duty as Conservatives, often in opposition to those who they were attempting to save.⁴⁵

Mill added that Hare, 'like many discoverers, has much to learn in the art of presenting his discoveries with a view to popular effect; but he seems truly anxious for advice and help, and we who did not make the discoveries must aid them in that way'.⁴⁶ In London three days later, on 8 February, Mill was personally introduced to Fawcett by Hare.⁴⁷

Subsequently in 1860, both Hare and Mill assisted Fawcett in writing a pamphlet, *Mr Hare's Reform Bill Simplified and Explained*, in which Fawcett reiterated Hare's opposition to the system of election then in operation under which 'large and intelligent minorities are permanently

and completely disfranchised'.⁴⁸ He argued that 'to a Conservative in Marylebone, and to a large proportion of the Liberals, the suffrage is a worthless and unused privilege'.⁴⁹ Thus he attacked virtual representation:

It may be, perhaps, maintained that there is, at least, an adjustment of the inequality; that injustice here is corrected by injustice there; and that, finally, a proper proportion of Liberals and Conservatives is preserved. Such arguments disregard all principles of representative government: and moreover they tacitly assume that there are only two sections of opinion in the country, and that each elector should be satisfied with the representative system if it practically realizes a due and proportionate utterance of the shibboleths of Whig and Tory politics.⁵⁰

He emphasized that personal representation by the single transferable vote would neither require nor prevent either an extension of the franchise or the adoption of the ballot.⁵¹ The system of election proposed by Hare was modified by Fawcett, however, who calculated the quota by dividing the number of votes rather than the number of electors on the register by the number of seats to be filled.⁵²

Mill, as he wrote to Helen Taylor on 17 February 1860, advised Fawcett that it was necessary 'to get access to individual minds likely to be influential' and suggested that his pamphlet be forwarded to selected members of Parliament and to 'all who signed the Memorial to Lord Palmerston for an educational suffrage', commenting: 'Though that scheme was not a good one, those who signed it were mostly persons of talent or instruction, & they have all given evidence that they want something out of the common line of parliamentary reform & are alive to one of the strong recommendations of Hare's plan. Most, no doubt, will disregard it, but if we can recruit a few of them, it will be a great gain.'⁵³ Likewise focusing attention on the clerisy, Hare wrote to Mill on 18 February that he considered those who had subscribed to the memorial to Palmerston 'the class to be most usefully addressed'.⁵⁴

While securing the support of Mill and Fawcett, Hare attempted to attract others in 'Representation in Practice and Theory' in *Fraser's Magazine* in February 1860. Therein he claimed that men of letters rather than party leaders treated political questions 'according to their moral aspects and general results' and were 'secure in the conclusion that what is morally wrong cannot be politically right'.⁵⁵ Quoting extensively from the social criticism of Thomas Carlyle, whose fear of democracy

exceeded that of Hare, as well as from works by Mill, John Ruskin, and Charles Kingsley, among others, Hare asserted that it was from writers rather than from politicians 'that we must seek the true principles of social and national progress'.⁵⁶ Politicians emphasized the practical aspects of political reform but did not consider the 'meaning and purpose' of institutions.⁵⁷ Representative institutions were of particular importance, he argued, for 'in political representation is contained the germ of a power, not only capable of upholding public freedom, but of developing the highest moral and intellectual qualities and energies with which the individual man, and the nation, may be gifted'.⁵⁸

The House of Commons, however, Hare complained, 'exhibits the caprice and inconsequence which, in individual conduct, is only expected from persons who are ignorant, prejudiced, and impulsive',⁵⁹ and 'the positive ends of government to which Coleridge adverts – that of "making the means of subsistence more easy to each individual – securing to each the hope of bettering his own condition, and that of his children – and the development of those faculties which are essential to his humanity – that is, to his rational and moral being," – all are utterly neglected'.⁶⁰ In 1832, he claimed, the Great Reform Act 'by extinguishing the influences which before predominated, had the effect of exciting the ambition of a numerous and increasing class of persons, whose obscurity and mediocrity would have prevented them from aspiring to a seat in Parliament, if an avenue had not thus been afforded'.⁶¹ Since 1832, he continued, the House of Commons was 'a new and tempting market, or rather hundreds of markets, to which every rich, reckless, or shameless man might resort and try his chances of acquiring celebrity, and even public honours and the distinctions of the Senate'.⁶² He admitted that 'the monied and the trading classes are doubtless as prolific as any other in competent men', but he insisted that 'the discouragement of the best and the tempting of the worst of them to aspire to the more elevated positions of the State, can lead to nothing but the low tone of political conduct and feeling to which the country has arrived'.⁶³ Seats in the House of Commons, he protested, were

filled by men of the most superficial talents, ready to pledge themselves to any dogma or adopt any nostrum which the greatest number of their supporters may agree upon. Such men, wanting in all the qualities that inspire confidence, sink necessarily into mere delegates. The mouthpieces of popular meetings, they pretend to discuss and vote, but without exercising any judgment, and according to the

directions of a multitude who have judged generally without even pretending to discuss, and always without real deliberation.⁶⁴

Such reforms as extension of the franchise, redistribution of seats, legislation against corrupt practices or introduction of the ballot, he indicated, 'will not give to the intelligent and conscientious the smallest additional power of choice from better and more intellectual men, but on the contrary, in so far as they make elections more expensive, and require more sacrifices to popularity, they will have the effect of narrowing the scope of choice'.⁶⁵ 'The true improvement', he emphasized, 'is to enlighten the understanding, and promote uprightness and sincerity of character in every elector'.⁶⁶

Meanwhile, Hare observed with disdain, it was 'no exaggeration to say that parliamentary elections are now almost in every case a bitter mockery to most of the more highly instructed and conscientious men, who will not or cannot attach themselves blindly to the chariot wheels of party, and accept whatever it may send them'.⁶⁷ Such frustration had been a motivation for the memorial to Palmerston, he suggested, and the proposal by Russell of the limited vote, which Hare described as 'the most remarkable, and looking at its spirit rather than its form, the most philosophical amendment of the representative institution which has in this country had anything like authoritative sanction'.⁶⁸ Referring to the report by Rowland Hill concerning the application of the single transferable vote in South Australia as well as to the second edition of Mill's *Thoughts on Parliamentary Reform* and to his own *Treatise*,⁶⁹ Hare summarized his proposed system of election and observed that it would eliminate objection to extension of the franchise. He emphasized, however, that it was 'above all things necessary that the extension should be *preceded by* such an electoral system as will make every man feel that the suffrage is a solemn duty to be prepared for in the quiet of his chamber, and not with drinking and clamour of a tavern, or amidst the shoutings of a mob'.⁷⁰ He concluded with particular emphasis on the significance of the individual in the polity: 'The safety of free institutions, the basis of liberty, will be found in bringing home to every man an adequate sense of the true, and to him, surpassing importance of his individual vote.'⁷¹ 'Political virtue is no more a corporate quality than Christian virtue', he added. 'It can only be attained through each individual mind.'⁷²

Mill was disappointed by 'Representation in Practice and Theory', considering it to be excessively theoretical, as he wrote to Helen Taylor on 2 February: 'There is nothing in it that lowers my opinion of his mind, but it is ineffective.'⁷³ On the same day, Mill wrote to Hare

that it was 'a little damaged by the introduction of so much of other people's generalities which (especially those of Carlyle) are associated in most minds with anything rather than a plan admitting of actual legislative realization', suggesting that it be 'followed up by another of a more distinctly practical character'.⁷⁴

In the House of Commons on 1 March 1860, Russell introduced a reform bill to lower the franchise qualification in boroughs to £6 rental and in counties to £10 occupation and to redistribute 25 seats while adding a third seat to large boroughs for the purpose of the representation of minorities.⁷⁵ Unlike in 1854, however, Russell in 1860 did not propose the adoption of the limited vote in constituencies with three seats. 'As that proposition was not very popular, although I think it was a fair and just one', he remarked, 'I shall not attempt to renew it upon the present occasion.'⁷⁶ With reference to the bill, Hare addressed the question of the representation of minorities in a letter in *The Times* on 15 March:

The effect on the House of enlarging the constituencies must depend on the degree to which the renovated bodies may be guided by a wise judgment in the choice of their representatives; and it is believed by many that this, again, depends on the existence of a free electoral organization, enabling the superiorities of mind and culture in every place to discover and elect superiorities of character and intellect, wherever they may be found, and thereby permitting to thought and intelligence the full exercise of their natural powers of expression and attraction.⁷⁷

To this end he proposed a variation of the limited vote whereby 'whatever may be the number of members to be returned by any county, city, borough, or other constituency, no vote for more than one candidate shall be received from one elector in the same constituency'.⁷⁸ His proposal was endorsed in the *Economist* two days later for the reason that it was 'important that mere numbers should not have the power of swamping the representation of less numerous but more intelligent and thoughtful classes'.⁷⁹

At the same time, Hare sought support for the single transferable vote from novelist Edward Bulwer Lytton, a Conservative member of Parliament for Hertfordshire, who wrote to Hare on 16 March that although devised by a 'political genius' it was 'too bold and too new for practical adoption in an old country'. He observed that he could not 'therefore flatter you with the hope that your scheme could yet be taken up in the

House of Commons. ... It will be well to get it familiarly before critical minds, and have it thoroughly sifted – but that, alas, will not at this moment help us'. He added that he feared a 'step on a wrong direction to which we are invited by the Government Bill'.⁸⁰ During the debate on the bill in the House of Commons on 26 April, however, Lytton commented:

Mr Mill has declared in favour of the scheme propounded by Mr Hare and explained by Mr Fawcett in a very remarkable pamphlet; a scheme that is based upon the principle of securing representation to the smallest minorities. These ideas are so against the taste of the House and the inclination of the public, that their adoption may be impossible; but I mention them to show that, here, are consummate reasoners whose doctrines of Government belong to the boldest school of Liberal opinion, and who are yet more anxious than the highest Tory amongst us to secure to property and intelligence a power that shall not be overborne by the influence of numbers.⁸¹

Such mention of his electoral system in the House of Commons would 'do good', Mill wrote to Hare on 9 May.⁸² The bill, however, without the support of Liberals or Conservatives, was withdrawn by Russell in June.⁸³

Meanwhile in April in *Fraser's Magazine*, Hare as Mill had suggested followed up the theoretical emphasis of 'Representation in Practice and Theory' with a practical emphasis in 'Representation of Every Locality and Intelligence' in which he asserted that 'the object of political representation at this day is nothing less than that of gathering to the national councils our wisest men, who if they be truly so, must include our best men'.⁸⁴ Quoting from works by Macaulay, Tocqueville, Mill, and Carlyle, among others, and drawing on passages from *The State in Its Relations with the Church* by Gladstone published in 1838 and *The Senses and the Intellect* by the psychologist Alexander Bain published in 1855,⁸⁵ Hare argued that the system of election in a borough or a county denied electors 'the power of acting upon any comparison between the more distinguished men of the age, and the two or three candidates who, probably by money or by intrigue, have forced themselves, or been forced, upon the constituency'.⁸⁶ Further, it reduced an election to a contest for votes which invited corruption and dragged 'the highest down to the level of the lowest', elector and candidate alike, he claimed:

Vain is the noblest aspiration for the future of his country or of mankind; vain is the most profound knowledge of economical science; vain is earnest and patriotic zeal, or unselfish devotion; a limited number of electors, accidentally dwelling in a certain place, can alone be appealed to. They must be persuaded, coaxed, flattered – if need be, bought; and the competition of the candidates for votes becomes like a contest for some object of passionate desire, in which everything is sacrificed to success.⁸⁷

Political parties manipulated the system, he continued, securing their majorities in accordance with the principle of virtual representation: ‘If the party is beaten in one town or county, the struggle is to succeed by overcoming their antagonists in another. It is the recipe for disguising minorities under a false show, by the politics of artifice, instead of securing their true representation by those of honesty.’⁸⁸ For good rather than evil and wisdom rather than ignorance to be represented, he argued, ‘the elector must first be allowed to select his representative from the widest possible field; and secondly, his means of co-operation with other electors must be extended beyond the comparatively narrow area of his own locality; and he must be relieved from the necessity of persuading the majority within that area to act in concert with him’,⁸⁹ adding: ‘The doctrines and morals of Christianity in three centuries permeated the Greek and Roman world; but to bend by the moral force of argument and persuasion the thoughts and wills of the majority of the dwellers of a single city was not given even to inspired truth in the mouths of the Apostles.’⁹⁰

Hare explained the electoral system which he advocated in his *Treatise* and which Fawcett simplified in his pamphlet, maintaining that it ‘would enable every voter to propose for his own constituency the man of all the candidates in the kingdom he deems the best and worthiest, and which would enable him to do this without controlling the choice of his neighbour, or without idly throwing away his vote’.⁹¹ Redistribution of seats would be unnecessary, and the franchise could be extended without ‘dread of “numbers”’, he argued, it being ‘by numbers that the nation will be governed, and political leaders must win them by the attractions addressed to their higher nature or by the temptations offered to their lower’.⁹² In the same month, Herbert Spencer, to whom Hare had forwarded a copy of his *Treatise*,⁹³ mentioned it in the *Westminster Review* in ‘Parliamentary Reform: Its Dangers and Safeguards’ in which he discussed extension of the franchise, which he opposed. In so far as he included the system of election proposed by Hare among

safeguards against dangers of parliamentary reform, however, Spencer had 'no faith in such methods'.⁹⁴

While the reform bill introduced by Russell was being debated in the House of Commons, Grey in the House of Lords on 19 April secured the appointment of a select committee to enquire into the effect of the proposed reduction of the franchise in boroughs and counties, including consideration of the participation of electors in large and small constituencies.⁹⁵ Hare offered to give evidence, writing to Grey on 23 April that he was 'anxious to give all aid in my power to the labours of that Committee, & I am therefore preparing tables of the proportionate numbers of voters who have polled in constituencies of different magnitudes for the last two elections, for the use of the Committee'.⁹⁶ Grey replied to Hare on the following day that such evidence would 'no doubt be of great value'.⁹⁷ Mill wrote to Hare on 9 May that giving evidence to the committee 'enables you, with a favorable Chairman, to bring forward the whole subject with advantages which you might have waited long for',⁹⁸ and he wrote to Fawcett on 12 May that 'Lord Grey's Committee with the prospect of Mr Hare's being examined, is one of the most fortunate things which could have happened'.⁹⁹

Hare appeared before the Grey Committee on 4 June and presented statistics calculated to demonstrate that in the general elections of 1857 and 1859 the percentage of registered electors who had voted in contested constituencies had been lower in large than in small boroughs and counties. In 1857 and 1859, he indicated, the mean result in boroughs of less than 5000 had been 83 per cent, but the mean result in boroughs of more than 5000 had been 67 per cent.¹⁰⁰ A reason for this, he suggested, was that the electoral system did not arouse a sense of duty to vote in large constituencies: 'The educated people and people of intelligence in those places have not their sense of duty awakened owing to the apparent impossibility that any effect can be given to their votes'.¹⁰¹ Another reason, he continued, was that the range of electoral choice did not correspond to the diversity of interests in large constituencies.¹⁰² Rather than advocating small constituencies, however, he attacked 'the process which has been adopted of dividing constituencies into districts, where there should be only two or three members'.¹⁰³ The solution to the problem of participation, he maintained, was to combine electoral districts to maximize electoral choice and to adopt a system of election such as the single transferable vote or the cumulative vote.¹⁰⁴

After appearing before the Grey Committee, Hare in London on 19 June read a paper, 'On the Application of a New Statistical Method to the Ascertainment of the Votes of Majorities in a More Exhaustive

Manner', at a meeting of the Statistical Society, which had been founded in 1834.¹⁰⁵ Reiterating his arguments concerning corruption and the extinction of minorities by majorities within constituencies, he observed that in elections by the limited vote or the cumulative vote 'there would still be minorities, of greater or less magnitude, unrepresented'.¹⁰⁶ 'That the smaller number should not possess a weight greater or equal to that of the larger number, – except such weight as they may win for themselves by any superiority of virtue or intelligence they may possess, – must be admitted', he maintained, 'but that the smaller body, even having regard to numbers only, should have a weight proportioned to its relative number, would seem to be a necessary principle and safeguard of public and individual freedom'.¹⁰⁷ He argued that this would be accomplished by 'contingent voting', or the single transferable vote, explaining how it could operate within multi-member constituencies such as the West Riding of Yorkshire, which had four seats.¹⁰⁸ The single transferable vote, he emphasized, 'is, however, capable of far more extensive development',¹⁰⁹ further explaining how it could operate on a national basis as he advocated in his *Treatise*:

Property will be represented, by representing every possessor of property, far more effectually than by a struggle of one kind of property against another. Education and intelligence will be represented by the representation of every man of education and intelligence. The professional, agricultural, commercial, and working classes may be represented by their chosen exponents. Every locality will have its special representatives in the members who have received the greatest number of votes in the county or borough, but local divisions become rather, as Bacon says, lines and veins than sections and separations. All contribute to the national representation, which will be as perfect as the understanding and patriotism of each succeeding age can make it.¹¹⁰

In the same month, Frederick Denison Maurice discussed Hare's *Treatise* in *Macmillan's Magazine* in which he quoted at length from the second edition of Mill's *Thoughts on Parliamentary Reform*, a copy of which he had received from Hare.¹¹¹ Although Maurice withheld endorsement of Hare's electoral system, he remarked of his *Treatise* that he had 'read no book for a long time which combines so much nobleness of thought, so much general philosophy with a devotion to details, and the acuteness of a practiced lawyer. It is delightful to find one who proposes so wide a representative reform sustaining himself by the weighty words of Burke,'

adding: 'Mr Hare is an excellent specimen of that zeal for the moral as superior to the material interests of the community. . . . He has given proof, not only to lawyers, but perhaps still more to clergymen, how possible it is to combine the most energetic desire for reform with the truest Conservatism.'¹¹²

In 1861, a second edition of Hare's *Treatise* was published incorporating the quota proposed in the pamphlet by Fawcett,¹¹³ and in the same year, two editions were published of *Considerations on Representative Government* by Mill. Written with reference to the parliamentary debates over franchise extension, Mill's *Considerations* was in part a contribution to Hare's campaign for personal representation by the single transferable vote. As in *Thoughts on Parliamentary Reform*, so in *Considerations* Mill was concerned with the protection of the clerisy as a minority, discussed in the sixth chapter, 'Of the Infirmities and Dangers to which Representative Government is Liable', warning against 'a constitution of the representation which does not secure an adequate amount of intelligence and knowledge in the representative assembly'.¹¹⁴ Such 'intelligence and knowledge' were not to be secured by the majority, as he emphasized in the seventh chapter, 'Of True and False Democracy; Representation of All, and Representation of the Majority Only':

The natural tendency of representative government, as of modern civilization, is towards collective mediocrity: and this tendency is increased by all reductions and extensions of the franchise, their effect being to place the principal power in the hands of classes more and more below the highest level of instruction in the community. But though the superior intellects and characters will necessarily be outnumbered, it makes a great difference whether or not they are heard. In the false democracy which, instead of giving representation to all gives it only to the local majorities, the voice of the instructed minority may have no organs at all in the representative body.¹¹⁵

Virtual representation of the clerisy he rejected: 'The constituencies to which most of the highly educated and public spirited persons in the country belong, those of the larger towns, are now, in great part, either unrepresented or misrepresented. The electors who are on a different side in party politics from the local majority are unrepresented.'¹¹⁶ Personal representation, he asserted, was the alternative whereby 'no elector would, as at present, be nominally represented by some one whom he had not chosen',¹¹⁷ and 'the minority of instructed minds scattered throughout the local constituencies would unite to return a

number, proportioned to their own numbers, of the very ablest men the country contains',¹¹⁸ adding: 'I am unable to conceive any mode by which the presence of such minds can be so positively insured, as by that proposed by Mr Hare.'¹¹⁹ In the House of Commons, the majority would 'outnumber' and 'outvote' the minority, Mill recognized, but 'they would speak and vote in their presence, and subject to their criticism',¹²⁰ having argued in *On Liberty* that truth was a function of conflict of opinion.¹²¹ While defending plural voting and attacking the ballot,¹²² he considered the limited vote and the cumulative vote to be systems of election 'infinitely better than none at all' but inferior to the single transferable vote, 'since all local minorities of less than a third, and all minorities, however numerous, which are made up from several constituencies, would remain unrepresented'.¹²³ The electoral system proposed by Hare in his *Treatise*, according to Mill, was 'among the very greatest improvements yet made in the theory and practice of government'.¹²⁴

In *Macmillan's Magazine* in June 1861, Fawcett took the opportunity of reviewing Mill's *Considerations* to abridge the clauses of Hare's electoral system, as he had done in his pamphlet, to 'give the reader the means of understanding the convincing arguments by which Mr Mill defends the scheme'.¹²⁵ It was a 'standard of excellence', Fawcett stated, although he assumed that 'it would be futile to ask the House of Commons to accept it'.¹²⁶ When the second edition of *Considerations* was published, Mill wrote to Hare on 5 July that he had 'written a few additional pages for the new edition, to keep up the fight against the objections to the plan'.¹²⁷ In the following month, reflecting the interest of Maurice, the *Working Men's College Magazine* published a condensation of the chapter in Mill's *Considerations* concerning Hare's electoral system.¹²⁸

Meanwhile, Walter Bagehot in the *Economist* in May 1861 devoted half of his review of Mill's *Considerations* to a critical evaluation of Hare's proposal. Likewise fearing franchise extension and 'tyranny of the majority',¹²⁹ Bagehot conceded that minority representation was sound in theory but argued that in practice it would encourage factions and jeopardize cabinet stability. He observed:

Mr Hare's and Mr Mill's hope is that it would enable the educated to combine to elect fitting representatives as against the ignorant and uneducated. But, unfortunately, the mere preference for intellectual and thoughtful men is faint in comparison with the special ties of sectarian and commercial interests. And there is great danger

that the result would be a Parliament in which no party-organisation was possible at all – one set of members being pledged to desert the government on one question, another on another, so that no government would be able to direct the general policy of the country, because it would have no security against repeated and continuous defeats.¹³⁰

In addition to being a potential obstacle to efficient administration, Bagehot feared that Hare's electoral system would facilitate manipulation, claiming that party 'tickets' would be employed, such being equated with political corruption in the United States. Regarding the clerisy, he commented: 'We doubt whether the real purpose Mr Mill has in view – that of getting the educated classes better represented by intellectual men of independent thought – would be effectively answered at all under this scheme.' Bagehot concluded: 'We wish Mr Mill would reconsider this scheme of Mr Hare's with more special reference to its practical working; and we rather think that he would see some reason to withdraw his confidence from it.'¹³¹

Further objections were raised two months later in a review of Mill's *Considerations* in the *Westminster Review* which argued that Hare's electoral system would be used by the ignorant as well as by the educated, that it demanded extreme confidence in those responsible for its application, and that it could not be used to fill vacant seats. There were 'collateral advantages which it would bring in its train to any community prepared to carry it out', however. 'All motives for the undue influence of individual electors would be at once annihilated by the destruction of the local omnipotence of a club in a closely-contested borough, and what would be effectual in this strongest case would of course be fatal to bribery or intimidation in less aggravated ones.'¹³² Nevertheless, there was 'little prospect of its speedy execution... until a much higher general level of national intelligence be attained... It is a leap beyond our powers'.¹³³

Continuing the campaign for his electoral system, Hare in February 1862 contributed to *Macmillan's Magazine* 'Suggestions for the Improvement of Our Representative System: The University Elections Act of Last Session.' The passage of the University Elections Act of 1861, which provided for the use of voting papers in parliamentary elections for the university seats,¹³⁴ was regarded by Hare as evidence of 'the growing force of the opinion, that real improvement in political representation must consist not merely in the increase of the numbers of voters, but also in bringing to the work as much of the enlightened intelligence

of every constituency as can be gathered and roused into activity'.¹³⁵ Meanwhile, he complained:

At the present time, the understanding and intellect of the far larger portion of the educated classes of the country, in the matter of political action, are hopelessly fettered, and the conscience of the same classes, in regard to political duty, is paralysed, by the overwhelming force of local majorities, wielded, for the most part, by men who are the least likely in each community to be guided by any large or enlightened views, or to be worthy of general confidence.¹³⁶

The University Elections Act itself, he suggested, afforded an opportunity for the application of the single transferable vote, 'to have rendered the representation of the members of the universities as nearly perfect as the present restrictions in our electoral system will permit',¹³⁷ adding that the system was 'applicable as well to other constituencies as to the Universities'.¹³⁸ In April, however, his electoral system was criticized in *Macmillan's Magazine* by George Otto Trevelyan, a nephew of Macaulay educated at Trinity College, Cambridge, who in 'A Few Remarks on Mr Hare's Scheme of Representation' argued that electors would despair to choose from among the range of candidates and would welcome instruction by national caucuses at the expense of local interests. 'It would be hard indeed to conceive of any system of which the Carlton could not make something', he suggested. 'But of all systems that were ever devised, this of Mr Hare's is most adapted to serve the ends of party.'¹³⁹

Later in 1862, at the meeting of the Social Science Association held in London on 11 June, Hare read a paper, 'On the Election of Representative or Governing Bodies by Exhaustive Majorities and Unanimous Quotas of the Constituencies', in which he reported on the 'progress of the movement' at home and abroad. In addition to the publications by himself and Mill, he observed that the issue of the representation of minorities was being debated in America and Germany, that the question was being raised in Geneva and Zürich, and that in South Australia 'some of the deepest thinkers have endeavoured to prepare the popular mind for the substitution of the method of real for what is called virtual representation, – a representation of all instead of a representation of majorities only'.¹⁴⁰ In the discussion which followed his paper, Mayo defended Hare's system of election: 'If it once came into operation, they would not see the House of Commons crowded with speculators and lawyers, nor would they see such men as the late Lord Macaulay

or the late Sir Robert Peel excluded from that assembly through a feeling of revengeful spite', claiming that 'all men of average energy and social position would have a fair chance of a seat in Parliament'.¹⁴¹ Hare's electoral system was attacked, however, by Peter Taylor, a Liberal member of Parliament for Leicester, who 'considered the scheme proposed by Mr Hare too refined, and too delicate for the wear and tear of actual use', preferring 'the present system of local constituencies; the more intimate the relations between the representative and the represented the better, for that was the great safeguard against positive democracy'.¹⁴²

In April 1863, Hare contributed to *Macmillan's Magazine* 'Ideal of a Local Government for the Metropolis' in which again he advocated personal representation in opposition to virtual representation. He proposed, as he had in *Usque ad Coelum*, that the single transferable vote be applied to the election of a London Council of 150 members, half chosen by owners of property and half by occupiers, so that 'representation be real and actual, and not merely nominal or virtual; that each proprietor and each inhabitant may be certain that, at least, one member has been chosen by himself, and not by any majority or number of other persons for him and that such member is the exponent of his opinions and the guardian of his interests'.¹⁴³

In opposition to Hare's electoral system, Lord Robert Cecil argued in the *Saturday Review* in September 1864 that such a proposal would be futile because minority representatives in Parliament would be impotent in the division lobbies. 'The real protection to the minority', he claimed, 'is to be found in the sense of fair-play, the instinct of moderation, the traditional habit of never pushing a victory to extremes, the independent spirit with which a Legislature of unpaid members will always resist the efforts of a headstrong party-leader to draw them into an overbearing or violent policy. As long as this spirit rules the deliberations of a Legislature, the rights of a minority are safe.'¹⁴⁴ Likewise critical of Hare's electoral system in 1864 was Grey, who in a second edition of his *Parliamentary Government Considered with Reference to Reform* considered it to be too complicated and 'calculated to give a preponderance of power rather to the best organized political party than to that in which the most intelligent part of the Nation has the greatest confidence'.¹⁴⁵ Its object, however, was 'desirable to accomplish', he agreed, to which end he favoured the cumulative vote, which he considered to be 'the first of the Reforms of a Conservative tendency which I should suggest, and one which I should consider a great improvement under any circumstances, but quite indispensable if any changes favourable to Democratic power

are to be admitted'.¹⁴⁶ Grey was in contact with James Garth Marshall, who wrote to him on 19 May that the single transferable vote might be used by a large educational constituency like that proposed in the memorial to Palmerston.¹⁴⁷

In 1865, in which year a third edition of Mill's *Considerations* was published, Russell, in the House of Lords as of 1861, abandoned the representation of minorities in the third edition of his *An Essay on the History of the English Government and Constitution from the Reign of Henry VII to the Present Time*, the first edition of which had been published in 1821, dismissing Hare's electoral system in particular as associated with 'contrivances altogether unknown to our habits'.¹⁴⁸ The limited vote as well he thought 'would be difficult to introduce, and would perhaps be unpalatable in its first working'.¹⁴⁹

Hare replied to such criticisms of his electoral system in the preface to a third edition of his *Treatise* published in 1865 in which he emphasized that its object was the representation of all electors, promoting the elevation of 'individual character'. 'Personal representation encourages every man to do the best that is in him', he wrote, 'and leaves him without excuse if he does not'.¹⁵⁰ He insisted that it was for the representation of the majority as well as of the minority and disclaimed 'representation of minorities' as its designation.¹⁵¹ That his concern was to maintain the influence of the clerisy was evident in his attitude towards the working class, however: 'The wise parent admits his children to his counsels, and makes them partners of his labours and his hopes, not from caprice or by fits and starts, but gradually and impartially, as education bears its fruit, and intellect is matured. The nation is but a greater family'.¹⁵² He denied that his system of election was hostile to localities, arguing that it would serve local interests naturally rather than artificially unlike redistribution proposals made by 'popular reformers'.¹⁵³ That the quota would be calculated on a national basis had misled critics into thinking that the system was for a national electorate, he suggested, and he maintained that local representation would be 'preserved and secured to an extent and with a completeness hitherto unknown'.¹⁵⁴ Accordingly, he argued, a party 'ticket' would be of no effect, for 'the voting paper in every constituency would be different'.¹⁵⁵ Likewise corruption would be eliminated, he predicted, for 'personal representation equalizes the pecuniary value of every vote, and reduces it to its minimum'.¹⁵⁶ Further, he denied that the single transferable vote was too complicated, pointing out that voters need only write down one or more names and need not calculate the quota or transfer a surplus, such being the duties of returning officers.¹⁵⁷

In an appendix to the third edition of his *Treatise*, Hare drew attention to a modification of the calculation of the quota suggested to him by Henry Richmond Droop, a Lincoln's Inn barrister who had read mathematics at Trinity College, Cambridge. In 1855, Droop had been elected a Fellow of Trinity and was appointed a Lecturer in Mathematics, but he had resigned his fellowship and lectureship to study the law and had been called to the bar in 1859.¹⁵⁸ Following the general election of 1857, he had addressed the question of the representation of minorities and had developed a system of election similar to that proposed by Hare but with a different quota, as Hare explained in his *Treatise* in 1865:

Perceiving that I had introduced contingent voting, which was also part of his scheme, he has kindly communicated to me his method of appropriation of every vote to the candidate for whom it is successively designed, and of arriving at a quota which should be exactly the number of votes that ought to be retained for each successful candidate to ensure his election. . . . One step of this process may be adopted with great advantage. It is the result of an observation that the quota proposed to be adopted cannot be greater than the quotient produced by dividing the aggregate number of votes polled for the number of candidates to be elected who stand highest on the poll, by such last-mentioned number. Thus, if there were 2000 candidates, all polling more or less votes, of whom only 654 can be elected, it is not necessary to take as the dividend the whole number of votes polled by the 2000, but it is sufficient to take the number of votes polled by the 654 who stand highest on the poll.¹⁵⁹

Hare observed that 'in adopting this reduced quota a succession of trials is indispensable' but added that 'it only repeats several times what it was at first proposed to do once for all'.¹⁶⁰

Hare argued in his *Treatise* in 1865 that the practicality of his proposed electoral system was demonstrated by the operation of that in Denmark, the subject of a detailed report prepared and submitted to the Foreign Office in July 1863 by the Secretary of Legation at Copenhagen, Robert Lytton, son of Edward Bulwer Lytton. In his report, Lytton wrote that he thought the subject was of 'singular and special importance'.¹⁶¹ He compared Hare's electoral system with Carl Andrae's and observed that the latter 'has been in practice for eight years, without any flaw having been brought to light in its machinery'.¹⁶² Hare in his *Treatise* in 1865 referred to the report by Lytton as an 'unexpected and conclusive refutation' of the impracticality of his electoral system.¹⁶³ He sent a copy of

his *Treatise* to Lytton, who wrote to him in April 1865 that his work was of 'paramount importance' and that he 'rejoiced' that his own report had 'provided you with one more amongst many proofs of the perfect mechanical practicableness of your proposed Reform Bill'.¹⁶⁴

Hare devoted a series of appendices in his *Treatise* in 1865 to a discussion of the representation of minorities and his electoral system in Australia, Europe and the United States. Regarding Australia, he included New South Wales and Victoria,¹⁶⁵ but he omitted South Australia where, in Adelaide, Catherine Helen Spence, a conservative journalist and novelist, discovered Hare's electoral system in Mill's 'Recent Writers on Reform' in *Fraser's Magazine* in 1859. This reminded her of the experiment conducted in Adelaide by Rowland Hill which was known to her as her father had been the town clerk between 1840 and 1843 and one of her friends was a niece of Rowland Hill.¹⁶⁶ Hare's system was of interest to her also because she was an opponent of the South Australian Political Association founded in 1859. When this organization won five of six seats in Adelaide in the election of the assembly in 1860, Spence became a public advocate of personal representation. In later years she explained: 'I confess that at first I was struck chiefly by its conservative side, and I saw that its application would prevent the political association, which corresponded roughly with the modern Labour Party, from returning five out of six members.'¹⁶⁷ After reading Hare's 'Representation in Practice and Theory' and 'Representation of Every Locality and Intelligence' in *Fraser's Magazine* in 1860, Spence wrote *A Plea for Pure Democracy: Mr Hare's Reform Bill Applied to South Australia*, a pamphlet which was published in Adelaide in 1861.¹⁶⁸ Subsequently, she incorporated discussion of Hare's electoral system in a novel published in 1865, *Mr Hogarth's Will*, wherein Francis Hogarth, a member of Parliament who supports the representation of minorities, tells a deputation that 'the effect of any great extension of the suffrage, as things are at present, would be to put the *whole* political power into the hands of the least educated class of the community'.¹⁶⁹ Spence presented a copy of the novel to Hare when she met him in England in 1865.¹⁷⁰

Regarding Europe, Hare included consideration of his electoral system in Frankfurt and Brussels and at the International Congress for the Promotion of Social Science held in Amsterdam in 1864.¹⁷¹ In Geneva, the French socialist Victor Considérant had proposed a list system for the representation of minorities in 1842 and 1846,¹⁷² and the proposal was revived in Geneva in 1861 by Antoine Morin in *Un nouveau système électoral*.¹⁷³ In 1862, Morin repeated his argument for the list system in *De la représentation des minorités* and discussed Hare's proposal, and it

was from this work that Hare drew an extract in his *Treatise* in 1865.¹⁷⁴ Unlike Hare's electoral system, the list system was for the representation of political parties in proportion to their relative strength, and it was in this sense that the term 'proportional representation' then was used in Switzerland.¹⁷⁵ In the wake of a riot in Geneva over the result of the election of the cantonal Grand Council in 1864,¹⁷⁶ Ernest Naville urged the representation of minorities in *Les élections de Genève, mémoire présenté au Conseil fédéral et au peuple suisse*, which he followed in 1865 with *La patrie et les parties, discours sur le réforme électorale* and the formation in Geneva of an organization dedicated to the representation of minorities, L'Association Réformiste.¹⁷⁷ As he later wrote to Spence, Naville was in favour of Hare's system, but L'Association Réformiste advocated the list system because it was better suited to the electoral structure of Geneva where party lists were in use.¹⁷⁸

As in Switzerland, Hare's electoral system was discussed in the United States. In New York, the representation of minorities was advocated by Simon Sterne and David Dudley Field, both lawyers, in opposition to the New York County Democratic Committee, or Tammany Hall. In 1865, Sterne visited England and met Hare, and in 1866 he and Field together founded the Personal Representation Society of New York.¹⁷⁹

In England in 1865, Hare in the *Daily News* on 20 March proposed that the London metropolitan constituencies be combined to form a single constituency returning 22 members to the House of Commons and that the electors use the single transferable vote.¹⁸⁰ This proposed application of his electoral system he proceeded to discuss in a paper which he read at a meeting of the Social Science Association held in London on 10 April.¹⁸¹ Reported in the *Daily News* and *The Times*, the meeting was conducted by Lord Stanley and attended by Mill, Frederick Hill, and William Torrens, an Irish radical who was a Liberal candidate for Parliament in Finsbury. Hill, who in the same year wrote a pamphlet on parliamentary reform, commented in support of Hare that the electoral system earlier devised by his father, Thomas Wright Hill, 'was found to work well'.¹⁸² Torrens, however, claimed that in South Australia it had been a failure, to which Hare replied that to his knowledge the system in South Australia had been 'the very reverse of his system'.¹⁸³ At the conclusion of the meeting, Lord Stanley remarked that 'it would be unwise prematurely to express any decided opinion upon Mr Hare's plan, which was to most persons new, and involved wide considerations'.¹⁸⁴

Meanwhile on 22 March, Richard Cobden wrote to fellow radical Thomas Bayley Potter, who was to succeed him in Parliament as a Liberal member for Rochdale, in response to a request for his opinion of

the ideas of Mill. 'I would give only one vote to each elector, and one representative to each constituency', Cobden wrote, thus in support of the electoral system that had been advocated by Bentham in his *Plan of Parliamentary Reform, in the Form of a Catechism* in 1817. 'I don't know of any better chance of being heard; after all, it is opinions that are to be represented,' Cobden asserted. 'If the minority have a faith that their opinions, and not those of the majority, are the true ones, then let them agitate and discuss until their principles are in the ascendant.'¹⁸⁵ Earlier in 1865, on 16 January, Cobden had conveyed to Bright the same opinion of Hare's electoral system, which he considered to be 'incomprehensible': 'I would allow each constituency to return one representative. Thus, for instance, if Birmingham had six members, they should be elected by six wards. This would give every section of the community the opportunity of suiting itself. The idea of giving representation to minorities is an absurdity.'¹⁸⁶ After the death of Cobden on 2 April 1865, his letter to Potter was published in the *Daily News* on 19 April, and Hare responded in the *Daily News* on 9 May. The plan advocated by Cobden was retrogressive, Hare argued: 'By placing representation under such difficulties the progress of great measures may be indefinitely delayed.' His central concern, however, was 'individual freedom', he added: 'It is by the emancipation of the voters individually from both the majorities and minorities around them that the nation will obtain the aid of the personal knowledge and discretion of the best and the most capable of its electors.'¹⁸⁷

During the general election which was in progress at the same time in 1865, personal representation 'for the first time passed into the domain of popular discussion', as Mill wrote to Hare on 29 May.¹⁸⁸ Mill was a Liberal candidate in Westminster and Fawcett in Brighton. After the publication of his declaration of political opinions, which included the representation of minorities though without reference to Hare's electoral system, Mill was attacked in the *Daily News* on 24 April by Francis Henry Berkeley, the leader of the Ballot Society, for his rejection of the ballot.¹⁸⁹ Mill was defended by Hare in the *Daily News* on 2 May. The ballot, Hare argued,

to enable a voter – and, if the secrecy be of any use, to encourage him – to do himself the moral wrong of affecting to support what he secretly opposes, or to oppose what he secretly supports – to the extent to which electors avail themselves of it – can have none but a demoralizing tendency. It is scarcely possible for men to be habitually untruthful in one part of their conduct without lowering the

standard of morality in the other actions of life, and without injury to character.¹⁹⁰

Were the ballot adopted, he added, the options to electors would remain limited. The obstacle to true reform, he emphasized, was the 'false principle' of virtual representation.¹⁹¹ In addition to Mill and Fawcett, another Liberal candidate who supported Hare's electoral system scheme was Thomas Hughes, a Christian Socialist and associate of Maurice in the founding of the Working Men's College. Like Hare, Hughes had been a student at the Inner Temple, and his popular novel *Tom Brown's School Days* had been published in the same year as had Hare's *The Machinery of Representation*.¹⁹² Hughes endorsed Hare's electoral system in his address to the electors of Lambeth on 6 May in which he said on the issue of franchise reform: 'I have too intimate a knowledge of the masses of my poorer countrymen to fear any extension whatever; at the same time I should like to see a scientific reform, embodying the cardinal principles of Mr Hare's plan, which would give every voter a *bona fide* representative in the House, and make every member the representative of an unanimous constituency.'¹⁹³ With the election of Mill, Fawcett, and Hughes in 1865, advocacy of personal representation by the single transferable vote entered the House of Commons.

Later in the same year, Hare in 'An Electoral Reform' in the *Fortnightly Review* in October agreed that 'it is desirable to admit to the franchise at least the intelligent and prudent of the working classes' but also shared 'apprehension lest they should, by their numbers, swamp or extinguish the influence of the more educated and the more wealthy', adding that the latter 'more and more withdraw themselves from political action as constituencies are increased, and single votes therefore become of smaller importance'.¹⁹⁴ 'The object to be sought', he argued, 'is a method of accomplishing the enfranchisement of the working population, without swamping the others, and at the same time stimulating the political activity of the leisured and intellectual classes, without any artificial contrivance, and according to the natural laws of political life – the healthy circulation of the public opinion and will, through the great body politic of the nation'.¹⁹⁵ Assuming that 'the public mind is not prepared for the full measure of political freedom, involved in the perfect adoption of the principle of personal representation',¹⁹⁶ he proposed a variation of his proposal in which electors could voluntarily withdraw from their constituencies and create a national 'electoral college' which would return to Parliament a number of representatives in proportion to the number of its members. There being 658 members of the House

of Commons,¹⁹⁷ he explained, 'if 1,316,000 voters were registered, and 100,000 transferred their names from the local to the general register, the electoral college thus formed would be entitled to fifty members'. The election would be by the single transferable vote: 'In the election of the fifty members no vote would be taken for more than one candidate, but every voter might insert on his voting paper the names of as many candidates as he pleased, in the order of his preference.'¹⁹⁸ He indicated that he intended to discuss his proposal at the meeting of the Social Science Association in Sheffield,¹⁹⁹ which he proceeded to do after it opened on 10 October. There he defended the clerisy: 'It cannot be other than a national gain to substitute an unanimous body of thoughtful persons, limited in number and composed for the most part of the *élite* of all the constituencies of the nation, in place of the political jobbers and petty dealers and shopkeepers, with their paltry aims, who now go far to make up the smaller constituencies.'²⁰⁰ Further advocating personal representation by the single transferable vote, he criticized the representation of minorities by the limited vote and the cumulative vote as these electoral systems 'make no appreciable addition to the individual power of each elector', observing: 'What objects they may accomplish in a party point of view I will not say; but the individual independence which I seek, they will not achieve.'²⁰¹

The death of Palmerston on 18 October and the succession of Russell as Prime Minister raised the prospect of a new reform bill in Parliament, but Hare and Mill disagreed over the best way to proceed. Hare, as he had explained in his *Treatise*, thought that franchise extension and redistribution of seats should be considered separately, whereas Mill thought that the two issues should be combined. Mill warned Hare in a letter on 11 January 1866 that if reform was to be limited to franchise extension, 'it may be assumed as certain that no other point of parliamentary reform will be allowed to be discussed this year. . . . And it is to my mind equally indubitable that when *any* reform has been passed the whole subject of changes in the representation will be tabooed for years to come.'²⁰²

Hare, however, asserted in 'The Keystone of Parliamentary Reform' in the *Fortnightly Review* in January 1866 that 'whatever suffrage may be determined upon . . . the one essential condition of true Parliamentary reform . . . is that throughout the work of the election there shall be the most complete provision for the freedom and independence, together with the best means of encouraging the development, of individual thought and action'.²⁰³ In defence of personal representation by the single transferable vote, again he rejected the representation of minorities

by the limited vote and the cumulative vote, which 'instead of liberating the personal intellect and conscience ... would aggravate the slavery of individuals to the leaders of parties'.²⁰⁴ Likewise he rejected the ballot.²⁰⁵ Rather, he insisted: 'If every elector had before him, and were enabled, according to the measure of his judgment and intelligence, to unite with others of like opinions and sympathies, and express by his vote his estimation of the character of, and his confidence in, any man of his time, whom he might regard as deserving of public trust, a train of thought would be opened of which it is impossible to calculate the value.'²⁰⁶ He recommended that a Committee of the House of Commons address such questions 'without impeding the progress of any Bill which may propose to deal with the suffrage', thereby doing 'great service to the cause of civilisation and humanity by indicating the course to be pursued in the progressive improvement of representative institutions'.²⁰⁷ He directed further attention to his electoral system in the paper on local government which he read before the session of the Social Science Association held in London in February.²⁰⁸

Hare's electoral system was attacked by John Boyd Kinnear in 'Practical Considerations on the Representation of Minorities' in the *Fortnightly Review* in February. A Scottish barrister, whose *Principles of Reform, Political and Legal* had been published in the previous year, Kinnear in 1866 considered the question of minority representation to be of importance, and he demonstrated a thorough knowledge of the limited vote, the cumulative vote, and the single transferable vote, including the system of election introduced by Andrae and supported by Lytton. Kinnear noted that among the merits of Hare's electoral system 'that which is above all insisted on by its supporters is, that it affords to educated minorities a means of being heard in resistance to less instructed majorities'.²⁰⁹ Although he admitted 'the possibility of the system cutting both ways',²¹⁰ he denied that minorities were better suited to legislate than were majorities. The minority rather than the majority had resisted progressive measures, he observed, such as the repeal of the Corn Laws. Beyond specific criticism, he rejected Hare's system in general due to regard for the masses. The nation was ruled not only by Parliament but also by 'public opinion of all classes', he argued and added 'not least, of those classes who are below the present electoral standard'.²¹¹

Hare replied to Kinnear in 'Individual Responsibility in Representative Government' in the *Fortnightly Review* in March. He pointed out that his system was for the representation of majorities as well as of minorities,²¹² but he took exception to the emphasis on public opinion, arguing

that discontent of the lower classes needed to be channelled into Parliament:

It is far better that their complaints, whether well or ill founded, should be discussed in the House of Commons, and that they should learn to what extent, if any, they are capable of remedy, than that they should rankle in their minds, or be ever a cause of silent discontent with the institutions under which they live. The process of association, the election of their representative, their appeals to and communications with him, and the necessary inquiry and exposure of the peculiar difficulties of their position, would be no slight step towards raising them from their condition of ignorance. On the other hand, the power of combination which is given to enlightened and liberal thought wherever it can be found, affords the most certain means of sending to Parliament some of our best and wisest men.²¹³

This exchange between Hare and Kinnear was the context of the criticism of Hare's electoral system by Bagehot in 'The House of Commons' in the *Fortnightly Review* in March, the sixth in his series of articles on 'The English Constitution'.²¹⁴ Technically less substantive than the article by Kinnear, its content was essentially an expansion of the argument which Bagehot had directed against personal representation in his review of Mill's *Considerations* in the *Economist* in 1861.²¹⁵ Bagehot in 1866 did not discuss virtual representation, but he remarked that in his Conservative constituency his Liberal vote was of 'no use'.²¹⁶

In the *Fortnightly Review* in April, Spence argued in defence of the parliamentary representation of the working classes but warned against 'the danger of the undue predominance of the numerical majority'.²¹⁷ Emphasizing the representation of interests rather than of minorities, however, she indicated that 'the schemes of Hare, Mill, Sir Rowland Hill, and others, stop short at a very singular point, and that we ought not to represent minorities till we have critically analysed the elements of which these minorities consist'.²¹⁸ Minorities 'resolve themselves into separate interests', she suggested, 'and we should strive incessantly for the proper representation of such interests, and consider as an imposture any representative assembly in which the great leading interests are either unduly represented, or not represented at all'.²¹⁹ To this end she proposed 'dividing the country into a very few large electoral provinces ... though not so large as to do away with local interests, which might be the case if the United Kingdom were formed into

one constituency'.²²⁰ 'We do not want a constant struggle between two parties', she added, 'but a fair hearing to all classes and an impartial verdict by all classes'.²²¹

Another defence of the representation of minorities in 1866 came from Maurice, then Professor of Moral Philosophy at Cambridge, who in *The Workman and the Franchise* declared: 'So help me God, I do not mean to follow the will of a majority. . . . If it could be put to the vote of the greatest number what they would have for happiness, I have no security that they would not decide for something low and swinish.'²²² Accordingly, he recommended consideration of the electoral system proposed by Hare.²²³ Also in May 1866, Hare further discussed the single transferable vote in his appearance before the Select Committee on Metropolitan Local Government, of which Mill was a member.²²⁴

In the House of Commons on 12 March 1866, Gladstone, a Liberal member for South Lancashire as of 1865 and the Chancellor of the Exchequer in the Liberal ministry of Russell, introduced a reform bill for franchise extension without redistribution of seats.²²⁵ A redistribution bill was conceded to the opponents of franchise reform, however, whereby large counties and boroughs were to have three members.²²⁶ The introduction of the redistribution bill, although calculated to defeat the reform bill by its opponents, provided an opportunity to discuss the issue of the representation of minorities. On 15 May, Grey wrote to Mill suggesting that he propose the adoption of the cumulative vote, commenting that 'among the provisions which would remove some of the objections to a large extension of the franchise, there is none which in my opinion w[oul]d be so important'.²²⁷ Mill replied to Grey on 21 May that he could not do so: 'If I were to originate any move for representation of minorities, it would only be in the form which alone, as I conceive, carries out the principle, that of Mr Hare's system.' Mill added, however: 'My inability to originate a proposition for the cumulative vote plan (which I regard as the next best) would be no hindrance to my supporting it if proposed by others.'²²⁸

Subsequently, on 31 May, the issue was raised in the House of Commons during the second reading of the redistribution bill by Sir John Pakington, a Conservative member for Droitwich, who stated that while he was opposed to third members, he would accept them if the limited vote was included in the measure.²²⁹ If Pakington, said Mill, 'will bring forward a Motion, in any form which can possibly pass, with a view to engraft that principle upon any Bill, I shall have the greatest pleasure in seconding him'.²³⁰ He emphasized that 'the representation of minorities appears to me an absolutely necessary part of any representative

constitution which it is intended should permanently work well'.²³¹ Thus on an issue which he regarded as crucial, Mill took the side of a Tory rather than of a radical. The issue was not pursued further, however, and in June both bills were defeated by Conservatives and Liberals opposed to franchise reform, or Adullamites, led by Robert Lowe, the member for Calne.²³² Upon the consequent resignation of Russell, a Conservative ministry was formed by the 14th Earl of Derby, in the House of Lords, with Benjamin Disraeli, a Conservative member for Buckinghamshire in the House of Commons, as the Chancellor of the Exchequer.

In the following month in London, one of a series of reform demonstrations organized by the Reform League resulted in destruction of the railings in Hyde Park. On the next day, 24 July, Gladstone 'viewed the "field of battle"', as he recorded in his diary: 'Alack for the folly that made it.'²³³ Further reform demonstrations took place in London, Birmingham, Manchester, and other cities in August and September.

In October 1866 at the congress of the Social Science Association held in Manchester, Hare read a paper, 'A Grouping of Parliamentary Electors that Combines a Just and Equal Distribution of Seats, and the Free Expression both of Individual and Public Opinion, with the Smallest Degree of Disturbance from Corrupt Influences', in which he responded to the dismissal of his electoral system by Russell in his 1865 edition of *An Essay on the History of the English Government*. With reference to 'contrivances altogether unknown to our habits', Hare asserted: 'To say that it is not necessary now, because in earlier times communication was difficult or impossible, would be as reasonable as to say that as free trade was not needed in the infancy of society, when each community depended on its own productions, it is therefore unnecessary now.'²³⁴ Whereas Russell doubted 'that there are models of government still untried, promising a cup of felicity and freedom which England has not yet tasted', Hare doubted 'that civilisation is so impotent in the work of social improvement'.²³⁵ In the discussion which followed his paper, his electoral system was explained and defended by John Westlake.²³⁶ Most of the other participants, however, were critical if not hostile. Subsequently, on 7 January 1867, Hughes wrote to Hare that he feared 'we shall scarcely have had time to drive the principles of your Reform Bill into John Bull's thick head before the next change in representation'.²³⁷

That the fear of Hughes was justified was evident in 1867 when two reform bills were introduced by Disraeli in the House of Commons on 14 February and 18 March.²³⁸ Amid debate outside Parliament, the

electoral system proposed by Hare was rejected when not ignored in both *Essays on Reform* and *Questions for a Reformed Parliament*, volumes published in March and April by 'university liberals' who supported franchise reform in opposition to Lowe and his fellow Adullamites.²³⁹ Among the twelve contributors to *Essays on Reform* were Kinnear and Stephen. Whereas Kinnear in 'Redistribution of Seats' made no mention of Hare,²⁴⁰ Stephen in 'On the Choice of Representatives by Popular Constituencies' did so within the context of his discussion of Mill, whose election to Parliament in Westminster suggested to him that the democratic threat to the educated elite was exaggerated, he argued: 'The advocacy of the rights of women, of Mr Hare's scheme, and of unpopular views upon theology, for which Mr Mill was notorious, were industriously urged, but without any serious effect.'²⁴¹ Stephen further criticized Hare in *Macmillan's Magazine* in April, arguing against the necessity of his electoral system, seeing 'no reason for representing every shade of opinion in Parliament. A sect which represents one six hundred and fifty-eighth part of the country is not really the stronger for having one member of Parliament'.²⁴² Nor was it immune to corruption, he continued:

Reformers of Mr Hare's sanguine temperament seem always to imagine that the institutions they provide will be worked in the spirit they intend – not that they will be subjected to the strain of every political passion, bearing them in all directions. . . . Money would buy votes, and influence compel votes, as easily as ever; men would have the same motives for getting into Parliament, and the same motives for choosing members of Parliament. . . . With all respect for the great authorities enlisted in behalf of the scheme, we cannot anticipate from it the moral reformation of the constituent, and therefore no radical change in the government which he constitutes.²⁴³

In short, Stephen remarked, 'we confess to a general prejudice against reforming mankind by clever arithmetical dodges'.²⁴⁴

Nevertheless, during the debate on the reform bill in the House of Commons on 30 May, Mill moved an amendment for the single transferable vote, referring to Hare as 'a man distinguished by that union of large and enlightened general principles with an organizing intellect and a rare fertility of practical contrivance, which together constitute a genius for legislation'.²⁴⁵ The principle of personal representation was 'most important to the beneficial working of representative government', Mill asserted, and was 'neither democratic nor aristocratic – neither Tory,

Whig, nor Radical; or, let me rather say, it is all these at once'.²⁴⁶ He assured those who feared that 'the single class of manual labourers would, by dint of numbers, outvote all other classes, and monopolise the whole of the Legislature' that by Hare's system of election 'no such thing could happen; no considerable minority could possibly be swamped; no interest, no feeling, no opinion, which numbered in the whole country a few thousand adherents, need be without a representation in due proportion to its numbers'.²⁴⁷ In particular, he emphasized, 'under any suffrage approaching to universal, it would operate in favour of the propertied and of the most educated classes'.²⁴⁸ Hare's electoral system was not, he added, 'the mere crotchet of an individual' but had adherents in Australia, America, France, Germany, Italy, and Switzerland. 'In one illustrious though small commonwealth, that of Geneva', he noted with reference to Naville, 'a powerful association has been organized and is at work, under the presidency of one of the most eminent men in the Swiss federation, agitating for the reform of the constitution on this basis'.²⁴⁹ Mill concluded:

Those who are anxious for safeguards against the evils they expect from democracy should not neglect the safeguard which is to be found in the principles of democracy itself. It is not only the best safeguard, but the surest and most lasting: because it combats the evils and dangers of false democracy by means of the true, and because every democrat who understands his own principles must see and feel its strict and impartial justice.²⁵⁰

His speech was not well received, however, as a sympathetic spectator, Lady Amberley, recorded in her diary: 'I was next to Mr Hare's two daughters who were much disgusted at the stupidity of the M.P.s for they laughed very much and were very inattentive.'²⁵¹

Viscount Cranborne (formerly Cecil) rose after Mill to say that 'he did not profess to be a disciple of the hon. Member for Westminster; but he felt that the House of Commons was scarcely doing itself justice in not giving some attention to proposals which had evidently been deeply thought out, earnestly supported out of doors, and advocated that evening in a speech of no common eloquence and ability'.²⁵² He remarked that although he thought Hare's electoral system was 'impracticable', the 'evil' against which it was directed was 'real', being the 'introduction of the hard machinery of local party organization conducted by party managers'.²⁵³ Walter Morrison, a Liberal for Plymouth, expressed the opinion that Hare's electoral system could encourage

bribery and interfere with legislation, although it would 'carry out democracy, or popular government, to its logical consequences'.²⁵⁴ He thought 'further consideration' was necessary.

Mill withdrew his amendment, but the issue of the representation of minorities was raised again on 17 June when Samuel Laing, a Liberal for Wick and an Adullamite, moved an amendment to add a third member to boroughs with a population of 150,000 or more, and Hughes moved an amendment for the application of the cumulative vote.²⁵⁵ The Hughes amendment was ruled 'a separate and distinct proposal' and was withdrawn, but the cumulative vote was revived during the debate on the Laing amendment. Opposing the Laing amendment, Disraeli attacked the cumulative vote and 'other fantastic schemes',²⁵⁶ while Gladstone in defending the Laing amendment remarked that the cumulative vote was due 'careful and impartial consideration'.²⁵⁷ Cranborne spoke in favour of both the Laing amendment and the cumulative vote, which he considered to be in the interest of Conservatives in Liberal boroughs. He demonstrated greater sympathy for the position of Bright than of Hare, however, when he spoke in favour of single-member districts for the same reason. 'I am very much in favour of representing minorities directly', he stated. 'If I cannot do that I would then adopt the scheme attributed to Mr Cobden of obtaining the representation of these minorities by geographical divisions.'²⁵⁸ In the division that followed, the Laing amendment was defeated by a majority of eight votes while being supported by Gladstone and Cranborne as well as by Mill, Hughes, and Morrison, Fawcett being absent.²⁵⁹

Another amendment for the cumulative vote was moved on 4 July by Lowe, who did so, he admitted, 'with no great confidence of success'. His reason, he explained, was that 'all our other arrows have been shot; not one remains in the quiver; so that if this does not hit, there will be nothing left but one simple uniform franchise to be intrusted to, and left to, the hands of the lowest class of society. I must not be understood as coming forward to argue for any protection for the minority; but I cannot allow that there is any right in the majority to coerce the minority.'²⁶⁰ In the ensuing debate, which continued on the following day, sides were taken with specific reference to the issue of the representation of minorities. The Lowe amendment was opposed by Disraeli who denounced 'the schemes of coteries'.²⁶¹ In his attack on such 'peculiar crotchets', Bright defended virtual representation, employing the argument that had been used against the representation of minorities by Disraeli in 1859: 'At present the minority of one set of politics in a

particular borough are generally represented by the Members returned by the majority in an adjacent borough....The minority in Manchester has always had its case fairly stated by the representative of the majority in Liverpool.¹²⁶² Mill took issue with Bright, referring to his defence of personal representation by the single transferable vote earlier in the year.²⁶³ In the division on the amendment, Mill, Fawcett, Hughes, and Morrison were joined by Cranborne and voted with Lowe against Gladstone, Bright, and Disraeli.²⁶⁴ The Lowe amendment was defeated by a majority of 141.²⁶⁵

Mill voted with Lowe and Cranborne again in a more significant division by which was adopted the limited vote, or minority clause.²⁶⁶ This was moved as an amendment in the House of Lords on 30 July by Lord Cairns, a Conservative who when in the House of Commons in 1866 had said that the principle of the constitution was 'that Parliament shall be a mirror...so that the various classes of this country may be heard...without the possibility of any one class outnumbering and reducing to silence all the other classes in the kingdom'.²⁶⁷ The amendment moved by Cairns in 1867 was supported by Russell, in the House of Lords as of 1861, who on 30 July defended the amendment as a means to 'introduce into the House of Commons men of moderate views whose influence would tend to reconcile parties on those occasions, which now and then arise, when neither extreme is completely right, and when the influence of moderate men is of much use in allying the heat of party passion'.²⁶⁸ When the limited vote was considered in the House of Commons on 8 August, it was denounced by Bright in a lengthy speech directed against the representation of minorities and Mill's support for Hare's electoral system:

I think we have a right to complain of the hon. Member for Westminster and his friends, not that they are in favour of representing everybody, but that they are in favour of a proposal like this, which really strikes off a large portion of the representative power which the population of this country enjoys; and does not effect in any degree that which my hon. Friend and his friends wish to be done by the establishment of Mr Hare's system....I think those gentlemen who are in favour of Mr Hare's plan are not in the slightest degree bound to support this plan. There is no intention at present on the part of the Government, or on the part of this House or of the House of Lords, or of any one in the country, to establish Mr Hare's plan in this country.²⁶⁹

Likewise the limited vote was denounced by Gladstone who employed the principle of virtual representation with reference to the proprietary borough of the Duke of Norfolk, a Roman Catholic: 'If you ask me where is the representation of minorities, I tell you it is in Arundel.'²⁷⁰ Gladstone admitted that the limited vote might operate to the advantage of the Liberal party but were it adopted 'it must unfold and expand itself over the whole country', he warned:

Opposed as I am to the principle of representation of minorities, I feel that if we are forced into it on the basis of a plan such as that before us, the injustice that will be inflicted upon the great towns and counties with tripartite representation will be so gross as to be almost penal, on the majorities of those constituencies, and... we must not be accused of inconsistency if we go further in the choice of evils.²⁷¹

Disraeli, taking his stand against Gladstone rather than against the limited vote, joined Cranborne and Lowe in support of the limited vote. So too Mill, Fawcett, Hughes, and Morrison voted in its support.²⁷² It was carried by a majority of 49, thereby applying the minority clause to the four-member City of London, five three-member boroughs, and seven three-member counties.²⁷³

As passed in August 1867, the Second Reform Act did not alter the electoral system as such. It lowered the franchise in England and Wales to include all householders and £10 lodgers in boroughs and £5 leaseholders and £12 occupiers in counties, which nearly doubled the electorate to some two million, and a limited redistribution reduced the number of borough seats and increased the number of county seats, decreasing the representation of England and increasing the representation of Scotland.²⁷⁴ The plurality system of voting within territorial constituencies was maintained, however, in accordance with the principle of virtual representation to the exclusion of the principle of personal representation.

Nevertheless, on 26 October, Mill wrote to Marshall with reference to the adoption of the minority clause which introduced the representation of minorities by the limited vote if not by the single transferable vote that 'the footing, small as it is, which the principle has obtained... by the new Reform Act, ensures its being discussed and rediscussed with a practical aim, and, if so, it is sure to be, ere long, understood and appreciated'.²⁷⁵

4

The Representative Reform Association, 1867–1874

On 25 October 1867, Hare wrote a letter to Edmund Beales, the president of the Reform League, which was published in the *Daily News* on the following day. Therein Hare denounced the neglect by Parliament to complement the extension of the borough franchise with a comprehensive redistribution of seats, predicting that ‘after a new registration, the disproportion in the relative political power of the large and small constituencies will be more offensive than ever’.¹ He condemned the principle of virtual representation as ‘nothing but an abuse’, noting that Gladstone had employed the argument in the House of Commons in opposition to the Cairns amendment for the limited vote. Anticipating further parliamentary consideration of these issues, Hare proposed that the Reform League sponsor a conference to ‘clear away unsound theories, establish just and expose fallacious claims, and bring to light some distinct and definite proposals in which all sincere reformers may concur’. In so doing, he added, the participants would become ‘pioneers in the work of reform which is yet to be done’.²

The conference proposal by Hare was brought before the executive committee of the Reform League on 8 November by George Howell, the secretary,³ when it was left in the hands of Beales, and on the next day Howell wrote to Hare that his ‘valuable suggestions’ were being considered.⁴ Two weeks later, on 22 November, Beales placed the matter before the executive committee which agreed to form a subcommittee ‘to arrange the details with regard to the proposed conference’, the subcommittee consisting of Beales, Howell, George Mantle, a Chartist, and George Odger, a trade unionist.⁵ Mill thought that this activity ‘may turn out very important’, as he wrote to Hare on 30 December: ‘There are a number of the most intelligent leaders of the working men in the league, and even in the council. ... If you could make an impression on

two or three of these...the gain would be immense.⁶ Hare remained opposed to manhood suffrage and the ballot which were the objectives of the Reform League. After the passage of the Second Reform Act, however, he assumed that leaders of the working class would be of greater influence in the future, and he intended to persuade them of the advantage of his electoral system not necessarily because he desired to increase the leverage of labour but more likely because he assumed that labour support would further the adoption of his system. At the same time, the Reform League was under financial strain and was anxious to maintain the support of middle-class patrons, among whom were friends of Hare such as Fawcett, who delivered one of a series of five lectures sponsored by the Reform League between November and February 1868.⁷ The Reform League agreed to arrange the conference, and in February an advertisement was prepared by Hare and circulated by Howell. Therein the significance of the terminology 'personal representation' and 'representation of minorities' was qualified, explaining that Hare's electoral system would not eliminate the representation of communities and majorities, thereby rendering it more adaptable to the needs of labour.⁸

Four meetings of the conference were held in the rooms of the Reform League at Adelphi Terrace in London. In addition to Hare, Howell, and Beales, who acted as chair, participants included John Stuart Mill, Henry Fawcett, John Westlake, Walter Morrison, and Thomas Hughes as well as various Liberals and radicals in and out of the House of Commons, such as John Boyd Kinnear, James Acland, Charles Bradlaugh, William Randall Cremer, Sir Charles Dilke, John Passmore Edwards, Auberon Herbert, George Jacob Holyoake, Lloyd Jones, and Peter Alfred Taylor.⁹ This assembly encompassed a variety of causes, the personnel of which was somewhat interdependent. In later years, some participants would be steadfast supporters of Hare's electoral system and others unyielding opponents. From the United States came Simon Sterne of the Personal Representation Society in New York.¹⁰ At the first meeting on 29 February, Hare emphasized that his system of election 'was not so much the introduction of a new system as the abolition of the restrictions of the old'.¹¹ He argued that the assertion that it was for the representation of minorities to the exclusion of majorities was 'utterly unfounded in fact. It afforded the most perfect representation of all majorities, for it carefully economised their force, so that none might be lost or thrown away....It helped only the minorities that were popular enough to acquire the rank of a majority.' Likewise, he denied that it was for the representation of individuals to the exclusion of communities. 'It afforded the largest scope for local representation which had

ever been devised', he claimed. 'A hundred towns, important enough to be distinctly represented, might immediately be created separate electoral communities, and instead of disfranchisement of localities, as all other extensive schemes proposed, every borough would be preserved; but with no other than its exact share of political power.'¹² He added that it avoided the 'Gerrymandering' associated with American politics.¹³ No doubt aware of a dispute within the Reform League over Fenian violence, he indicated that under his electoral system there would be 'no dispute as to the real sentiments of the Irish people, for they would be expressed with mathematical certainty'.¹⁴ He made reference in particular to 'the claims of labour' and 'the condition of the poorest classes of the metropolis':

If, instead of a metropolitan representation feeble from its number and the divided interests and objects of its constituents, London were represented in proportion to its votes, elected by constituencies voluntarily associated, the vast materials at hand for elevating the moral and intellectual condition of its poorer inhabitants would be made useful, and in a few years their social condition would be altogether raised.¹⁵

His system of election would entrust voters with 'discretion and power', he claimed, emphasizing that

it was in this very trust, and in the cultivation of the mental powers to which it led, that our hope of the elevation of the masses was found. It offered to every voter the contemplation of some ideal of excellence or worth, either in persons or things, with the assurance that he might do something to add to its weight and recommend its acceptance. The exercise of such a power would gradually raise the ideal standard in every mind.¹⁶

This was in keeping with the political opinions of John Milton, Hare suggested, which in the same month were the subject of an article in *Macmillan's Magazine* by John Seeley, Professor of Latin at University College, London as of 1863. Under the influence of Coleridge and a defender of the clerisy, Seeley wrote of Milton's 'comprehensive view of national well-being....The Church and the State to him appeared related as mind and body, constituting together one nation, suffering together, and needing to be healed together'.¹⁷

Both Mill and Fawcett spoke in support of Hare's electoral system, Fawcett commenting that 'the pleasure he derived from the conference might be imagined when he stated that the first political thing he ever did was to write a pamphlet in defence, or rather explanation, of Mr Hare's scheme'.¹⁸ Read to the conference was a letter in opposition from Frederic Harrison, a spokesman for positivism, who argued that its complexity would benefit 'professional wire-pullers' and that 'a powerful executive parliament' was as important as 'representation alone'.¹⁹ The secularist Bradlaugh, however, spoke in its defence 'for the reason mentioned by Mr Harrison, that what we wanted was a strong executive parliament, which could only be secured by getting the best men elected to it'.²⁰ Kinnear spoke in opposition as he thought that it would sever the contact between representatives and constituents, arguing that it was impractical and complex and that he doubted the electorate would apply the effort it demanded for effective operation. He preferred Cobden's plan of single-member districts.²¹ Morrison 'thought the way in which Mr Hare's scheme dealt with the present power of minorities was a practical point in its favour'. As he 'foresaw a considerable difficulty in working it, and an enormous difficulty in inducing the House of Commons to accept it', he recommended that it be 'applied within the limits of some particular county or district'.²² Mill commented that this suggestion 'would very likely be adopted some day'.²³ Following the meeting, Morrison wrote to Howell that he was 'pleased today at finding how thoroughly at home the members of your council were in Mr Hare's theory, and how fairly it was discussed even by its opponents'. Referring to the speeches on Hare's electoral system by himself and Mill in the House of Commons in the previous year, Morrison predicted to Howell that 'if you will only back us, and show that it is a subject not to be cast lightly and contemptuously aside, we will yet make the House of Commons listen to us'.²⁴ In addition, he enclosed a contribution of £20 to the Reform League lecture fund.

The second meeting of the conference was held on 7 March with some 60 in attendance. Among those who spoke against Hare's electoral system were Acland, Beales, and Taylor, who objected to its complexity, claimed that it would encourage corruption, and emphasized the need for manhood suffrage and the ballot.²⁵ Personal representation was defended by Westlake, Hughes, and Holyoake, Westlake attacking the principle of virtual representation with reference to the operation of single-member equal electoral districts in the United States: 'Owing to the complexion of each electoral district being so much like that of

another, the minority in one clearly could not depend upon being represented by the majority in another.¹²⁶ Dilke made a brief comment concerning 'the local element in the proposed scheme', and Herbert remarked that application of it to a county 'would be an excellent way of trying the merits of the scheme'.¹²⁷ On the following day, Mill wrote to Hare that he had received information indicating that Kinnear 'seems a good deal shaken in his opposition.... The perfectly intelligent adhesion of so many of the working men at the meeting, is most encouraging.'¹²⁸

At the third meeting on 21 March, Hare spoke in response to the three principal objections to his electoral system which had been raised at the previous meeting. Its complexity, he admitted, was due perhaps to the detail in which he had explained its mechanism when in reality its operation was quite simple from the point of view of the voter. The process of transferring surplus votes, he indicated, was no more complex than procedures used in banking: 'Payments were made daily by millions throughout the kingdom, which were settled every morning at the clearing house, yet without debiting or crediting any check to the wrong account. The voting paper would be treated with the same care.'¹²⁹ With reference to corruption, he claimed 'no recipe for making the political world suddenly virtuous' but observed that under his electoral system a vote 'was worth no more in one place than in another' and that a voter 'could do no more than sell himself'. 'Wire-pulling', he added, 'was bribery in another form.... Those who were willing to submit to wire-pullers if the proposed plan were adopted might do so, but every man would be free to act for himself – no wire-puller could control him.'¹³⁰ He emphasized that he remained opposed to the ballot but that his system of election was adaptable to it and that likewise it was compatible with universal suffrage.¹³¹

Fawcett remarked that he 'confessed himself the friend of universal suffrage, and not alone of manhood suffrage as advocated by the League, but the plan of Mr Hare would be applicable to every description of franchise'.¹³² Further, he indicated that Hare's electoral system would operate in the interest of the working men, observing that in the House of Commons 'there were probably not half a dozen members of the House who could be said to represent the interests and feelings of the working men'.¹³³ Birmingham under Hare's system of election, Fawcett calculated, 'would return seven members to Parliament. Of those seven he assumed that Mr Bright would be considered as the national representative, while among the six others there would be found men who would attend to the local interest of the town.'¹³⁴ Following Fawcett,

Sterne argued at length that Hare's electoral system was an 'absolute necessity' in the United States, which, he explained, 'suffered from the non-representation of the opinions of a great mass of their people, and of very important elements, and also from the very unfair representation of the whole community'.³⁵ In the Congressional elections in 1866, the Republicans who supported a protective tariff had won a large majority in both the House of Representatives and the Senate, and he considered this domination to be unfair: 'Freetraders... were not heard in Congress simply because they were not sufficiently numerous in any one district to elect a representative'.³⁶ Praising the British Parliament for representing wealth and intellect, Sterne advised that 'better were it for the nation by far never to have universal suffrage unless it were accompanied by electoral reform which gave the fullest possible expression to all classes. If such were not the case, they would be able to swamp, as had been done in America, the most cultivated and the most intelligent part of the community'.³⁷ That nine out of ten American politicians were corrupt, he asserted, 'arose principally from the fact that the wire-pulling and machinations of party were so corrupting in their influence.... To the extent that Mr Hare's plan tends to emancipate men from parties to that extent it made them more pure, and thus, indirectly, Mr Hare's plan was one which tended to purify the whole political atmosphere'.³⁸ Sterne emphasized that the United States as a democracy 'should serve as a warning as well as an example'.³⁹

Upon a motion by Cremer seconded by Fawcett, the conference resolved that a committee be formed to prepare a report to explain Hare's proposed reform, the members including Hare, Beales, Morrison, Cremer, Holyoake, Odger, Acland, and Howell as secretary.⁴⁰ Dilke was appointed but was unable to participate due to ill health.⁴¹ A report was drafted by Hare for consideration by the committee,⁴² which began its work on 14 April.⁴³ The committee report was completed by 23 May and was presented at the fourth meeting of the conference held on 13 June. At this final meeting, Morrison expressed reservations about aspects of the reform proposal but seconded a motion by Hare that the report be adopted. Also carried were resolutions for the circulation of the report and for the formation of an association: 'That, to facilitate communication between persons in the United Kingdom, our colonies, and foreign countries, having for their object the improvement of representative government, it is desirable to establish an association to collect and interchange papers and reports, and otherwise propagate information on such an organization of constituencies as shall best secure true

representation.⁴⁴ Accordingly, the committee was constituted as a provisional committee, which subsequently organized the Representative Reform Association and declared its purpose:

It is established to promote such amendments in the Representative System of Government as shall apportion justly the number of members of the representative body to that of electors or population, so as to secure, in all places, not merely what is called virtual, but real and complete representation of the constituents; to afford, at the same time, to the individual elector, the largest and freest choice of candidates, and full liberty and opportunity of voting for the candidate of his choice; to examine, compare, and discuss such methods as are or shall be proposed for accomplishing these objects; and with this view, to form a centre of communication with the Personal Representation Society of New York, the Association Réformiste of Geneva, and other Societies and persons having similar designs – that thus the members of all such bodies, in their several countries and districts may be able most effectually to call general attention to the conditions of political representation most favourable both to the character of the electors and the elected, and to the true purpose of all government – the highest welfare of the people.⁴⁵

Mill, Fawcett, and Hughes were added to the membership of the provisional committee, and Hare was designated the president of the Association, Morrison the treasurer, and Howell the secretary.⁴⁶ Enrolled as corresponding members were Spence in Australia, Sterne and Field in the United States, and Naville in Switzerland.⁴⁷ An annual subscription was set at a minimum of one shilling, but the Association was to be financed primarily by Morrison, who was responsible for the publication of the report as a pamphlet, *Representative Reform*.⁴⁸

The formation of the Representative Reform Association coincided with the general election of 1868 which followed the succession of Disraeli to Derby as Prime Minister in February. The primary issue during the campaign was the disestablishment of the Irish Church proposed by Gladstone in the House of Commons in March, secondary issues being education, administration, finance, and the ballot.⁴⁹ Hare's electoral system received little attention even from Liberal candidates.⁵⁰ Mill was associated with it in his contest in Westminster, his support for the minority clause, or limited vote, introduced by the Second Reform Act in 1867 being among the reasons why he was not supported in 1868 by

Bright, who considered the minority clause to be 'odious'.⁵¹ Other candidates supporting the single transferable vote were Fawcett in Brighton and Hughes in Frome. Morrison advocated it in his contest in Plymouth but complained to Howell that it was seen by the working men as being against their interests. 'I shall very gladly meet them and show them how many representatives of labour are likely to get in under the present system', Morrison wrote to Howell. 'From all I can learn not one, and they certainly would under Mr Hare's. I imagine the effect will be to make me stronger than ever among them, though I fear I shall lose many of the shopkeepers.'⁵² Howell was a candidate in Aylesbury with the support of Mill and Morrison and advocated further electoral reform but without direct reference to Hare's electoral system.⁵³ Mill also supported Bradlaugh in Northampton who included among his objectives 'a provision by which minorities may be fairly represented in the legislative chambers'.⁵⁴ At the polls in November, Morrison, Fawcett, and Hughes were returned, but Mill, Howell, and Bradlaugh were defeated. Morrison wrote to Howell:

The struggle has not yet begun. Hare's plan is laughed at and despised; so soon as it becomes a real question every effort will be made to swamp us. And I have been seriously warned by long-headed men who know what they are talking about against my folly in taking up a question which is going to produce the keenest enmity in the most powerful quarters. And we must have numbers as well as brains on our side, so let us make disciples as fast as we can.⁵⁵

Among the opponents of Hare's electoral system were the Liberals in Birmingham, which was one of the thirteen constituencies to which the minority clause was first applied in the general election in 1868. Of the thirteen only two constituencies returned members of Parliament all of one party, three Liberals defeating one Conservative in Glasgow, and three Liberals defeating two Conservatives in Birmingham.⁵⁶ The victories in Birmingham of Bright, George Dixon, and P.H. Muntz were due to the ward organization of the Birmingham Liberal Association, founded in 1865 and directed by William Harris.⁵⁷ After Bright attacked the minority clause at a meeting of the Birmingham Liberal Association in October 1868, the Birmingham Liberals in November manipulated the electoral system to their advantage by instructing Liberal voters to vote for pairs of Liberal candidates.⁵⁸ Rather than regarding the minority clause as the vehicle of their victory, however,

they treated it as an obstacle to be overcome and pressed for its abolition. This opposition to the minority clause entered the cabinet in December when Gladstone, a member for Greenwich as of 1868, formed his first ministry and appointed Bright the President of the Board of Trade.

On 10 December 1868, Hare read a paper, 'On the Means of Manifesting Public Opinion in Election of Representatives to Parliament', at a meeting of the Social Science Association, stating that the electoral system nullified the influence of the individual elector: 'If the votes of every member of this Society were computed, has the whole Society and all their accumulated labours had the smallest influence on the elections? I think the answer must be in the negative.'⁵⁹ This 'individual impotence' threatened self-government, he argued, whatever the claims of virtual representation:

The word *self* no longer means the great body of the people, but those, and the friends of those, who to a favourable opportunity and wealth enough to encounter the expenses of publicity, add sufficient tact to discern what will be the most popular cry in a particular district. The admirers of this kind of representation – which they tell us is virtual, and better than if it were real – say to those whose votes are extinguished, 'If you are not represented here, persons who resemble you in education and opinion, and therefore, as they infer, must also resemble you in their judgment of men, will be successful somewhere else, and so you have no reason to complain.'⁶⁰

He added that 'no provision is possible for arriving at such a counter-vailing result'. The minority clause he considered to be 'an important attempt to prevent the nation from being deprived of the benefit of the political judgment of large minorities'.⁶¹ However, he 'regarded the method with some apprehensions, for reasons expressed in last week's *Economist*, the increased power which the system throws into the hands of central committees, and the suppression it involves of individual preferences'.⁶² Whereas the *Economist* had commented that the minority clause 'made representation somewhat more true and complete than it would otherwise have been' and was due 'a longer trial',⁶³ Hare considered it to be 'only transitional'.⁶⁴ He made reference to *Representative Reform*, indicating that copies were 'accessible to every one at the price of little more than the smallest coin'.⁶⁵ Also speaking at the meeting were Westlake and Frederic Hill, the latter referring to the work of his father and endorsing the minority clause.⁶⁶ Earlier in the year,

Hill had compared Hare's electoral system and that of his father in a paper read at the congress of the Social Science Association held in Birmingham.⁶⁷

A work of particular significance published in 1868 was *On Methods of Electing Representatives* by Henry Richmond Droop in which like Morrison he advocated the application of Hare's system of election in local constituencies rather than on a national basis. 'To a highly-educated political thinker', Droop observed,

the liberty of choice Mr Hare offers in allowing an elector to vote, with a reasonable prospect of not throwing his vote away, for any one of six hundred odd candidates, holding all possible varieties and shades of opinion on the principal questions of the day, and all possible combinations of these opinions, is very tempting, and he will turn with disdain from an election, by cumulative or successive voting, of a limited number of representatives; but if we exclude the small minority who make politics their special study, we shall find comparatively few, even among the more highly educated classes of voters, who would be unable to find satisfactory representatives of their opinions, if allowed to choose freely between six or eight candidates.⁶⁸

Further, Droop indicated that

there are obvious advantages in our present system of local constituencies, each returning a limited number of representatives, which it is desirable to retain as far as possible. For instance, this system concentrates the attention of each elector upon a limited number of candidates, whose opinions, character, and antecedents he reads about in the local newspapers and discusses with his neighbours. It also compels each candidate to get his quota of votes from the electors residing within a limited area, subject to the jealous scrutiny of the other candidates for the same constituency.⁶⁹

In addition, he proposed and explained a modification of the calculation of the quota, calculating one lower than that of Hare. Whereas Hare divided the number of votes by the number of seats, Droop divided the number of votes by the number of seats plus 1 and added 1 to the quotient, thereby maximizing the number of votes transferred and minimizing the number of votes wasted. By this method, he argued, 'the principle of giving effect, as far as possible, to the second votes of the

different voters is carried out more completely'.⁷⁰ He did not, however, abandon the use of poll books.⁷¹ Familiar with the work of Carl Andrae as well as that of Naville and Sterne, Droop like Hare considered the single transferable vote to be superior to both the limited vote and the cumulative vote:

It differs from majority voting and 'limited voting' in securing that the members elected, instead of being the spokesmen exclusively of the dominant party, or of the two chief contending parties, will, so far as their numbers allow, represent all the principal opinions prevailing in the constituency each in its due proportion, – and it attains this result without imposing an expensive organization upon each of the contending parties to secure their votes being applied to the best advantage, as 'cumulative voting' and 'single voting' would do, employing instead what I may call a self-acting machinery, as each voter has merely to state what he wishes to have done with his vote, and then leaves it to the returning officer to carry out his directions.⁷²

In the following year, on 10 March 1869, Droop discussed the issue in a paper read at a meeting of the Juridical Society, 'On the Political and Social Effects of Different Methods of Electing Representatives', again advocating the application of the single transferable vote in local constituencies rather than on a national basis, noting: 'Mr Hare's scheme has been of great service not only to this country, but to the cause of free government throughout the world, by attracting public attention to the evils of the present system, and proving the possibility of remedying them.'⁷³

A similar approach was taken in 1869 in *A Scheme for Proportional Representation* by Walter Baily, a Lincoln's Inn barrister and a former Fellow of St John's College, Cambridge, who was a brother-in-law of Droop.⁷⁴ In his work, Baily advocated the single transferable vote with the Droop quota in local constituencies but suggested that candidates rather than electors publicly determine the transfer of surplus votes.⁷⁵ Of greater significance than this procedural variation, however, was the terminological clarification, Baily defining the term 'proportional representation' to mean the representation of 'different parties in a Constituency in proportion to their strength'.⁷⁶ Likewise, Droop applied 'proportional representation' to the representation of 'all parties'.⁷⁷ Thus the term 'proportional' as used by Baily and Droop, unlike the term 'personal' as used by Hare, was defined to mean the representation of political parties rather than of individual electors. Such use of the

term 'proportional representation' reflected not only consideration of the application of Hare's single transferable vote within territorial constituencies but also the development of the organization of political parties following the Second Reform Act.

Further reform of the electoral system as considered by the Gladstone ministry was limited to the adoption of the ballot, accepted by Gladstone largely in return for the support of Bright for his policy on the Irish land question.⁷⁸ On 16 March 1869, the House of Commons appointed a Select Committee on Parliamentary and Municipal Elections to be concerned principally with the ballot.⁷⁹ To be chaired by the Whig marquess of Hartington, Liberal member for Radnor and Postmaster General, among the members selected was Bright. During the debate in the House of Commons, Morrison objected that its membership would not represent concerns such as labour representation and minority representation by Hare's electoral system,⁸⁰ both of which, he pointed out in a letter to Howell, were opposed by the ministry.⁸¹ Shortly thereafter, on 19 March, Fawcett was appointed to the committee.⁸²

On the following day, the Representative Reform Association met and prepared a petition for consideration by the Hartington committee, and it was presented on 12 April.⁸³ At the same time, Hare wrote to Hartington offering testimony by himself and Howell.⁸⁴ Hartington replied on 22 June, however, that what Hare proposed to consider was not within the scope of the committee. 'The object of their enquiry is the mode of conducting elections in the existing constituencies, and under the existing conditions', Hartington wrote to Hare. 'The Committee understand that the system which you advocate would make a great change in the constituencies, and would, in fact, totally alter the system of representation.'⁸⁵ Hare replied on 26 June that 'Proportional Representation may be adapted to some existing Parliamentary constituencies, and to all existing municipal bodies. I, therefore, am ready to undertake that my evidence shall be strictly confined to the application of the system to the present constituent bodies.'⁸⁶ The response of Hartington on 6 July again was negative.⁸⁷ This course of events was reported by Hare at a general meeting of the Representative Reform Association held on 15 July.⁸⁸

Meanwhile, on 12 July, Hare chaired a meeting of the Social Science Association at which a paper was read by Clair J. Grece, who argued that voters should be able to register what they opposed as well as what they favoured within constituencies, which he said had a 'collective, or collegiate will'.⁸⁹ Westlake objected, saying that 'the only collegiate will which it was desirable to arrive at was that of the nation', with which

view Hare concurred.⁹⁰ Hare returned to the Social Science Association in the following year, on 13 June 1870, when he spoke on the electoral dimension of local government with reference to the question of the establishment of school boards which was under consideration in Parliament.⁹¹

During these years, minority representation and Hare's system of election continued to receive attention in the United States. In a lecture delivered at Cooper Union in New York in February 1869, Sterne referred to Hare as 'the first to trace to their true cause the evils of our present majority system, and to propose a systematic and elaborate plan for their removal', although Sterne noted that 'the over-conscientiousness of his labours... have proved the greatest obstacle to their acceptance'.⁹² In Boston in April 1870, Field spoke of Hare's electoral system at a meeting of the American Social Science Association.⁹³ In the same month, the single transferable vote was used by the alumni of Harvard College for the nomination of candidates for the Board of Overseers as had been advocated by W.R. Ware, a Harvard alumnus who was a professor at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.⁹⁴ Not unrelated was the subsequent adoption in July 1870 of the cumulative vote as recommended by the Illinois Constitutional Convention for the election of the Illinois General Assembly.⁹⁵

In the House of Commons on 15 June 1870, there was a debate on the representation of minorities, a bill having been introduced to repeal the minority clause.⁹⁶ Brought in by three Liberals, J.A. Hardcastle, member for Bury, William Vernon Harcourt, member for Oxford, and Thomas Bayley Potter, who had succeeded Cobden as member for Rochdale, the motion for leave on 14 February had the support of Gladstone, who said that Hardcastle 'had a very fair case for being allowed to introduce his measure without opposition. For the opinion upon which his hon. Friend acted was not merely his (Mr Gladstone's) opinion... but the opinion of the House of Commons, which sent up the Reform Bill to the House of Lords without the Minority Clauses [sic], and passed them afterwards in order to avoid running the risk of losing the Bill for a year.'⁹⁷ During the second reading on 15 June, Hardcastle disclaimed partisan motivation for the bill, pointing out that 'the working of the clauses had been more beneficial to the Liberals than to the Conservatives.'⁹⁸ The intention of Cairns in moving the amendment for the limited vote had not been fulfilled, he argued, in that members returned for the constituencies to which his amendment applied did not represent minority interests. 'In not one single instance had any representative been returned for a unicorn county who was unconnected

with land', he claimed, 'and in no instance had a representative for a city or borough been returned who was not connected with trade or commerce'.⁹⁹ Quoting from Cobden's last letter, Hardcastle proceeded to link the minority clause to Hare's electoral system:

As to Mr Hare's plan of proportionate representation – a principle which these clauses carried out to a certain limited extent – he must say that, if ever a scheme united ingenuity with impossibility, Mr Hare's was that scheme. If it were applied to all the constituencies of the kingdom it would be a revolution compared with which every other revolution sank into complete insignificance. . . . The constitutional principle had always been that Members should be sent to the House to represent, first of all, political opinions; but the result of Mr Hare's scheme would be entirely to alter that state of things, because many persons would be returned under it who possessed no political opinions whatever. Such a result would be most detrimental to the character of that great representative Assembly.¹⁰⁰

His opposition to Hare's electoral system, Hardcastle indicated, was among 'the reasons that had induced him to introduce this Bill'.¹⁰¹

Following opposition to the bill by Thomas Collins, a Conservative member for Boston, who attacked the principle of virtual representation,¹⁰² the bill was defended by Gladstone, who again employed the argument of virtual representation. Noting that Liberals had gained a slight advantage from the minority clause, he argued that 'the fact is the majority of one constituency is the minority of another', minority representation being provided by 'the variety of the constituencies of the kingdom'.¹⁰³ Pointing out that both Bright and Disraeli had opposed the limited vote in the House of Commons in 1867 before the Cairns amendment in the House of Lords, Gladstone observed that 'the current of public opinion has been, in the main, decidedly unsatisfactory as regards the operation of the clause; and it may not be unreasonable for those who supported it in 1867, and who with sanguine hopes anticipated that experience would be so satisfactory as to lead to its general adoption, to admit that their expectations have not been realized'.¹⁰⁴ He asserted his concept of political representation:

The principle of Parliamentary representation is, that we should recognize each constituency as being in itself an integer – as being in itself a community – and what we want in this House is to have

the prevailing sense of the community. We do not want to have represented in miniature particular shades of opinion that may at the moment prevail in it, but the sense of the majority, which represents the whole community; because the community is, in the spirit and sense of the Constitution, recognized as being in itself an integral quantity.¹⁰⁵

While the bill was not sponsored by the Government, he added, he was in agreement with it and would support it.¹⁰⁶

Morrison responded in defence of the minority clause. 'The principle upon which representation should be based was', he insisted, 'that a hearing should be obtained in the Legislature for advocates of every diversity of opinion mustering a very considerable number of adherents – that, in fact, the minority should be represented, but that the majority should rule'.¹⁰⁷ Accordingly, he rejected virtual representation: 'He thought the House had heard the last of that argument in 1867, when they were told that, though the working men had no votes themselves, they were virtually represented by the middle-class electors.'¹⁰⁸ He explained that he had supported the minority clause in 1867 in the hope that it 'would lead to the extension of the principle over the whole of England',¹⁰⁹ pointing out that the issue 'involved the whole question of the redistribution of seats'.¹¹⁰ With specific reference to Hare's electoral system, Morrison surveyed the movement for proportional representation in Europe and the United States where, unlike in Britain, he emphasized, 'this principle was surely gaining ground'.¹¹¹ Fawcett, while recognizing that the minority clause was inferior to the cumulative vote and the single transferable vote, also attacked the bill, arguing that it 'asked them to retrace their steps, and to declare that it was right and just that the majority alone in each constituency should be represented, and to such a declaration he could not be an assenting party'.¹¹² Parliament should be, he concluded, 'the mirror of the nation'.¹¹³ Disraeli opposed the bill on the ground that the minority clause was deserving of a longer trial.¹¹⁴ The bill was defeated by 183 to 175.¹¹⁵

The issue of the representation of minorities was debated again in the House of Commons in the following month within the context of the Elementary Education Bill introduced by W.E. Forster, a Liberal member for Bradford and Vice-President of the Council, which provided for the election of school boards by town councils in boroughs and by vestries in rural districts.¹¹⁶ On 4 July 1870, following a narrowly defeated motion by Dilke, a radical Liberal member for Chelsea, for direct election

of school boards, Lord Frederick Cavendish, a Whig-Liberal member for the West Riding of Yorkshire, proposed an amendment for direct election of school boards by the cumulative vote.¹¹⁷ Defended by Fawcett,¹¹⁸ the amendment was attacked by Harcourt who said that adoption of the principle would be 'a most dangerous experiment – than which he could not conceive one more likely to wreck the success of the Bill'.¹¹⁹ The amendment was accepted by Gladstone, however, who argued that the election of school boards was not analogous to the election of members of Parliament. 'There were many sections of persons all of whom had interests and feelings which it might be desirable to have represented on the local Boards', he observed, and 'the representation on the local Board of every shade of opinion would tend to divest the elections of acrimony and animosity'.¹²⁰ He indicated that the Commons 'would act wisely in adopting it, and if they did so he hoped it would prove successful'.¹²¹ The amendment was agreed to without a division.¹²² Subsequently, the *Annual Register* commented that this was 'a decision remarkable for being the occasion of the first introduction into England of the form of election so much discussed in America, and calculated to secure the representation of minorities'.¹²³

At a general meeting of the Representative Reform Association held on 6 August 1870 and attended by Mill, Morrison, Howell, and Droop, among others, Hare reported that the adoption of the cumulative vote for the election of school boards was 'of great significance', suggesting that although it constituted only a 'partial application' of the principle of the representation of minorities and was vulnerable to 'skillful party organization', it made it 'more difficult to resist the conclusion that it ought to be extended to the constitution of the governing bodies to which the determination of other great political and social questions is entrusted'.¹²⁴ Following the report by Hare, members of the Representative Reform Association conferred with members of the Labour Representation League, created in 1869 for the purpose of organizing working-class voters, concerning the application of proportional representation to the representation of labour.¹²⁵

In September 1870, an article in defence of Hare's electoral system was contributed to *Macmillan's Magazine* by Millicent Garrett Fawcett, who had married Henry Fawcett in 1867. A supporter of Mill, she had been in contact with Hare not only through her husband but also through their mutual membership of the London National Society for Woman Suffrage founded in 1867, a public meeting of which Hare chaired in July 1869.¹²⁶ In her article in September 1870, 'Proportional Representation', she emphasized the need for a reform to equalize the value of votes but

rejected the prospect of single-member equal electoral districts, claiming that they 'would remove some of the most glaring defects of the present system' but 'would not touch the difficulty of obtaining representation for local minorities'.¹²⁷ At the same time, she rejected the principle of virtual representation:

The idea of the minority in one place being represented by the majority in another place is certainly ingenious, but it overlooks the fact of there being any difference between members of the same political party. There are Liberals and Liberals, and it was probably no source of consolation to Mr Mill's supporters in Westminster to know that in Marylebone Mr Harvey Lewis had been returned by a triumphant majority.¹²⁸

The minority clause she considered to be defective. 'At the last election for Cambridgeshire four candidates were started, two Conservatives and two Liberals', she observed. 'The Conservatives had a considerable majority, and the return of their candidates was at two o'clock virtually secured. The remaining Conservative votes were then used to prevent the return of the most radical of the two Liberal Candidates.' Thus, she argued, the minority was 'deprived of the right of selecting between their own candidates the one whom they consider their fittest representative'.¹²⁹ She considered the cumulative vote to be superior to the limited vote but nevertheless insufficient:

The great defect of such forms of proportional representation is that, by leaving local representation in its present position, they limit the choice of electors to the candidates who present themselves for election in a particular constituency. By so doing, they prevent the total result of a general election being really representative of the entire nation; for if all constituencies returned three members, and if cumulative voting were adopted, local minorities of less than one-fourth would still remain unrepresented, although they might form a very important proportion of the entire body of electors throughout the country.¹³⁰

The adoption of the cumulative vote for school board elections 'may be a useful precedent for future legislation',¹³¹ she commented, but she advocated the application the single transferable vote for parliamentary elections so as to secure the representation of minorities while assuring the 'supremacy' of majorities.¹³²

At a meeting of the Representative Reform Association held on 22 October, Hare discussed the operation of the cumulative vote in the impending school board elections in London, emphasizing that women played an important role in the education question and that they 'should not be excluded from the board'.¹³³ Accordingly, his daughter Alice and her husband John Westlake were members of the London School Board Election Campaign Committee of Elizabeth Garrett, a sister of Millicent Garrett Fawcett.¹³⁴ Hare presented a table for calculating the number of votes needed for election depending on the number of seats to be filled, Mill spoke at some length, and resolutions were passed to examine the operation of the cumulative vote after the elections had been held.¹³⁵

Of the school board elections in November 1870, the most controversial proved to be that in Birmingham where in 1868 the nonconformist Liberals had founded the National Education League to promote non-sectarian universal primary education.¹³⁶ There were 15 seats on the Birmingham school board, and the nonconformist Liberal majority attempted to win all and nominated 15 candidates. The Anglican Conservative minority nominated only eight candidates, divided the city into eight wards, and instructed electors in each ward to vote for only one candidate. There was one Roman Catholic candidate. As the votes of the Liberal electors were widely distributed, only six Liberal candidates were elected to the board, among whom were Dixon and the manufacturer Joseph Chamberlain, the Chairman of the executive committee of the National Education League. The votes of the Conservative electors were less widely distributed, and all eight Conservative candidates were elected, giving them a majority on the school board. All the votes of the Roman Catholic electors were concentrated on their single candidate who topped the poll.¹³⁷

On 13 February 1871, at a meeting of the Social Science Association with Mill in the chair and Alice and John Westlake and Droop in attendance, Hare defended the operation of the cumulative vote in the school board elections, observing that without it in Birmingham 'the diversities in religious opinion would, for want of harmonious action, have failed in distinct expression' and 'the representative body would have been of a more uniform type'.¹³⁸ He added:

The victory which was anticipated by those who complain of the cumulative vote in Birmingham would elsewhere have been often on the other side. Would it have been wise or just to exclude in one district all who insist on education for its own sake and desire it

to be unsectarian, and in another all who distrust it unless it have a denominational connection? The cumulative vote prevents these party triumphs, and encourages the advocates of both systems to come together, that they may find some common ground for working out this great educational experiment.¹³⁹

He indicated, however, that the most effective means of preventing 'electoral dictatorship' was the single transferable vote.¹⁴⁰ In concluding the meeting, Mill likewise commented that the cumulative vote was 'a very imperfect mode of obtaining – partially – or a part of the results that would flow from Mr Hare's system'.¹⁴¹

Four days later, however, Chamberlain wrote to Dilke that 'the large majority' of the members and the executive committee of the National Education League were 'opposed to the Cumulative Vote and think it a device of the enemy' although 'no one is pledged to this view'. He added that the executive committee had 'approved the intention to publish and circulate a pamphlet on the Cumulative Vote, which will be out in a day or two'.¹⁴² This pamphlet, *The Cumulative Method of Voting: Its Nature, Operation and Effects as Exhibited in the Late School Board Elections*, was a sustained attack not only on the cumulative vote but also on the principle of representation of minorities. It began with a quotation from the eighteenth-century legal authority William Blackstone to the effect that representatives represent general rather than particular concerns, arguing that this was the necessary case in the instance of school boards. The limited vote in parliamentary elections as introduced by the minority clause in the Second Reform Act was criticized for exaggerating the influence of minorities, and the cumulative vote in school board elections was treated as an extension of its operation: 'A like end is reached by each of the methods, but it is attained, in the education system, by a far more violent strain of the voting machinery.'¹⁴³ It questioned the motivation of the Liberal party in the House of Commons in permitting the adoption of the cumulative vote: 'The question can only be answered on the supposition that the House, afraid of its own creation, was unwilling to entrust the administration of the new law to the free judgment of the people.'¹⁴⁴ With reference to Birmingham, it asserted that 'a Liberal Government has the discredit of having fettered a constituency on which it has leant for a considerable portion of its support'.¹⁴⁵ The working classes, it indicated, were adversely affected by the cumulative vote: 'Since... they are in so great a degree incapable of mastering the intricacies of the voting-paper and of the cumulative rule, their dependence on the aid of canvassers is now much increased,

and their power of co-operating in electing good men is correspondingly diminished.¹⁴⁶ It complained further that the cumulative vote gave an advantage to the 'Church party'.¹⁴⁷

In the same month that the National Education League pamphlet was published, William Torrens, a member of the Finsbury school board and a Liberal member of Parliament for Finsbury, expressed opposition to the cumulative vote in the *Contemporary Review*:

If minorities are to be represented, they ought to be minorities that bear some adequate and reasonable proportion to the majorities in the midst of which they dwell. But the anomaly of enabling each of two or three cliques who happen to be eager, exclusive, and well-organized, to return a member for a large community, although they may number but one in ten on the rate-book, while in the adjoining borough such a minority would have no chance of obtaining their object if they were less than one in three, seems as palpable as it is preposterous.¹⁴⁸

Bright in particular was adamant in his opposition to the cumulative vote, writing to Forster on 5 March that it was 'monstrous and intolerable',¹⁴⁹ to which Forster replied on 7 March that it had not been proposed by the ministry and that unlike in Birmingham 'in many places, London especially, it is clear that those who think with the [National Education] League owe to it their return'.¹⁵⁰ On the same day in the House of Commons, the first reading was given to a bill prepared by Dixon, Muntz, Potter, and Jacob Bright, brother of John and a Liberal member for Manchester, to abolish the cumulative vote and to adopt a single-member ward system for school board elections.¹⁵¹

On 8 March, Fawcett remarked in Brighton that 'representative reform lies in the direction of the cumulative vote, if, in addition to it, some system were introduced of not allowing the surplus votes of the successful candidates to be thrown away'.¹⁵² Droop also addressed the issue of the use of the cumulative vote in the school board elections in a paper read before the Juridical Society on 19 April, 'Proportional Representation as Applied to the Election of Local Governing Bodies'. In the case of the London school board, he indicated, 'the different parties and sections, religious and otherwise, which take an interest in education are represented, and probably the share each has obtained of the representation is not very far from proportional to its actual numbers and importance'.¹⁵³ An exception was the case of Birmingham, however, he observed, where the use of party lists 'prevented the

individual electors from choosing for themselves, and where, in consequence, the representatives belong entirely, or for the most part, to two or more disciplined parties, as under majority voting'.¹⁵⁴ He recommended that school boards and other such local bodies be elected by the single transferable vote as proposed by Hare and modified by Baily.¹⁵⁵

In the same month, Millicent Garrett Fawcett further defended Hare's electoral system in *Macmillan's Magazine* with direct reference to the school board election in London:

By the Education Act of 1870, it was decreed that two of the most important principles of Mr Hare's scheme should be partially adopted in the election of the London School Board. In the first place, by the introduction of the cumulative vote the advantages of proportional representation were recognized. In the second place, by making the Board metropolitan and not merely local, the advantages of extending the electoral area may become more apparent, and may ultimately lead to the conversion of London, for educational purposes, into one large constituency.¹⁵⁶

The complaint against the cumulative vote and proportional representation in Birmingham, she observed, was due to the attempt by the Liberals to win all of the seats. 'They further alienated support', she added, 'by not including in this ticket one woman or working man'.¹⁵⁷ She suggested that the success of the cumulative vote in London

may possibly lead to so much approval of the results of proportional representation, that a demand may be made to extend the system to parliamentary elections, and to group all the boroughs in London, for representative purposes, into one large constituency. This proposal suggests the feasibility of an electioneering experiment, by means of which Mr Hare's scheme could be applied to London for the purpose of returning twenty members to Parliament.¹⁵⁸

As of 24 May, Hare had prepared a memorandum on the school board elections in response to a request from the Foreign Office for information to provide foreign governments interested in the operation of the cumulative vote. Therein he commented on critics of the cumulative vote that 'popular ignorance and party prejudice are too often impatient of argument in defence of that which, to a superficial view,

may be made to appear as a hardship'.¹⁵⁹ With reference to its operation in the school board election in Birmingham, he observed that 'it is impossible to say that there was any injustice in this result'.¹⁶⁰ Following an analysis of the results of the elections of the school boards in Finsbury, Lambeth, Marylebone, and Sheffield and a survey of the complaints directed against the cumulative vote by the National Education League in its pamphlet, he argued that any defects in the system, such as dependence on party organization and loss of surplus votes, would be remedied by the adoption of the single transferable vote. Its benefits, he indicated, were demonstrated by its application in Denmark and at Harvard.¹⁶¹ He concluded that the objections to the cumulative vote were 'so many testimonies in favour of its principle'.¹⁶²

Two months later, on 8 July, the Gladstone ministry was considering its position on the bill to abolish the cumulative vote in school board elections, and the decision of the cabinet was to oppose the bill.¹⁶³ The second reading of the bill followed on 12 July with Dixon speaking in its defence largely on the basis of the results in Birmingham.¹⁶⁴ He was opposed by Morrison, Herbert, Collins, and Cavendish, Morrison saying that he recognized defects in the cumulative vote such as an 'enormous waste' of surplus votes but that this 'could be cured by some system of preferential voting'.¹⁶⁵ Harcourt defended the bill 'because it raised the question of proportional representation'. Those who opposed the bill, he argued, 'were advocates of proportional representation. But that principle had never been adopted by the Liberal party.' Referring to 'philosophical Liberals', he complained: 'Propositions from that party had been numerous of late. Female suffrage, minority votes, payment of members, and payment of election expenses out of rates, had been proposed by it.'¹⁶⁶ He concluded that 'proportional representation was contrary to the habits and sentiments of the people', and he 'promised it continual opposition'.¹⁶⁷ The bill was withdrawn without a division. Subsequently in December in the annual report of the Representative Reform Association, Hare noted the failure of the bill and commented that the cumulative vote was 'successful in bringing together bodies more truly representative than the communities which chose them had probably ever before returned'.¹⁶⁸

Among the advocates of Hare's system of election encouraged by the adoption of the cumulative vote for the election of school boards was Baily, whose *Proportional Representation in Large Constituencies* was published in January 1872. Therein he commented that although an 'imperfect system, not capable of giving representation in due proportion', the

cumulative vote in the election of school boards he considered to be 'a great practical step in the direction of proportional representation'.¹⁶⁹ As in municipal elections, he argued, so 'in Parliamentary elections, if a fair number of members were given to the metropolitan and other large boroughs, and the rest of the country were divided into districts returning not less than five members a piece, Proportional Representation could be introduced'.¹⁷⁰

In the following month in *Fraser's Magazine*, Millicent Garrett Fawcett turned her attention to the campaign for proportional representation in the United States in a review of *On Representative Government and Personal Representation* by Sterne which had been published in Philadelphia in the previous year. 'The plan of representative reform known in connection with the name of Mr Hare has been the subject of so many essays, pamphlets, and speeches', she observed, 'that Mr Sterne's pages will probably not afford to English readers any new information on the subject'.¹⁷¹ However, she concluded: 'Whatever may be the opinion formed of the respective merits of the various schemes advocated in Mr Sterne's book, we trust it may lead English Radicalism to look to something more than Universal Suffrage and the Ballot as the ideal of political perfection'.¹⁷² Also in February, the Representative Reform Association issued an invitation to the Personal Representation Society in New York to participate in the formation of an International Committee for Electoral Reform in Municipalities.¹⁷³

At a meeting of the fourth Co-operative Congress held in Bolton in April, Morrison introduced the use of Hare's electoral system for the determination of the location of the meeting of the following congress, the voting being supervised by Howell.¹⁷⁴ Later in June, Morrison published under the name of the Representative Reform Association a pamphlet version of an article on proportional representation by Ware which had appeared in the *American Law Review* earlier in January.¹⁷⁵ Also in June, Droop provided a preface and notes to an English translation of French essays on proportional representation by Naville previously published in Geneva in 1871.¹⁷⁶

In the House of Commons in 1872, in which year G.O. Trevelyan, Liberal member for Hawick district, introduced and Fawcett seconded the first of a series of bills for an extension of the franchise in the counties,¹⁷⁷ Morrison, Fawcett, Herbert, and Hughes introduced a bill for proportional representation, providing for a comprehensive redistribution of seats, each constituency to return three or more members by the single transferable vote. Limited to England and Wales, the bill

provided for 22 boroughs, 42 counties, and a single-constituency grouping Oxford, Cambridge, and London universities.¹⁷⁸ During the second reading on 10 July, Morrison attacked the caucus and defended the clerisy:

One marked and growing feature of modern political life was the rise of organizations, outside of the House of Commons, banded together to carry out some object by means of legislation. Each such organization usually had an affinity with one of the political parties; its delegates attended the caucus. Various names were proposed; but it was a *sine qua non* that the candidates should swallow certain Shibboleths. Now, what you wanted here were men of education, thought, and force of character. Such men had thought out their opinions for themselves, and would not mould their political creed on the demands of associations. Under the caucus system such men would be passed over for a man of a very different type, and thus there would be a gradual deterioration of the quality and personnel of the House of Commons.¹⁷⁹

Hughes seconded the motion for the second reading,¹⁸⁰ but the bill had few supporters, such as Collins,¹⁸¹ and it was defeated on a motion by Dilke that no redistribution could be considered that did not apply to Scotland and Ireland.¹⁸²

In the following month, on 26 August, Morrison in pursuit of Whig support emphasized to the 3rd Earl Grey that 'if we are to keep men of independent mind in Parliament it can only be by some form of Proportional Representation'.¹⁸³ Fawcett likewise endeavoured to encourage the support of Grey, writing to him on 28 August that 'the House of Commons as at present constituted cannot be regarded as a National Assembly in the true sense of the word.... I think it would be very desirable to introduce some scheme of proportional representation such as that brought forward by Mr Walter Morrison last session'.¹⁸⁴ Grey was sceptical, as he replied to Fawcett on 2 September: 'With respect to the scheme for proportional representation, I confess it appears to me to be too complicated to work in practice, & to be liable also to other objections, though the principles on which it proceeds, are nearly the same as those of the plan of reform of which I gave a sketch in 1864'.¹⁸⁵ These attempts to attract Whig support were combined with further overtures to the working class, Morrison speaking on proportional representation and labour representation in an address to his constituents at the Mechanics' Institute in Plymouth on 10 October.¹⁸⁶

In an article on redistribution in *Macmillan's Magazine* in November, E.H. Knatchbull-Hugessen, a Whig-Liberal and undersecretary for the Colonies, proposed an increase of the number of multi-member constituencies on a population basis to equalize boroughs and counties and suggested the possibility of employing a modified form of Hare's system of election, although he preferred the cumulative vote.¹⁸⁷ In the same month at a reform conference held in London organized by the Electoral Reform Association led by Dilke, Hare's electoral system as advocated by Howell was considered as one of various means of equalizing the value of votes.¹⁸⁸

In the House of Commons on 6 May 1873, Dilke moved a resolution that 'it is desirable to redress the inequalities of the distribution of electoral power in England and Scotland as well as in Ireland',¹⁸⁹ to which Collins moved an amendment 'by the application of the cumulative vote or otherwise, so as to secure a better proportional representation of the people in the respective constituencies'.¹⁹⁰ Collins indicated, however, that he had 'no sympathy whatever with Mr Hare's plan of personal representation, seeing no reason why an elector in Westminster should vote for a candidate in Glasgow. Such a question and that of the cumulative vote should by no means get mixed up together'.¹⁹¹ Gladstone supported neither Dilke nor Collins.¹⁹² The amendment was withdrawn, and the motion was defeated.¹⁹³ In the following month, however, Collins and Morrison proposed a bill for the application of the cumulative vote to the election of aldermen by town councils.¹⁹⁴ In the debate on 16 July, Morrison stated that 'town councillors had become mere delegates, instead of representatives, and their election was always arranged by a preliminary "Caucus."' He recognized that the bill was small and explained that he 'advocated it only for the sake of the principle it involved', adding that he 'hoped that if the measure were brought in again, that principle would be applied to the election of town councillors as well as of aldermen'.¹⁹⁵ The issue was raised again in the following week in the debate on another bill introduced by Trevelyan for county franchise extension. On 23 July, Collins opposed the bill and argued for simultaneous redistribution, arguing: 'If a Bill like the present should ever pass, together with a measure for the re-distribution of seats, ... we should have to adopt the cumulative vote, or some other method of proportional representation'.¹⁹⁶ Likewise Fawcett argued for the need for redistribution with the representation of minorities.¹⁹⁷

Bright, who had resigned as President of the Board of Trade in 1870, returned to the cabinet as Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster in September 1873. He was not reconciled to the cumulative vote, about

which again he complained to Forster on 27 October: 'Then we have the cumulative vote with its aggravation of another evil. The school board is comprised of delegates of church and chapels; and the miserable squabbles of these delegates, suspecting and thwarting each other, fill up many of the reports of the school board discussions.'¹⁹⁸ In the school board election in Birmingham in the following month, however, the Liberals adapted to the system of the cumulative vote and adopted the method of the Conservatives, thereby securing the eight seats necessary for a majority.¹⁹⁹ Nevertheless, this result did not lessen their opposition to the cumulative vote or to the minority clause and other electoral systems for the representation of minorities such as that of Hare. Their hostility was reinforced by James E. Thorold Rogers, a political economist and friend of Cobden, who in his *Cobden and Modern Political Opinion* published in 1873 criticized minority representation and Hare's electoral system, observing that 'the whole theory seems to me to be derived from a misconception of the functions of constituencies and representatives.'²⁰⁰

The fourth and final edition of Hare's *Treatise* was published in 1873, and therein he reluctantly adapted the single transferable vote to the ballot which had been adopted for parliamentary and municipal elections by the Ballot Act in 1872.²⁰¹ Among the additions to the appendices was his memorandum of 1871 on the use of the cumulative vote in school board elections.²⁰² Likewise he included further information on the international movement for proportional representation since the third edition of 1865. Also published in 1873 was the *Autobiography* of Mill, who died at his home in France on 7 May, in which he praised Hare's electoral system as a 'great practical and philosophical idea, the greatest improvement of which the system of representative government is susceptible'.²⁰³ It was reviewed by Hare in the *Westminster Review* in January 1874, affording him another opportunity of discussing his electoral system within the context of *Considerations on Representative Government* and including references to *The Machinery of Representation* and the *Treatise*.²⁰⁴

In the general election in January 1874, which resulted in the fall of the Gladstone ministry and the formation of a second ministry by Disraeli,²⁰⁵ Morrison was defeated, and shortly thereafter the Representative Reform Association was dissolved, having been dependent on his financial support. Meanwhile, Hare was 'more than ever busy with his official engagements at the Charity Commission', Howell later recalled, adding: 'The chief pleasure I derived from my association with the Association as Secretary was my association with Mr Hare.'²⁰⁶

5

Proportional Representation and the Caucus, 1874–1884

The 'relative importance' of representation was 'impossible to exaggerate', Hare emphasized in his paper on 'The Construction of a Municipality for the Metropolis' read at the session of the Social Science Association held in London in November 1874.¹ Among the members in attendance were Henry Richmond Droop and John Westlake.² 'In the progress of representative institutions, as they become more comprehensive they require to be made more complete', Hare continued. 'The greater the numbers to be represented, the more necessary it becomes that the organization be suited to the object of giving to all individual thought its due power of action, and enabling the intellect and judgment of the community to direct and govern its force.'³ He admitted that 'it may be true that this will never be perfectly accomplished', that 'ignorance and selfishness will still be found, and still be more or less operative', but he insisted that 'every step in a constitutional progress should be directed to the end of securing to all the best elements which exist in society the means of development'.⁴

Thus public discussion of political representation was continued by Hare following the dissolution of the Representative Reform Association. Meanwhile, at the sixth annual Co-operative Congress held in Halifax in April 1874, the use of Hare's electoral system for appointment of the central board was proposed by the Christian Socialist Edward Vansittart Neale, the secretary of the congress and an associate of Walter Morrison in the co-operative movement.⁵ In the House of Commons, in the following month, the bill for the application of the cumulative vote to municipal elections previously introduced by Morrison and Thomas Collins was renewed by Henry Fawcett, a member for Hackney as of 1874, and William Unwin Heygate, a Conservative member for South

Leicestershire.⁶ The bill was withdrawn after the first reading,⁷ but on 14 July 1875 a second reading of the same bill was moved. Heygate commented with reference to the school board elections in Birmingham that 'even on a large scale, the cumulative system brought about a fair representation', indicating that 'by the means proposed in the Bill a fair representation, would be obtained of the different sections and classes of the community'.⁸ Birmingham Liberal member George Dixon protested that a reason for the introduction of the bill was 'the application of the principle of minority representation to municipal elections'.⁹ The bill did not have the support of the Disraeli ministry, and the motion for a second reading was defeated.¹⁰

Meanwhile, the parallel efforts of G.O. Trevelyan for country franchise reform and of Sir Charles Dilke for redistribution continued to provide another forum for discussion of the representation of minorities. In the debate in the House of Commons on the Trevelyan bill on 7 July 1875, Fawcett emphasized the need for redistribution, saying that the House of Commons required variety in its composition and that he 'believed that equal electoral districts would not conduce to secure that variety'.¹¹ On 15 July, the day after the debate on the cumulative vote bill, Fawcett seconded a motion by Dilke for an enquiry into methods of redistribution. Dilke remarked that he was acting in accordance with a suggestion by the 3rd Earl Grey that there be such an enquiry, commenting: 'I hold in my hand a letter from Mr Hare, for instance, in which he reminds me that when the subject of Parliamentary elections was inquired into by a Select Committee of this House, the Chairman refused to take evidence upon the representative system on the ground that it was outside the scope of the already large inquiry.'¹² Again speaking against equal electoral districts, Fawcett indicated that 'the purpose of an inquiry would be to discover some means of preventing a waste of voting power, and, at the same time, of giving every section of opinion its due share of representation'.¹³ Disraeli opposed both Dilke and Fawcett, asserting regarding the question of the representation of minorities that he 'would not consign this great subject, on which public opinion is not in any way matured, and which is engaging the attention of the greatest authors and the highest philosophers, to the machinery of a Royal Commission' and adding: 'I would not forget the traditions of the country, and I would remember under all circumstances that it is not well to surrender, for what, after all, may be the vagary of philosophers, a Parliamentary system which has raised this country to the highest glory, and certainly is the admiration of the world.'¹⁴ The resolution was defeated by 190 to 120.¹⁵

During this same period, Hare's electoral system came under attack by Leslie Stephen in the *Fortnightly Review* in June 1875 in his review of *Order and Progress* by the positivist Frederic Harrison, who had contributed an essay on 'Foreign Policy' to *Questions for a Reformed Parliament* in 1867.¹⁶ The first part of *Order and Progress*, 'Thoughts on Government', was an introduction to the second part, 'Studies of Political Crises', which consisted of previously published articles by Harrison, the first being 'Our Venetian Constitution' in 1867.¹⁷ In the introduction to his book in 1875, Harrison directly attacked personal representation, with which he associated proportional representation.¹⁸ He considered the idea to be unrealistic and impractical, maintaining that its advocates wrongly assumed that the masses were capable of making intelligent political decisions and arguing that it would encourage 'pedants' and 'fanatics'.¹⁹ Stephen, a sympathetic critic of positivism,²⁰ in his review of *Order and Progress* took up the opposition of Harrison to Hare's electoral system, claiming that 'it is plain that Parliament cannot be at once an accurate mirror of public opinion and a collection of the wisest men', given that 'ninety-nine men out of a hundred are utterly incompetent to form an opinion worth having upon most political problems', and objecting: 'Is it not a palpable absurdity to say that that system is best which should make Parliament reflect most accurately the gross, uniformed, unreasoning judgment of the masses?'²¹ 'Solid reform', he asserted, required 'the gradual infiltration of sound beliefs through the whole social organism.... The change must be inward before it can be outward; no shuffling of the cards can make them all turn up trumps; it is a new force that is required, not a new machinery'.²²

Hare replied to Stephen in 'A Note on Representative Government' in the *Fortnightly Review* in July, arguing that local majorities which were national minorities had excessive influence in parliamentary elections. There was a 'tyranny of minorities distributed throughout the constituencies', he complained. 'There are minorities among whom the prevailing motives are the product of ignorance, prejudice, selfishness, narrow and mistaken views of class interests, and a compound of elements discreditable both to social and political life.'²³ He referred to Mill having been defeated in Westminster in 1868 and to Gladstone having had to seek alternative constituencies in 1865 and 1868:

Thousands of voters throughout the country desired that Mr Mill should be in a position to contribute to the expression of profound thought in the House of Commons, amidst its superficial and frivolous talk. Half the voters in Westminster were able to prevent it.

Mr Gladstone who, by anything like a plebiscite, might have had a million of supporters, is driven from the University of Oxford to South Lancashire; from South Lancashire to Greenwich; and may have to fall back upon Stoke-upon-Trent!²⁴

Disputing the claim by Stephen that Parliament could not reflect public opinion and contain the best men at the same time, Hare argued that although the public may not be able to determine the best policy, the public could recognize who was able to do so. 'It is not necessary seriously to consider the capacity of the ordinary voter to deal with recondite matters of opinion', he maintained. 'The nation is one of old traditions. People are ready to place themselves under the banner of those who are generally regarded with reverence and respect, and to be associated with others who appreciate such a title to regard.'²⁵ He concluded with kind words for Mill, 'who adopted the proportional and preferential system as the solution of the difficulty of popular representation', and harsh words for Gladstone, retired from the leadership of the Liberal party as of 1874:

It was at a time when philosophical politicians looked with hope on Mr Gladstone as a leader in the path of constitutional progress, and they imagined that the intellectual power thus set free, and brought to the work of representative reconstruction, would be in his sight a political object of incalculable value. In this they were mistaken. It was perhaps too much to expect that a statesman, responsible to his party, could, even if he approved it, adopt a principle which must displace so many of his supporters from their seats, and therefore call forth the emphatic condemnation of the party whip. But the probability is that Mr Gladstone regards with no less aversion than more than one of his ministry is known to have done, any proposal to interfere with the pure and rigid geographical distribution of electoral power, and still more to substitute for it a mental distribution.²⁶

'It would not be without interest in a psychological study of the progress of political theories', Hare added with reference to the minority clause opposed by Gladstone, 'if we could know the effect produced on the opinion of a member who had a strong dislike to what are called the three-cornered constituencies, by the event of a subsequent election when he came to owe his seat to the operation of that very imperfect application of the proportional principle'.²⁷

Stephen in turn replied to Hare in 'The Value of Political Machinery' in the *Fortnightly Review* in December 1875 that while reducing the influence of local majorities which were national minorities, his system would increase the influence of national party organizations and decrease local influences which he considered 'in the main natural and healthy'.²⁸ 'Assuming', he continued, 'that the main object of the reformer is to prevent the exclusion from influence upon legislation of any legitimate body of opinion', he argued that 'the influence depends primarily upon conditions altogether outside of the representative system'.²⁹ 'If intelligence should cease to be respected', he maintained, 'if every man should think himself as good a financier as Mr Gladstone, or if the masses should come to the conclusion that all the Gladstones of the day were in a conspiracy to pick their pockets, it is plain enough that neither Mr Hare's scheme nor any other would do us much good'.³⁰ The election of Mill for Westminster, Stephen suggested, 'was gratifying because it showed that the great philosophical reputation had an influence upon the ordinary constituent'.³¹ The election to Parliament of men such as Mill as advocated by Hare was not necessarily advantageous, however, according to Stephen, disillusioned by the compromises of the recent Gladstone ministry: 'If Mr Mill had devoted the time spent in watching with extraordinary industry the working of the minute details of the legislative machine to the composition of some serious work upon political or social philosophy, I fancy that the nation might have been the gainer not only in philosophy, but in an immediate practical sense.'³² The essential question, Stephen asserted, was 'one of moral influence, and only occasionally and accidentally one of machinery.... To give weight to intellect or to character we do not require a parliamentary representation, but the maintenance of healthy instincts in the nation at large.'³³

In the following year, a further response to Stephen was published in the *Fortnightly Review*, 'Political Machinery and Political Life' by Leonard Courtney, who had been concerned with the issue of the representation of minorities since the Second Reform Act in 1867. Born at Penzance in 1832, he had read mathematics at St John's College, Cambridge, followed by election as a fellow in 1856, thereafter going to London and being called to the bar at Lincoln's Inn in 1858. Defeated by Fawcett for the Chair of Political Economy at Cambridge in 1863, Courtney became a writer of leading articles for *The Times* in 1865. While living in London, he became a friend of John and Alice Westlake with whom he attended St Peter's Church where Frederick Denison Maurice was clergyman.³⁴ This contact with the Westlakes likely brought Courtney

into contact with Hare. In later years, Courtney recalled that 'it was in relation to proportional representation... that my own political intimacy with [John] Westlake first deepened'.³⁵ During the reform debates in 1867, however, Courtney supported not the single transferable vote but rather the cumulative vote and the limited vote, which he defended in a series of leading articles in *The Times*.³⁶ In 1868, he wrote of the Reform League conference on Hare's electoral system:

One's first impulse is to turn away from such an idle proceeding. . . . But we believe it would be a great mistake summarily to dismiss the consideration of Mr Hare's proposals as wholly unprofitable. . . . The great merit of Mr Hare's investigation of the methods of electing representatives is that it does lead those who follow him to the discovery of principles. Very few of his readers will dream that the method he himself recommends will ever be adopted in England; and of those who are sanguine enough to think that it may one day be reduced to practice scarce any would hope to see more than a partial and limited application of it for many years to come; but whatever may be the opinion of the students of Mr Hare's method as to its realization, none will fail to admit the light he throws on the ends to be pursued by Reformers.³⁷

Subsequently, Courtney in his leading articles in *The Times* defended the minority clause and favoured the cumulative vote in school board elections.³⁸ Like Hare a member of the Athenaeum, the Political Economy Club, and the Radical Club, while Professor of Political Economy at University College in London he attended the session of the Social Science Association at which Hare read his paper on 'The Construction of a Municipality for the Metropolis' in November 1874.³⁹ In the same year, Courtney was narrowly defeated when he stood for Parliament as a Liberal in Liskeard, but he was to be returned in a by-election in December 1876.

In 'Political Machinery and Political Life' in the *Fortnightly Review* in July 1876, Courtney argued that elections were not an accurate expression of public opinion because electoral choice was limited to party candidates pledged to political organizations. Independent candidates were rare, minority opinions were excluded, and the House of Commons was a 'chamber of mediocrity'.⁴⁰ Like Hare and unlike Gladstone, Courtney assumed a premise of pluralism rather than of dualism: 'A contest necessarily divides the voters into two opposing parties; but what becomes of those who are unable to adopt in their entirety the

watchwords of either host?’⁴¹ The solution, he maintained, was a ‘gradual transformation of our electoral system, according to the principles developed at length by Mr Hare’, adding: ‘The immediate adoption of Mr Hare’s system in its entirety I neither expect nor desire, but its introduction into use within the limited areas of our great towns and more populous counties may be anticipated, without extravagance of thought, in the lifetime of the new generation.’⁴² The limited vote adopted in 1867 for parliamentary elections and the cumulative vote adopted in 1870 for school board elections were beneficial but both were defective, Courtney observed, ‘and it may be hoped that the occasion of the next Reform Act will be used not merely to extend the representation of minorities but to secure their proportional representation in the most effective manner’.⁴³ This could be done, he suggested, ‘by increasing the number of representatives of the largest constituencies by the transfer of the seats now belonging to the smallest’ and ‘by union of contiguous constituencies so as to make constituencies of adequate size by their fusion’.⁴⁴ Such parliamentary constituencies could accommodate the cumulative vote if necessary as an improvement over the limited vote. In advocating ‘applying the method of proportional representation within each of certain districts, whether counties or divisions of counties, that seem especially fitted for the experiment’,⁴⁵ he was in agreement with Morrison, Droop, and Walter Baily. Redistribution would have to accompany an extension of the franchise in counties, Courtney concluded, and proportional representation would ‘make the House of Commons a better presentment of the political life of the whole nation’.⁴⁶

John Morley, a disciple of Mill and the editor of the *Fortnightly Review*,⁴⁷ was sceptical, as he wrote to Courtney in June 1876: ‘Your article interests me enormously – though my mind halts this side of your conclusion. At this moment I am not quite sure where the point of divergence is exactly to be found.’⁴⁸ The point of divergence was located near the point of contact between Morley and Joseph Chamberlain, who had been the Mayor of Birmingham from 1873 to 1875. Morley had met Chamberlain in 1873, in which year Chamberlain had contributed his first article to the *Fortnightly Review*, ‘The Liberal Party and Its Leaders’,⁴⁹ and had encouraged him to enter Parliament,⁵⁰ which Chamberlain had done in June 1876 as a Liberal member for Birmingham upon the retirement of Dixon. Morley wrote to Chamberlain to congratulate him after his maiden speech in August, in which he made reference to the operation of the cumulative vote in the first school board election in Birmingham.⁵¹ As Morley came to identify with the political position

of Chamberlain, he came to agree with his opposition to proportional representation.⁵²

When the National Liberal Federation was founded in Birmingham in May 1877 in succession to the National Education League, affiliating local party associations and modelled on the Birmingham Liberal Association, opposition to proportional representation was one of its objectives.⁵³ President of the National Liberal Federation, Chamberlain emphasized in 'A New Political Organization' in the *Fortnightly Review* in July 1877 that organization in Birmingham, 'where the Liberals form at least two-thirds of the constituency, ... has given them the control of the representation and of the local government of the town; and has enabled them to defeat the various devices wherewith some political philosophers have sought to secure the representation of minorities by the practical disfranchisement of the majority'.⁵⁴ Referring to 'the greatest happiness of the greatest number' and denying that such was 'tyranny', he added:

In this country the minority is always represented on the platform and in the press; it performs in this way its useful functions of criticism and examination, and it is desirable that the majority, which has all the responsibility of government, should not be prevented by artificial restrictions on the popular vote from fairly trying its conclusions, under condition of being displaced if its policy is unsuccessful or is carried further than public opinion is ready to support it.⁵⁵

In Parliament in 1876 and 1877, the period of the Bulgarian agitation taken up by Gladstone, who had spoken on the Eastern question at the founding of the National Liberal Federation,⁵⁶ franchise extension as advocated by Trevelyan and redistribution as advocated by Dilke were combined, and with the support of the marquess of Hartington, who had replaced Gladstone as leader of the Liberal party in 1874, parliamentary reform became official Liberal party policy.⁵⁷ The issue of the representation of minorities was raised in Parliament by Fawcett in 1876 during the debate on the motion by Trevelyan for joint franchise extension and redistribution on 30 May. Fawcett spoke in opposition to equal electoral districts and stated: 'In those great constituencies ... which ought to have four or five members some plan should be adopted so as not to give the representation entirely to the majority, but to enable important sections of political opinion to exercise the political power which was fairly their due.'⁵⁸ In 1877, during the debate on the Trevelyan motion on 19 June, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice, a Liberal

member for Calne, defended minority representation by the limited vote and the cumulative vote, pointing out that it had been in operation since 1867 and saying he 'could not see that the objections to it all outweighed its advantages'.⁵⁹ He added that it was supported by Fawcett and Courtney and observed: 'The reason why the minority vote at Birmingham was beaten was, that the minority there was not sufficiently large to elect a Member on the minority principle. He believed that if the most cunning wire-pulling scheme ever devised were applied at a Birmingham election when there was a real Conservative minority, there never would be an instance of keeping that minority out.'⁶⁰

When in late 1877 and early 1878 Gladstone in the *Nineteenth Century* defended further franchise reform in response to opposition by Robert Lowe in the *Fortnightly Review*,⁶¹ Hare joined the debate with an article in the *Fortnightly Review* in January 1878, 'The Reform Bill of the Future'. Therein Hare emphasized the significance of redistribution as an issue which

becomes at this time one of greater importance than ever, in view of a movement going on in several parts of the country to establish a system of stereotyped parties, in order to accomplish a more perfect party union, by waiving differences, and thus suppressing the action of independent thought among its members. In Birmingham, Southwark, and other places, it would appear that some of the Liberal party have entered into this kind of organization. It is the design of this condensation of party that all who compose it shall follow their leaders implicitly, with the fidelity and obedience of an army acting under its commander. Divisions founded on opinion, however conscientiously entertained, must be excluded from consideration in Parliament, where none but the majority of the party can have a representative, and where, therefore, the opinions and views of the minority of the party will not be heard.⁶²

Thus Hare focused his attention not on the external relationship between political parties but on the internal organization of political parties. He reiterated the principle of pluralism which he had expounded 20 years earlier in *The Machinery of Representation*, claiming that a 'healthy' party was one 'subject to expansion and division into sections as numerous as the opinions which divide mankind'.⁶³ Organization of political parties on the Birmingham model, he argued, threatened such pluralism and increased the danger of further franchise

reform. Franchise extension needed to be accompanied by redistribution which would permit effective voting by minorities, he insisted, which would be made possible by the single transferable vote as advocated in Parliament by Mill in 1867 and Morrison in 1872.⁶⁴ Hare emphasized that this was 'utterly opposed to the party objects of the Birmingham school', quoting a statement by Chamberlain in opposition to the limited vote, the cumulative vote, and proportional representation.⁶⁵ The single transferable vote, Hare argued, would 'open a door for the admission of competent men wider than it could ever have been before the days of Parliamentary Reform', adding: 'The bitterest opponents of such a system will be those who fear that their chances of obtaining seats would be reduced if the worth of the candidate should be too much taken into account.'⁶⁶

In the same month, the historian Lord Acton, a Roman Catholic and a Whig-Liberal member of Parliament from 1859 to 1866 prior to being raised to the peerage in 1869, expressed his support for proportional representation as the 'remedy' for the 'tyranny of the majority, or rather of party', which he considered to be 'the one pervading evil of democracy'.⁶⁷ Reviewing *Democracy in Europe: A History* published in two volumes in 1877 by Sir Thomas Erskine May, clerk of the House of Commons, Acton wrote in the *Quarterly Review* that proportional representation was 'profoundly democratic, for it increases the influence of thousands who would otherwise have no voice in the government; and it brings men more near an equality by so contriving that no vote shall be wasted, and that every voter shall contribute to bring into Parliament a member of his own opinions'.⁶⁸

In the House of Commons two months later, on 8 March 1878, Sir Rowland Blennerhassett, a Liberal member for Kerry and a supporter of Irish Home Rule, moved a resolution 'that, as far as possible, all opinions should have an opportunity of being represented in direct proportion to the number of electors by whom they are held'.⁶⁹ In a lengthy speech he proceeded to advocate the single transferable vote, referring directly to Hare's *Treatise*.⁷⁰ In so doing, he attacked the principle of virtual representation:

It is not the fact that the opinions suppressed in one constituency are expressed in another. There might be some truth in this if nothing was to be thought of in public life but Party, and if all considerations of variety of opinion, of individual preference and personal feeling were to go for nothing, and Members were to be elected simply, so to speak, on one ticket or another, constituents being nothing but

mere mechanical puppets worked by the machinery of hard Party organization.⁷¹

He associated such party organization with American presidential politics in contrast 'to the free, ancient, and honourable character of the British House of Commons'. The various reasons for adopting a system of proportional representation were all the more compelling, he maintained, given the movement towards a wider franchise which, he calculated, 'would give us about 5,000,000 of poor electors as compared with 2,000,000 of well-to-do electors'.⁷² The present electoral system, he projected, 'would not only give the 5,000,000 poor electors a proportionate majority of representation; but would shut out every other class altogether, and put the whole representation practically and virtually into the hands of the numerical majority'.⁷³ The limited vote and the cumulative vote would not alter this, he argued, to the extent that the 'scientific or proportional system' would.⁷⁴ 'Personal representation', he emphasized, 'would not...deprive the majority of the electoral body of their right to a majority of the representation; but it would make it impossible for any one class to monopolize the representation, and it would effectually protect the cultivated and educated minority from the danger of exclusion'.⁷⁵ Courtney seconded the motion, although he said that he was sceptical Hare's system 'could be submitted as a practical proposal in the present generation'.⁷⁶ The limited vote and the cumulative vote had been successfully adopted, however, and he was 'satisfied those who were in favour of the representation of minorities would win'.⁷⁷ Regarding opposition in Birmingham, he said that if the representation of minorities were to 'destroy the power' of its organization he would 'greatly rejoice'.⁷⁸

As of 1878, the National Liberal Federation was increasingly characterized as a caucus commonly associated with American politics and the 'tyranny of the majority'.⁷⁹ In 'Political Clubs and Party Organization' in the *Nineteenth Century* in May 1878, W. Fraser Rae, a *Daily News* American correspondent, claimed that the Liberals in Birmingham 'appear to have drawn their inspiration from the United States'⁸⁰ and warned: 'Happily, the tyranny which is the essence of the system when fully developed, and the yoke under which citizens of the United States groan and appear helpless to shake off, cannot yet be found in this country on such a scale as to excite general remark. But identical causes must produce identical results.'⁸¹ The ensuing debate over party organization was directly related to the issue of minority representation, and the conflict between the National Liberal Federation and labour political

interests was one of the origins of the Labour party.⁸² Thus one of the various criticisms of the caucus was by the former secretary of the Representative Reform Association, George Howell, who had been active in the Labour Representation League until 1876.⁸³ In 'The Caucus System and the Liberal Party' in the *New Quarterly Magazine* in October 1878, Howell wrote not unlike Hare:

The greatest danger to be apprehended from this newly discovered form of local organisation is that, in course of time, it will cease to represent the constituency as a whole, in which case it would be even less respectable than that of the American caucus. Its natural tendency is to drift towards such a condition, and the inevitable result of this state of things will be that the power will lapse into the hands of a few active men, and be used by the officials in the interest of the sitting member, whoever he may happen to be – whose tools, politically speaking, they will more or less become. ... In other cases they will endeavour to smother the personal independence of their representative by seeking to make him entirely dependent on their suffrages, and thus reduce him to the level of a mere delegate of a local association, instead of being the chosen representative of the constituency.⁸⁴

Conversely, opposition to minority representation included defence of the caucus system and American politics. In 'The Caucus' in the *Fortnightly Review* in November 1878, written at the request of Morley as a response to Rae,⁸⁵ Chamberlain indicated difference between the American caucus and the Birmingham model but denied that American politicians were as ignorant or corrupt as their critics charged. Americans, he emphasized, 'have acted on the opinion that government, whether of the nation or of a party within it, rightly belongs to the majority', adding that

it is the minority, according to the American practice, which yields to the majority, and not the majority which accepts the rule of the minority. This rule is too frequently reversed in England, and it is because minorities, and often very small minorities, have had such power in determining the course of English politics, that such deep hostility is shown by a minority to a system which is avowedly designed to relieve majorities from the disabilities under which they have so long laboured.⁸⁶

The operation of the cumulative vote in the election of school boards, he argued, contributed to 'delay' and 'friction'.⁸⁷ He accused critics of the caucus of wanting minority power rather than representation and asserted that 'the problem for their advocates to solve is how this power is to be given to them without injustice to the majority'.⁸⁸ An electoral reform which would be advantageous, he suggested, would be the adoption of the second ballot in single-member constituencies, thereby allowing electors to directly determine who among a variety of candidates represented the majority.⁸⁹ 'But failing some such plan', he insisted, 'the caucuses remain the best and fairest method yet devised of preventing waste of power, and of concentrating the whole force of the party on the most popular of its candidates'. Arguments against the caucus were 'based on that distrust of the people which seems innate in some of those who call themselves Liberals', he complained, such as 'self-appointed philosophers'.⁹⁰

Such defence of majority as opposed to minority representation was reiterated in the following month in 'The Birmingham Liberal Association and Its Assailants' in *Macmillan's Magazine* by Henry W. Crosskey, a Birmingham Liberal and associate of Chamberlain, who asserted:

When the majority have decided that legislation is imperatively demanded in one given direction, no Liberal Association ought to decline the services of Liberals who take the opposite view in positions which are not directly affected by the special question at issue. But no member of a minority has the slightest right to demand that he should occupy an office in which he can harass and impede the work the majority have resolved to undertake. ... There are periods in the history of our country in which the House of Commons cannot be looked upon as a debating club, which fulfils its functions when varying 'views' find a fit expression. ... Those Liberals who have political convictions have a higher duty than to devise subtle and intricate methods for the expression of a variety of conflicting opinions. They are bound to select representatives who will support the definite measures they believe to be immediately necessary for the peace and prosperity of the land.⁹¹

Further, with reference to Howell, Crosskey protested that 'I fail to see why a constituency should not protect itself against divisions which can only ruin the Liberal cause; and I equally fail to understand in what way freedom is violated by a candidate's submission to the will of the majority of his party'.⁹²

The opposition of the Birmingham Liberals and the National Liberal Federation to the representation of minorities was clearly stated at the first general meeting of the council of the National Liberal Federation held in Leeds on 22 January 1879, when Chamberlain spoke directly against proportional representation and 'political philosophers'. 'The ideal of these gentlemen', he complained

appears to be a Parliament elected by the cumulative vote, in which I suppose every political crotchet would be represented – all the minor currents of the national life, and none of its main courses. Such a body might, indeed, be far removed from popular passion and popular prejudice: but it would also be up in a cloud with regard to the popular will and the popular sentiment. It seems to me that this is an ideal which is much better suited to the island of Laputa than to this practical world.⁹³

Meanwhile in Parliament, Chamberlain had formed an alliance with Dilke,⁹⁴ who advocated the second ballot in a pamphlet on parliamentary reform published in 1879.⁹⁵

In the House of Commons on 4 March 1879, when Dilke seconded a motion by Trevelyan for a resolution affirming the necessity for franchise extension and redistribution,⁹⁶ Blennerhassett in an amendment to the motion requested recognition of the principle of the representation of minorities, referring to Birmingham as 'the great home of the caucus' which 'with a population of 343,000 and 63,000 electors, returns three Liberals and not one Conservative'.⁹⁷ Courtney followed Blennerhassett to state that he could vote for the motion only if accompanied by the amendment.⁹⁸ In the presence of Hartington, Gladstone, and Chamberlain, Courtney argued that 'dependence of hon. Members upon the feelings of the people outside was growing rapidly, and was undermining their independence of thought'.⁹⁹ Having adopted the cumulative vote for school boards, he claimed that 'there was no reason why the same principle should not be carried out in the representation of the people in that House'.¹⁰⁰ He quoted the defence of Hare's electoral system in Mill's *Autobiography* and concluded:

Those who rejected it as a crotchet, by that rejection showed themselves to be 'incompetent statesmen, unequal to the politics of the future'. It was because he was so impressed by the importance of that principle, and of that mode of raising up their political life from the degradation into which it was falling, and of cherishing the elements

of individual excellence and independence, while, at the same time, they gave the utmost freedom to the will of majorities, that he was unable to support the unqualified proposition of the hon. Member for the Border Boroughs [Trevelyan].¹⁰¹

In the division, Courtney was among those who defeated the motion by 291 to 226 in opposition to Chamberlain, Dilke, Bright, Hartington, and Gladstone.¹⁰²

Subsequently, Courtney reiterated his arguments in a lecture at the Radical Club in Southwark, and his remarks were published in 'The Representation of Minorities' in the *Nineteenth Century* in July 1879. Therein he warned against adoption of single-member equal electoral districts, which he compared to the wards of Birmingham where 'we condemn to atrophy and extinction the political energies of the minority' and 'throw away the use of such practical talents as they may possess'.¹⁰³ The representation of minorities would effect 'a real and not an artificial democracy', he claimed, and 'instead of making mediocrity a condition without which nobody could enter, you would have life and energy secured in the return of able men; and of course if you got candidates thus independent you would change the House of Commons'.¹⁰⁴ A further result of the introduction of minority representation, he emphasized, 'would be the disintegration of party. Parties would not cling together so closely as Conservatives and Liberals now do. Amongst Conservatives you would find differences of opinion as also amongst Liberals, and you would more freely detach men, one by one, from any majority.'¹⁰⁵ He endorsed the electoral system proposed by Hare:

Next week Mr Hare will come before you, explaining to you what is the machinery by which this idea can be realized – an idea under which any adequate number of persons, wherever they be found, might combine together and get a representative. Mr Hare was the first person who developed that idea, and I have wished that he was here to-night so as to go before me rather than come after me. I confess to you that the realization of his scheme as he sees it is a longish way off. I don't expect we shall live to see it realized, but the thing is a good aim to work for, and we may realize some of it even in our own time.¹⁰⁶

Courtney referred to the adoption of 'the principle of the representation of minorities in School Boards by means of the cumulative vote', and he advocated the introduction of the representation of

minorities in the House of Commons by the application within multi-member constituencies of 'the cumulative vote or some equivalent method'.¹⁰⁷ Were such constituencies to be amalgamated, he suggested, 'step by step and bit by bit, you would go on extending the system until by-and-by you might even get Mr Hare's system in its entirety adopted'.¹⁰⁸

Later in 1879, Hare spoke on redistribution at the congress of the Social Science Association held in Manchester in October, advocating his electoral system as expounded in the fourth edition of his *Treatise*. Regarding the electors, he noted that 'the proportional system leaves the laws which confer the suffrage entirely unaffected'. Rather, he explained, 'its object is to give to every voter a far more extensive choice of candidates, to make it certain that every vote shall be counted for the candidate or one of the candidates for whose support it is given'.¹⁰⁹ Regarding the candidates, he emphasized:

In nothing has the result of the proportionate system been more mistaken or disregarded by those who have but superficially considered it, than its effect in opening other and more numerous and better avenues to the House of Commons to those who desire or deserve to enter it. The wide choice of candidates opened to every voter has been pointed out. The field for selection of the constituencies to which the candidates may address themselves, or from which they may seek and find supporters, is equally without limit. . . . The barrister of reputation would be likely to secure supporters in the towns of his circuit. The vast number of voters on the registers of London and its suburbs would make room, as metropolitan candidates, for persons of eminence in every career of life; and the various scientific and professional bodies would be represented by men who are most esteemed among them, and who would bring into the Legislature new elements of great value in its labours.¹¹⁰

Redistribution 'which would do no more than add a patch to the present system by the transfer to great towns of five or six seats, disregarding the new and powerful moral and intellectual forces which a just and equal distribution would bring into exercise', he suggested, 'may be not inaptly compared to some of the empirical remedies applied to the human body before the discovery of the circulation of the blood'.¹¹¹ Further, he argued that by his system of election 'corruption, which we cannot in human institutions yet hope entirely to extinguish, will be minimised or neutralized', and he added: 'There is nothing to impede

party organization where that is thought desirable. It is equally fair to all parties.¹¹²

In the general election in 1880, franchise extension and redistribution were not major issues as were foreign policy and finance.¹¹³ During the course of the campaign, however, Fawcett in 'The Next Reform Bill' in the *Nineteenth Century* in March observed that 'almost complete unanimity which exists among the [Liberal] party in favour of an extension of the suffrage and the redistribution of seats must offer an additional inducement to a Liberal Government to give a Reform Bill precedence to almost all other proposals of domestic legislation'.¹¹⁴ He proceeded to argue in favour of dealing with franchise extension and redistribution jointly rather than separately and to advocate provision for the representation of minorities. He did not mention Hare's electoral system, but he suggested 'that the present method of carrying out minority voting in Parliamentary and School Board elections might be easily improved'.¹¹⁵

Following the Liberal victory in 1880, Gladstone, returned for Midlothian and restored as leader of the party, formed a second ministry, and among those in the cabinet were Bright, resuming his position as Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, and Chamberlain, appointed to the Board of Trade. The only member of the government in support of the representation of minorities was Fawcett, who as Paymaster General, however, was not a member of the cabinet. On 28 April, Fawcett wrote to Gladstone suggesting consideration of a position for Courtney, advising 'of his great political capacity and of his unusual acquaintance with finance'.¹¹⁶ In the following year, Courtney was appointed undersecretary for the Home and Colonial offices in succession, and he replaced Lord Frederick Cavendish as Financial Secretary to the Treasury on 8 May 1882, two days after Cavendish as Chief Secretary for Ireland had been murdered in Dublin. Courtney like Fawcett, however, was not a member of the cabinet.

While the issue of the representation of minorities had no support within the cabinet, it continued to be addressed in public, in particular within the context of debate over party organization. In a lengthy paper read before the Statistical Society in April 1881, Droop warned of the possibility of the 'caucus system in England' developing 'the evil characteristics of its American prototype',¹¹⁷ arguing that 'any system of minority or proportional representation' must 'secure individual liberty of choice to the electors, and... not compel them to put themselves into the hands of the party managers, and vote as they are directed'.¹¹⁸ Rejecting majority systems and analysing both the limited vote and the cumulative vote, he advocated the electoral systems proposed by both

Hare and Baily, giving preference to that of Baily as less perfect but more practical.¹¹⁹ These systems, Droop claimed

are free from the various evils produced by majority voting. We shall have an approximately proportional representation of all parties, and the relative strength of these parties in the representative assembly will only fluctuate in proportion to the changes of opinion in the constituencies instead of very much exaggerating them. Elections will but seldom turn on narrow majorities, and as it will be very difficult to foresee their doing so, there will be little or no temptation to corruption, extravagant expenditure, or gerrymandering. Whatever is artificial in our present division into two parties will disappear, and members will be much more free to act according to their individual opinions, instead of suppressing them when they differ from those of the leaders of their party.¹²⁰

Both Hare and Baily were in attendance, Hare defending his electoral system,¹²¹ followed by Baily suggesting that he was unrealistic in projecting its application on a national basis.¹²²

In the following year, Hare published as a pamphlet a collection of his papers read at the meetings of the Social Science Association on the application of his system of election to London government.¹²³ Other works concerning the representation of minorities published during these years were two by Alfred Frisby, *A Practical Scheme of Fair Representation* in 1881 and 'The Next Reform Bill' in the *Fortnightly Review* in August 1882. In his article, which incorporated responses to his pamphlet, Frisby quoted Courtney as indicating that Hare's electoral system would work

with smoothness and simplicity if you could stimulate public opinion so as to give it a trial; but this is not as yet to be hoped for. There is a great obstacle of stupidity, a greater obstacle of laziness, and a third, perhaps the greatest of all, of self-interest opposed to the trial. Ordinary minds are puzzled to follow out the scheme; others turn away from the labour; others (especially M.P.'s who, as such, have already got a foothold, if not a secure one) see that it would set free the representation of the electorate, and many of them are not sure what would be their fate under its operation.¹²⁴

Morrison was quoted by Frisby as observing: 'In 1880, Mr Gladstone would undoubtedly have received an overwhelming majority of votes of

the Liberals in any constituency for which he stood, unless indeed the caucus should succeed in becoming as despotic here as in America.¹²⁵

Meanwhile, in July 1882, a defence of the caucus had been published in the *Nineteenth Century* by Francis Schnadhorst, full-time secretary of the Birmingham Liberal Association and part-time secretary of the National Liberal Federation.¹²⁶ An advocate of single-member districts,¹²⁷ in 'The Caucus and Its Critics' he denounced the 'minority clause' introduced in 1867 as an 'odious attempt to defraud the constituency of its rights'.¹²⁸ Likewise Francis Adams, former secretary of the National Education League, complained in his *History of the Elementary School Contest in England* published in 1882 that the 'immediate result' of the cumulative vote introduced in 1870 'was to exasperate the majority to widen the breach, to encourage the spirit of sectarianism, and to make the [Education] Act the most unpopular measure of modern times'.¹²⁹ The subsequent attempt by Dixon to abolish the cumulative vote in 1871,¹³⁰ Adams argued, was defeated in part by those 'who belonged to the school of philosophic Radicals, and who were anxious to experiment in forms of proportional representation'.¹³¹

Another defence of the caucus followed by T.H.S. Escott, the editor of the *Fortnightly Review* as of October 1882 in succession to Morley, who entered Parliament as a Liberal member for Newcastle-upon-Tyne in February 1883, both men being supporters of Chamberlain.¹³² 'The new machinery employed by Radicalism is that which is best calculated, in the opinion of its authors, whose view has certainly thus far been justified by results, to elicit and give effect to the wishes of the majority', Escott asserted in 'The Future of the Radical Party' in the *Fortnightly Review* in July 1883. 'What is called the caucus is the practical expression of the principle that the popular will is the basis of political power.'¹³³ In the following month in the *Fortnightly Review*, Escott contributed the first article, 'Machinery', in a series on 'The Radical Programme' initiated by Chamberlain.¹³⁴ Claiming that the caucus in Birmingham was a response to the minority clause,¹³⁵ Escott insisted:

An equitable system of parliamentary representation is absolutely inconsistent with the minority vote, and no sound Radical can acquiesce in such a device for minimising, and it may be for nullifying altogether, the power of the majority. The principle on which this vexatious expedient rests is distrust of the people, and when eminent members of the Liberal party vindicate it, they practically make an unworthy imputation on those who are the source of political power. Moreover, it must be borne in mind that the minority vote is resented

as a grievance and resisted as an infringement on popular rights in those places where it is in force.¹³⁶

In the same month in 'Women and Representative Government' in the *Nineteenth Century*, Millicent Garrett Fawcett was criticizing the 'Birmingham Liberals' for not giving political support to women's suffrage in the speeches delivered at a meeting in honour of Bright held in Birmingham in June.¹³⁷

Later in 1883, on 15 October, a letter by Bright was published in *The Times* in which he complained that 'the new fads, minority clauses and new modes of making a Parliament all tend to mischief; they show mistrust of the people, and they are mainly intended to weaken the popular voice. I am for none of these things.'¹³⁸ On the next day in reply to a reader's enquiry whether he considered Hare's electoral system to be one of such 'fads', Bright stated:

I think Mr Hare's plan more of a 'fad' than any other yet submitted to the public, and it has this disadvantage – that scarcely anyone can understand it. It aims at making Parliament an exact photograph of every phase of public opinion, and under it there is no fancy or folly which might not, and probably would not, have its representative in the House. Parliament would be broken up into busy cliques, led by political lunatics who would have entrance within its walls. ... I have known several or a few of Mr Hare's supporters. Not one of them has seemed to me to possess the common sense which is as useful and necessary for legislation and government as in the ordinary pursuits of life. ... I do not seek the perfection which its friends claim for the patent Constitution of Mr Hare.¹³⁹

On the day after Bright thus stated his opposition to Hare, a conference on parliamentary reform sponsored by the National Liberal Federation opened at Leeds with Morley presiding, and a resolution was approved that borough and county franchise assimilation should precede redistribution.¹⁴⁰ On the second day of the conference, 18 October, Edward Russell, editor of the *Liverpool Daily Post* and a member of the Liverpool Liberal Association, moved a resolution that 'the attempt to secure the representation of minorities by special legislative enactments is a violation of the principle of popular representative government'.¹⁴¹ The motion was carried unanimously,¹⁴² and a speech against the minority clause delivered by Russell at the conference was published later as a pamphlet by the National Liberal Federation.¹⁴³

Speaking at Liskeard on 29 October, Courtney attacked the Leeds conference resolution against the representation of minorities and asserted that ‘the principle was one which the truest democrat should applaud because it gave the people full and equal representation’. Taking issue with Bright, he argued that ‘the principle of proportionate representation had so far recommended itself to thinking politicians that when the question of reform should be next taken up that principle would be developed and placed on a firmer basis’.¹⁴⁴ Two days later, Chamberlain wrote to Kate Courtney, the wife of Leonard, that her husband ‘should not unnecessarily emphasize the differences which separate us’.¹⁴⁵ Nevertheless, on 2 November, Courtney emphasized his position in a speech at the Plymouth Liberal Club, stating that ‘respecting the principle of minority representation, though he had the greatest respect for Mr Bright, yet he held his own opinion on the question, even against Mr Bright – against the world if necessary’.¹⁴⁶ When Chamberlain and Morley dined with the Courtneys six days later, Kate Courtney noted in her diary that Chamberlain ‘will *never consent* to Propr. Rep. & he thinks it a pity L[eonard] should have gone out of his way to pledge himself to it & criticise program of Leeds Conference’.¹⁴⁷

That night, on 8 November, Fawcett addressed a meeting of his constituents in Hackney and took note of the criticism by Bright of the advocates of proportional representation, disagreeing with that criticism and advocating multi-member constituencies with proportional representation. ‘I know it is sometimes contended that proportional representation would be just if it could be applied to the entire country’, he remarked, ‘but if a principle is just in itself, it seems to me that it is far better to promote its gradual extension than to sanction its entire extinction’.¹⁴⁸ Speaking at Reading on 15 November, Fawcett reiterated his opposition to equal electoral districts and his support for proportional representation.¹⁴⁹ The position of Courtney and Fawcett was reinforced six days later by the *Manchester Guardian*, which attacked the Leeds conference resolution against minority representation and advocated the application of Hare’s electoral system to multi-member constituencies, considering it ‘well worth a trial’.¹⁵⁰

At the sixth annual meeting of the National Liberal Federation held in Bristol on 26 November, the resolutions of the Leeds conference were endorsed, and Chamberlain addressed the question of proportional representation. He argued that minorities exercised excessive influence, as on school boards, and he urged abolition of both the cumulative vote and the minority clause, which he called ‘stupid, silly, unconstitutional devices’.¹⁵¹ The advocates of the representation of minorities, he

complained, sought 'ingenious machinery by which minorities may be saved from the natural consequences of being outnumbered. ... When men differ, either the majority must give way to the minority or the minority must give way to the majority.'¹⁵² In his argument he employed the principle of virtual representation: 'The minority not returned in one place finds its exponent in another. The minority in Birmingham becomes the majority in Liverpool; the minority in Bristol is the majority in the country, and so I might go on.'¹⁵³ He encouraged Liberals to 'resist the extension or continuance' of systems of minority representation, which he claimed 'do more than anything else to defeat the party of progress – the popular party – in the face of a united party of obstruction and privilege'.¹⁵⁴

As Courtney's biographer G.P. Gooch observes, 'Chamberlain's open antagonism convinced the friends of Proportional Representation that they must organize their forces.'¹⁵⁵ One among the Liberals in the House of Commons was Sir John Lubbock, a prominent polymath.¹⁵⁶ Born in London in 1834, the eldest son of Sir John William Lubbock, a banker, astronomer, and mathematician, the younger John had spent his childhood at High Elms in Kent near to the home at Down of Charles Darwin who was a friend of his father.¹⁵⁷ Educated at Eton, Lubbock had entered the family banking house in 1849, meanwhile devoting himself to natural history under the tutelage of Darwin. Attending meetings of the British Association for the Advancement of Science as of 1853, he had been elected a member of the Geological Society with the support of Charles Lyell in 1855,¹⁵⁸ and in 1858 he had been elected a fellow of the Royal Society with the support of Darwin.¹⁵⁹ Following the publication of Darwin's *On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection* in 1859, Lubbock had joined Thomas Henry Huxley in defence of natural selection in opposition to Bishop Samuel Wilberforce at the British Association meeting held in Oxford in 1860.¹⁶⁰ In 1864, Lubbock had been elected to the Society of Antiquaries and with Huxley had been among the founders of the X-Club, an informal society of scientists and mathematicians,¹⁶¹ and in the following year Lubbock's first book had been published, *Prehistoric Times as Illustrated by Ancient Remains and the Manners and Customs of Modern Savages*, in which he had coined the terms 'palaeolithic' and 'neolithic'.¹⁶²

In 1865, Lubbock had stood for Parliament in West Kent as a Liberal with the support of Mill,¹⁶³ stating in his election address: 'The plan suggested by Mr Hare, and advocated by Mr Mill, of giving members to minorities, was worthy of consideration; but he could not say that he was prepared to support such a plan at present.'¹⁶⁴ Defeated in that

contest and in another in West Kent in 1868, he had been returned for Maidstone in a by-election in 1870.¹⁶⁵ Meanwhile in 1869 he had been among the original members of the Metaphysical Society for discussion of the relation between science and religion founded by James Knowles, an architect and the editor of the *Contemporary Review* as of 1870,¹⁶⁶ in which year had been published Lubbock's second book, *The Origin of Civilisation and the Primitive Condition of Man*.¹⁶⁷ In the following year in the House of Commons, he had introduced the Bank Holidays Act,¹⁶⁸ the first of sixteen acts for which he was responsible during the 1870s and 1880s.¹⁶⁹ During these years, additional books by Lubbock had been published, such as *The Origin and Metamorphoses of Insects* in 1873 and *Ants, Bees and Wasps* in 1882. In 1877, he had introduced Gladstone to Morley at High Elms and to Darwin at Down,¹⁷⁰ and upon the death of Darwin in 1882 Lubbock had joined Huxley among the pall-bearers at his funeral in Westminster Abbey.¹⁷¹ Meanwhile, Lubbock had served as a Vice-President of the Royal Society and as a Vice-Chancellor of the University of London, and when Robert Lowe had been raised to the peerage as Viscount Sherbrooke in 1880, Lubbock had replaced him in the House of Commons as member for the University of London,¹⁷² which seat he was to hold until he also was raised to the peerage as Baron Avebury in 1900. As of 1883, Lubbock was the principal of the Working Men's College with which Hare's son-in-law John Westlake was associated.¹⁷³

A Whig-Liberal in Parliament, Lubbock had supported the Trevelyan resolution for franchise extension and redistribution in 1879,¹⁷⁴ and in a speech at Sidcup on 4 December 1883, the month after the Bristol annual meeting of the National Liberal Federation, Lubbock spoke in favour of the representation of minorities, defending the minority clause and stating that 'extension of the suffrage would render this question one of very great importance'. In England, he suggested, 'if they arranged the country into single seats, the case would be very different. There was much to be said for such a system'. However, he argued, 'if they retained the great cities as single constituencies and gave them anything like a fair number of representatives... no one could seriously maintain that in a place like Liverpool, where parties were so evenly balanced, it would be tolerable that perhaps a difference of half a dozen votes at an election should make a difference of eight or ten seats'. In Ireland, he added, 'if they extended the suffrage largely there without any minority vote, and did not break up the greater constituencies, they might find that, although there were everywhere a large number of loyalists and Protestants, they might be outnumbered by Catholics and revolutionists'. Accordingly, he 'did not see why the system of

three-cornered constituencies should not be extended'. With reference to the Liberal party, he concluded, 'if they maintained the minority vote they would be strong enough when they were in the majority to carry their measures, and when they were in the minority not too weak to defend them'.¹⁷⁵

Later in the same month, on 24 December, Lubbock prepared an invitation to a private meeting, explaining: 'Several gentlemen who are interested in the proposals for proportional representation in Parliament have suggested to me that much advantage might arise from a private conference for the purpose of discussing the best form in which to bring them before Parliament, & the best mode of calling attention to them.'¹⁷⁶ Subsequently, the meeting was held in London at the home of Beaumont Lubbock, brother of John, on 16 January 1884, following which it was announced in the press that the participants had 'decided to form a society for the purpose of promoting the principle of proportional representation'.¹⁷⁷

6

The Proportional Representation Society and the Third Reform Act, 1884–1888

Thomas Hare at first did not receive an invitation to the meeting called by Sir John Lubbock on 16 January 1884. Hare thought this was due perhaps to 'a desire not to include any who were committed to particular schemes', as his son-in-law John Westlake wrote to Lubbock, but Westlake thought 'the omission is more likely to have been accidental' and asked if there was 'any reason why I should not bring Mr Hare to the conference?'¹ Consequently, Hare was in attendance at the meeting.² George Howell also requested an invitation and attended the meeting with Walter Morrison,³ whereby the leaders of the former Representative Reform Association were among the founders of the Proportional Representation Society.

Henry Fawcett declined to attend the meeting, but he wrote to Lubbock from Cambridge that he would be 'delighted to talk the whole subject over with you some evening when you can spare half an hour in the House'.⁴ Fawcett was to join the society, however,⁵ as was Millicent Garrett Fawcett.⁶ Henry Richmond Droop, who was mortally ill at the time,⁷ informed Lubbock that if his health did not permit him to attend the meeting he would 'hope to hear what has been decided upon, in order that I may cooperate as far as I can'.⁸ In the following month, Droop forwarded for the use of the society books on proportional representation and a copy of his pamphlet edition of the English translation of the study of elections by Ernest Naville published in 1872, indicating that he had 'some 300 copies' and 'could send you as many as you might like to have for distribution'. He added that he had a 'considerable stock' of copies of a pamphlet edition of the paper he had delivered before the Juridical Society in 1871.⁹ At the same time, Droop provided information concerning *La Représentation Proportionnelle*, the journal of L' Association Réformiste Belge pour l'Adoption de la Représentation

Proportionnelle, which had been founded in Brussels in 1881. This society advocated a list system of proportional representation associated with Victor d'Hondt, a professor at the University of Ghent, who like Carl Andrae was to be in contact with Lubbock in 1885.¹⁰

While Fawcett and Droop did not attend the meeting, Leonard Courtney was present as was Albert Grey, nephew and heir of the 3rd Earl Grey and a Liberal member of Parliament for South Northumberland since 1880.¹¹ A Whig-Liberal like Lubbock, Grey had spoken in defence of proportional representation in a speech to his constituents at Hexham on 5 January 1884, saying that he agreed with Fawcett that redistribution must accompany franchise extension and that he would 'vote in favour of any scheme which might tend to maintain the voting strength of minorities'.¹² This would be particularly necessary, he added, to ensure the representation of Irish Loyalists. They should have 35 representatives, he calculated, while the Nationalists 'would certainly not be entitled to have more than 70 representatives'.¹³ To achieve this, he advocated the application of Hare's electoral system within multi-member constituencies, saying that 'because Mr Hare's scheme as originally proposed is impossible, it does not follow that some modification of it is not practicable'.¹⁴ He concluded by quoting from the speech in defence of proportional representation delivered by Fawcett at Hackney in November 1883.¹⁵ The *Manchester Guardian* praised the speech by Grey, calling it 'a powerful plea, admirably put, for proportional representation'.¹⁶ The position on franchise extension taken by Grey was similar to that of Lubbock, but the *Manchester Guardian* reported on 15 January that Lubbock denied forming a new cave.¹⁷

Among others present at the meeting on 16 January were Henry Bompas, an Inner Temple barrister who had read mathematics at St John's College, Cambridge only a few years after Courtney, and Frederic Seebohm, a banker and historian whose *The English Village Community* had been published in 1883.¹⁸ In December of that year, Seebohm had contributed to the *Contemporary Review* an article on 'Proportionate Representation' in which he had attacked equal electoral districts as endorsed by the National Liberal Federation at the Leeds conference and advocated the representation of minorities:

Our faith in the democracy of the future, if it rests upon a rational basis, rests chiefly upon the fair representation of the whole people; upon the success with which the mass of sound political conviction, which we believe to lie at the bottom of our national life, is secured its due weight by means of a fair representation in Parliament; upon

keeping the best minds in the nation interested in politics, and upon the growth in the constituencies of a solid and stable public opinion, which will have its due influence in steering the vessel of the State in a steady course.¹⁹

Considering both the limited vote and the cumulative vote to be unsatisfactory, he acknowledged that Hare's single transferable vote was 'understood by nearly all practical politicians to be too complicated, and to leave too much to chance'.²⁰ Subsequently, Seebohm proposed a list, or joint-candidate, system related to those of Naville and d'Hondt.²¹ This system was developed by Seebohm together with J. Parker Smith,²² who had been educated at Trinity College, Cambridge and had been called to the bar at Lincoln's Inn in 1881. In November 1883, Smith had written letters concerning proportional representation to the editors of the *Spectator* and *The Times*.²³ In 'Parliamentary Reform: Minority Representation' in the *Westminster Review* in January 1884, he criticized Bright and Chamberlain and advocated Hare's electoral system with the Droop quota in multi-member constituencies, concluding: 'The plan is now commended not only to minorities and interests who dread that they may in future find themselves without a spokesman in the House of Commons, but to all who fear that the unquestioned supremacy of the democracy may lead to the suppression of individual opinion in politics which has long been deplored in American public life.'²⁴

At the meeting called by Lubbock held on 16 January, a provisional committee was formed with Lubbock as Chairman, Grey as Treasurer, and A. Cromwell White as Secretary.²⁵ Most members of the society favoured the single transferable vote, while Courtney favoured the cumulative vote.²⁶ When notice of the formation of the society appeared in the press, however, no particular electoral system for the representation of minorities was specified, the request being for 'all persons who are in favour of any such system of election to send their names to Sir John Lubbock'.²⁷ Among those who responded was John Chapman, the proprietor and editor of the *Westminster Review*, in which he offered to place 32 pages at the disposal of the society for advocacy of proportional representation.²⁸

Meanwhile, opinion regarding proportional representation was being disseminated in the pages of the *Pall Mall Gazette*, which had issued to members of Parliament a 'circular of inquiry' on forthcoming legislation. Eighty-five per cent of those who replied favoured franchise extension prior to redistribution, and the 'balance of opinion' was 'against minority representation'.²⁹ Further opinion reported a few weeks later

indicated that the majority favoured equal electoral districts, a comment being added that most support for proportional representation was 'platonic'. Lubbock, however, was quoted as stating: 'If we do not have single seats, I think we must have proportional representation.'³⁰ Another circular was issued by the *Pall Mall Gazette* to Liberal associations, to which Francis Schnadhorst replied for the Birmingham Liberal Association that it was 'ripe for equal electoral districts and unanimously hostile to proportional representation'.³¹ Glasgow, however, was reported to be 'against equal electoral districts' and 'in favour of proportional representation', while the Radical Club of Hackney was 'in favour of proportional representation on the basis submitted by Mr Hare'.³²

In the following month, Hare published two articles in the *Pall Mall Gazette*. In the first, 'A Plea for Minority Representation', he asserted that the argument of virtual representation was 'fallacious', in particular when applied to Ireland, enquiring: 'In how many constituencies is it supposed that those who are friends of order and opposed to violence, and that those who shrink from adopting the principles of the Land League, will be found in a majority?' He added that 'Mr Bright may confidently reckon on the strenuous support of Mr Parnell in his hostility to the recognition of any electoral rights in minorities.'³³ Hare proceeded to criticize Chamberlain for not giving support to female suffrage and protested that electors 'cannot be regarded as mere counters to be tossed from one side to the other by some managers or caucus superior to themselves'.³⁴ In the second article, 'An Ideal Reform Bill', he reiterated the process of voting by his electoral system and recommended the article on minority representation by Smith in the *Westminster Review* in the previous month.³⁵

Also in February in the *Law Magazine and Review*, Smith wrote that 'the undue power of the "caucus" in this country, and still more in America, lies in the fact that a voter who does not vote as he is told unnecessarily wastes his vote or admits an opponent'.³⁶ He advocated an experimental application of the single transferable vote to a parliamentary constituency combining the universities of Oxford and Cambridge. In the same month, a pamphlet by Smith, *Preferential Voting*, was published by the Proportional Representation Society, explaining the procedure for the transfer of surplus votes in accordance with the diversity of preferences indicated by the electors.³⁷ His joint-candidate system, however, was rejected by Lubbock, who told Grey later in May that 'it seems to me to give more power to agents & Committees which is just the very thing we wish to avoid'.³⁸

The formation of the Proportional Representation Society in January was announced to members of Parliament by Lubbock in February in a circular indicating that its purpose was to bring together 'all those who while desiring that the majority of the electors should have their due preponderance, are also anxious that the minority should be fairly represented'. Asserting that the electoral system 'notoriously fails to secure this, nor would the plan of equal electoral districts promise in this respect much better results', he added that the society had yet to determine the best electoral system to adopt for provision of proportional representation.³⁹ The circular was followed by a request that Gladstone receive a deputation of members of the society, but the response on 27 February was that Gladstone thought 'it would be as well if the matter can be postponed until after the statements which he intends to make in his speech... when he asks for leave to introduce the Franchise Bill'.⁴⁰

On 28 February, when the Franchise Bill was introduced by Gladstone in the House of Commons, a list appeared in *The Times* indicating that the Proportional Representation Society had been joined by 110 members of Parliament, both Whig and radical Liberals, Conservatives, and Irish Home Rulers opposed to Parnell.⁴¹ There were 64 Liberals, including Joseph Cowen, a radical opponent of the Newcastle caucus, who had expressed interest in Hare's electoral system in a speech in his constituency of Newcastle-upon-Tyne in December 1883.⁴² He was not optimistic about the prospects for proportional representation in February 1884, however, when he wrote: 'I don't know that much can be done with it in parliament just now. Mr Gladstone is very hostile, and those liberals in favour of it are not disposed to endanger the Franchise Bill by pressing the project too hard.'⁴³ Among the Conservatives who joined the society were Arthur Balfour and James Lowther.⁴⁴

The Franchise Bill introduced by Gladstone separated franchise extension and redistribution.⁴⁵ During the debate on the first reading on 3 March, Lubbock stated that he considered the bill to be 'just and right in itself' but that the 'present system of mere majority voting is...uncertain and defective in its operation'.⁴⁶ The electoral system did not accurately register support for minorities or for majorities, he argued: 'In 1874...the Liberals and Home Rulers had 56 Members too few in relation to their total poll; while, on the contrary, in 1880 they secured 43 too many.'⁴⁷ Roman Catholics in England were not adequately represented, he remarked, and he warned:

The case of Ireland is the most serious of all. Certainly one-third of its population is moderate, loyal, and desirous of maintaining the

integrity of the Empire; but we are told, on high authority, that under this Bill, unless some system of proportional representation be adopted, the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr Parnell) will secure 95 seats out of 100, leaving only five to the Liberals and Conservatives together; whereas it is clear that under any just system of representation they ought to have over 30.⁴⁸

Rejecting compensation by virtual representation, he denied 'that inequalities in one district are made up for them in another', stating: 'The present system... may be good, or may be bad, but it is not representation; and the question is, whether we wish for representation in fact, or in name only.'⁴⁹ He took issue with Chamberlain: 'The right hon. gentleman the President of the Board of Trade, I believe, once characterized proportional representation as a pernicious restriction on free voting, while, in fact, the very reverse is the case.'⁵⁰ Lubbock ventured to suggest that the American Civil War might have been prevented had the House of Representatives been elected by proportional representation.⁵¹ He did not agree with those who thought that proportional representation would obstruct the executive function of Parliament: 'A Government, of course, must be, as far as possible, homogeneous, and of one mind; but a Representative Assembly should be a mirror of the nation.'⁵² Quoting Mill, Lubbock advocated Hare's single transferable vote.⁵³

Two days later, on 5 March, the first general meeting of the Proportional Representation Society was held at Palace Chambers, Westminster, at which Lubbock was elected President and Grey Treasurer. An executive committee was appointed which included Sir Rowland Blennerhassett, Bompas, Morrison, Seeböhm, Smith, Westlake, and White. Of the members of Parliament on the executive committee in addition to Blennerhassett, five were Liberals and five were Conservatives.⁵⁴ Also on the executive committee was C.P. Scott, the editor of the *Manchester Guardian*, and subsequently a branch of the society was established in Manchester under the direction of John Pennington Thomasson, a Liberal member of Parliament for Bolton. Two resolutions were passed at the meeting, the first: 'That, without prejudging how far the principle may be subsequently carried out, it is indispensable, as a first step towards securing the true representation of the electors, that whenever a constituency returns more than two members, some form of proportional representation be adopted.' And the second: 'That the Committee be requested to collect information as to what is being done in other countries, and take all steps

in their power to disseminate a knowledge of the subject as widely as possible.⁵⁵

Also on 5 March, the issue was on the cabinet agenda as recorded by Gladstone: 'Members of Govt. & Proportional Voting. Nothing need be said to C[ourtney] & F[awcett] at present.'⁵⁶ Five days later, on 10 March, the general committee of the National Liberal Federation met in Birmingham and passed a resolution reaffirming the resolution of the Leeds conference against minority representation: 'This meeting regrets that any Liberal members should coalesce with the strongest opponents of reform in a movement intended primarily to fetter and restrict the electoral power of the great constituencies. The meeting trusts that any scheme that may be propounded with this object in view will meet with the strenuous opposition of the Liberal party.'⁵⁷ In Parliament on 24 March, when Lord John Manners, a Conservative member for North Leicestershire, moved an amendment to the Franchise Bill to force the introduction of redistribution,⁵⁸ Lord Hartington, leader in the House of Commons in the absence of Gladstone, who was ill, invoked the principle of virtual representation and spoke against minority representation by 'artificial devices', arguing that 'the real protection and the real safety of the minority in Ireland will be found in the English and Scottish representatives in the House'.⁵⁹

The question of redistribution raised by Manners was addressed by Hare two days later, on 26 March, in the *Pall Mall Gazette* in 'Eighty Members for London: Why Not?', in which he advocated the application of his electoral system to the representation of London as suggested in his *Treatise*.⁶⁰ In the same month in 'Proportional Representation: A Practical Proposal' in the *Contemporary Review*, Westlake defended the representation of minorities on school boards and further advocated proportional representation for parliamentary constituencies with reference to the writings of Hare and Seebohm.⁶¹ Likewise Fawcett on 9 April, two days after the second reading of the Franchise Bill was approved in the House of Commons,⁶² defended proportional representation in a speech at Salisbury, suggesting that 'there is little doubt that there will be a preponderance of public opinion in favour of some plan'.⁶³

Lubbock defended proportional representation and advertised the society in the *Daily News* on 15 April,⁶⁴ and in the same month he further discussed the question in the *Nineteenth Century* in 'Proportional Representation', drawing attention to the position of G.J. Goschen, a Whig-Liberal member of Parliament for Ripon and an opponent of the Franchise Bill,⁶⁵ who was in favour of the principle of proportional representation although not a member of the society.⁶⁶ Lubbock emphasized

that members of Parliament in the Proportional Representation Society, however, were from 'every section of the House of Commons – with one significant exception; that, namely, which follows the lead of Mr Parnell'.⁶⁷ Lubbock reiterated the points he had made in the House of Commons in the previous month, including his analysis of recent election results, and he suggested that proportional representation was a possible solution to the conflict between the government and the opposition over redistribution as it would be in the interest of the majority as well as the minority. Writing in his 'individual capacity' rather than as president of the society, he advocated the application of the single transferable vote with the Droop quota in multi-member constituencies, explaining its mechanism as proposed by Morrison in 1872 and indicating that it was 'Mr Hare's celebrated scheme applied within the constituency'.⁶⁸ Appended to the article was a list of 176 members of Parliament who had joined the Proportional Representation Society.⁶⁹

Following the article by Lubbock in the *Nineteenth Century* in April was another on proportional representation by H.O. Arnold-Forster, a member of the executive committee of the society, explaining a test election by the single transferable vote that had been conducted by himself and Blennerhassett at the elementary school of St Stephen's Church in Westminster.⁷⁰ A test election among adults was also conducted in the same month by Bompas,⁷¹ after which Courtney suggested to Westlake that in subsequent test elections the same votes should be counted twice by different methods to demonstrate 'how little the result was affected by chance'.⁷² On 19 April, the *Saturday Review* commented that the test election conducted by Bompas 'proved... the practicability of the novel method'.⁷³ It also indicated that while the society was not committed to a particular system of proportional representation, 'probably most of its members will ultimately adhere to the plan which is preferred by the Chairman, Sir John Lubbock', which it explained was 'a modification of Mr Hare's famous proposal'.⁷⁴ This projection was reinforced in the same month by an article on proportional representation in the *Westminster Review* which concluded with a defence of the society and the single transferable vote, calling it an electoral system 'free from any objection that is found in the present system or in the systems of limited and cumulative voting'.⁷⁵

Meanwhile, the opposition of Chamberlain to proportional representation was noted by A.C. Sellar, a Whig-Liberal member of Parliament for Haddington, in an article on parliamentary reform in the *Edinburgh Review* in April.⁷⁶ In the same month, another voice raised against proportional representation was that of Lord Randolph Churchill, the

Conservative member of Parliament for Woodstock and the spokesman for 'Tory democracy' who was in a power struggle with the Conservative leadership over the influence of the National Union of Conservative Associations. Speaking in Birmingham on 16 April, Churchill like Hartington invoked the principle of virtual representation: 'I do not fear for minorities. . . . Modern checks and securities are not worth a brass farthing. Give me a fair arrangement of constituencies, and one part of England will correct and balance the other.'⁷⁷ While he was opposed to the caucus in Birmingham, he favoured single-member equal electoral districts.⁷⁸

In the following month in the *Contemporary Review*, additional opposition to proportional representation was expressed in an article on 'The Representation of Minorities' by J.G. Shaw-Lefevre, a Liberal member of Parliament for Reading associated with Chamberlain and First Commissioner of Works in the government.⁷⁹ Replying to the article by Lubbock in the *Nineteenth Century* in the previous month, Shaw-Lefevre surveyed the discussion of minority representation since the parliamentary debate on the minority clause in 1867, which he pointed out he had opposed, and the adoption of the cumulative vote in the House of Commons in 1870.⁸⁰ Although the minority clause was to the benefit of Liberal representation in Parliament, he claimed, 'in more than one case the minority member has ceased to be in harmony with his party' while 'in other places, such as Birmingham and Glasgow, . . . the opposite effect has been produced. The system has unduly fostered and excited party organization.'⁸¹ The minority clause had 'failed', he argued, adding that

it stands condemned even by those who originally proposed it, if not as a bad scheme, at least as the very worst form in which their theories of representation can be put into practice. It is significant that the supporters of these theories have dropped the title of 'minority representation' and have generally adopted that of 'proportional representation' as one likely to hide the defects of the present system, and to commend itself more to the community.⁸²

The cumulative vote in school board elections had also failed, he maintained: 'It was desired to sectarianize the Boards. This object has been thoroughly attained. Whether it has been an advantage to the cause of education may be doubted.'⁸³ School board elections, he complained, involved 'a wasteful accumulation of votes upon the successful candidates of the more powerful sections, and small groups and

sections have consequently been able to secure the return of members, when their numbers did not really entitle them to it. Men have been returned upon Boards this way who have proved to be a power only for mischief.⁸⁴ The system proposed in the *Contemporary Review* in March by Westlake, 'a strong supporter of proportional representation', Shaw-Lefevre observed, 'would entail evils and difficulties greater than those it is intended to cure'.⁸⁵

Regarding the results of the general elections of 1874 and 1880 discussed by Lubbock in the *Nineteenth Century* in April, Shaw-Lefevre calculated that they were due in part to uncontested constituencies,⁸⁶ and he maintained that it was unnecessary to apply proportional representation by an electoral system such as Hare's to Ireland with an extended franchise: 'At worst the loyal party in Ireland may be certain of securing twenty-five out of 100 members.'⁸⁷ Regarding the theory of the representation of minority opinions or interests by Hare's electoral system as endorsed by Mill, Shaw-Lefevre protested:

The system appears to consecrate the principle of sectarianism as opposed to nationalism. It invites people to combine together in groups for the purposes not of the public interest, but their own private interests, or their own special views. . . . The House of Commons would become a collection of men representing cliques and petty interests, and without any common views as to the general policy of the country.⁸⁸

'The same arguments apply', he added, 'in a less degree only, when the principle is applied, not to the whole country, but to large constituencies or districts returning six or ten or more members'. The plan advocated by Lubbock, he argued, also involved elements of chance, jeopardizing majorities, and 'would very unduly favour independent candidates, representing small sections of a constituency'.⁸⁹ The present electoral system was defective, he suggested, 'only in the imagination of a certain school of philosophers and of timid politicians'.⁹⁰ He asserted, echoing Walter Bagehot, that proportional representation would 'result in weakening the position of the executive, in making it more difficult, if not impossible, to the nation to carry out its will'.⁹¹

There was little scope for discussion of proportional representation in Parliament while the Franchise Bill was in the committee stage in May and June. In the House of Commons on 17 June, Thomas Collins, a Conservative member for Knaresborough, proposed an amendment for restricting electors in double-member constituencies to a single

vote,⁹² a modification and extension of the minority clause, but Lubbock objected that the proposal 'would not secure the proportional representation which he desired... The argument in its favour was much stronger as regards constituencies returning three or more Members.'⁹³ Balfour and Lowther both spoke in sympathy with Collins,⁹⁴ while Gladstone pointed out that the question was one of redistribution which was not under consideration. Gladstone remarked:

We should be doing positive mischief if we were to attempt to anticipate that measure of redistribution by a partial and a single portion of the subject, which must be brought before us in a much larger form than it could be in the proposition of the hon. Gentleman. I cannot see for myself how, from any point of view, this clause could be accepted. It involves an innovation which would be received with astonishment, and the discontent it would excite would be so universal that it could never be carried out. I must say that it would require a great deal of argument to convince me that in a constituency having a voting power of 1500, 501 should be able to elect a Member for themselves.⁹⁵

Lubbock requested that Collins withdraw the amendment, 'leaving the House to consider the whole question when they came to the Redistribution Bill'.⁹⁶ When Collins consented to do so he observed that 'in the majority of the constituencies there was what in another year he believed the House would consider to be an unfair proportion of voting power in respect of this dual representation'.⁹⁷

When the Proportional Representation Society held its second general meeting on 2 July, it was with reference not to parliamentary representation but to the London Government Bill which had been introduced in the House of Commons in April to provide for the triennial election by majority vote of a common council of 240 members and district councils.⁹⁸ It was to have its second reading on 3 July, and Lubbock proposed and the society agreed that an attempt should be made to introduce an amendment for election of the common council by either the single transferable vote or the joint-candidate system. Westlake advocated the single transferable vote against Seebohm, who spoke in favour of the joint-candidate system.⁹⁹ After the meeting, Lubbock noted in his diary that there was 'still a good deal of difference of opinion as to the best mode of voting'.¹⁰⁰ No action could be taken in any event, as in the House of Commons the bill was withdrawn on 10 July.¹⁰¹

Meanwhile in the House of Lords on 8 July, however, an amendment to the Franchise Bill moved by Lord Cairns, the Conservative who had moved the amendment for the minority clause in 1867, was carried with the support of Lord Salisbury (formerly Viscount Cranborne), Conservative leader in the House of Lords following the death of Disraeli in 1881, necessitating the introduction of a redistribution measure.¹⁰² Two days later, on 10 July, at Christ Church, Oxford, Charles Lutwidge Dodgson wrote to Salisbury congratulating him on the Cairns amendment.¹⁰³ Better known as Lewis Carroll, the pseudonym under which he had published the stories he had invented for Alice and the two other daughters of H.G. Liddell, the Dean of Christ Church who had signed the memorial to Palmerston in 1857,¹⁰⁴ Dodgson was a mathematician who had contributed four letters on proportional representation to the *St James Gazette* in May and June and an article in July.¹⁰⁵ Dodgson had sent a copy of the article to Salisbury with the comment that ‘some such scheme is needed, and much more needed than *any* scheme for mere redistribution of electoral districts’.¹⁰⁶ Salisbury replied on 9 July that it was difficult to obtain a hearing for ‘anything...absolutely new...however Conservative its object’,¹⁰⁷ to which Dodgson replied on 10 July that his ‘scheme of Proportionate Representation’ was not Conservative: ‘Most sincerely, *all* I aim at is to secure that, *whatever* be the proportions of opinion among the Electors, the *same* shall exist among the Members. Such a scheme may at one time favour one party, at one time another: just as it happens. But really it has *no* political bias of its own.’¹⁰⁸

Subsequently, on 11 October, Dodgson published an article on ‘Redistribution’ in the *St James Gazette*, and in the following month, on 2 November, he forwarded to Salisbury the proof sheets of a pamphlet he had written, *The Principles of Parliamentary Representation*, which he distributed to all members of Parliament.¹⁰⁹ In this work, he raised objections to Hare’s electoral system, one being ‘the confusion it would cause in the mind of an ignorant Elector, who, though quite able to name his favourite Candidate, would be utterly puzzled if told to arrange 5 or 6 names in order of merit’.¹¹⁰ Another objection was to the element of chance in the method of the transfer of surplus votes as explained by Smith in *Preferential Voting*. Dodgson agreed that each elector should have only one vote, but he thought that the candidates rather than the electors should determine the transfer of surplus votes, a procedure not unlike that advocated by Baily in *A Scheme for Proportional Representation* in 1869.¹¹¹ A second edition of *The Principles of Parliamentary Representation* was prepared by Dodgson in December 1884 ‘to

give to members of the Proportional Representation Society who are not M.P.'s'.¹¹² In a subsequent supplement to the pamphlet, which also he distributed to all members of Parliament and members of the Proportional Representation Society, Dodgson emphasized his support for the single transferable vote in multi-member constituencies but reiterated his critical analysis.¹¹³

After the Franchise Bill was amended in the House of Lords on 8 July, Gladstone instructed Dilke to prepare a redistribution measure for consideration by the cabinet.¹¹⁴ In 1876, Dilke had chaired a select committee on parliamentary and municipal elections which had inquired into the operation of the Ballot Act,¹¹⁵ and he had been responsible for the enactment of the Registration Act two years later.¹¹⁶ The responsibility of Dilke for redistribution in 1884 combined with the opposition of Gladstone to the representation of minorities was not advantageous to the Proportional Representation Society. Further, among the six members of the cabinet committee on redistribution with Dilke were other opponents of the representation of minorities, Chamberlain, Shaw-Lefevre, and Hartington. Working with Sir John Lambert, the former permanent secretary to the Local Government Board, Dilke on 16 September submitted a memorandum containing a proposal that multi-member constituencies and the minority clause be abolished. Counties were to be double-member districts with the exceptions of Lancashire and Yorkshire which were to be single-member districts. Boroughs with a population of less than 15,000 were to be merged into the counties; boroughs with a population of between 15,000 and 50,000 were to be single-member districts, and those above 50,000 were to have two members only.¹¹⁷

In the following month, while attacking the Liberals and the caucus in a series of speeches in Scotland,¹¹⁸ Salisbury in 'The Value of Redistribution: A Note on Electoral Statistics' in the *National Review* maintained that the object of reform was 'the perfect representation of the interests, the opinions, and the divisions of the nation; of minorities as well as majorities; of interests which are weak, as well as of those which are strong'.¹¹⁹ Arguing against Shaw-Lefevre, he asserted that 'no system of distribution is completely just which does not, formally or virtually, give to the minority a representation corresponding to its actual weight'.¹²⁰ Rejecting virtual representation,¹²¹ he observed that the minority clause in parliamentary elections was 'necessarily scanty and tentative' and not likely to be 'usefully carried further' but that the cumulative vote had 'worked satisfactorily' in school board elections,¹²² and he suggested that it be applied with grouping of seats.¹²³ However, he considered

an alternative to the cumulative vote to be 'Mr Cobden's principle of single-membered constituencies'.¹²⁴ Single-member districts, Salisbury calculated, would protect rural Conservative influence in the counties and promote urban Conservative influence in the boroughs.¹²⁵ Accordingly, Salisbury did not mention Hare's electoral system, with which his approach to the representation of minorities by way of single-member districts was incompatible. Indeed, Salisbury commented: 'No argument, it may be said, has yet been proposed, which could be relied upon to give at Westminster an exact reflection, in reduced proportions, of the political divisions of the nation.'¹²⁶

In response to Salisbury, Dilke wrote to Chamberlain on 2 October that 'grouping with cumulative vote is the Tory game',¹²⁷ and at Hanley five days later, Chamberlain denounced the proposal by Salisbury as 'monstrous gerrymandering', asserting that he hoped it 'may have the effect of opening the eyes of some of our Liberal friends who have been bitten with the idea of minority representation, and who do not see that in whatever form it is represented, it always lends itself to the party of obstruction'.¹²⁸ He claimed that 'the whole object in this theoretical proposal is wrong at the bottom' and that he opposed 'minority voting in every form', emphasizing that 'the majority has the right to enjoy the fruits of victory'.¹²⁹ 'I will only say', he insisted

I can conceive of nothing more foolish, nothing more suicidal, on the part of Liberals of any section that at this moment, when we are struggling for our lives against the aggression of a minority, and when we hope triumphantly to assert the rights of numbers, that we should voluntarily substitute another device, more ingenious, more elaborate, more plausible, and, therefore, more dangerous to popular rights and popular government.¹³⁰

On the following day, 8 October, Grey wrote to Lubbock that Chamberlain 'ought at once to receive a hard blow from a P.R. fist right between the eyes', adding: 'He has given us an opportunity... of knocking into the thick skull of Demos the truths which lie at the bottom of our position, & I trust you may think the occasion calls for a quick reply from you in *The Times*'.¹³¹ Three days later, a letter by Lubbock was published in *The Times* in which he accused Chamberlain of distorting proportional representation and asserted that majority rule was not at issue save in that it was not guaranteed by majority voting. 'The Government is the executive power, and must, as far as possible, be homogeneous', Lubbock argued, 'but Parliament is a deliberative assembly, and should

represent not the majority only but the whole nation'.¹³² He added that 'the object of the society over which I have the honour to preside is to secure for the minority their fair share in proportion to their numbers'.¹³³ Chamberlain, on 14 October, wrote to Lubbock in protest:

My views on Proportional Representation have been publicly declared on more than one occasion. They are shared, I believe, by Mr Gladstone and Mr Bright, and they lie at the root of all Liberalism as I conceive it.

Your proposals seem to me to proceed from a settled distrust of the people. You want to trammel their decisions by checks and devices which if they were ever adopted would certainly be swept away by some gust of popular passion.

I am sorry, but not surprised that we differ on this as on many political questions, but I confess that I have always thought that the most open Tory opposition was less dangerous to Liberal progress than the theories to which you have given your influential support.¹³⁴

During the period of this exchange between Lubbock and Chamberlain, both Courtney and Fawcett were defending proportional representation in their respective constituencies. At Liskeard on 8 October, Courtney agreed with the demand for redistribution and suggested that if the House of Lords were to be mended, rather than ended, it should be by the formation of a second chamber elected on the principle of proportional representation. At the same time, he claimed that the House of Commons 'gives wholly disproportionate representation to the people of wealth and capital' and 'is too much consumed with the spirit of party'.¹³⁵ Subsequently at Hackney on 13 October, Fawcett remarked that the article by Salisbury in the *National Review* that same month contained 'much from which every Liberal is bound most strongly to dissent' but that Salisbury, 'without propounding any particular scheme of proportional representation, says on this subject many things which will, I am sure, be cordially endorsed by a considerable number of Liberals'. Fawcett rejected single-member districts, however, and denied that the minority clause and the cumulative vote had been failures. The example of Mill, he observed, was proof that proportional representation was not a 'Tory device'.¹³⁶

In the House of Commons on 23 October, Lubbock gave notice of a motion that 'no Redistribution Bill will be satisfactory which does not

recognize the principle of proportional representation',¹³⁷ and he again raised the issue during the debate on the Address on 27 October, asking Gladstone if there would be a discussion of the voting system to be adopted under the Franchise Bill.¹³⁸ Gladstone replied that it was not the occasion for such a discussion and added that 'I own that I am by no means convinced that it would be most convenient to discuss separately the mode of voting'.¹³⁹ Two days later, Edward Hamilton, private secretary to Gladstone, reflected the ministerial view when he noted in his diary that proportional representation was 'a fad which has many powerful advocates on both sides' and that it was 'perfect in theory, but totally unworkable in practice'.¹⁴⁰

At the Treasury on 8 November, Courtney prepared a memorandum on proportional representation which he submitted to Gladstone, stating: 'The answer you gave last week to the enquiry of Sir John Lubbock was probably such as he himself expected, but it must have left him and those who like myself agree with him anxious lest the principle of proportional representation should not receive due consideration at a time when consideration of it may be fruitful.' He indicated that at least 190 members of Parliament had joined the Proportional Representation Society, and he proceeded to argue the case against majority voting in electoral districts, which he claimed disadvantaged independent candidates and jeopardized the relationship between popular opinion and political power. If support for a party was evenly distributed on a national basis, he argued, it would dominate Parliament with a slight majority. The minority clause was better than majority voting, he contended, and he considered the cumulative vote in school board elections to have been a 'remarkable success'. Hare's electoral system, however, he proposed, 'would realize all the good the cumulative vote has secured whilst emancipating the electors from the necessity of conforming to the directions of some political organization which the cumulative vote undoubtedly requires'. While there was a 'strong case' for minority representation in Britain, he emphasized, in Ireland it was of 'transcendent importance'.¹⁴¹ Accordingly he submitted with his memorandum a list of Irish Liberal, Home Rule, and Conservative members of Parliament who belonged to the Proportional Representation Society, commenting that none were Parnellites.¹⁴² Two days later, on 10 November, when Courtney was in Cambridge for the funeral of Fawcett, who had died on 6 November after a sudden illness, Kate Courtney noted that 'the road to Trumpington Church where he was buried was lined with people for a mile or more'.¹⁴³ A few days after the funeral, Leonard Courtney wrote to Richard Potter, his father-in-law: 'The loss of Fawcett is a terrible

blow. . . . I doubt whether he could have been taken from us at a time of greater political anxiety. The immediate future is most dark. My own fortunes are mixed up in the struggle.¹⁴⁴

Courtney was informed by Gladstone on 20 November that his memorandum had been brought to the attention of the cabinet, but little more was said.¹⁴⁵ The prospect of a resolution of their differences was unlikely, however. As Jonathan Parry observes, Gladstone during these years intended 'to keep the Liberal Party together as a national, classless party, capable of responding quickly to genuine grievances and abuses, but incapable of descending into sectional favouritism itself'.¹⁴⁶ Proportional representation was not conducive to so doing, and Courtney intended not to compromise. When Courtney discussed proportional representation with Gladstone on 22 November, according to Hamilton, 'Mr. G. found him very stiff and unbending', and on 25 November, after Lubbock in the House of Commons had complained that proportional representation was not being given consideration, Hamilton observed: 'These crotcheteers meet with no sympathy from Mr. G. Their theories are alien to his nature.' 'I am afraid this question will involve the loss of Courtney', Hamilton added, 'and his resignation will be a real loss'.¹⁴⁷

Meanwhile, the modifications of the government redistribution measure further reduced the prospects for proportional representation. The *National Review* article by Salisbury had attracted the attention of Gladstone,¹⁴⁸ and by 8 October, Dilke and Lambert had increased the number of single-member districts, rejecting grouping.¹⁴⁹ During the course of an inter-party conference held in the following month, Salisbury proposed and Gladstone accepted, as part of a redistribution settlement, the adoption of single-member constituencies as the rule for counties and boroughs. Counties were to be single-member districts, boroughs with a population of less than 15,000 were to be merged into the counties, and boroughs with a population of between 15,000 and 50,000 were to be single-member districts. Boroughs above 50,000 were to have two members only.¹⁵⁰ Dilke was a central figure in the conference and was in communication with Chamberlain. Chamberlain hesitated over single-member seats for London but deferred to Dilke when offered extra seats for Birmingham and Glasgow.¹⁵¹ When the two parties reached agreement on redistribution on 27 November, assuring passage of the Franchise Bill, Chamberlain wrote to John Morley that 'minority representation is smashed. . . . Not bad for a Tory Bill!'¹⁵² The 'Arlington Street Compact' that concluded the conference on the next day effectively precluded proportional representation in Parliament.¹⁵³

While the party leaders were negotiating, the executive committee of the Proportional Representation Society, joined by Courtney, decided that it was necessary to agree on a mode of voting, and they adopted a motion by Westlake for the single transferable vote.¹⁵⁴ A letter by Lubbock was published in *The Times* on 26 November defending Hare's electoral system and announcing the resolution of the society to advocate the single transferable vote 'while willing to accept the extension of the present "Limited Vote" ... or any other system which would fairly secure proportional representation'.¹⁵⁵

When Gladstone introduced the Redistribution Bill in the House of Commons on 1 December, Courtney submitted his resignation from the government.¹⁵⁶ Gladstone attempted to dissuade him, but Hamilton predicted that this would have 'no effect on a man of such courage, integrity, and pigheadedness combined as Courtney is'.¹⁵⁷ On the following day, Courtney wrote to the chairman of the Liskeard Liberal Association that his constituents 'will hardly be surprised at what I have done' and 'would have been surprised, and a little ashamed of their member, if he had hesitated'.¹⁵⁸ At the same time, Millicent Garrett Fawcett wrote to Courtney to congratulate and encourage him, assuring him that 'you would not have been alone in this action of yours if Harry [Henry] had been here to join you. He often spoke of this to me.'¹⁵⁹ A week later, another member of the Proportional Representation Society, Lord Acton, wrote to Mary Gladstone, a daughter of the Prime Minister, that Lord Enfield 'was a little shocked to find that I agree with Courtney'.¹⁶⁰ At a general meeting of the Proportional Representation Society on 3 December, Lubbock spoke in defence of Hare's system, and Courtney argued that in Parliament they should introduce an amendment to the 'clause dealing with the bigger towns, which would have members running from three to nine, and which would be divided into single-member districts – that was the clause they wished to attack'.¹⁶¹

In the House of Commons on the following day, 4 December, during the debate on the second reading of the Redistribution Bill, Courtney spoke at length in explanation of his resignation and opposition to single-member constituencies and argued in favour of the single transferable vote, which he said was 'the realization of Democracy in its freest and widest form'.¹⁶² Replying in defence of single seats, Gladstone said that he considered Hare's electoral system to be a '*pons asinorum*, which very few of us indeed... would have been enabled to pass'.¹⁶³ Earlier that same day, Gladstone had been reading 'Proportional versus Majority Representation' in the *Nineteenth Century* by Grey,¹⁶⁴ who argued that whereas majority or 'locality' representation 'means that

the majority shall have everything and the minority nothing', by proportional or personal' representation 'the vote of every single elector shall count for as much as that of any other elector' and 'secure to every large section of opinion a representation in just and fair proportion to its strength'.¹⁶⁵ 'If the object of reform is', he maintained, 'as the Prime Minister asserts, to bring about an increase of citizenship, it will be attained far more completely through the adoption of the proportional principle than by any system of majority representation',¹⁶⁶ concluding that by 'some plan of proportional representation... we can hope to realize the fulfillment of the Radical formula, "To every vote an equal value"'.¹⁶⁷ Gladstone, however, associated proportional representation with the Tory position as 'it would check the triumph of Democracy', suggesting that the single transferable vote was 'a favourite scheme of *The Quarterly Review*'.¹⁶⁸ Lubbock responded by indicating that it was 'supported with equal energy by *The Edinburgh Review*.... It combines the two advantages for which both sides of the House contend – a secure hearing for the minority, and the certainty of power to the majority'.¹⁶⁹ Hare's electoral system, Lubbock argued, 'is to the history of the theory of government what gravitation is to astronomy, or evolution to biology'.¹⁷⁰ Subsequently, the second reading of the Redistribution Bill was carried without a division. Following the debate, Bright commented that Courtney's 'long speech' was 'not easy to be understood' and that Gladstone's reply was 'amusing and clever'.¹⁷¹

When Parliament adjourned on 6 December, the executive committee of the Proportional Representation Society initiated a campaign in London and the provinces to promote popular support for the single transferable vote and to demonstrate that it was intelligible and practical.¹⁷² The first of a series of meetings conducted by Lubbock, Courtney, Grey, and Westlake was held in London on 15 December,¹⁷³ followed by meetings on the next two nights in Manchester.¹⁷⁴ Among meetings held in January 1885 were two conducted by Lubbock and Courtney in Leicester and Nottingham and one by Westlake in Finsbury,¹⁷⁵ and among those held in February was one by Courtney and Grey in Glasgow.¹⁷⁶

Beatrice Potter, a sister of Kate Courtney, attended a meeting in London in early 1885 and reported to her father: 'The hall was fairly well filled: the reserved seats with intelligent looking men of the professional classes, chiefly I should say members of the society; and the back part with cadaverous-looking mortals. The regular London, go-to-meeting, radical, odds-and-ends men.'¹⁷⁷ Her brother-in-law spoke at the meeting, she indicated, but it was Charles Bradlaugh, the secularist and

radical member of Parliament for Northampton, who 'was received with great enthusiasm. *He* really carried the meeting. . . . The mere *assertion* of Bradlaugh that he believed in it was sufficient to decide them; he would have had their support either way.' 'There was no real unity of feeling or thought on the platform or in the hall', however, she observed: 'The subject I fear, is at present a dead one: the educated classes are too cynical as to the possibility of foretelling the result of any scheme to take much interest in this one; the uneducated classes struggling for their bare existence, do not see in it any help towards solving that great problem – how to get more from those who have.'¹⁷⁸ The Social Democratic Federation led by H.M. Hyndman, a Marxian socialist, favoured proportional representation, however, unlike the Fabian Society.¹⁷⁹ The Social Democratic Federation newspaper, *Justice*, commented in December 1884 that it was 'the fairest form of electing either representatives or delegates. It puts an end to jerry-mandering of constituencies' and 'the excessive influence of corrupt middle class caucuses'. It added that 'we are glad to see that a body of Parliament men have taken up this point' but regretted that 'the hands of Socialists are quite full with their own definite social agitation, and they can spare no time for this political movement'.¹⁸⁰

In London in January 1885, the Proportional Representation Society convened a meeting of trade union delegates. Lubbock, Courtney, and Westlake denied being opposed to the Redistribution Bill and explained that 'all that they proposed to do was to move an alteration of its clauses in Committee, giving effect to their ideas'.¹⁸¹ They defended Hare's electoral system and, as at other meetings, conducted a test election. At a meeting held in Oxford in February at which Lubbock, Courtney, and Grey spoke, the chair was occupied by Sir William Anson, the warden of All Souls' College,¹⁸² and at Cambridge in the same month, a meeting concerning proportional representation was presided over by Henry Sidgwick, a fellow of Trinity College and Knightbridge Professor of Moral Philosophy.¹⁸³ Although Sidgwick favoured proportional representation, he had written in December 1884 that 'its advocates seem to me to be flogging a dead horse'.¹⁸⁴ Indeed, most considered the crusade to be quixotic. Howell wrote to Grey in the same month that the Proportional Representation Society 'is too late in its action to do any good',¹⁸⁵ and Cowen wrote to Grey in January 1885 that 'I only wish there was more hope of your success than is'.¹⁸⁶

Meanwhile, Grey had taken the campaign to Northumberland, where he had formed the North of England Proportional Representation League in December 1884.¹⁸⁷ At the office in Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Grey was the president, and the secretary was Samuel Neil, a miner from

Seaton Delaval and a member of the Northumberland Miners' Political Reform Association.¹⁸⁸ Neil had been in contact with Grey since 1880 through the Northumberland university extension movement,¹⁸⁹ and obtained books from him.¹⁹⁰ In 1884, Grey sent proportional representation literature to Neil,¹⁹¹ and Neil discussed with Grey the possibility of organizing the movement in Northumberland.¹⁹² To do so was encouraged by Lubbock, who wrote to Grey, 'If you can carry out your plan with Neil it will be very important, & a great help.'¹⁹³ Neil proceeded to write a pamphlet on proportional representation published as 'an address to working men', extracts from which were published in the *Manchester Guardian*.¹⁹⁴ Grey spoke on Hare's electoral system at a meeting of miners held at Seghill on 6 December, and at a meeting that followed on 13 December it was decided to form the League.¹⁹⁵ Grey and Neil, joined by Courtney, conducted test elections in Newcastle-upon-Tyne and Seghill in December and January 1885,¹⁹⁶ and further meetings in support of Hare's electoral system were held in January and February.¹⁹⁷ Such meetings had a limited impact on the working class, however, as forewarned by the *Newcastle Chronicle*, which in February 1884 had supported the position of Gladstone 'concerning the constitutional basis of our system', explaining: 'He denies that numbers should be the only test of political power, and believes that parliamentary representation should bear the impress of local life and peculiarities.'¹⁹⁸

In addition to holding public meetings, the Proportional Representation Society also published and distributed various pamphlets, including reprints of speeches by Mill and Fawcett.¹⁹⁹ A leaflet written by Courtney, *Is Proportional Representation a Puzzle?*, was intended to refute the accusation by Gladstone that it was a *pons asinorum*.²⁰⁰ In the *Fortnightly Review* in January 1885, Courtney attacked the Redistribution Bill: 'Some may stubbornly doubt, in the teeth of experience, that elections through single-membered districts may result in a balance in the Legislature contrary to the opinion of the nation; but all will admit that such elections tend to exclude all but strictly party candidates, and to deprive the minority in great spaces of country of any share of representation.'²⁰¹ 'The ideal we would go forward to make real', he argued, 'is the enlistment into the House of Commons in their proportional strength of all the political forces that go together to make up the political life of the country', adding: 'It is a labour to be completed in the future – at another time and by other hands. But we may begin it now.'²⁰² He appended to the article an explanation of the operation of the single transferable vote.²⁰³ In the following month in an article in the *Nineteenth Century* he joined Lubbock, Grey, and Westlake in

answering objections to proportional representation raised by Gladstone and Shaw-Lefevre, among others, defending the single transferable vote and concluding that the Franchise Bill 'will necessitate continual rearrangements of boundaries, will greatly increase the difficulties of the Irish problem, and will fail to secure the main object of representation, namely, that a majority of the electors should secure a majority of representatives in the House of Commons'.²⁰⁴ Also in February, Lonsdale Broderick, a member of the Proportional Representation Society, spoke in favour of Hare's electoral system at a meeting of the Manchester Statistical Society. Addressing the question of the Franchise Bill, he suggested that 'if it appear that an arrangement designed to commit the political life of the country to the wire pullers of the two prominent parties, that results in distorted representation, is bad, then the ground has been cleared for a system which would avoid these evils and secure as far as practicable a natural and real representation of the opinion of the country'.²⁰⁵ Hare's single transferable vote, he maintained, 'seems to me better calculated to accomplish this result than any other plan brought into public notice'.²⁰⁶

Hare himself, who in January provided the society with copies of the report of the Reform League meeting in 1868 and others of his works,²⁰⁷ in February 1885 contributed a final article on proportional representation to the *Fortnightly Review*, to which Shaw-Lefevre contributed an attack on the 'crusade' of Courtney, Lubbock, and Grey.²⁰⁸ Hare maintained regarding the Redistribution Bill that 'it may not unreasonably be suspected that some part of it is due to the influence of Mr Chamberlain' and emphasized that 'of the modifications of our constitutional system which he seems to desire I entertain great dread', adding a further warning: 'The electoral and single member district once established, the attempt to introduce the payment of members, thereby to make the dominance of the majorities irrevocable, will certainly follow.'²⁰⁹ He denounced the proposed 'vivesection' of 'the greater cities and towns' such as Birmingham, Manchester, and Liverpool: 'For the preservation of the political status of Liverpool, connected, as it is, with my earliest associations and labours on subjects of public import, I would earnestly plead. . . . If Liverpool had then been divided into wards, would any of them have been represented by Canning or Huskisson?'²¹⁰ Hare argued as he had in *The Machinery of Representation* in 1857 for 'voluntary associations . . . as the constituencies which would under the proportional system be represented by the most distinguished and able men in the kingdom'.²¹¹ He quoted from the last speech delivered by Fawcett at Hackney in October 1884 and concluded: 'Whatever

else may be done or omitted, let us not be without the ameliorating influences of the votes of women at the general elections of the future.²¹²

Apart from a short contribution to the slim volume *Why I am a Liberal* in 1885,²¹³ and an article published in *La Représentation Proportionnelle* in the same year,²¹⁴ Hare wrote nothing further on the reform of political representation. As he explained to Lubbock later in 1885: 'At my advanced years, and with official duties daily to perform, I have really given up the consideration of details in the method, – leaving the question of details to younger and clearer heads.'²¹⁵

In the House of Commons on 2 March during the debate on the committee stage of the Redistribution Bill, Lubbock moved an amendment for the single transferable vote, referring to the public meetings that had been held in favour of proportional representation.²¹⁶ He was supported by Grey,²¹⁷ and both were opposed by Dilke and Shaw-Lefevre.²¹⁸ On the following night, Courtney joined the debate in support of Lubbock,²¹⁹ but the amendment was defeated by 134 to 31.²²⁰ Of those voting with Lubbock, Courtney, and Grey all but five were members of the Proportional Representation Society, including Conservatives as well as Liberals. Among those voting with Dilke and Shaw-Lefevre were Chamberlain and Gladstone. On 6 March, the Redistribution Bill as further debated in the committee stage excluded proportional representation.

On the same day, the executive committee of the Proportional Representation Society decided to move for a parliamentary committee on voting in school board elections.²²¹ The cabinet did not object,²²² and in the House of Commons on 24 March, Lubbock moved for a select committee to examine the operation of the cumulative vote in school board elections.²²³ The committee was approved and met from April to July.²²⁴ Ten of the twenty-three members of the committee, including Lubbock and Courtney, were members of the Proportional Representation Society, and the committee functioned in part as a forum for advocacy of the single transferable vote as an alternative to the cumulative vote. One of the witnesses was Courtney himself, and the last was Neil, who was examined by Lubbock and explained the test election in Seghill, claiming that the miners in the Northumberland Political Reform Association 'as a body are strongly in favour of the system, and have adopted it in several of their own elections'.²²⁵ Committee opinion was divided, however, and only the evidence was reported.

Meanwhile in May, the Redistribution Bill was approved in the House of Commons, and in June, shortly before the government was

defeated on the budget and a Conservative ministry was formed by Salisbury, the bill was approved in the House of Lords. The single-member constituencies thereby created were criticized by Lubbock in a short book, *Representation*, published in the same year, in which he defended Hare's electoral system and warned that 'the system of single seats will but seldom give a fair representation of the electorate'.²²⁶ Its effect in the general election of 1885, in which Courtney was returned for Bodmin, Grey for Tyneside, Howell for North-East Bethnal Green, and Westlake for Romford, was marked in Birmingham. There the Liberals, including Chamberlain and Bright, won the seats in all of the borough divisions, excluding all minorities: 'We are seven.'²²⁷ Lubbock discussed the election results in a letter published in the *Daily News* on 22 December in which he complained that the effect of single-member constituencies had been 'to exclude a considerable number of our ablest and most trusted leaders', 'to annihilate the Liberal representation in Ireland', and 'to give the Parnellites more representatives than they are entitled to'.²²⁸ His letter was printed as a leaflet by the Proportional Representation Society in January 1886 and distributed with copies of *Representation* to members of Parliament.²²⁹

As of 1886, Lubbock and Courtney, joined in the House of Commons by Morrison, who in the general election of that year was returned for Skipton while Grey and Westlake were defeated, were allied with Chamberlain and Bright in opposition to the Irish Home Rule policy of Gladstone which split the Liberal party and in support of the Conservative ministry of Salisbury.²³⁰ The dispute over proportional representation continued, however. When in 1888 the ministry proposed a reform of local government, the Proportional Representation Society organized a deputation to Salisbury and C.T. Ritchie, the Conservative member for St George's in the East and the President of the Local Government Board, to suggest that county councils be elected by the single transferable vote. The deputation which met with Salisbury and Ritchie on 2 March was led by Lubbock and included Courtney, Morrison, Westlake, and Hare.²³¹ Salisbury stated that he could say nothing as the bill for local government reform was still under discussion by the cabinet.²³² When subsequently introduced in the House of Commons, the Local Government Bill provided for the election of provincial county councils by majority voting in single-member districts and for the election of a London County Council by the block vote in multi-member constituencies, a majority system by which an elector has the same number of votes as seats but may not give more than one vote to

a candidate, the same system applied to double-member parliamentary districts by the Redistribution Act.²³³

In the House of Commons on 16 April, Courtney in a lengthy speech emphasized the importance of the Local Government Bill, but attacked the provision of single-member districts, arguing: 'People are alarmed about the disestablishment of the squirearchy and the advantages which will be given to democracy. . . . I object to the Bill, not because it is too democratic, but because it is not democratic enough.'²³⁴ To this end he advocated the adoption of multi-member districts with the single transferable vote: 'The system I plead for secures for everyone an interest in the government of the country to which he belongs; it secures the majority in their power, and does not deprive the minority of their just influence. . . . The democracy would be supreme, but it would be a democracy reflecting the whole community; and small and great, rich and poor, the squire and farmer, and the labourer may all expect to be thrown in.'²³⁵ In opposition to Courtney, Chamberlain remarked that his 'speech is one that might with great propriety have been made before the Reform Bill of 1832' and objected that he 'is always in the belief that the majority of the people are inclined to go wrong – that the majority of the people do not know what is best for them – and, in these circumstances, he wants to secure some plan by which superior persons of prominence and ability – who are not popular enough to get elected – shall get upon the Council'.²³⁶ Subsequently on 12 June, when Lubbock with the support of Morrison moved an amendment for proportional representation,²³⁷ Chamberlain and Ritchie spoke against the amendment,²³⁸ and it was defeated by a majority of 278.²³⁹

Two years later, on 25 June 1888, Lubbock, Courtney, Westlake, and Bompas held the last meeting of the executive committee of the Proportional Representation Society until its revival in 1905,²⁴⁰ thereby ending the Victorian proportional representation movement. Despite its failure, however, *The Times* referred to Thomas Hare following his death in 1891 as 'a man whose name is familiar to all thoughtful students of the theory of politics'.²⁴¹

Conclusion

The proportional representation movement in Britain as revived in the twentieth century is beyond the scope of this work other than to note that it was no less a failure than in the nineteenth century.¹ In the twenty-first century, however, the extensive writings of Thomas Hare on political representation remain of more than antiquarian interest, for as Quentin Skinner has suggested with reference to the neo-Roman or republican theory of civil liberty in the seventeenth century, the historical study of political ideas in context can contribute to a clarification of contemporary alternatives.² With regard to ideas of political representation in modern Britain, the principle of virtual representation has been sustained within the electoral system which has been maintained since the Victorian period, parliamentary reform having been confined to extension of the franchise and redistribution of seats without having been concerned with alteration of the plurality system of voting in single-member territorial constituencies. Meanwhile, the principle of personal representation has been contained within the alternative system of election by the single transferable vote in multi-member territorial constituencies associated with proportional representation, but such has been obscured by the limited attention devoted to the writings of Hare.

Within the context of nineteenth-century democratisation, the substantial contribution of Hare to public debate over the nature and function of political representation in Victorian Britain was related to eighteenth-century public debate over virtual representation,³ which principle he rejected and proposed to replace by the principle of personal representation in *The Machinery of Representation* in 1857 and at greater length in *A Treatise on the Election of Representatives, Parliamentary and Municipal* in 1859 followed by additional writings during

the 1860s. The electoral system of the single transferable vote within the context of a national constituency, which he proposed during the 1850s, as a means to the end of personal representation was conceptually related to the limited vote and the cumulative vote, all having been proposed for the purpose of the representation of minorities. That these electoral systems were proposed amid public debate over parliamentary reform within the context of political diffusion between 1846 and 1859 indicates that the issue of the representation of minorities was raised in response to a multi-party system of Tories, Peelites, Whigs, and radicals during those years. Neither the limited vote nor the cumulative vote, however, offered an alternative to the principle of virtual representation as did the single transferable vote proposed by Hare in accordance with the principle of personal representation.

A significant aspect of personal representation was elitism. The emphasis by Hare on electoral protection of the educated elite, or clerisy as defined by Samuel Taylor Coleridge, had affinity with the position of Whigs rather than of radicals associated with the utilitarianism of Jeremy Bentham. A barrister in the employ of the Charity Commission and a high Anglican, Hare was a member of the Victorian clerisy, participating in the deliberations of the Social Science Association as well as other political and literary societies and accordingly communicating with others of like mind such as Henry Fawcett. This aspect of personal representation attracted the support of John Stuart Mill in his fear of the 'tyranny of the majority' in a democratic polity as observed in America by Alexis de Tocqueville. The defence of personal representation by the single transferable vote in Mill's writings during the 1850s and 1860s was supplementary to the advocacy in Hare's *Treatise*. Likewise, the criticism of the representation of minorities in the writings of Walter Bagehot during the same period was in reply to Hare as well as to Mill. Meanwhile, the writings of Hare were being read beyond Britain within the context of an international dimension of the movement for the representation of minorities.

Another significant aspect of personal representation was pluralism, as Hare emphasized that 'many sided all great subjects are'.⁴ Such was of particular relevance to the Liberal party as a coalition of Whigs, radicals, and Peelites, the formation of which in 1859 ended political diffusion and restored a two-party system. After 1859, the principle of personal representation was related to the diversity of opinion within the Liberal party rather than to the electoral competition between the Liberal and Conservative parties. Thus it was in the interest of party cohesion

that Liberal leaders such as William Gladstone, who endorsed dualism,⁵ and John Bright opposed the representation of minorities by the limited vote, the cumulative vote, and the single transferable vote, as they did during the debates in the House of Commons on the Second Reform Act in 1867. Personal representation by the single transferable vote as moved by Mill was defeated, although the limited vote, or minority clause, as introduced in the House of Lords was adopted for 13 multi-member constituencies with the support of the Conservative leader Benjamin Disraeli.

As the Second Reform Act was concerned with franchise extension rather than with the electoral system of plurality voting in territorial constituencies, Hare continued to advocate personal representation and the single transferable vote in further works during the 1870s and by means of the Representative Reform Association which he led between 1868 and 1874. His campaign was supported by Liberal members of Parliament such as Walter Morrison and Thomas Hughes as well as by Mill and Fawcett. Among supporters outside the House of Commons were Henry Richmond Droop and Walter Baily, who contributed works on political representation, Droop introducing a modified calculation of the quota required for election by the single transferable vote, which came to bear his name. As party organization became increasingly significant after the Second Reform Act, Droop and Baily among others proposed that the single transferable vote be applied within multi-member constituencies and in so doing contributed to the concept and terminology of proportional representation as the representation of political parties, while maintaining the principle of personal representation, a modification which Hare accepted albeit with reluctance.

During these years, the Liberal ministry formed by Gladstone in 1868 rested on the fragile support of various groups with diverse concerns, religion in particular, for which reason the cumulative vote was accepted for the election of school boards introduced by the Elementary Education Act in 1870. Hare and his associates defended the cumulative vote in school board elections, but the Liberal leaders remained opposed to the representation of minorities in Parliament which was expected to facilitate centrifugal tendencies and not be conducive to cohesive support for the party or ministry. The issue was practical as well as theoretical due to opposition to the cumulative vote and to the minority clause alike by the Liberals in Birmingham led by Joseph Chamberlain and Bright whose party organization, or caucus, was developed to

overcome the obstacles of both electoral systems so as to exclude minority representation. In advocating abolition of the cumulative vote and the minority clause, with which they associated the single transferable vote, they increased the significance of the issue of proportional representation within the Liberal party and defended the principle of virtual representation.

After the Gladstone ministry collapsed and the Representative Reform Association was dissolved in 1874, opposition to the representation of minorities was continued into the 1880s by the National Liberal Federation founded in 1877 and led by the Birmingham Liberals. Thus development of extra-parliamentary party organization involved the debate over proportion representation, and the writings of Hare continued to be of significance as the single transferable vote was considered to be another possible obstacle to the caucus. The National Liberal Federation supported the electoral system of plurality voting in single-member territorial constituencies, the abolition of the minority clause, and the exclusion of proportional representation. Following the formation of a second Gladstone ministry in 1880 and the prospect of further parliamentary reform, Gladstone, Chamberlain, and Bright had a common interest in opposition to proportional representation, in response to which the Proportional Representation Society was formed by Sir John Lubbock, Leonard Courtney, and Albert Grey, Liberals in Parliament who were opposed to the caucus.

During the debates in the House of Commons on the Third Reform Act in 1884 and the Redistribution Act in 1885, the writings of Hare were the source of proportional representation by the single transferable vote advocated by Lubbock, Courtney, and Grey but denounced by Gladstone as a *pons asinorum*.⁶ In keeping with the principle of virtual representation denounced by Hare in his *Treatise* in 1859 as 'the *ignis fatuus* of the politicians of this century',⁷ Gladstone supported not only the extension of the franchise but also the extension of single-member territorial constituencies as proposed for electoral advantage by Lord Salisbury, the leader of the Conservative party, thereby abolishing the minority clause, which had been opposed by Gladstone and Chamberlain since 1867. Thus the party system determined the electoral system,⁸ maintaining plurality voting and sustaining the principle of virtual representation, thereby excluding proportional representation by the single transferable vote and rejecting the principle of personal representation. Subsequent divergence of Gladstone and Chamberlain and convergence of Chamberlain and Lubbock over the issue of Irish Home

Rule did not alter their respective positions on the issue of proportional representation, however. This high politics of parliamentary reform in Victorian Britain as emphasized by Maurice Cowling was informed by the rhetoric of public debate which was influenced by the writings of Thomas Hare on political representation.

Notes

Introduction

1. Michael St John Packe, *The Life of John Stuart Mill*, pp. 415–8, 436, 457, 478; Nicholas Capaldi, *John Stuart Mill*, 293, 298, 301, 303; Richard Reeves, *John Stuart Mill*, pp. 309–14, 321, 324, 341, 347, 389, 429; John M. Robson, *The Improvement of Mankind*, pp. 199–200, 228, 231–3; Bruce L. Kinzer, Ann P. Robson, and John M. Robson, *A Moralist In and Out of Parliament*, pp. 87, 100, 126, 104–7, 133, 136, 284, 292; Bruce L. Kinzer, *J.S. Mill Revisited*, pp. 164, 167, 169, 192, 195, 198; Dennis F. Thompson, *John Stuart Mill and Representative Government*, pp. 102–12. See also Paul B. Kern, ‘Universal Suffrage without Democracy’.
2. Jenifer Hart, *Proportional Representation*, Chapters 2 and 3. Her father, J. Fisher Williams, also wrote on proportional representation of which he was an advocate. See Jenifer Hart, *Ask Me No More*, pp. 160–1.
3. John H. Humphreys, *Proportional Representation*, Chapters 7 and 9; J.F.S. Ross, *Elections and Electors*, pp. 94, 157–9; Enid Lakeman, *How Democracies Vote*, pp. 27, 113, 117, 152, 287–8. These authors were associated with the Proportional Representation Society founded in 1884 and renamed the Electoral Reform Society in 1958. See also from the American proportional representation movement Clarence Gilbert Hoag and George Hervey Hallett, Jr., *Proportional Representation*, pp. 175–7.
4. Vernon Bogdanor, *The People and the Party System*, pp. 99, 104–12, 142, 212, 232, 248; Michael Steed, ‘The Evolution of the British Electoral System’, p. 40; Stein Rokkan, *Citizens, Elections, Parties*, pp. 162–4. See also Andrew McLaren Carstairs, *A Short History of Electoral Systems in Western Europe*, pp. 1–4, 193–4.
5. J.W. Burrow, *Whigs and Liberals*, pp. 17, 123, 138–9, 149.
6. Christopher Harvie, *The Lights of Liberalism*, pp. 118, 134, 187; Ian Bradley, *The Optimists*, p. 161; Stefan Collini, *Public Moralists*, pp. 194, 322, 325.
7. Mark Francis and John Morrow, *A History of English Political Thought in the Nineteenth Century*, pp. 140, 237, 247; Jon Roper, *Democracy and Its Critics*, pp. 150–1, 154; Iain Hampsher-Monk, *A History of Modern Political Thought*, p. 395. H.S. Jones does not refer to Hare in *Victorian Political Thought*.
8. Hanna Fenichel Pitkin, *The Concept of Representation*, pp. 62–3; A.H. Birch, *Representative and Responsible Government*, pp. 62–3; Iain McLean, ‘Forms of Representation and Voting Systems’, p. 179.
9. K. Theodore Hoppen, *The Mid-Victorian Generation*, p. 238. See also G.I.T. Machin, *The Rise of Democracy in Britain*, pp. 48–9, 86; Jonathan Parry, *The Rise and Fall of Liberal Government in Victorian Britain*, p. 209.
10. Lawrence Goldman, *Science, Reform, and Politics in Victorian Britain*, pp. 17, 67, 103, 125, 283–7.
11. On Fawcett and Hare see Lawrence Goldman, ‘Introduction: “An Advanced Liberal”’, p. 10; Lawrence Goldman, ‘Henry Fawcett and the Social Science

- Association', p. 155; Stefan Collini, '“Manly Fellows”', pp. 46, 48. On Howell and Hare see F.M. Leventhal, *Respectable Radical*, pp. 135–6 concerning the Representative Reform Association.
12. David Owen, *English Philanthropy*, pp. 203–4, 308, 321, 325–7, 333.
 13. Henry Pelling, *America and the British Left*, pp. 12–13.
 14. Miles Taylor, *The Decline of British Radicalism*; Jonathan Parry, *Democracy and Religion*; Jonathan Parry, *The Politics of Patriotism*; T.A. Jenkins, *Gladstone, Whiggery and the Liberal Party*; Eugenio Biagini, *Liberty, Retrenchment and Reform*; Eugenio Biagini, *British Democracy and Irish Nationalism*.
 15. F.B. Smith, *The Making of the Second Reform Bill*, pp. 212–13; Maurice Cowling, 1867, p. 22; Andrew Jones, *The Politics of Reform 1884*, pp. 95, 97, 99, 101; William A. Hayes, *The Background and Passage of the Third Reform Act*, pp. 117–18 concerning Sir John Lubbock and the Proportional Representation Society without direct reference to Hare.
 16. See H.J. Hanham, *Elections and Party Management*, p. 96 concerning Mill and debate over proportional representation without direct reference to Hare.
 17. See in this regard the inaugural lecture by Derek Beales, 'History and Biography'.
 18. See in this regard H.C.G. Matthew, 'Rhetoric and Politics in Great Britain,' and Brian Harrison, 'The Rhetoric of Reform in Modern Britain', pp. 378–85.
 19. On contextual methodology in intellectual history see Quentin Skinner, 'Meaning and Understanding in the History of Ideas', and John Dunn, 'The Identity of the History of Ideas'.
 20. See the discussion of high politics by Maurice Cowling in 1867, pp. 311–40, and by Andrew Jones in *The Politics of Reform 1884*, pp. 236–7. See also Michael Bentley, 'Party, Doctrine, and Thought', pp. 128–32.
 21. See the comments on the relationship between political language and high politics by Jonathan Parry in *The Politics of Patriotism*, pp. 31–2. See also Eugenio Biagini, *British Democracy and Irish Nationalism*, p. 15.

1 The Life and Work of Thomas Hare, 1806–1891

1. Quoted in A.C. Benson, *The Life of Edward White Benson*, II, p. 399.
2. See the emphasis on continuity between the late seventeenth century and the early nineteenth century in Britain as an *ancien régime* by J.C.D. Clark in *English Society*, pp. 14–42, *passim*. For a critique see Joanna Innes, 'Jonathan Clark, Social History and England's "Ancien Regime"', to which Clark responded in 'On Hitting the Buffers: The Historiography of England's Ancien Regime'. See also the emphasis on transformation by Boyd Hilton in *A Mad, Bad, and Dangerous People?*, pp. 24–31.
3. The parents of Thomas Hare, not identified by W.P. Courtney in his entry on Hare in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, were identified for me by David Roberts, whose maternal grandmother was Katherine Clayton, a daughter of Thomas Hare. On the early life of Hare see also Jenifer Hart, *Proportional Representation*, pp. 24–6.
4. Typescript memoir by Katherine Esdaile, p. 2. The mother of Katherine Esdaile, Ada McDowall, was a sister of Eleanor Bowes Benson, the second wife of Thomas Hare. After Ada died in childbirth, Katherine, who was born

- in 1881, lived in the home of Hare until the death of Eleanor in 1890, this according to the manuscript memoir by Katherine Clayton, p. 26, for whom see note 3 above.
5. Typescript memoir by Katherine Esdaile, p. 1, which information she attributed to her father, Andrew McDowall, who with his daughter Katherine is treated briefly by David Newsome in *On the Edge of Paradise*, p. 127.
 6. On Huskisson, free trade and the Navigation Acts see Boyd Hilton, *Corn, Cash, Commerce*, pp. 197–200; Barry Gordon, *Economic Doctrine and Tory Liberalism*, pp. 103–5; Sarah Palmer, *Politics, Shipping and the Repeal of the Navigation Laws*, pp. 50–2, 68–70.
 7. In 1885, Hare wrote that the city of Liverpool was ‘connected... with my earliest associations and labours on subjects of public import.... In the library of the Athenaeum there... I gathered materials for a publication in support of one of the first of the legislative attempts of Mr Huskisson to promote commercial freedom.’ See Thomas Hare, ‘Representation and Misrepresentation: II. The Coming Steps in Representation’, p. 221. The role of Huskisson in the publication of *The Maritime Policy of Great Britain* is indicated in the Hare obituary by his son-in-law John Westlake in the *Academy*, 16 May 1891, p. 465.
 8. See David Robinson, ‘The Shipping Interest’. On Robinson and *Blackwood’s* see Harold Perkin, *The Origins of Modern English Society*, pp. 244–52; Boyd Hilton, *The Age of Atonement*, p. 36; Anna Gambles, *Protection and Politics*, pp. 154–5; Anna Gambles, ‘Rethinking the Politics of Protection’; David Eastwood, ‘Tories and Markets’, pp. 82–3, 87; S. Rashid, ‘David Robinson’.
 9. Thomas Hare, *The Maritime Policy of Great Britain*, p. 4.
 10. *Ibid.*, p. 5.
 11. *Ibid.*, p. 10.
 12. *Ibid.*, pp. 12–13.
 13. *Ibid.*, pp. 14–15.
 14. *Ibid.*, p. 15.
 15. *Ibid.*, p. 17.
 16. *Ibid.*, p. 21.
 17. *Ibid.*, pp. 22–3.
 18. *Ibid.*, pp. 23–4.
 19. *Ibid.*, pp. 25–6.
 20. *Ibid.*, p. 26. See also Edmund Burke, *On Conciliation with America*, p. 265.
 21. Thomas Hare, *The Maritime Policy of Great Britain*, p. 82.
 22. See Adam Smith, *The Wealth of Nations*, pp. 39–42. On Smith, free trade and the Navigation Acts see D.D. Raphael, *Adam Smith*, pp. 76–7; Donald Winch, *Adam Smith’s Politics*, pp. 98, 150; Sarah Palmer, *Politics, Shipping and the Repeal of the Navigation Laws*, pp. 70–1.
 23. Thomas Hare, *The Maritime Policy of Great Britain*, p. 24. On Smith and natural law see Knud Haakonssen, *The Science of a Legislator*, pp. 147–51, and *Natural Law and Moral Philosophy*, pp. 130–5.
 24. Thomas Hare, *Maritime Policy of Great Britain*, p. 3. On the empiricism of Smith see D.D. Raphael, *Adam Smith*, pp. 73, 92.
 25. On the rationalism of Ricardo see Elie Halévy, *The Growth of Philosophic Radicalism*, pp. 266–73.

26. See Jeremy Bentham, *Plan of Parliamentary Reform, in the Form of a Catechism*, pp. xxxvi–lxxvi, and James Mackintosh, 'Universal Suffrage'. On Bentham and universal suffrage see Elie Halévy, *The Growth of Philosophic Radicalism*, pp. 412–17; William Thomas, *The Philosophic Radicals*, pp. 15–45; Philip Schofield, *Utility and Democracy*, pp. 137–70; J.R. Dinwiddy, 'Bentham's Transition to Political Radicalism', pp. 280–9; Frederick Rosen, 'Jeremy Bentham's Radicalism', pp. 217–23; J.C.D. Clark, 'Religion and the Origins of Radicalism in Britain', pp. 257–60. On the criticism of Bentham by Mackintosh see Donald Winch, 'The Cause of Good Government', p. 98; Biancamaria Fontana, *Rethinking the Politics of Commercial Society*, p. 150; J.R. Dinwiddy, 'Early-Nineteenth-Century Reactions to Benthamism', pp. 353–4. See also Mark Francis and John Morrow, *A History of English Political Thought in the Nineteenth Century*, pp. 82–9; Knud Haakonssen, *Natural Law and Moral Philosophy*, pp. 285–93.
27. See James Mill, *Essay on Government*, pp. 4, 11. See also his 'Reply to Macaulay from *A Fragment on Mackintosh*' of 1835. On James Mill and rationalism see Elie Halévy, *The Growth of Philosophic Radicalism*, pp. 492–9; William Thomas, *The Philosophic Radicals*, pp. 95–146; William Thomas, 'James Mill's Politics: The "Essay on Government"'; William Thomas, 'James Mill's Politics: A Rejoinder'; J.P. Dinwiddy, 'James Mill on Burke's Doctrine of Prescription'; J.P. Dinwiddy, 'Burke and the Utilitarians'; J.C.D. Clark, *English Society*, pp. 159–62. See also Mark Francis and John Morrow, *A History of English Political Thought in the Nineteenth Century*, pp. 49–66; Knud Haakonssen, *Natural Law and Moral Philosophy*, pp. 304–9.
28. See Thomas Babington Macaulay, 'Mill's Essay on Government'; Thomas Babington Macaulay, 'Bentham's Defence of Mill'; Thomas Babington Macaulay, 'Utilitarian Theory of Government'. On Macaulay and empiricism see John Clive, *Macaulay*, pp. 130–2; Joseph Hamburger, *Macaulay and the Whig Tradition*, pp. 50–2. On the criticism of Mill by Macaulay see Donald Winch, 'The Cause of Good Government', pp. 99–105; William Thomas, *The Quarrel of Macaulay and Croker*, pp. 84–7; Biancamaria Fontana, *Rethinking the Politics of Commercial Society*, pp. 160–4; Biancamaria Fontana, 'Whigs and Liberals', pp. 47–8. See also Mark Francis and John Morrow, *A History of English Political Thought in the Nineteenth Century*, pp. 89–102; P.R. Ghosh, 'Macaulay and the Heritage of the Enlightenment', pp. 360–1.
29. W.P. Courtney, 'Thomas Hare', p. 390.
30. Thomas Hare to William Huskisson, 28 January 1830, Huskisson Papers, Add. MSS 38758, ff. 99–117. In forwarding his letter, Hare explained to Edward Leves, the private secretary of Huskisson: 'Should Mr Huskisson consider the publication of the suggestions therein made, as likely to be in any respect useful and not calculated to embarrass a subject already sufficiently complicated, I would certainly take that step, but otherwise I should not do so, as I have simply taken the liberty to forward it for the perusal of Mr Huskisson'. Thomas Hare to Edward Leves, 28 January 1830, Huskisson Papers, Add. MSS 38758, f. 97.
31. On the East India Company charters and China see C.A. Bayly, *Indian Society and the Making of the British Empire*, pp. 76, 116; J.H. Clapham, *An Economic*

- History of Modern Britain*, pp. 251, 486. With reference to Huskisson see Boyd Hilton, *Corn, Cash, Commerce*, pp. 198–200.
32. Thomas Hare to William Huskisson, 28 January 1830, Huskisson Papers, Add. MSS 38758, f. 102.
 33. *Ibid.*, ff. 102–3.
 34. *Ibid.*, f. 110.
 35. *Ibid.*, f. 111.
 36. *Ibid.*, f. 112.
 37. *Ibid.*, ff. 113–4.
 38. *Ibid.*, f. 116.
 39. *Ibid.*, f. 117.
 40. *Ibid.*, ff. 117–8.
 41. On James Mill and *The History of British India* see Eric Stokes, *The English Utilitarians and India*, pp. 47–80; William Thomas, *The Philosophic Radicals*, pp. 97–119; J.W. Burrow, *Evolution and Society*, pp. 42–9; Donald Winch, 'The Cause of Good Government', pp. 114–18; Knud Haakonssen, *Natural Law and Moral Philosophy*, pp. 296–304; Lynn Zastoupil, *John Stuart Mill and India*, pp. 7–27; Javed Majeed, 'James Mill's *The History of British India*'. See also Duncan Forbes, 'James Mill and India'.
 42. According to Katherine Clayton in her manuscript memoir, p. 1, Huskisson had intended to employ Hare as a secretary, and according to Katherine Esdaile in her typescript memoir, p. 1, Hare claimed to have been present when Huskisson was killed, but neither assertion has been substantiated.
 43. On the legal profession see Daniel Duman, *The English and Colonial Bars in the Nineteenth Century*, pp. 78–120; Daniel Duman, 'Pathway to Professionalism'.
 44. W.P. Courtney, 'Thomas Hare', p. 390.
 45. On the Court of Chancery and equity law see J.H. Baker, *An Introduction to English Legal History*, pp. 97–116.
 46. See James Wigram, *Points in the Law of Discovery*, p. 1 n. See also William Holdsworth, *A History of English Law*, pp. 309–10. On legal treatises see C.J.W. Allen, *The Law of Evidence in Victorian England*, pp. 14–25.
 47. See J.C. Fox, *A Handbook of English Law Reports*, pp. 70–1; William Holdsworth, *A History of English Law*, p. 261. See also William Holdsworth, 'Law Reporting in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries'. On law reporters see C.J.W. Allen, *The Law of Evidence in Victorian England*, pp. 25–6.
 48. On the Charitable Trusts Act of 1853 see David Owen, *English Philanthropy*, pp. 202–3; Richard Thompson, *The Charity Commission and the Age of Reform*, pp. 213–16; W.L. Burn, *The Age of Equipoise*, pp. 198–9. See also Brian Harrison, 'Philanthropy and the Victorians'.
 49. W.P. Courtney, 'Thomas Hare', p. 390.
 50. *Ibid.*
 51. See *Parliamentary Papers*, 1880, XX, pp. 367–734.
 52. See *Parliamentary Papers*, 1884, XXXIX, Vol. 1, pp. 89–106, and *Parliamentary Papers*, 1884, XXXIX, Vol. 4.
 53. David Owen, *English Philanthropy*, pp. 203–4. See also David Owen, 'The City Parochial Charities', p. 121.
 54. David Owen, *English Philanthropy*, p. 327.

55. Evidence by Thomas Hare in 1860 before the Newcastle Commission on Popular Education, in *Parliamentary Papers*, 1861, XXI, Vol. 6, p. 485.
56. *Ibid.*
57. Thomas Hare, 'A Letter to the Mayor of the City of Salisbury', in *ibid.*, p. 492. Hare referred to Chalmers as one who had 'the zeal of a Christian as well as the intelligence of a philosopher'. On the influence of Chalmers and his attitude to charity see Boyd Hilton, *The Age of Atonement*, pp. 55–63, 85–9, 101, 104. See also Boyd Hilton, 'Chalmers as Political Economist'.
58. Thomas Hare, 'A Letter to the Mayor of the City of Salisbury', in *Parliamentary Papers*, 1861, XXI, Vol. 6, p. 504.
59. *Ibid.*, p. 491. In his evidence before the Newcastle Commission in *ibid.*, p. 485, Hare indicated that a revised version of his letter had been printed for general circulation in Salisbury by a local journalist.
60. *Ibid.*, p. 491.
61. *Ibid.*, p. 492.
62. *Ibid.*, p. 493.
63. *Ibid.*
64. *Ibid.*, p. 499.
65. *Ibid.*, p. 502.
66. *Ibid.*, pp. 503–4.
67. *Ibid.*, p. 504.
68. *Ibid.*, pp. 488–9.
69. *Ibid.*, p. 490.
70. *Ibid.*, p. 505.
71. *Ibid.*, p. 506.
72. Thomas Hare, 'On Endowments Created for the Apprenticeship of Children', p. 293.
73. *Ibid.*, p. 294.
74. *Ibid.*, p. 292.
75. *Ibid.*, p. 296.
76. *Ibid.*
77. See Lawrence Goldman, *Science, Reform, and Politics in Victorian Britain*, pp. 1–23, 61–84. See also Brian Rodgers, 'The Social Science Association'.
78. Thomas Hare, 'On the Application of Endowed Charities', p. 237.
79. *Ibid.*, pp. 240–1.
80. *Ibid.*, pp. 239–40.
81. *Ibid.*, p. 240.
82. *Ibid.*, pp. 240–1.
83. *Ibid.*, p. 241.
84. See the comment in this regard by Jenifer Hart in *Proportional Representation*, pp. 25–6.
85. For *The Machinery of Representation* and *A Treatise on the Election of Representatives*, *Parliamentary and Municipal* see Chapter 2.
86. For the Second Reform Act see Chapter 3, and for the Third Reform Act see Chapter 6.
87. The *Transactions* of the Social Science Association list Hare as a member of the executive committee in 1862, 1863, 1864, and 1865.

88. See the Hare obituary by Leonard Courtney in the *Athenaeum* (16 May 1891), p. 636. On the Victorian Athenaeum see Leslie A. Marchand, *The Athenaeum*, and F.R. Crowell, *The Athenaeum*, pp. 21–37.
89. See John Stuart Mill to Thomas Hare, 4 February 1865, in Frances E. Mineka and Dwight N. Lindley, eds, *The Later Letters of John Stuart Mill, Collected Works*, XVI, p. 990; H.C.G. Matthew, ed., *The Gladstone Diaries*, VI, p. 331. See also G.P. Gooch, *Life of Lord Courtney*, p. 459.
90. See Stephen Gwynn and Gertrude M. Tuckwell, *The Life of the Rt. Hon. Sir Charles Dilke*, I, p. 100 n.
91. See John Stuart Mill to William Fraser Rae, 19 July 1869, in Frances E. Mineka and Dwight N. Lindley, eds, *The Later Letters of John Stuart Mill, Collected Works*, XVII, p. 1624 n3, and John Stuart Mill to George Croom Robertson, 13 May 1871, in *ibid.*, p. 1818, n3. See also Patricia Hollis, *Ladies Elect*, p. 92.
92. For the Representative Reform Association see Chapter 4.
93. On the Newcastle Commission see Jonathan Parry, *The Rise and Fall of Liberal Government in Victorian Britain*, p. 203; James Winter, *Robert Lowe*, pp. 174–5.
94. Education Commission [Newcastle]: Minutes of Evidence, *Parliamentary Papers*, 1860, XII, p. 473.
95. *Ibid.*, p. 481.
96. On the Law Amendment Society see Lawrence Goldman, *Science, Reform, and Politics in Victorian Britain*, pp. 33–9, 86–7.
97. See the statement in this regard by Hare in 1866 in Schools Enquiry Commission [Taunton]: Minutes of Evidence, *Parliamentary Papers*, 1867–1868, XXVIII, Vol. V, Pt. 2, p. 412.
98. Thomas Hare, ‘Charitable Trusts’, pp. 310–1.
99. *Ibid.*, p. 312.
100. *Ibid.*, p. 313.
101. Thomas Hare, ‘The Laws Controlling or Regulating the Perpetual Dedication of Property for Public or Charitable Purposes’, p. 163.
102. *Ibid.*, pp. 163–4.
103. *Ibid.*, p. 164.
104. On the taxation proposal by Gladstone in 1863 see John Morley, *The Life of William Ewart Gladstone*, II, pp. 65–6; H.C.G. Matthew, *Gladstone*, I, p. 139; David Owen, *English Philanthropy*, pp. 330–2; Martin Daunton, *Trusting Leviathan*, pp. 211–13.
105. Thomas Hare, ‘The Injustice and Impolicy of Exempting the Income of Property’, p. 734.
106. *Ibid.*
107. *Ibid.*
108. *Ibid.*, p. 739.
109. Thomas Hare, Report on Christ’s Hospital, *Parliamentary Papers*, 1865, XLI, p. 63.
110. *Ibid.*
111. *Ibid.*, p. 65. See also David Owen, *English Philanthropy*, p. 333; Martin Daunton, *Trusting Leviathan*, p. 214.

112. On the Taunton Commission see W.L. Burn, *The Age of Equipoise*, pp. 199–201; Jonathan Parry, *The Rise and Fall of Liberal Government in Victorian Britain*, p. 181.
113. Schools Enquiry Commission [Taunton]: Minutes of Evidence, *Parliamentary Papers*, 1867–1868, XXVIII, Vol. V, Pt. 2, p. 400.
114. *Ibid.*, p. 401.
115. *Ibid.*, p. 416.
116. *Ibid.*, p. 418.
117. Thomas Hare, 'What Conditions or Limitations Ought to be Imposed upon the Power of Disposing in Perpetuity of Property', p. 194.
118. *Ibid.*, p. 192.
119. *Ibid.*, pp. 192–3.
120. Thomas Hare, 'Charitable Endowments', p. 133.
121. Thomas Hare, 'Public and Private Property: I', p. 293.
122. *Ibid.*, On Maine and *Ancient Law* see R.C.J. Cocks, *Sir Henry Maine*, pp. 52–78; R.C.J. Cocks, 'Maine, Progress and Theory'. See also J.W. Burrow, *Evolution and Society*, pp. 137–53; J.W. Burrow, 'Henry Maine and Mid-Victorian Ideas of Progress'; Stefan Collini, 'Democracy and Excitement'.
123. Hare, 'Public and Private Property: I', p. 294.
124. *Ibid.*
125. Thomas Hare, 'Public and Private Property: II', p. 734.
126. David Owen, *English Philanthropy*, p. 327.
127. Thomas Hare, 'What Limits Ought to be Placed by Law to Charitable Endowments?', p. 133. Hare refers to Arthur Hobhouse, *A Lecture on the Characteristics of Charitable Foundations in England* of 1868, Robert Lowe, *Middle Class Education: Endowment or Free Trade?* of 1868, and John Stuart Mill, 'Endowments' in the *Fortnightly Review* in April 1869. See also David Owen, *English Philanthropy*, pp. 322–7; Lawrence Goldman, 'The Defection of the Middle Class', pp. 124–5.
128. Thomas Hare, 'What Limits Ought to be Placed by Law to Charitable Endowments?', pp. 136–7.
129. *Ibid.*, p. 137. On the Endowed Schools Act see Jonathan Parry, *The Rise and Fall of Liberal Government in Victorian Britain*, p. 264; Jonathan Parry, *Democracy and Religion*, p. 309; Lawrence Goldman, 'The Defection of the Middle Class', pp. 126–7.
130. For the Education Act see Chapter 4.
131. Thomas Hare, 'Estates of Endowments as Instruments of Industrial and Political Education', p. 309.
132. *Ibid.*
133. *Ibid.*, p. 310.
134. *Ibid.*, p. 314.
135. *Ibid.*, p. 317.
136. See Thomas Hare, 'On the Study of the Condition and Capacity of the Lands of Endowments and Other Public Estates'.
137. See J.M. Ludlow, ed., *Proceedings of the Co-operative Congress*, p. 7. On Ludlow see Edward Norman, *The Victorian Christian Socialists*, pp. 58–79; Peter Allen, 'F.D. Maurice and J.M. Ludlow'. On Neale and the first co-operative

- congress see Philip N. Backstrom, *Christian Socialism and Co-operation in Victorian England*, pp. 89–92.
138. Thomas Hare, 'The Claims of Co-operative Societies to the Use of Public Land', p. 89.
 139. *Ibid.*
 140. For Hare as a member of the Land Tenure Reform Association see the report of the inaugural meeting held in London in May 1871 in John Stuart Mill, *Public and Parliamentary Speeches, Collected Works*, XXIX, p. 422. For the objectives of the Land Tenure Reform Association see the programme statement in John Stuart Mill, *Essays on Economics and Society, Collected Works*, V, pp. 689–95.
 141. Thomas Hare, 'On Lands Held by Corporations', p. 148.
 142. *Ibid.*, pp. 158–9.
 143. See Gareth Stedman Jones, *Outcast London*, pp. 159–78; H.J. Dyos, 'The Slums of Victorian London'; H.J. Dyos and D.A. Reeder, 'Slums and Suburbs'. See also Martin Daunton, *House and Home in the Victorian City*, and Martin Daunton, 'Housing'.
 144. See Gareth Stedman Jones, *Outcast London*, pp. 179–96. See also Anthony S. Wohl, *The Eternal Slum*; Anthony S. Wohl, 'Unfit for Human Habitation'. On the Metropolitan Association and the Peabody Trust see also David Owen, *English Philanthropy*, pp. 374–5, 380–1; John Nelson Tarn, 'The Peabody Donation Fund'.
 145. Thomas Hare, *Usque ad Coelum*, p. 15. See also Enid Gaudie, *Cruel Habitations*, p. 147.
 146. Thomas Hare, *Usque ad Coelum*, p. 14.
 147. *Ibid.*, p. 15.
 148. *Ibid.*, p. 18.
 149. *Ibid.*, p. 19. See also H.J. Dyos, 'Railways and Housing in Victorian London', pp. 112, 237, n.74.
 150. Thomas Hare, *Usque ad Coelum*, p. 12.
 151. *Ibid.*, p. 15.
 152. *Ibid.*, pp. 3–4.
 153. *Ibid.*, p. 4.
 154. *Ibid.*
 155. *Ibid.*, p. 16.
 156. *Ibid.*, p. 26.
 157. *Ibid.*, pp. 26–7.
 158. *Ibid.*, pp. 21–2.
 159. *Ibid.*, p. 23.
 160. *Ibid.*, pp. 33–46. On the election of the members of the Metropolitan Board of Works by the members of the vestries see David Owen, *The Government of Victorian London*, pp. 37–9. With reference to Hare see also Bryan Keith-Lucas, *The English Local Government Franchise*, pp. 211–2.
 161. Thomas Hare, 'Ideal of a Local Government for the Metropolis', p. 443.
 162. *Ibid.*, pp. 443–4.
 163. *Ibid.*, p. 446.
 164. *Ibid.*, p. 447.

165. Thomas Hare, 'An Improved Constitution of Local Governing Bodies', pp. 144–6.
166. *Ibid.*, p. 138.
167. *Ibid.*, p. 139.
168. *Ibid.*, pp. 146–8.
169. See David Owen, *The Government of Victorian London*, p. 196.
170. Thomas Hare, 'An Improved Constitution of Local Governing Bodies', p. 148.
171. See *Parliamentary Papers*, 1866, XIII, pp. 378–93. On the Select Committee on Metropolitan Local Government see David Owen, *The Government of Victorian London*, p. 195.
172. Thomas Hare, 'On the Constitution of Municipalities and Local Governing Bodies for London and Other Towns and Districts'.
173. Thomas Hare, 'The Construction of a Municipality for the Metropolis', p. 3.
174. *Ibid.*, pp. 6–7.
175. On the 'Blue Mutiny' see Sugata Bose, *Peasant Labour and Colonial Capital*, pp. 154–6; E.D. Steele, *Palmerston and Liberalism*, pp. 339–40. See also T.H. Bullock, 'A Blue Mutiny' in *Fraser's Magazine* in January 1861.
176. Thomas Hare, 'On the Development of the Wealth of India', p. 417.
177. *Ibid.*, p. 421.
178. *Ibid.*
179. *Ibid.*, p. 425.
180. *Ibid.*, p. 426.
181. Thomas Hare, 'What Ought To Be the Legal and Constitutional Relations between England and Her Colonies?', p. 100.
182. *Ibid.*, p. 102. See Adam Smith, *The Wealth of Nations*, pp. 535–6. See also Donald Winch, *Adam Smith's Politics*, pp. 154–6. On consideration of colonial representation see Ged Martin, 'Empire Federalism and Imperial Parliamentary Union'; Miles Taylor, 'Colonial Representation at Westminster'; Miles Taylor, 'Empire and Parliamentary Reform'.
183. Thomas Hare, 'What Ought to be the Legal and Constitutional Relations between England and Her Colonies?', pp. 102–3.
184. *Ibid.*, p. 104.
185. *Ibid.*
186. *Ibid.*
187. See Chapters 5 and 6.
188. See Thomas Hare, *London Municipal Reform*.
189. See *Parliamentary Papers*, 1884, XXXIX, Vol. 1, pp. 89–106. On the Derby Commission see David Owen, *English Philanthropy*, pp. 284–90.
190. See *Parliamentary Papers*, 1884–1885, XXX, Vol. 2, pp. 586–91. On the Dilke Commission see Anthony S. Wohl, *The Eternal Slum*, pp. 235–45.
191. See Chapter 6.
192. In Andrew Reid, ed., *Why I am a Liberal*, p. 55.
193. W.P. Courtney, 'Thomas Hare', p. 391.
194. See by Sherlock Hare *A Short Summary of the Election of Representatives in 1901 and Proportional Representation in 1904*, both published in London by the Civil Service Co-operative Society.

195. See Patricia Hollis, *Ladies Elect*, pp. 91–2. See also Chushichi Tsuzuki, *The Life of Eleanor Marx*, pp. 48–9.
196. Manuscript memoir by Katherine Clayton, p. 25. See also A.C. Benson, *Memories and Friends*, p. 14. On A.C. Benson see David Newsome, *On the Edge of Paradise*.
197. See Noel Annan, 'The Intellectual Aristocracy', p. 265. See also a revised version in Noel Annan, *The Dons*, pp. 304–41. For a critique see Stefan Collini, *Absent Minds*, pp. 140–5, 153, n. 18.
198. Henry Sidgwick to Arthur Balfour, 23 February 1888, Salisbury Papers, 3M/Balfour 5/8.
199. A.C. Benson, *Memories and Friends*, p. 3.
200. *Ibid.*
201. Typescript memoir by Katherine Esdaile, p. 3.
202. A.C. Benson, *Memories and Friends*, p. 6.
203. *Ibid.*
204. Manuscript memoir by Katherine Clayton, p. 1.
205. A.C. Benson, *Memories and Friends*, p. 3.
206. *Ibid.*, p. 7.
207. Manuscript memoir by Katherine Clayton, pp. 2–3.
208. *Ibid.*, p. 2.
209. *Ibid.*, p. 15.
210. *Ibid.*, p. 8. Following the death of Grote in 1871, Hare reviewed *The Personal Life of George Grote* by Mrs Grote in the *Westminster Review* in July 1873. Following the death of Mill in 1873, Hare reviewed his posthumously published *Autobiography* in the *Westminster Review* in January 1874.
211. Manuscript memoir by Katherine Clayton, pp. 8–12.
212. John Westlake, 'Thomas Hare', p. 466.

2 Personal Representation and the Clerisy, 1857–1859

1. Thomas Hare, *The Machinery of Representation*, p. 4.
2. On the 1857 general election see Jonathan Parry, *The Rise and Fall of Liberal Government in Victorian Britain*, pp. 192–4; T.A. Jenkins, *The Liberal Ascendancy*, pp. 85–7; Miles Taylor, *The Decline of British Radicalism*, pp. 269–84; E.D. Steele, *Palmerston and Liberalism*, pp. 73–9; Angus Hawkins, *Parliament, Party and the Art of Politics in Britain*, pp. 64–5. See also Herbert C. Bell, 'Palmerston and Parliamentary Representation', pp. 205–6, and Kristen Zimmerman, 'Liberal Speech', pp. 1178–9.
3. Trevor Lloyd, 'Uncontested Seats', p. 261.
4. Jonathan Parry, 'Past and Future in the Later Career of Lord John Russell', pp. 161–5.
5. Miles Taylor, *The Decline of British Radicalism*, pp. 276–7; Nicholas C. Edsall, *Richard Cobden*, pp. 307–10; Keith Robbins, *John Bright*, pp. 125–6. See also Norman McCord, 'Cobden and Bright in Politics', pp. 109–11.
6. Richard Shannon, *Gladstone*, I, p. 337. See also H.C.G. Matthew, *Gladstone*, I, p. 105.
7. Wilbur Devereux Jones and Arvel B. Erickson, *The Peelites*, pp. 201–5.

8. G.I.T. Machin, *Politics and the Churches in Great Britain, 1832–1868*, pp. 284–5.
9. William Gladstone, 'The New Parliament and Its Work', p. 566. See also Richard Shannon, *Gladstone*, I, pp. 340–1.
10. On the Great Reform Act see Charles Seymour, *Electoral Reform in England and Wales*, pp. 7–76; John Cannon, *Parliamentary Reform*, pp. 204–63; Michael Brock, *The Great Reform Act*, pp. 314–36; John Prest, *Lord John Russell*, pp. 38–54; John Prest, *Politics in the Age of Cobden*, pp. 10–22; Norman Gash, *Politics in the Age of Peel*, pp. 3–101, Ian Newbould, *Whiggery and Reform*, pp. 40–80; Peter Mandler, *Aristocratic Government in the Age of Reform*, pp. 123–31; K. Theodore Hoppen, 'The Franchise and Electoral Politics in England and Ireland'; Norman McCord, 'Some Difficulties of Parliamentary Reform'. See also Boyd Hilton, *A Mad, Bad, and Dangerous People?*, pp. 420–38. For regional analyses of electoral politics before and after 1832 see David Cresap Moore, *The Politics of Deference*; Frank O'Gorman, *Voters, Patrons, and Parties*; John A. Phillips, *The Great Reform Bill in the Boroughs*; Philip Salmon, *Electoral Reform at Work*; J.R. Vincent, *Pollbooks*; T.J. Nossiter, *Influence, Opinion, and Political Idioms in Reformed England*. The impact on the middle class is treated by David Cannadine in *Class in Britain*, pp. 73–88, and by Dror Wahrman in *Imagining the Middle Class*, pp. 298–327. See also David Eastwood, 'Contesting the Politics of Deference'; Miles Taylor, 'Interests, Parties and the State'.
11. Thomas Hare, *The Machinery of Representation*, pp. 13–14. On Hallam see Timothy Lang, *The Victorians and the Stuart Heritage*, pp. 23–52; J.W. Burrow, *A Liberal Descent*, pp. 24, 28–35, 39.
12. Thomas Hare, *The Machinery of Representation*, pp. 14–15. On Macaulay and Whig history see Joseph Hamburger, *Macaulay and the Whig Tradition*, pp. 73–114; J.W. Burrow, *A Liberal Descent*, pp. 11–93. See also William Thomas, *The Quarrel of Macaulay and Croker*, pp. 210–76.
13. Thomas Hare, *The Machinery of Representation*, pp. 15–16.
14. *Ibid.*, p. 26.
15. *Ibid.*, pp. 27–8.
16. *Ibid.*, p. 28.
17. *Ibid.*, pp. 4–5.
18. *Ibid.*, pp. 5–6.
19. *Ibid.*, p. 6.
20. *Ibid.*, pp. 12–13.
21. *Ibid.*, p. 42.
22. *Ibid.*
23. *Ibid.*, pp. 44–5.
24. For the Finsbury election see Thomas H. Duncombe, *The Life and Correspondence of Thomas Duncombe*, II, pp. 196–8; E.D. Steele, *Palmerston and Liberalism*, p. 77; Miles Taylor, *The Decline of British Radicalism*, p. 278. See also the comment by Jonathan Parry in *The Rise and Fall of Liberal Government in Victorian Britain*, p. 99.
25. Thomas Hare, *The Machinery of Representation*, p. 46.
26. *Ibid.*
27. *Ibid.*
28. *Ibid.*, p. 48.

29. *Ibid.*, p. 49.
30. For the distinction between express consent and tacit consent by John Locke see his *Two Treatises of Government*, pp. 347–8. See also John Dunn, *The Political Thought of John Locke*, pp. 131–3; John Dunn, 'Consent in the Political Theory of John Locke'. For the relationship between tacit consent and virtual representation see J.R. Pole, *Political Representation in England and the Origins of the American Republic*, p. 23.
31. Quoted in Bernard Bailyn, *The Ideological Origins of the American Revolution*, p. 166. See also Gordon Wood, *The Creation of the American Republic*, pp. 173–4.
32. Quoted in Gordon Wood, *The Creation of the American Republic*, pp. 174–5. See also John Brewer, *Party Ideology and Popular Politics at the Accession of George III*, pp. 208–10.
33. See Edmund S. Morgan and Helen S. Morgan, *The Stamp Act Crisis*, pp. 84–5.
34. See John W. Osborne, *John Cartwright*, p. 21.
35. See Paul Langford, 'Property and "Virtual Representation" in Eighteenth-Century England'.
36. Paul Langford, *Public Life and the Propertied Englishman*, p. 206. In 1784, five members of Parliament owned property in Manchester. See Paul Langford, 'Property and "Virtual Representation" in Eighteenth-Century England', p. 105.
37. *Ibid.*, p. 114.
38. On Sidney see A.H. Birch, *Representation*, p. 38. On Sidney and Burke see J.G.A. Pocock, 'The Varieties of Whiggism from Exclusion to Reform'. See also J.G.A. Pocock, 'Burke and the Ancient Constitution', and John Brewer, 'Rockingham, Burke and Whig Political Argument'.
39. Quoted in Hanna Fenichel Pitkin, *The Concept of Representation*, p. 171. In addition to the discussion of Burke by Hanna Fenichel Pitkin in *ibid.*, pp. 168–71, see Samuel H. Beer, *Modern British Politics*, pp. 15–20; Samuel H. Beer, 'The Representation of Interests in British Government'; Lucy S. Sutherland, 'Edmund Burke and the Relations between Members of Parliament and Their Constituents'. See also the comment on Burke and Bristol by Paul Langford in 'Property and "Virtual Representation" in Eighteenth-Century England', p. 87.
40. Quoted in Hanna Fenichel Pitkin, *The Concept of Representation*, p. 173. See also John Cannon, *Parliamentary Reform*, pp. 31–2.
41. Quoted in Hanna Fenichel Pitkin, *The Concept of Representation*, p. 175.
42. See Jeremy Bentham, *Plan of Parliamentary Reform, in the Form of a Catechism*, pp. lvi–xv. On this work see William Thomas, *The Philosophic Radicals*, pp. 28–9; J.C.D. Clark, 'How Ideologies Are Born', pp. 129–31.
43. James Mackintosh, 'Universal Suffrage', p. 182. See John Cannon, *Parliamentary Reform*, p. 176; Biancamaria Fontana, *Rethinking the Politics of Commercial Society*, pp. 152–6; Donald Winch, 'The Cause of Good Government', p. 98.
44. James Mackintosh, 'Universal Suffrage', p. 186.
45. *Ibid.*, pp. 182–3.
46. James Mackintosh, 'Parliamentary Reform', p. 471. See John Cannon, *Parliamentary Reform*, p. 178.
47. James Mackintosh, 'Parliamentary Reform', p. 475.

48. Ibid.
49. James Mill, *Essay on Government*, p. 33. See William Thomas, *The Philosophic Radicals*, pp. 119–40; William Thomas, 'James Mill's Politics'. Debate followed in Wendell Robert Carr, 'James Mill's Politics Reconsidered'; William Thomas, 'James Mill's Politics: A Rejoinder'; Wendell Robert Carr, 'James Mill's Politics: A Final Word'. See also Robert A. Fenn, *James Mill's Political Thought*, pp. 118–27; Joseph Hamburger, 'James Mill on Universal Suffrage and the Middle Class'.
50. James Mill, *Essay on Government*, pp. 22–3.
51. Ibid., p. 26.
52. Ibid., p. 27.
53. Ibid., See also Terence Ball, 'Utilitarianism, Feminism, and the Franchise'.
54. James Mill, *Edinburgh Review*, p. 221.
55. James Mill, *Edinburgh Review* on Parliamentary Reform', pp. 214–15.
56. Thomas Babington Macaulay, 'Mill's *Essay on Government*', p. 293. See also John Clive, *Macaulay*, pp. 126–31; Joseph Hamburger, *Macaulay and the Whig Tradition*, pp. 55–62; Biancamaria Fontana, *Rethinking the Politics of Commercial Society*, pp. 147–64; Donald Winch, 'The Cause of Good Government', pp. 99–105.
57. Thomas Babington Macaulay, 'Mill's *Essay on Government*', pp. 293–4.
58. Ibid., p. 299.
59. Thomas Babington Macaulay, 'Bentham's Defence of Mill', p. 163.
60. Thomas Babington Macaulay, 'Utilitarian Theory of Government', p. 206. See also John Clive, *Macaulay*, p. 132.
61. Thomas Babington Macaulay, 'Utilitarian Theory of Government', p. 206.
62. Ibid., p. 223.
63. John Clive, *Macaulay*, p. 167.
64. J.R. Pole, *Political Representation in England and the Origins of the American Republic*, p. 495.
65. Quoted in *ibid.*
66. See John Clive, *Macaulay*, pp. 168–70; E.P. Thompson, *The Making of the English Working Class*, p. 823.
67. Quoted in John A. Phillips, *The Great Reform Bill in the Boroughs*, pp. 181–2.
68. George Cornewall Lewis, *Remarks on the Use and Abuse of Some Political Terms*, p. 141. See the comment by George Watson in *The English Ideology*, p. 91. See also Kenneth E. Bock, 'History and a Science of Man'.
69. George Cornewall Lewis, *Remarks on the Use and Abuse of Some Political Terms*, p. 141.
70. On the Chartist theory of political representation, see Miles Taylor, 'The Six Points'. On the contemporary perception of the political system as unrepresentative and the working class as unrepresented see Gareth Stedman Jones, 'Rethinking Chartism', pp. 105–7. On the post-Chartist radical theory of political representation see Miles Taylor, *The Decline of British Radicalism*, pp. 159–73. See also Miles Taylor, 'Rethinking the Chartists'.
71. Thomas Hare, *The Machinery of Representation*, p. 25.
72. Ibid., p. 26. On King see F.B. Smith, *The Making of the Second Reform Bill*, pp. 30–1, 38.
73. See E.D. Steele, *Palmerston and Liberalism*, p. 220.

74. Thomas Hare, *The Machinery of Representation*, p. 27.
75. *Ibid.*, p. 52.
76. *Ibid.*, p. 7.
77. *Ibid.*, p. 9.
78. *Ibid.*, pp. 16.
79. *Ibid.*, pp. 16–24.
80. *Hansard*, Third Series, CXLV, cols. 1104–10.
81. Thomas Hare, *A Note to The Machinery of Representation*, p. I; Thomas Hare, *The Machinery of Representation*, 2nd edn, pp. 1, 18. On the single transferable vote in the first and second editions of *The Machinery of Representation* see also Jenifer Hart, *Proportional Representation*, pp. 26–9.
82. See Clarence Gilbert Hoag and George Hervey Hallett, Jr., *Proportional Representation*, pp. 164–7; George Birkbeck Hill, *The Life of Sir Rowland Hill*, I, pp. 24, 69.
83. Clarence Gilbert Hoag and George Hervey Hallett, Jr., *Proportional Representation*, pp. 167–70; George Birkbeck Hill, *The Life of Sir Rowland Hill*, I, p. 233. For the Colonization Commission Report see *Parliamentary Papers*, 1839, XVII, p. 709.
84. Frederic Hill, *An Autobiography of Fifty Years in Times of Reform*, p. 20.
85. Clarence Gilbert Hoag and George Hervey Hallett, Jr., *Proportional Representation*, pp. 171–5; Poul Andrae, *Andrae and His Invention: The Proportional Representation Method*. See also Robert Lytton, Report on the Election of Representatives for the Rigsraad, 1 July 1863, in *Parliamentary Papers*, 1864, XLI, pp. 576–99.
86. See P.M. Gurowich, 'The Continuation of War by Other Means', pp. 606–13. On the party system between 1846 and 1859 see J.B. Conacher, *The Peelites and the Party System*; J.B. Conacher, *The Aberdeen Coalition*; Angus Hawkins, *Parliament, Party and the Art of Politics in Britain*; Wilbur Devereux Jones and Avrel B. Erickson, *The Peelites*; J.R. Vincent, *The Formation of the British Liberal Party*. See also J.B. Conacher, 'Party Politics in the Age of Palmerston'; Angus Hawkins, '“Parliamentary Government” and Victorian Political Parties'; Hugh Berrington, 'Partisanship and Dissidence'; D.E.D. Beales, 'Parliamentary Parties and the “Independent” Member'; Francis H. Herrick, 'The Second Reform Movement in Britain'; Thomas Gallagher, 'The Second Reform Movement'.
87. William Gladstone, 'The Declining Efficiency of Parliament', p. 560. This article was based on a letter from Gladstone to Lord Aberdeen on 13 March 1856, for which see H.C.G. Matthew, ed., *The Gladstone Diaries*, V, pp. 112–4. See also H.C.G. Matthew, *Gladstone*, I, pp. 104–5.
88. Thomas Hare, *The Machinery of Representation*, pp. 501.
89. *Ibid.*, p. 42.
90. *Ibid.*
91. *Ibid.*, p. 31.
92. *Ibid.*, On Ebrington see *ibid.*, pp. 32–3.
93. *Ibid.*, p. 33.
94. On the Whig view of representatives as trustees and the radical view of representatives as delegates see Norman Gash, *Politics in the Age of Peel*, pp. 29–31. See also Hanna Fenichel Pitkin, *The Concept of Representation*, pp. 112–43.

95. Thomas Hare, *The Machinery of Representation*, pp. 33–4. On Bentham as an advocate of representatives as delegates rather than as trustees see Frederick Rosen, *Jeremy Bentham and Representative Democracy*, p. 176. The view of Burke is expressed in his speech to the electors of Bristol, for which see note 39 above.
96. Thomas Hare, *The Machinery of Representation*, p. 34.
97. *Ibid.*, pp. 51–2.
98. On civic humanism see Hans Baron, *The Crisis of the Early Italian Renaissance*, and J.G.A. Pocock, *The Machiavellian Moment*. On Harrington see J.G.A. Pocock, 'Machiavelli, Harrington and English Political Ideologies in the Eighteenth Century', and on Burke see J.G.A. Pocock, 'Burke and the Ancient Constitution'. J.G.A. Pocock further discusses the relationship between civic humanism and the Whig tradition in 'The Varieties of Whiggism from Exclusion to Reform'. On the relationship between Burke and Macaulay with reference to civic humanism see Joseph Hamburger, *Macaulay and the Whig Tradition*, pp. 181–8. On Macaulay and the Whig tradition see also J.W. Burrow, *A Liberal Descent*, pp. 11–93; J.W. Burrow, *Whigs and Liberals*, pp. 28–38, 53–4, 91–2, 102–5.
99. Thomas Hare, *The Machinery of Representation*, p. 31.
100. See John Morrow, *Coleridge's Political Thought*, pp. 126–55; Pamela Edwards, *The Statesman's Science*, pp. 175–200; John Colmer, *Coleridge*, pp. 153–66; Ben Knights, *The Idea of the Clerisy in the Nineteenth Century*, pp. 37–71; David Newsome, *Two Classes of Men*, pp. 115–8. See also Peter Allen, 'S.T. Coleridge's *Church and State* and the Idea of an Intellectual Establishment'; John Morrow, 'The National Church in Coleridge's *Church and State*: A Response to Allen'; Peter Allen, 'Morrow on Coleridge's *Church and State*'.
101. Samuel Taylor Coleridge, *On the Constitution of the Church and State, According to the Idea of Each*, in John Morrow, ed., *Coleridge's Writings*, pp. 174–5.
102. Thomas Hare, *The Machinery of Representation*, pp. 25–6.
103. *Ibid.*, p. 53.
104. See Frederick Rosen, *Jeremy Bentham and Representative Democracy*, pp. 130–1. The suggestion by Rosen in *ibid.*, pp. 184–5, that Bentham 'would have been as enthusiastic an advocate of Thomas Hare's system of proportional representation as Mill' is not convincing. As L.J. Hume comments in *Bentham and Bureaucracy*, p. 216, 'Electoral politics would, he believed, enable the self-interested subjects to neutralize each other and would permit the universal interest to emerge'. Hare did not intend his electoral system to so neutralize interests.
105. Samuel Taylor Coleridge, *Table Talk*, 24 April 1832, in R.J. White, ed., *The Political Thought of Samuel Taylor Coleridge*, p. 233.
106. Thomas Hare, *The Machinery of Representation*, p. 51.
107. *Ibid.*
108. *Ibid.*, p. 52.
109. *Ibid.*, p. 53. Christopher Kent in *Brains and Numbers*, p. 45, argues that 'the whole principle of minority representation was repugnant to the assumptions and ideals of a clerisy – to the Coleridgean emphasis on national unity.' Hare did not deny the importance of national unity, however.

- Rather, he denied that exclusion of the clerisy by the electoral system contributed to such national unity.
110. See E.D. Steele, *Palmerston and Liberalism*, pp. 73–9; Jonathan Parry, 'Past and Future in the Later Career of Lord John Russell', p. 166.
 111. James Lorimer, *Political Progress Not Necessarily Democratic*, p. 295.
 112. *Ibid.*, p. 239.
 113. *Ibid.*, pp. 249–50.
 114. *Ibid.*, p. 250.
 115. Thomas Hare, *The Machinery of Representation*, 2nd edn, p. 2.
 116. George Harris, *The True Theory of Representation in a State*, 2nd edn, p. 21.
 117. *Ibid.*, p. 28.
 118. *Ibid.*, pp. 13–14.
 119. *Ibid.*, p. 28.
 120. *The Times*, 19 December 1857, p. 8.
 121. *The Times*, 21 December 1857, p. 6.
 122. In his *Autobiography*, Harris does not indicate that *The Educational Franchise* was the work of the Stapleton committee. A pamphlet by Stapleton, *Suggestions for a Conservative and Popular Reform in the Commons House of Parliament*, was published in London in 1850.
 123. *The Educational Franchise*, Table I and Table II.
 124. *The Times*, 19 December 1857, p. 8.
 125. On Maurice see Owen Chadwick, *The Victorian Church*, I, pp. 346–63; Edward Norman, *The Victorian Christian Socialists*, pp. 14–34. For the influence on Maurice of Coleridge and Cambridge see David Young, *F.D. Maurice and Unitarianism*, pp. 117–30. See also Peter Allen, *The Cambridge Apostles*, pp. 36, 206; W.C. Lubenow, *The Cambridge Apostles*, pp. 337, 374.
 126. F.D. Maurice to Thomas Hare, 30 April 1860, Hare Papers, MS. 356.
 127. John Stuart Mill to unidentified correspondent, 11 December 1857, in Frances E. Mineka and Dwight N. Lindley, eds, *The Later Letters of John Stuart Mill, Collected Works*, XV, p. 543.
 128. See John Stuart Mill, *Autobiography*, pp. 111–31. For various accounts of the 'mental crisis' see Michael St John Packe, *The Life of John Stuart Mill*, pp. 74–80; John M. Robson, *The Improvement of Mankind*, pp. 21–7; Alan Ryan, *J.S. Mill*, pp. 30–3; William Thomas, *The Philosophic Radicals*, pp. 147–52; William Thomas, *Mill*, pp. 30–3.
 129. Samuel Taylor Coleridge, *Biographia Literaria*, p. 167. See also Richard Holmes, *Coleridge: Darker Reflections*, pp. 392–402; Richard Holmes, *Coleridge*, pp. 48–54.
 130. John Stuart Mill, *Autobiography*, p. 124. See also Basil Willey, *Nineteenth Century Studies*, pp. 141–9; Graham Hough, 'Coleridge and the Victorians'.
 131. John Stuart Mill, 'Bentham', p. 468. See also F.R. Leavis, 'Introduction', pp. 1–38; Raymond Williams, *Culture and Society*, pp. 49–70; Alan Ryan, *J.S. Mill*, pp. 53–6; William Thomas, *The Philosophic Radicals*, pp. 203–5; William Thomas, *Mill*, pp. 48–50; Frederick Rosen, 'The Method of Reform'.
 132. John Stuart Mill, 'Bentham', p. 468.
 133. *Ibid.*, p. 488.
 134. *Ibid.*, pp. 489–90.
 135. *Ibid.*, p. 490.

136. John Stuart Mill, 'Coleridge', p. 289. See also John M. Robson, *The Improvement of Mankind*, pp. 70–6; Alan Ryan, *J.S. Mill*, pp. 56–8; William Thomas, *The Philosophic Radicals*, pp. 203–5; William Thomas, *Mill*, pp. 48–50; Ben Knights, *The Idea of the Clerisy in the Nineteenth Century*, pp. 142, 155; Christopher Kent, *Brains and Numbers*, p. 128; Christopher Turk, *Coleridge and Mill*, pp. 233–50. For a caustic account of the clerisy as an agency of secular doctrine see Maurice Cowling, *Mill and Liberalism*. See also the account of Cowling by P.R. Ghosh, 'Towards the Verdict of History'.
137. John Stuart Mill, 'Coleridge', p. 290.
138. *Ibid.*, p. 301.
139. See André Jardin, *Tocqueville*, pp. 81–2; Hugh Brogan, *Alexis de Tocqueville*, pp. 90–4, 115–7; Larry Siedentop, *Tocqueville*, pp. 6–8. On Guizot and history see also Larry Siedentop, 'Introduction'.
140. See André Jardin, *Tocqueville*, pp. 88–177; Hugh Brogan, *Alexis de Tocqueville*, pp. 148–213; Larry Siedentop, *Tocqueville*, pp. 9–12. On Jacksonian democracy see also Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., *The Age of Jackson*, pp. 30–43; Sean Wilentz, *The Rise of American Democracy*, pp. 280–311.
141. Alexis de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, p. 7. For French liberalism during this period see Alan S. Kahan, *Aristocratic Liberalism*, pp. 34–57; Alan S. Kahan, *Liberalism in Nineteenth-Century Europe*, pp. 35–45; Annelien de Dijn, *French Political Thought from Montesquieu to Tocqueville*, 129–54.
142. Alexis de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, p. 241.
143. *Ibid.*
144. *Ibid.*, p. 244.
145. John Stuart Mill, 'Rationale of Representation', p. 342. See also J.H. Burns, 'J.S. Mill and Democracy, 1829–1861: I', p. 164.
146. John Stuart Mill, 'De Tocqueville on Democracy in America' [I], p. 91. See also David Paul Crook, *American Democracy in English Politics*, pp. 176–86; John M. Robson, *The Improvement of Mankind*, pp. 105–14; Alan Ryan, *J.S. Mill*, pp. 47–8; J.H. Burns, 'J.S. Mill and Democracy, 1829–1861: I', pp. 166–75; H.O. Pappé, 'Mill and Tocqueville'; Joseph Hamburger, 'Mill and Tocqueville on Liberty'.
147. Mill, 'De Tocqueville on Democracy in America' [I], p. 110.
148. *Ibid.*, pp. 110–1.
149. *Ibid.*, p. 112.
150. *Ibid.*, pp. 118–19.
151. *Ibid.*, p. 119.
152. *Ibid.*, p. 124.
153. John Stuart Mill, 'Civilization', p. 8.
154. John Stuart Mill, 'Bentham', p. 500.
155. John Stuart Mill, 'De Tocqueville on Democracy in America' [II], p. 13.
156. *Ibid.*, p. 24.
157. *Ibid.*, p. 25.
158. *Ibid.*, p. 26.
159. *Ibid.*, p. 36.
160. *Ibid.*, pp. 43–5.
161. *Ibid.*, p. 47.

162. See Dennis F. Thompson, *John Stuart Mill and Representative Government*, pp. 91–145; Ben Knights, *The Idea of the Clerisy in the Nineteenth Century*, pp. 171–7. See also Graeme Duncan, *Marx and Mill*, pp. 259–72.
163. James Garth Marshall, *Minorities and Majorities*, p. 14.
164. *Ibid.*, p. 17. See also 3rd Earl Grey, *The Colonial Policy of Lord John Russell*, II, pp. 362–3, and the correspondence in *Parliamentary Papers*, 1850, XXXVIII, p. 214.
165. John Stuart Mill to Lord Monteagle, 20 March 1853, in Frances E. Mineka and Dwight N. Lindley, eds, *The Later Letters of John Stuart Mill, Collected Works*, XIV, pp. 101–2.
166. *Ibid.*, p. 102.
167. John Stuart Mill to Harriet Mill, 9 January 1854, in Frances E. Mineka and Dwight N. Lindley, eds, *The Later Letters of John Stuart Mill, Collected Works*, XIV, p. 126. *Thoughts on Parliamentary Reform* was published in 1859.
168. William Rathbone Greg to William Gladstone, 4 April 1852, quoted in Derek Fraser, *Urban Politics in Victorian England*, p. 262.
169. William Rathbone Greg, 'The Expected Reform Bill', p. 270.
170. William Rathbone Greg, 'Parliamentary Purification', pp. 622–3.
171. James Garth Marshall, *Minorities and Majorities*, p. 27.
172. John Stuart Mill to James Garth Marshall, 7 January 1854, in Frances E. Mineka and Dwight N. Lindley, eds, *The Later Letters of John Stuart Mill, Collected Works*, XIV, p. 124.
173. John Stuart Mill to unidentified correspondent, 11 December 1857, in Frances E. Mineka and Dwight N. Lindley, eds, *The Later Letters of John Stuart Mill, Collected Works*, XV, p. 543.
174. *Hansard*, Third Series, V, cols. 1359–73. The seven constituencies were Berkshire, Buckinghamshire, Cambridgeshire, Dorset, Herefordshire, Hertfordshire, and Oxfordshire. See Norman Gash, *Politics in the Age of Peel*, p. 79.
175. *Hansard*, Third Series, XXXIV, cols. 927–8.
176. *Hansard*, Third Series, CXXX, col. 499. See also Jenifer Hart, *Proportional Representation*, pp. 21–2; Robert Saunders, 'Lord John Russell and Parliamentary Reform', pp. 1310–1.
177. George Cornewall Lewis, 'Marshall on the Representation of Minorities', p. 235.
178. Thomas Hare, *The Machinery of Representation*, p. 43.
179. *Economist*, 25 July 1857, p. 819.
180. William Rathbone Greg, 'Representative Reform', p. 282.
181. Herbert Spencer, 'Representative Government: What Is It Good For?'
182. F.W. Newman, 'Party Government'.
183. On this work by 3rd Earl Grey see Angus Hawkins, '"Parliamentary Government" and Victorian Political Parties', pp. 657–61.
184. Henry Reeve, 'Earl Grey on Parliamentary Government'.
185. Lord Robert Cecil, 'The Theories of Parliamentary Reform', p. 67. On Cecil and parliamentary reform see Paul Smith, 'Editor's Introduction', pp. 23–47; E.D. Steele, *Lord Salisbury*, p. 36; Andrew Roberts, *Salisbury*, p. 58; Roland Quinault, 'Democracy and the Mid-Victorians', p. 115.
186. Thomas Hare, *A Treatise on the Election of Representatives*, pp. xxi–xxii.

187. Ibid., pp. xxxiii–xxxiv. On the electoral system in this first edition of *A Treatise on the Election of Representatives* as related to the second edition of *The Machinery of Representation* see also Jenifer Hart, *Proportional Representation*, pp. 33–7.
188. On these various references, with emphasis on Calhoun, see also Jenifer Hart, *Proportional Representation*, pp. 30–3. On Calhoun see Richard Hofstadter, *The American Political Tradition*, pp. 67–91; Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., *The Age of Jackson*, pp. 402–6; Sean Wilentz, *The Rise of American Democracy*, pp. 535–7; Ralph Lerner, ‘Calhoun’s New Science of Politics’; Daryl H. Rice, ‘John C. Calhoun’.
189. Letter from Thomas Hare to Simon Sterne in 1870 quoted by Sterne in the preface to his *Representative Government and Personal Representation*.
190. Thomas Hare, *A Treatise on the Election of Representatives*, pp. 9–10.
191. Ibid., p. 19.
192. Ibid., p. 17.
193. Ibid., p. xi.
194. Ibid., p. 275.
195. Ibid., p. 277.
196. Ibid., p. 12.
197. Ibid., pp. xii–xiii.
198. Ibid., pp. 322–38.
199. Ibid., pp. 300–1.
200. Ibid., p. 320.
201. Ibid., p. 321.
202. Ibid., pp. 168–9.
203. George Cornewall Lewis, ‘History and Prospects of Parliamentary Reform’, p. 289.
204. *Saturday Review*, 26 February 1859, p. 244.
205. Walter Bagehot, ‘Parliamentary Reform’.
206. Walter Bagehot, ‘Present Aspects of Parliamentary Reform’, p. 551.
207. *Economist*, 11 June 1859, p. 649.
208. See Jenifer Hart, *Proportional Representation*, p. 22.
209. John Bright to Thomas Hare, 8 February 1859, Hare Papers, MS. 356.
210. William Gladstone to Thomas Hare, 12 March 1859, Hare Papers, MS. 356.
211. *Hansard*, Third Series, CLII, cols. 1002–3.
212. Ibid., CLIV, col. 131.
213. John Stuart Mill, *On Liberty*, pp. 7–8, 66–7.
214. John Stuart Mill to Thomas Hare, 3 March 1859, in Frances E. Mineka and Dwight N. Lindley, eds, *The Later Letters of John Stuart Mill, Collected Works*, XV, pp. 598–9. The one point was: ‘You propose that (assuming the quota to be 2000) the *first* 2000 votes a candidate obtains at the place for which he stands, should be counted for his return, and his name struck out of all *subsequent* voting papers. Should it not be the *last* 2000 rather than the first? Otherwise there is a premium on hanging back from the poll; the later votes having more power than the earlier ones, inasmuch as after the attainment of their first object, their second votes also are counted.’ Ibid., p. 599.
215. Ibid.

3 Personal Representation and the Second Reform Act, 1859–1867

1. John Stuart Mill to George Cornewall Lewis, 20 March 1859, in Frances E. Mineka and Dwight N. Lindley, eds, *The Later Letters of John Stuart Mill, Collected Works*, XV, p. 608.
2. See John Stuart Mill, *Autobiography*, pp. 140–1, and Leslie Stephen, *The English Utilitarians*, III, p. 318. Austin's *A Plea for the Constitution* was reviewed in conjunction with Mill's *Thoughts on Parliamentary Reform* by Walter Bagehot in 'Present Aspects of Parliamentary Reform' in the *National Review* in April 1859.
3. John Stuart Mill, 'Recent Writers on Reform', pp. 489–99. See also his comment in *ibid.*, p. 504, on the discussion of parliamentary reform and the representation of minorities by Bagehot in 'Parliamentary Reform' in the *National Review* in January 1859.
4. John Stuart Mill, 'Recent Writers on Reform', pp. 499–500.
5. *Ibid.*, p. 500.
6. *Ibid.*
7. *Ibid.*
8. *Ibid.*
9. *Ibid.*
10. *Ibid.*, p. 501.
11. *Ibid.*, p. 502.
12. *Ibid.*
13. *Ibid.*
14. *Ibid.*, p. 503.
15. *Ibid.*, p. 505.
16. *Ibid.*, p. 506.
17. *Ibid.*, p. 503.
18. *Ibid.*
19. *Ibid.*, p. 504.
20. *Ibid.*, p. 504.
21. *Ibid.*, p. 508.
22. *Ibid.*
23. *Ibid.*, p. 504. Plural voting and proportional representation as advocated by Mill are considered to be 'mutually contradictory' by R.P. Anschutz in *The Philosophy of John Stuart Mill*, p. 45, n.1. A resolution of the contradiction in an analysis of intention with reference to distinctions between true and false democracy and between democracy and representation is suggested by J.H. Burns in 'J.S. Mill and Democracy, 1829–1861: II', pp. 293–4. That the contradiction was due to simultaneous application to voting of egalitarian and inegalitarian standards is suggested by Dennis F. Thompson in *John Stuart Mill and Representative Government*, pp. 106–7, and a similar approach with reference to the relation between competence and participation is taken by J.J. Miller in 'J.S. Mill on Plural Voting'. The contradiction as construed by Anschutz remains, however, and a resolution necessitates a clarification of terminology. Mill like Hare was concerned not with proportional representation as such but with personal representation as an alternative to virtual representation. Hare's electoral system as advocated

- by Mill was a matter of electoral organization, whereas plural voting was a matter of franchise qualification, which were separate although related and thereby not in contradiction. For an alternative resolution see Frederick Rosen, 'The Method of Reform', pp. 143–4.
24. Mill, 'Recent Writers on Reform', pp. 504, 506.
 25. *Ibid.*, p. 508.
 26. John Stuart Mill, *Thoughts on Parliamentary Reform*, 2nd edn, pp. 41–58. This and subsequent support for Hare's electoral system by Mill during the 1860s is surveyed by Jenifer Hart in *Proportional Representation*, pp. 37–55. See also Bruce L. Kinzer, *J.S. Mill Revisited*, pp. 164–70, 195–8.
 27. *Economist*, 11 June 1859, p. 649.
 28. The Social Science Association *Transactions* for 1859 refers to this paper which was not published. This and subsequent papers on his electoral system read by Hare at meetings of the Social Science Association during the 1860s and 1870s are surveyed by Jenifer Hart in *Proportional Representation*, pp. 56–61, 65–6. For the Social Science Association itself see Chapter 1.
 29. John Stuart Mill to Thomas Hare, 6 August 1859, in Frances E. Mineka and Dwight N. Lindley, eds, *The Later Letters of John Stuart Mill, Collected Works*, XV, pp. 632–3.
 30. John Stuart Mill to Thomas Hare, 24 August 1859, in *ibid.*, p. 635.
 31. The Social Science Association *Transactions* for 1859 refers to this paper which was not published.
 32. John Stuart Mill to Thomas Hare, 30 October 1859, in Frances E. Mineka and Dwight N. Lindley, eds, *The Later Letters of John Stuart Mill, Collected Works*, XV, p. 642. 33.
 33. See Lawrence Goldman, 'Henry Fawcett and the Social Science Association', pp. 152–3.
 34. See the biography of Fawcett by Leslie Stephen, who contributed the entry on him in the *Dictionary of National Biography* which Stephen edited. See also Lawrence Goldman, 'Introduction: "An Advanced Liberal"'; Stefan Collini, '"Manly Fellows"'; Boyd Hilton, 'Manliness, Masculinity and the Mid-Victorian Temperament'; Christopher Harvie, 'Fawcett as Professional Politician'.
 35. Both papers were published in the Social Science Association *Transactions* for 1859, pp. 635–40, 704–5. See also Giacomo Beccattini, 'Henry Fawcett and the Labour Question', pp. 125–6.
 36. John Stuart Mill to Thomas Hare, 30 October 1859, in Frances E. Mineka and Dwight N. Lindley, eds, *The Later Letters of John Stuart Mill, Collected Works*, XV, pp. 642–3.
 37. Henry Fawcett to John Stuart Mill, 23 December 1859, quoted in Leslie Stephen, *Life of Henry Fawcett*, p. 102.
 38. *Ibid.*, pp. 82, 197.
 39. *Ibid.*, pp. 87–9.
 40. See Duncan Black, *A Mathematical Approach to Proportional Representation*, pp. 75–82.
 41. Leslie Stephen, *Life of Henry Fawcett*, p. 170.
 42. *Ibid.*
 43. Henry Fawcett to 3rd Earl Grey, 28 January 1860, Grey Papers.

44. John Stuart Mill to Thomas Hare, 4 February 1860, in Frances E. Mineka and Dwight N. Lindley, eds, *The Later Letters of John Stuart Mill, Collected Works*, XV, pp. 668–9.
45. John Stuart Mill to Henry Fawcett, 5 February 1860, in *ibid.*, p. 672.
46. *Ibid.*
47. Leslie Stephen, *Life of Henry Fawcett*, p. 103.
48. Henry Fawcett, *Mr Hare's Reform Bill*, p. 20.
49. *Ibid.*
50. *Ibid.*, p. 21.
51. *Ibid.*, pp. 22–4.
52. *Ibid.*, pp. 12–3.
53. John Stuart Mill to Helen Taylor, 17 February 1860, in Frances E. Mineka and Dwight N. Lindley, eds, *The Later Letters of John Stuart Mill, Collected Works*, XV, p. 680. For the memorial to Palmerston see Chapter 2.
54. Thomas Hare to John Stuart Mill, 18 February 1860, Mill–Taylor Collection, XLVIII, fol. 72.
55. Thomas Hare, 'Representation in Practice and Theory', p. 188.
56. *Ibid.*, See the note regarding the futile attempt by Hare to recruit the support of Carlyle in John Morrow, *Thomas Carlyle*, p. 256, n.78.
57. Thomas Hare, 'Representation in Practice and Theory', p. 189.
58. *Ibid.*, p. 190.
59. *Ibid.*, p. 191.
60. *Ibid.*, p. 192.
61. *Ibid.*, p. 193.
62. *Ibid.*
63. *Ibid.*, p. 194.
64. *Ibid.*, pp. 194–5.
65. *Ibid.*, p. 195.
66. *Ibid.*
67. *Ibid.*, p. 197.
68. *Ibid.*, p. 198.
69. *Ibid.*, pp. 200–1.
70. *Ibid.*, p. 201.
71. *Ibid.*, p. 204.
72. *Ibid.*
73. John Stuart Mill to Helen Taylor, 2 February 1860, in Frances E. Mineka and Dwight N. Lindley, eds, *The Later Letters of John Stuart Mill, Collected Works*, XV, p. 667.
74. John Stuart Mill to Thomas Hare, 2 February 1860, in *ibid.*, p. 665.
75. See F.B. Smith, *The Making of the Second Reform Bill*, pp. 46–7; E.D. Steele, *Palmerston and Liberalism*, p. 100.
76. *Hansard*, Third Series, CLVI, col. 2062. See also Jonathan Parry, 'Past and Future in the Later Career of Lord John Russell', p. 151; Robert Saunders, 'Lord John Russell and Parliamentary Reform', p. 1313.
77. *The Times*, 15 March 1860, p. 10.
78. *Ibid.*
79. 'The Reform Bill and Mr Hare's Proposed Clause', *Economist*, 17 March 1860, p. 278. See also 'Plurality of Votes', *Economist*, 24 March 1860, p. 309.

80. Edward Bulwer Lytton to Thomas Hare (copy), 26 March 1860, Proportional Representation Society Papers.
81. *Hansard*, Third Series, CLVIII, col. 146. See also Leslie Mitchell, *Bulwer Lytton*, pp. 204, 226.
82. John Stuart Mill to Thomas Hare, 9 May 1860, in Frances E. Mineka and Dwight N. Lindley, eds, *The Later Letters of John Stuart Mill, Collected Works*, XV, p. 697.
83. See F.B. Smith, *The Making of the Second Reform Bill*, p. 47.
84. Thomas Hare, 'Representation of Every Locality and Intelligence', p. 527.
85. *Ibid.*, pp. 527–8.
86. *Ibid.*, p. 528.
87. *Ibid.*, p. 529.
88. *Ibid.*, p. 530.
89. *Ibid.*
90. *Ibid.*, p. 531.
91. *Ibid.*, p. 532.
92. *Ibid.*, p. 543.
93. Herbert Spencer to Thomas Hare (copy), 10 December 1859, Proportional Representation Society Papers.
94. Herbert Spencer, 'Parliamentary Reform', p. 497. See also David Wiltshire, *The Social and Political Thought of Herbert Spencer*, pp. 110–19; Mark Francis, *Herbert Spencer*, pp. 316–17.
95. *Hansard*, Third Series, CLVII, cols. 1920–74.
96. Thomas Hare to 3rd Earl Grey, 23 April 1860, Grey Papers.
97. 3rd Earl Grey to Thomas Hare, 24 April 1860, Hare Papers, Add. MSS 43773, fols 30–1.
98. John Stuart Mill to Thomas Hare, 9 May 1860, in Frances E. Mineka and Dwight N. Lindley, eds, *The Later Letters of John Stuart Mill, Collected Works*, XV, p. 697.
99. John Stuart Mill to Henry Fawcett, 12 May 1860, in *ibid.*, p. 699.
100. *Parliamentary Papers*, 1860, XII, pp. 455–6.
101. *Ibid.*, p. 457.
102. *Ibid.*
103. *Ibid.*
104. *Ibid.*
105. On the background of the Statistical Society of London see M.J. Cullen, *The Statistical Movement in Early Victorian Britain*, pp. 78–104.
106. Thomas Hare, 'On the Application of a New Statistical Method to the Ascertainment of the Votes of Majorities in a More Exhaustive Manner', p. 343.
107. *Ibid.*, p. 344.
108. *Ibid.*, pp. 345–9.
109. *Ibid.*, p. 349.
110. *Ibid.*, pp. 352–3.
111. Frederick Denison Maurice to Thomas Hare, 30 April 1860, Hare Papers, MS 356.
112. Frederick Denison Maurice, 'The Suffrage Considered in Relation to the Working Class and to the Professional Class', p. 97. On this and subsequent discussion of Hare's electoral system by others including Hare in

- Macmillan's Magazine* during the 1860s and 1870s see George J. Worth, *Macmillan's Magazine*, pp. 72–4. See also Jenifer Hart, *Proportional Representation*, pp. 67–9.
113. Thomas Hare, *A Treatise on the Election of Representatives*, 2nd edn, pp. 29–30.
 114. John Stuart Mill, *Considerations on Representative Government*, p. 118.
 115. *Ibid.*, pp. 145–6.
 116. *Ibid.*, p. 135.
 117. *Ibid.*, p. 142.
 118. *Ibid.*, p. 146.
 119. *Ibid.*, p. 148.
 120. *Ibid.*, p. 147.
 121. See John Stuart Mill, *On Liberty*, Chapter 2: 'Of the Liberty of Thought and Discussion'.
 122. On plural voting in *Considerations on Representative Government* see Chapter 8: 'Of the Extension of the Suffrage', pp. 170–1, and on the ballot see Chapter 10: 'On the Mode of Voting', pp. 190–203.
 123. *Ibid.*, p. 139.
 124. *Ibid.*, p. 142. The significance of Hare's electoral system in relationship to Mill's *Considerations* is discussed by Dennis F. Thompson in *John Stuart Mill and Representative Government*, pp. 107–12, by John M. Robson in *The Improvement of Mankind*, pp. 228–33, and by Alan Ryan in *J.S. Mill*, pp. 207–10. See also Paul B. Kern, 'Universal Suffrage without Democracy', pp. 312–19. For the divergence of Mill's *Considerations* from James Mill's *Essay on Government* with reference to democracy and representation as related to Hare's electoral system see also Alan Ryan, 'Two Concepts of Politics and Democracy', pp. 99–111; Richard W. Krouse, 'Two Concepts of Democratic Representation', pp. 528–35; Nadia Urbinati, *Mill on Democracy*, pp. 78–9.
 125. Henry Fawcett, 'Mr Mill's Treatise on Representative Government', p. 103.
 126. *Ibid.*
 127. John Stuart Mill to Thomas Hare, 5 July 1861, in Frances E. Mineka and Dwight N. Lindley, eds, *The Later Letters of John Stuart Mill, Collected Works*, XV, p. 730.
 128. See R.B. Litchfield, 'Mr J.S. Mill on Representative Government'.
 129. See Alastair Buchan, *The Spare Chancellor*, pp. 116–17; J.W. Burrow, 'Sense and Circumstances', p. 180.
 130. Walter Bagehot, 'Considerations on Representative Government', p. 540.
 131. *Ibid.*, pp. 540–1.
 132. 'Mr Mill on Representative Government', pp. 107–8.
 133. *Ibid.*, p. 108.
 134. University Elections Bill, 1861, *Parliamentary Papers*, 1861, XIV, pp. 587–602.
 135. Thomas Hare, 'Suggestions for the Improvement of Our Representative System', p. 295.
 136. *Ibid.*
 137. *Ibid.*, p. 298.
 138. *Ibid.*, p. 299.
 139. G.O. Trevelyan, 'A Few Remarks on Mr Hare's Scheme of Representation', p. 170.

140. Thomas Hare, 'On the Election of Representative or Governing Bodies by Exhaustive Majorities and Unanimous Quotas of the Constituencies', p. 111.
141. *Ibid.*, p. 205.
142. *Ibid.*
143. Thomas Hare, 'Ideal of a Local Government for the Metropolis', p. 445. On *Usque ad Coelum* see Chapter 1.
144. Lord Robert Cecil, 'Representation of Minorities', p. 323. See also Michael Pinto-Duschinsky, *The Political Thought of Lord Salisbury*, pp. 109–10. See further Lord Robert Cecil, 'The House of Commons' and the comment by Michael Bentley in *Lord Salisbury's World*, p. 148.
145. 3rd Earl Grey, *Parliamentary Government Considered with Reference to Reform*, 2nd edn, p. 206. For the first edition published in 1858 see Chapter 2.
146. 3rd Earl Grey, *Parliamentary Government Considered with Reference to Reform*, 2nd edn, p. 203.
147. James Garth Marshall to 3rd Earl Grey, 19 May 1864, Grey Papers.
148. Lord John Russell, *An Essay on the History of the English Government and Constitution*, 3rd edn, p. li. On the first and second editions of this work in 1821 and 1823 see John Prest, *Lord John Russell*, pp. 20–1; Paul Scherer, *Lord John Russell*, pp. 35–6.
149. Russell, *An Essay on the History of the English Government and Constitution*, 3rd edn, p. li.
150. Thomas Hare, *A Treatise on the Election of Representatives*, 3rd edn, p. xix.
151. *Ibid.*
152. *Ibid.*, pp. xxi–xxii.
153. *Ibid.*, p. xii.
154. *Ibid.*, p. xiii.
155. *Ibid.*, p. xvii.
156. *Ibid.*, p. xviii–xix.
157. *Ibid.*, pp. ix–x.
158. See the entry on Droop in Frederic Boase, *Modern English Biography*, Vol. I, and his obituary in *The Times*, 22 March 1884. See also Duncan Black, *A Mathematical Approach to Proportional Representation*, pp. 76–7.
159. Thomas Hare, *A Treatise on the Election of Representatives*, 3rd edn, p. 305.
160. *Ibid.*, p. 306. See also Enid Lakeman, *How Democracies Vote*, pp. 146–9.
161. *Parliamentary Papers*, 1864, XLI, p. 579.
162. *Ibid.*, p. 596. For the electoral system of Carl Andrae in Denmark see Chapter 2.
163. Thomas Hare, *A Treatise on the Election of Representatives*, 3rd edn, p. x. See also pp. xi–xii and 302–5.
164. Robert Lytton to Thomas Hare, 17 April 1865, Hare Papers, MS 356.
165. Thomas Hare, *A Treatise on the Election of Representatives*, 3rd edn, pp. 307–28.
166. See Catherine Helen Spence, *Autobiography*, p. 23; R.B. Walker, 'Catherine Helen Spence and South Australian Politics', p. 35. See also R.B. Walker, 'Catherine Helen Spence: Unitarian Utopian'. For the Adelaide experiment see Chapter 2.
167. Catherine Helen Spence, *Autobiography*, pp. 23–4.

168. Spence quotes from the articles by Hare in her *A Plea for Pure Democracy*, pp. 10, 23.
169. Catherine Helen Spence, *Mr Hogarth's Will*, I, p. 244.
170. Catherine Helen Spence, *Autobiography*, p. 26. See also her 'An Australian's Impressions of England'.
171. Thomas Hare, *A Treatise on the Election of Representatives*, 3rd edn, pp. 298–301, 344–7. See also Maurice Block, 'Congrès International des Sciences Sociales'.
172. See Clarence Gilbert Hoag and George Hervey Hallett, Jr., *Proportional Representation*, p. 171; Andrew McClaren Carstairs, *A Short History of Electoral Systems in Western Europe*, pp. 137–8.
173. *Ibid.*
174. See A. Morin, *De la représentation de minorités*, pp. 9–22; Thomas Hare, *A Treatise on the Election of Representatives*, 3rd edn, pp. 295–7.
175. See A. Morin, *De la représentation de minorités*, p. 4.
176. See *The Times*, 29 August 1864, p. 8.
177. See Hélène Naville, *Ernest Naville*, II, pp. 49–86.
178. Ernest Naville to Catherine Helen Spence, October 1894, in John H. Humphreys, *Proportional Representation*, pp. 196–7.
179. See John Foord, *The Life and Public Services of Simon Sterne*, pp. 4–7, 96–133.
180. See *Daily News*, 20 March 1865, p. 5.
181. Thomas Hare, *On Such an Organisation of the Metropolitan Elections as would Call into Existence the Greatest Amount of Knowledge and Judgement of the Constituencies and as far as possible Discourage All Corrupt and Pernicious Influences*.
182. *Daily News*, 11 April 1865, p. 2. See also Frederic Hill, *Parliamentary Reform*, p. 21. On Thomas Wright Hill see Chapter 2.
183. *Daily News*, 11 April 1865, p. 2. The system provided for voluntary constituencies, but each constituency returned a single member by a majority voting system. See Clarence Gilbert Hoag and George Hervey Hallett, Jr., *Proportional Representation*, p. 168.
184. *Daily News*, 11 April 1865, p. 2.
185. *Daily News*, 19 April 1865, p. 6.
186. Richard Cobden to John Bright, 16 January 1865, quoted in John Morley, *The Life of Richard Cobden*, II, p. 461.
187. *Daily News*, 9 May 1865, p. 7.
188. John Stuart Mill to Thomas Hare, 29 May 1865, in Frances E. Mineka and Dwight N. Lindley, eds, *The Later Letters of John Stuart Mill, Collected Works*, XVI, p. 1060.
189. *Daily News*, 24 April 1865, p. 2.
190. *Daily News*, 2 May 1865, p. 6.
191. *Ibid.*
192. See Edward C. Mack and W.H.G. Armytage, *Thomas Hughes*, pp. 144–6.
193. *Bee-hive*, 13 May 1865, p. 6.
194. Thomas Hare, 'An Electoral Reform', p. 440.
195. *Ibid.*, p. 440.
196. *Ibid.*
197. The number of members in the House of Commons was 658 from 1801 to 1885 when it was increased to 670.

198. Thomas Hare, 'An Electoral Reform', p. 441.
199. *Ibid.*, p. 440.
200. Thomas Hare, 'On the Frame of a Bill for Enabling Parliamentary Electors Voluntarily to Withdraw their Names from the Local Registry, and form Unanimous Constituencies', p. 169.
201. *Ibid.*, p. 170.
202. John Stuart Mill to Thomas Hare, 11 January 1866, in Frances E. Mineka and Dwight N. Lindley, eds, *The Later Letters of John Stuart Mill, Collected Works*, XVI, p. 1138.
203. Thomas Hare, 'The Keystone of Parliamentary Reform', p. 559.
204. *Ibid.*
205. *Ibid.*, pp. 562–3.
206. *Ibid.*, p. 563.
207. *Ibid.*, p. 565.
208. Thomas Hare, 'An Improved Constitution', p. 145, for which see Chapter 1.
209. John Boyd Kinnear, 'Practical Considerations on the Representation of Minorities', p. 55.
210. *Ibid.*
211. *Ibid.*
212. Thomas Hare, 'Individual Responsibility in Representative Government', p. 351.
213. *Ibid.*, pp. 352–3.
214. Walter Bagehot, 'The English Constitution: VI', pp. 266–72, 282–3.
215. See note 130 above.
216. Walter Bagehot, 'The English Constitution: VI', p. 268.
217. Catherine Helen Spence, 'Principles of Representation', p. 426. This article was published under the name of Edward Wilson, an Australian journalist, for whom it was written by Spence. See Catherine Helen Spence, *Autobiography*, p. 25.
218. Spence, 'Principles of Representation', p. 428.
219. *Ibid.*
220. *Ibid.*, pp. 431–2.
221. *Ibid.*, p. 432.
222. Frederick Denison Maurice, *The Workman and the Franchise*, p. 203.
223. *Ibid.*, pp. 223, 231–2.
224. *Parliamentary Papers*, 1866, XIII, pp. 378–93. On this Select Committee see Chapter 1.
225. On the 1866 franchise bill see F.B. Smith, *The Making of the Second Reform Bill*, pp. 50–91. See also Jonathan Parry, 'Past and Future in the Later Career of Lord John Russell', p. 169; Robert Saunders, 'The Politics of Reform' p. 583.
226. On the 1866 redistribution bill see F.B. Smith, *The Making of the Second Reform Bill*, pp. 91–111.
227. 3rd Earl Grey to John Stuart Mill (draft), 15 May 1866, Grey Papers.
228. John Stuart Mill to 3rd Earl Grey, 21 May 1866, in Frances E. Mineka and Dwight N. Lindley, eds, *The Later Letters of John Stuart Mill, Collected Works*, XVI, p. 1169.
229. *Hansard*, Third Series, CLXXXIII, cols. 1582–3.

230. *Ibid.*, col. 1591.
231. *Ibid.*
232. See James Winter, *Robert Lowe*, pp. 212–26. See also Robert Saunders, 'The Politics of Reform', pp. 581–3; Kristen Zimmerman, 'Liberal Speech', pp. 1195–6.
233. Entry for 24 July 1866, H.C.G. Matthew, ed., *The Gladstone Diaries*, VI, p. 454. On the reform demonstrations see Royden Harrison, *Before the Socialists*, pp. 82–3; Eugenio Biagini, *Liberty, Retrenchment and Reform*, pp. 261–2.
234. Thomas Hare, 'A Grouping of Parliamentary Electors', p. 205.
235. *Ibid.*
236. *Ibid.*, p. 273.
237. Thomas Hughes to Thomas Hare, 7 January 1867, Hare Papers, Add. MSS 43773, fol. 43.
238. See F.B. Smith, *The Making of the Second Reform Bill*, pp. 148, 167.
239. See Chistopher Harvie, *The Lights of Liberalism*, pp. 116–40.
240. John Boyd Kinnear, 'Redistribution of Seats'.
241. Leslie Stephen, 'On the Choice of Representatives by Popular Constituencies', p. 112. See also Noel Annan, *Leslie Stephen*, pp. 48–60, 296–9.
242. Leslie Stephen, 'Reform', p. 535.
243. *Ibid.*, p. 536.
244. *Ibid.*, p. 534.
245. *Hansard*, Third Series, CLXXXVII, col. 1349.
246. *Ibid.*, col. 1344.
247. *Ibid.*, cols. 1351–2.
248. *Ibid.*, col. 1354.
249. *Ibid.*, cols. 1355–6.
250. *Ibid.*, col. 1356. See also Bruce L. Kinzer, Ann P. Robson; John M. Robson, *A Moralist In and Out of Parliament*, pp. 106–7.
251. In Bertrand Russell and Patricia Russell, eds., *The Amberley Papers*, II, p. 39.
252. *Hansard*, Third Series, CLXXXVII, col. 1359.
253. *Ibid.*, col. 1357.
254. *Ibid.*, col. 1360. On Morrison see Geoffrey Dawson, 'Walter Morrison'.
255. *Hansard*, Third Series, CLXXXVII, 1942 and 1953.
256. *Ibid.*, col. 1959.
257. *Ibid.*, col. 1966.
258. *Ibid.*, col. 1967.
259. *Ibid.*, cols. 1969–72.
260. *Hansard*, Third Series, CLXXXVIII, 1037.
261. *Ibid.*, col. 1112. See also the entry in the diary of Lord Stanley for 5 July 1867 in J.R. Vincent, ed., *Disraeli, Derby and the Conservative Party*, p. 313.
262. *Hansard*, Third Series, CLXXXVIII, col. 1095.
263. *Ibid.*, col. 1102.
264. As Mill supported the cumulative vote for the same reason as did Lowe, to maintain the electoral viability of the clerisy and to prevent the 'tyranny of the majority', and as both Gladstone and Disraeli were opposed to the representation of minorities, the division on the Lowe amendment need not be considered to have been 'extraordinarily confused' as does F.B. Smith in *The Making of the Second Reform Bill*, p. 213.

265. *Hansard*, Third Series, CLXXXVIII, cols. 1120–4.
266. The limited vote and the cumulative vote are confused by F.B. Smith in *The Making of the Second Reform Bill*, pp. 209–14, by Maurice Cowling in *1867*, p. 421, and by K. Theodore Hoppen in *The Mid-Victorian Generation*, p. 252.
267. *Hansard*, Third Series, CLXXXII, col. 1463.
268. *Hansard*, Third Series, CLXXXIX, col. 446. See also Robert Saunders, 'Lord John Russell and Parliamentary Reform', pp. 1313–14.
269. *Hansard*, Third Series, CLXXXIX, col. 1127.
270. *Ibid.*, col. 1172.
271. *Ibid.*, col. 1166. See also H.C.G. Matthew, *Gladstone*, I, pp. 139–42.
272. *Hansard*, Third Series, CLXXXIX. 1179–83.
273. The boroughs were Birmingham, Glasgow, Leeds, Liverpool, and Manchester, and the counties were Berkshire, Buckinghamshire, Cambridgeshire, Dorset, Herefordshire, Hertfordshire, and Oxfordshire. See H.J. Hanham, *Elections and Party Management*, p. 398. On the political implications of the minority clause see F.B. Smith, *The Making of the Second Reform Bill*, pp. 240–1. On the electoral consequences of the minority clause see John H. Humphreys, *Proportional Representation*, pp. 65–8; Enid Lakeman, *How Democracies Vote*, pp. 83–5; Jenifer Hart, *Proportional Representation*, pp. 119–21; Alistair McMillan, 'The Limited Vote in Britain'.
274. See F.B. Smith, *The Making of the Second Reform Bill*, p. 236–40; Robert Blake, *Disraeli*, pp. 475–7; K. Theodore Hoppen, *The Mid-Victorian Generation*, pp. 252–3; Jonathan Parry, *The Rise and Fall of Liberal Government in Victorian Britain*, pp. 216–7. The most detailed accounts of the legislation and its consequences remain Charles Seymour, *Electoral Reform in England and Wales*, pp. 234–316; H.J. Hanham, *Elections and Party Management*, pp. 3–113. See also Norman McCord, 'Some Difficulties of Parliamentary Reform'; K. Theodore Hoppen, 'The Franchise and Electoral Politics in England and Ireland'; John Davis and Duncan Tanner, 'The Borough Franchise after 1867'; J.R. Vincent, 'The Effect of the Second Reform Act in Lancashire'.
275. John Stuart Mill Mill to James Garth Marshall, 26 October 1867, in Frances E. Mineka and Dwight N. Lindley, eds, *The Later Letters of John Stuart Mill*, *Collected Works*, XVI, p. 1322.

4 The Representative Reform Association, 1867–1874

1. *Daily News*, 26 October 1867, p. 2.
2. *Ibid.*
3. Reform League Executive Committee Minute-books, 8 November 1867, Howell Collection. On Howell and the Reform League following the passage of the Second Reform Act see F.M. Leventhal, *Respectable Radical*, pp. 92–116.
4. George Howell to Thomas Hare, 9 November 1867, Letter-books, Howell Collection.
5. Reform League Executive Committee Minute-books, 22 November 1867, Howell Collection.

6. John Stuart Mill to Thomas Hare, 30 December 1867, in Frances E. Mineka and Dwight N. Lindley, eds, *The Later Letters of John Stuart Mill, Collected Works*, XVI, pp. 1341–2.
7. See F.M. Leventhal, *Respectable Radical*, p. 100.
8. Circular for 'Conference on the Redistribution of Seats', Howell Collection. See also George Howell to Edmund Beales, 7 February 1868, Letter-books, Howell Collection.
9. *Representative Reform*, p. 2. On the Reform League conference meetings see also Jenifer Hart, *Proportional Representation*, pp. 62–3.
10. See Chapter 3.
11. *Daily News*, 2 March 1868, p. 2.
12. *Ibid.*
13. The term 'gerrymander' was derived from the name of Elbridge Gerry, who when Governor of Massachusetts in 1812 rearranged the state senatorial districts in an irregular salamander shape for the benefit of the Jeffersonian Republican party. See W.R. Ware, *The Machinery of Politics and Proportional Representation*, pp. 28–9.
14. *Daily News*, 2 March 1868, p. 2. On the debate in the Reform League over Fenianism see F.M. Leventhal, *Respectable Radical*, pp. 98–9.
15. *Daily News*, 2 March 1868, p. 2.
16. *Ibid.*
17. John Seeley, 'Milton's Political Opinions', pp. 304–5. See also Deborah Wormell, *Sir John Seeley and the Uses of History*, pp. 146–7; Richard Shannon, 'John Robert Seeley and the Idea of a National Church'.
18. *Daily News*, 2 March 1868, p. 2.
19. *Ibid.*, On Harrison see Chapter 5.
20. *Daily News*, 2 March 1868, p. 2.
21. *Ibid.*
22. *Ibid.*
23. *Ibid.*
24. Walter Morrison to George Howell, 29 February 1868, Letters to Howell, 1868, fol. 34, Howell Collection.
25. *Daily News*, 9 March 1868, p. 3.
26. *Ibid.*
27. *Ibid.*
28. John Stuart Mill to Thomas Hare, 8 March 1868, in Frances E. Mineka and Dwight N. Lindley, eds, *The Later Letters of John Stuart Mill, Collected Works*, XVI, p. 1372.
29. *The Times*, 23 March 1868, p. 7.
30. *Ibid.*
31. *Ibid.*
32. *Ibid.*
33. *Ibid.*
34. *Ibid.*
35. *Ibid.*
36. *Ibid.*
37. *Ibid.*
38. *Ibid.*
39. *Ibid.*

40. *Daily News*, 23 March 1868, p. 3.
41. George Howell to Charles Wentworth Dilke, 25 March 1868, Letter-books, Howell Collection.
42. George Howell to Thomas Hare, 25 March 1868, Letter-books, Howell Collection.
43. Notice by George Howell dated 30 March 1868, Letter-books, Howell Collection.
44. *The Times*, 15 June 1868, p. 5.
45. *Representative Reform*, title verso.
46. *Ibid.*
47. *Ibid.*, On the founding and subsequent activities of the Representative Reform Association see also Jenifer Hart, *Proportional Representation*, pp. 63–5. On Spence, Sterne and Field, and Naville see Chapter 3.
48. Walter Morrison to George Howell, 9 October 1868, Letters to Howell, fol. 39, Howell Collection. The financial report for the first two years (July 1868 to July 1870) indicates that Morrison contributed £230.10s of the £258.2s total income, over half of which went for printing expenses (£161) and office rent (£62.10s). Subscriptions totalled £93.12s, which dropped to £32.15s in the next financial year report (August 1870 to December 1871). Howell Collection. In addition, Morrison paid Howell an annual salary of £100. See F.M. Leventhal, *Respectable Radical*, p. 136.
49. See H.J. Hanham, *Elections and Party Management*, pp. 209–17. On the politics of the question of the Irish Church and the 1868 election see Jonathan Parry, *Democracy and Religion*, pp. 267–80; G.I.T. Machin, *Politics and the Churches in Great Britain, 1832–1868*, pp. 355–79. See also Leslie Stephen, 'The Political Situation in England'.
50. The Reform League did not endorse Hare's electoral system as suggested by F.B. Smith in *The Making of the Second Reform Bill*, pp. 235, 241. See also Royden Harrison, *Before the Socialists*, pp. 137–209.
51. In R.A.J. Walling, ed., *The Diaries of John Bright*, p. 332. See also J.R. Vincent, *The Formation of the Liberal Party*, p. 201.
52. Walter Morrison to George Howell, 16 July 1868, Letters to Howell, 1868, fol. 37, Howell Collection.
53. See F.M. Leventhal, *Respectable Radical*, pp. 117–21.
54. Quoted in H.J. Hanham, *Elections and Party Management*, p. 340.
55. Walter Morrison to George Howell, 27 November 1868, Letters to Howell, 1868, fol. 43, Howell Collection.
56. See H.J. Hanham, *Elections and Party Management*, p. 398. According to Hanham, the minority clause gave the Liberals three extra votes in the House of Commons in 1868. See also F.B. Smith, *The Making of the Second Reform Bill*, pp. 240–1; Vernon Bogdanor, *The People and the Party System*, pp. 103–4. For the statistics of the Birmingham and Glasgow elections see F.W.S. Craig, *British Parliamentary Election Results*, pp. 48, 547. The application of the minority clause in Manchester in the 1868 general election is treated by Miles Taylor in *Ernest Jones*, pp. 238–9. See also 'The Minority Clause' in the *Spectator*, 5 December 1868, p. 1429.
57. See Tygrve Tholfsen, 'The Origins of the Birmingham Caucus'; E.P. Hennock, *Fit and Proper Persons*, pp. 131–3.
58. See Roland Quinault, 'John Bright and Joseph Chamberlain', p. 628.

59. Thomas Hare, 'On the Means of Manifesting Public Opinion', pp. 60–1.
60. *Ibid.*, p. 61.
61. *Ibid.*, p. 62.
62. *Ibid.*
63. 'The Working of the Minority Clause', *Economist*, 5 December 1868, pp. 1384–5.
64. Thomas Hare, 'On the Means of Manifesting Public Opinion', p. 66.
65. *Ibid.*, p. 63.
66. *Ibid.*, pp. 69–71. On Thomas Wright Hill see Chapter 2.
67. Frederic Hill, 'Principles and Functions of Government', p. 261.
68. Henry Richmond Droop, *On Methods of Electing Representatives*, p. 13. On Droop, see Chapter 3.
69. Henry Richmond Droop, *On Methods of Electing Representatives*, p. 13.
70. *Ibid.*, p. 17. For an example see Enid Lakeman, *How Democracies Vote*, pp. 146–9.
71. Henry Richmond Droop, *On Methods of Electing Representatives*, p. 18.
72. *Ibid.*, p. 32. See also Jenifer Hart, *Proportional Representation*, p. 70. On Andrae, see Chapter 2.
73. Henry Richmond Droop, 'On the Political and Social Effects of Different Methods of Electing Representatives', p. 507.
74. On Baily, see his obituary in *The Times*, 3 April 1917, p. 8. His sister Clara Baily married Henry Richmond Droop. See L.G.H. Horton-Smith, *The Baily Family*, p. 264.
75. Walter Baily, *A Scheme for Proportional Representation*, p. 3.
76. *Ibid.*
77. See Henry Richmond Droop, 'On the Political and Social Effects of Different Methods of Electing Representatives', p. 475.
78. See Bruce L. Kinzer, *The Ballot Question*, pp. 101–3; E.D. Steele, *Irish Land and British Politics*, pp. 94–5.
79. Bruce L. Kinzer, *The Ballot Question*, pp. 119–22.
80. *Hansard*, Third Series, CXCV, col. 1546.
81. Walter Morrison to George Howell, 16 March 1869, Letters to Howell, 1869, fol. 16, Howell Collection. Bruce L. Kinzer in *The Ballot Question*, p. 120, indicates that payment of election expenses was the central concern of Morrison without reference to Hare's electoral system.
82. *Hansard*, Third Series, CXCV, col. 1787. See also Bruce L. Kinzer, *The Ballot Question*, p. 121.
83. Report of General Meeting of 15 July 1869, Howell Collection.
84. *Ibid.*
85. Quoted in *ibid.*
86. *ibid.*
87. *Ibid.*
88. *Ibid.*
89. Clair J. Grece, 'Upon Negative Voting', p. 648.
90. *Ibid.*, pp. 662, 665.
91. Thomas Hare, 'On the Constitution of Municipalities and Local Governing Bodies for London and Other Towns and Districts', for which see Chapter 1.
92. Simon Sterne, *Representative Government: Its Evils and Their Reform*, p. 36.

93. David Dudley Field, 'Representation of Minorities'. This paper was also published in *Putnam's Magazine* in June 1870.
94. See Clarence Gilbert Hoag and George Hervey Hallett, Jr., *Proportional Representation*, p. 186; W.R. Ware, 'Application of Mr Hare's System'. The Harvard experiment was abandoned after 1872. See also the comments by Hare in 'Minority Representation in Europe', p. 190, a paper read at a general meeting of the American Social Science Association held in Philadelphia on 25 October 1870. On the American Social Science Association during the 1870s, see Thomas L. Haskell, *The Emergence of Professional Social Science*, pp. 122–43.
95. See George S. Blair, 'The Adoption of Cumulative Voting in Illinois'.
96. *Parliamentary Papers*, 1870, IV, p. 169.
97. *Hansard*, Third Series, CXCIX, col. 267. See also the cabinet minutes for 5 March 1870 in H.C.G. Matthew, ed., *The Gladstone Diaries*, VII, p. 250.
98. *Hansard*, Third Series, CCII, col. 129.
99. *Ibid.*, col. 130.
100. *Ibid.*, cols. 132–4.
101. *Ibid.*, col. 134.
102. *Ibid.*, col. 141.
103. *Ibid.*, col. 144. See also H.C.G. Matthew, ed., *The Gladstone Diaries*, VII, p. 307.
104. *Hansard*, Third Series, CCII, cols. 146–7.
105. *Ibid.*, col. 147. On the significance of communities in the political thought of Gladstone as related to parliamentary representation see David Bebbington, *The Mind of Gladstone*, pp. 269–88, 301–5; H.C.G. Matthew, *Gladstone*, II, p. 180. See also Roland Quinault, 'Gladstone and Parliamentary Reform', p. 89. The emphasis by Gladstone on the representation of communities as opposed to the emphasis by Mill on the representation of individuals renders problematic a reconciliation of the liberalism of Gladstone and the liberalism of Mill as attempted by Eugenio Biagini in 'Liberalism and Direct Democracy', pp. 39–41. Further on Mill see Eugenio Biagini, 'Radicalism and Liberty', pp. 106–9. In this regard see also Stefan Collini, *Public Moralists*, pp. 155–9, 167–9.
106. *Hansard*, Third Series, CCII, 148.
107. *Ibid.*, col. 155.
108. *Ibid.*, col. 150.
109. *Ibid.*, col. 151.
110. *Ibid.*, col. 157.
111. *Ibid.*, cols. 152–4.
112. *Ibid.*, cols. 172–3.
113. *Ibid.*, col. 175.
114. *Ibid.*, cols. 176–8.
115. *Ibid.*, cols. 180–3.
116. See Patrick Jackson, *Education Act Forster*, pp. 150–80.
117. *Hansard*, Third Series, CCII, 1420.
118. *Ibid.*, cols. 1420–1.
119. *Ibid.*, col. 1421.
120. *Ibid.*, col. 1424.
121. *Ibid.*, cols. 1424–5.

122. See the evidence by Forster before the Select Committee on School Board Elections (Voting), *Parliamentary Papers*, 1884–1885, XI, p. 416.
123. *Annual Register*, 1870, p. 69. For its consequences see John H. Humphreys, *Proportional Representation*, pp. 70–4; Shaun Bowler, Todd Donovan, and David M. Farrell, 'Party Strategy and Voter Organization under Cumulative Voting in Victorian England'.
124. Representative Reform Association report of meeting on 6 August 1870, p. 2, Howell Collection.
125. *The Times*, 8 August 1870, p. 10. For the Labour Representation League see Henry Pelling, *The Origins of the Labour Party*, pp. 2–3.
126. Hare was the first speaker at the meeting held on 17 July 1869. See Helen Blackburn, *Women's Suffrage*, p. 91. See also David Rubinstein, *A Different World for Women*, pp. 36–7. On Millicent Garrett Fawcett see also David Rubinstein, 'Victorian Feminists', and on the London National Society for Women's Suffrage see also A.P.W. Robson, 'The Founding of the National Society for Women's Suffrage'.
127. Millicent Garrett Fawcett, 'Proportional Representation', p. 377.
128. *Ibid.*
129. *Ibid.*, p. 378.
130. *Ibid.*, p. 379.
131. *Ibid.*
132. *Ibid.*, p. 382.
133. *Bee-hive*, 29 October 1870, p. 580.
134. See Patricia Hollis, *Ladies Elect*, p. 73. In 1876, Alice Westlake, supported by Eleanor Marx, became a member of the London school board in which office she proved a Liberal Party loyalist. *Ibid.*, p. 92. See also Chushichi Tsuzuki, *The Life of Eleanor Marx*, pp. 48–9.
135. *Bee-hive*, 29 October 1870, p. 580.
136. See Peter Griffiths, 'Pressure Groups and Parties in Late Victorian England'.
137. See N.J. Richards, 'Religious Controversy and the School Boards', pp. 182–3; G.I.T. Machin, *Politics and the Churches in Great Britain, 1869–1921*, p. 38. For the statistics of the 1870 Birmingham school board election see Francis Adams, *History of the Elementary School Contest in England*, pp. 249–50.
138. Thomas Hare, 'On the Suggestions Afforded by the Application of the Cumulative Vote', p. 218.
139. *Ibid.*, p. 219.
140. *Ibid.*, p. 221.
141. *Ibid.*, p. 234.
142. Joseph Chamberlain to Charles Wentworth Dilke, 17 February 1871, Chamberlain Papers, JC 5/24/276.
143. *The Cumulative Method of Voting*, p. 5.
144. *Ibid.*
145. *Ibid.*, p. 7.
146. *Ibid.*, p. 15.
147. *Ibid.*, p. 17.
148. W.M. Torrens, 'The London School Board', p. 387.
149. Quoted in T. Wemyss Reid, *Life of the Right Honourable William Edward Forster*, I, p. 527.
150. Quoted in *ibid.*, p. 528–9.

151. *Parliamentary Papers*, 1871, II, p. 1, and *Hansard*, Third Series, CCIV, col. 1499.
152. *Brighton Guardian*, 15 March 1871.
153. Henry Richmond Droop, *Proportional Representation as Applied to the Election of Local Governing Bodies*, p. 5.
154. *Ibid.*, pp. 5–6.
155. *Ibid.*, pp. 23–5.
156. Millicent Garrett Fawcett, 'A Short Explanation of Mr Hare's Scheme of Representation', p. 486.
157. *Ibid.*, p. 487.
158. *Ibid.*
159. Thomas Hare, *Memorandum on the History, Working, and Results of Cumulative Voting*, p. 7.
160. *Ibid.*, p. 9.
161. *Ibid.*, pp. 15–17.
162. *Ibid.*, p. 18.
163. See H.C.G. Matthew, ed., *The Gladstone Diaries*, VIII, p. 4.
164. *Hansard*, CCVII, cols. 1525–30.
165. *Ibid.*, col. 1535.
166. *Ibid.*
167. *Ibid.*, col. 1536.
168. Representative Reform Association report of December 1871, p. 2, Howell Collection.
169. Walter Baily, *Proportional Representation in Large Constituencies*, pp. 3–4.
170. *Ibid.*, pp. 21–2.
171. Millicent Garrett Fawcett, 'An American on Representation', p. 238.
172. *Ibid.*, p. 241.
173. Howell Collection.
174. See *The Fourth Annual Co-operative Congress*, p. 45, and the 1872 memorandum on preferential voting by Morrison in *The Fifth Annual Co-operative Congress*, pp. 121–3. See also Philip N. Backstrom, *Christian Socialism and Co-operation in Victorian England*, pp. 66, 80, 83.
175. See W.R. Ware, *The Machinery of Politics and Proportional Representation*.
176. See Ernest Naville, *On the Theory and Practice of Representative Elections*. Droop later wrote that he 'had [it] translated & printed, because I found that French pamphlets had such a limited circulation in England, and I considered his mode of dealing with the question particularly clear and good'. Henry Richmond Droop to unidentified correspondent, 15 February 1884, Proportional Representation Society Papers.
177. For the speech by Fawcett see *Hansard*, Third Series, CCX, cols. 1893–9.
178. *Parliamentary Papers*, 1872, IV, pp. 231–50. See also Jenifer Hart, *Proportional Representation*, pp. 70–1.
179. *Hansard*, Third Series, CCXII, cols. 894–5.
180. *Ibid.*, col. 903.
181. *Ibid.*, col. 916.
182. *Ibid.*, cols. 926.
183. Walter Morrison to 3rd Earl Grey, 26 August 1872, Grey Papers. See also the comment on this letter by Jonathan Parry in *Democracy and Religion*, p. 251.

184. Henry Fawcett to 3rd Earl Grey, 28 August 1872, Grey Papers. See the criticism of the Gladstone ministry by Fawcett in his 'The Present Position of the Government' in the *Fortnightly Review* in November 1871, and the comment on this article by Lawrence Goldman in 'Introduction: "An Advanced Liberal"', pp. 20–2.
185. 3rd Grey to Henry Fawcett (copy), 2 September 1872, Grey Papers. For the second edition of Grey's *Parliamentary Government Considered with Reference to Reform* in 1864 see Chapter 3.
186. *The Times*, 12 October 1872, p. 5.
187. E.H. Knatchbull-Hugessen, 'Redistribution of Political Power', pp. 75–6. See also the comments by Jonathan Parry in *Democracy and Religion*, pp. 79, 192.
188. *The Times*, 13 November 1872, p. 9. On the Electoral Reform Association see David Nicholls, *The Lost Prime Minister*, pp. 60–1.
189. *Hansard*, Third Series, CCXV, 1561.
190. *Ibid.*, col. 1573.
191. *Ibid.*, col. 1574.
192. *Ibid.*, cols. 1575–82.
193. *Ibid.*, col. 1590.
194. *Parliamentary Papers*, 1873, III, p. 351.
195. *Hansard*, Third Series, CCXVII, cols. 486–7.
196. *Ibid.*, col. 825.
197. *Ibid.*, cols. 844–8.
198. Quoted in T. Wemyss Reid, *Life of the Right Honourable William Edward Forster*, I, p. 566.
199. See N.J. Richards, 'Religious Controversy and the School Boards', p. 183; G.I.T. Machin, *Politics and the Churches in Great Britain, 1869–1921*, p. 38.
200. James E. Thorold Rogers, *Cobden and Modern Political Opinion*, p. 298. In 1867, Rogers had contributed 'Bribery' to *Questions for a Reformed Parliament*, for which see Chapter 3.
201. See Thomas Hare, *A Treatise on the Election of Representatives*, 4th edn, pp. vi and 124–6.
202. *Ibid.*, pp. 359–72.
203. John Stuart Mill, *Autobiography*, p. 193.
204. Thomas Hare, 'John Stuart Mill', pp. 145–50.
205. On the 1874 general election see H.J. Hanham, *Elections and Party Management*, pp. 218–27; Jonathan Parry, *Democracy and Religion*, pp. 387–410; T.A. Jenkins, *Gladstone, Whiggery and the Liberal Party*, pp. 30–1, 39–40; Lawrence Goldman, 'The Defection of the Middle Class', pp. 118–23.
206. Typescript memoir by George Howell concerning the Representative Reform Association, p. 2, Howell Collection.

5 Proportional Representation and the Caucus, 1874–1884

1. Thomas Hare, 'The Construction of a Municipality for the Metropolis', p. 8. On this paper see Chapter 1.
2. *Ibid.*, pp. 10–1.

3. Ibid., p. 8.
4. Ibid.
5. *The Sixth Annual Co-operative Congress*, p. 16. For Neale and Morrison see Philip N. Backstrom, *Christian Socialism and Co-operation in Victorian England*, pp. 66, 80, 83.
6. *Parliamentary Papers*, 1874, III, p. 483.
7. *Hansard*, Third Series, CCXIX, cols. 367–8.
8. Ibid., CCXXV, col. 1430.
9. Ibid., col. 1446.
10. Ibid., col. 1449.
11. Ibid., col. 1086.
12. Ibid., col. 1539.
13. Ibid., col. 1543.
14. Ibid., col. 1550.
15. Ibid., col. 1554.
16. On Harrison and parliamentary reform see Martha S. Vogeler, *Frederic Harrison*, pp. 70–85; Christopher Harvie, *The Lights of Liberalism*, pp. 119–25. On the positivism of Harrison see also T.R. Wright, *The Religion of Humanity*, pp. 101–111. On *Questions for a Reformed Parliament* see Chapter 3.
17. 'Our Venetian Constitution' was published in the *Fortnightly Review* in March 1867. On *Order and Progress* see Martha S. Vogeler, *Frederic Harrison*, pp. 119–20; Christopher Kent, *Brains and Numbers*, pp. 136–54.
18. Frederic Harrison, *Order and Progress*, p. 78.
19. Ibid., In his 1871 memorandum on the cumulative vote in school board elections, p. 1, Hare wrote that 'the principle thus adopted has nothing in common with that of the disciples of Comte, who repudiate all appeal to popular voice, whether directly or through representatives', referring to 'The Revolution of the Commune' by Frederic Harrison published in the *Fortnightly Review* in May 1871.
20. On Stephen and positivism see Noel Annan, *Leslie Stephen*, pp. 192–8; T.R. Wright, *The Religion of Humanity*, pp. 142–5.
21. Leslie Stephen, 'Order and Progress', p. 824. See also Noel Annan, *Leslie Stephen*, pp. 48–60, 296–9; Christopher Harvie, *The Lights of Liberalism*, pp. 197–8, 211.
22. Leslie Stephen, 'Order and Progress', p. 827. For earlier similar criticism of Hare's electoral system by Stephen in the *Nation* in the United States in 1872 see Brian D. Stenfors, *Signs of the Times*, p. 55.
23. Thomas Hare, 'A Note on Representative Government', p. 102.
24. Ibid., p. 104.
25. Ibid., p. 106.
26. Ibid., p. 107.
27. Ibid.
28. Leslie Stephen, 'The Value of Political Machinery', p. 844.
29. Ibid., p. 845.
30. Ibid., p. 846.
31. Ibid., p. 848.
32. Ibid., On Stephen and the Gladstone ministry see Noel Annan, *Leslie Stephen*, p. 220, and the comment by John W. Bicknell in John W. Bicknell, ed., *Selected Letters of Leslie Stephen*, I, p. 94.

33. Leslie Stephen, 'The Value of Political Machinery', p. 851.
34. G.P. Gooch, *Life of Lord Courtney*, pp. 45–6.
35. Leonard Courtney, 'Public Affairs', pp. 60–1.
36. G.P. Gooch, *Life of Lord Courtney*, pp. 83–6, and list of leading articles by Courtney, Courtney Papers, XX. See also Henry Pelling, *America and the British Left*, pp. 12–13.
37. *The Times*, 4 March 1868, p. 8, and Courtney Papers, XX.
38. A.I. Dasent, *John Thaddeus Delane*, II, pp. 263, and Courtney Papers, XX.
39. Thomas Hare, 'The Construction of a Municipality for the Metropolis', p. 10. See also his participation with Henry Richmond Droop in discussion in John Biddulph Martin, 'The Elections of 1868 and 1874', p. 227, on which see also Jenifer Hart, *Proportional Representation*, pp. 73–4.
40. Leonard Courtney, 'Political Machinery and Political Life', p. 81.
41. *Ibid.*, p. 83.
42. *Ibid.*, p. 85.
43. *Ibid.*, p. 91.
44. *Ibid.*
45. *Ibid.*
46. *Ibid.*, p. 92. See also Jenifer Hart, *Proportional Representation*, p. 72.
47. On the influence of Mill on Morley see D.A. Hamer, *John Morley*, pp. 20–31, 51–2. On Morley as editor of the *Fortnightly Review* from 1867 to 1882 see *ibid.*, pp. 70–4. See also E.M. Everett, *The Party of Humanity*.
48. John Morley to Leonard Courtney, 22 June 1876, quoted in G.P. Gooch, *Life of Lord Courtney*, pp. 116–7.
49. 'The Liberal Party and Its Leaders' was published in September 1873, followed by 'The Next Page of the Liberal Programme' in October 1874. On Chamberlain as a contributor to the *Fortnightly Review* see D.A. Hamer, *John Morley*, pp. 99, 119–20. See also the comment by Roland Quinault in 'Joseph Chamberlain', p. 73.
50. D.A. Hamer, *John Morley*, pp. 117–18.
51. *Ibid.*, p. 117. For the speech see *Hansard*, Third Series, CCXXXI, col. 539.
52. See the entry on minority representation from his commonplace book in D.A. Hamer, *John Morley*, pp. 386–7.
53. See Francis H. Herrick, 'The Origins of the National Liberal Federation'; Tyrgve R. Tholfsen, 'The Origins of the Birmingham Caucus'; Patricia Auspos, 'Radicalism, Pressure Groups, and Party Politics', pp. 198–204; D.A. Hamer, *Liberal Politics in the Age of Gladstone and Rosebery*, pp. 46–54; H.J. Hanham, *Elections and Party Management*, pp. 137–140; J.L. Garvin, *The Life of Joseph Chamberlain*, I, pp. 253–65; Peter T. Marsh, *Joseph Chamberlain*, pp. 116–21. See also Jonathan Parry, *The Rise and Fall of Liberal Government in Victorian Britain*, pp. 274–80; Eugenio Biagini, *Liberty, Retrenchment and Reform*, pp. 328–37; Eugenio Biagini, *British Democracy and Irish Nationalism*, pp. 169–83; Alex Windscheffel, *Popular Conservatism in Imperial London*, pp. 87, 115. The relationship between the foundation of the National Liberal Federation and opposition to the minority clause and proportional representation was emphasized by Moisei Ostrogorski in *Democracy and the Organization of Political Parties*, I, pp. 159–63. On Ostrogorski see Gaetano Quagliariello, *Politics Without Parties*, pp. 100–74; Paolo Pombeni, 'Starting in Reason, Ending in Passion'. For a critical evaluation of Ostrogorski with

- reference to the caucus and party cohesion see Gary W. Cox, *The Efficient Secret*, pp. 37–44.
54. Joseph Chamberlain, 'A New Political Organization', p. 129.
 55. *Ibid.*, p. 130.
 56. See Richard Shannon, *Gladstone and the Bulgarian Aggitation*, pp. 268–7; H.C.G. Matthew, *Gladstone*, II, p. 50.
 57. See William A. Hayes, *The Background and Passage of the Third Reform Act*, pp. 47–9; T.A. Jenkins, *Gladstone, Whiggery and the Liberal Party*, pp. 81–2.
 58. *Hansard*, Third Series, CCXXIX, col. 1456.
 59. *Hansard*, Third Series, CCXXXV, col. 534.
 60. *Ibid.*
 61. See Robert Lowe, 'A New Reform Bill' and 'Mr Gladstone on Manhood Suffrage', and William Gladstone, 'The County Franchise and Mr Lowe Thereon' and 'Last Words on the County Franchise'.
 62. Thomas Hare, 'The Reform Bill of the Future', p. 77.
 63. *Ibid.*, p. 78. On political pluralism in *The Machinery of Representation* see Chapter 2.
 64. Thomas Hare, 'The Reform Bill of the Future', p. 78.
 65. *Ibid.*, p. 79.
 66. *Ibid.*, p. 83.
 67. Lord Acton, 'Sir Erskine May's *Democracy in Europe*', p. 140.
 68. *Ibid.*, See also George Watson, *The English Ideology*, pp. 155, 160; George Watson, 'Acton's "History of Liberty"', p. 156; Hugh Tulloch, *Acton*, p. 70; G.E. Fasnacht, *Acton's Political Philosophy*, pp. 105, 183.
 69. *Hansard*, Third Series, CCXXXVIII, 979.
 70. *Ibid.*, cols. 984–5.
 71. *Ibid.*, col. 986.
 72. *Ibid.*, col. 993.
 73. *Ibid.*
 74. *Ibid.*, col. 996.
 75. *Ibid.*, col. 998.
 76. *Ibid.*, col. 1009.
 77. *Ibid.*, col. 1011.
 78. *Ibid.*, col. 1010. See also Jenifer Hart, *Proportional Representation*, pp. 81–2.
 79. See Henry Pelling, *America and the British Left*, p. 34–44.
 80. W. Fraser Rae, 'Political Clubs and Party Organization', p. 922, with reference to 'The Liberal Association – the "600" – of Birmingham' in *Macmillan's Magazine* in February 1877 by Henry W. Crosskey, a Birmingham Liberal.
 81. W. Fraser Rae, 'Political Clubs and Party Organization', pp. 923–4.
 82. Henry Pelling, *The Origins of the Labour Party*, pp. 17–18. See also Jon Lawrence, *Speaking for the People*, pp. 175–6.
 83. See F.M. Leventhal, *Respectable Radical*, pp. 127–32.
 84. George Howell, 'The Caucus System and the Liberal Party', p. 584. On criticism of the National Liberal Federation by Howell see also Eugenio Biagini, *Liberty, Retrenchment and Reform*, pp. 333–7; Eugenio Biagini, *British Democracy and Irish Nationalism*, pp. 173–4.
 85. See Murney Gerlach, *British Liberalism and the United States*, pp. 62–3.
 86. Joseph Chamberlain, 'The Caucus', pp. 726–7.
 87. *Ibid.*, p. 731.

88. Ibid.
89. Ibid., pp. 737–8. On the second ballot, which was being used in France, see Enid Lakeman, *How Democracies Vote*, pp. 61–3; Peter Campbell, *French Electoral Systems and Elections*, pp. 69–72.
90. Joseph Chamberlain, 'The Caucus', p. 740.
91. Henry W. Crosskey, 'The Birmingham Liberal Association', p. 153.
92. Ibid., p. 156.
93. National Liberal Federation, *First Annual Report*, pp. 25–6.
94. See Richard Jay, *Joseph Chamberlain*, p. 42; David Nicholls, *The Lost Prime Minister*, pp. 77–8.
95. See Charles Wentworth Dilke, *Parliamentary Reform*, pp. 38–9.
96. *Hansard*, Third Series, CCXLIV, cols. 137, 151.
97. Ibid., col. 223.
98. Ibid., col. 228.
99. Ibid., col. 237.
100. Ibid.
101. Ibid., col. 239.
102. Ibid., cols. 252–3. See also Jenifer Hart, *Proportional Representation*, pp. 82–3. On subsequent attempts by Blennerhassett to raise the issue in Parliament in 1881 and 1882 see *ibid.*, pp. 83–4.
103. Leonard Courtney, 'The Representation of Minorities', p. 146.
104. Ibid., p. 151.
105. Ibid., p. 154.
106. Ibid., p. 155.
107. Ibid.
108. Ibid., p. 156. See also Jenifer Hart, *Proportional Representation*, p. 74.
109. Thomas Hare, 'A System of Election', p. 218.
110. Ibid., pp. 226–7.
111. Ibid., p. 227.
112. Ibid., p. 228.
113. On the issues of the election see Trevor Lloyd, *The General Election of 1880*, pp. 38–62, and on the result of the election see *ibid.*, pp. 134–60. See also H.J. Hanham, *Elections and Party Management*, pp. 227–32.
114. Henry Fawcett, 'The Next Reform Bill', p. 443.
115. Ibid., p. 459.
116. Henry Fawcett to William Gladstone, 28 April 1880, Gladstone Papers, Add. MSS 44156, fols 45–8.
117. Henry Richmond Droop, 'On Methods of Electing Representatives', p. 166.
118. Ibid., pp. 167–8.
119. Ibid., pp. 178–93.
120. Ibid., pp. 193–4.
121. Ibid., pp. 198–9.
122. Ibid., p. 199.
123. See Thomas Hare, *London Municipal Reform*.
124. Leonard Courtney quoted in Alfred Frisby, 'The Next Reform Bill', p. 252.
125. Walter Morrison quoted in *ibid.*, p. 253.
126. Schnadhorst resigned his Birmingham position and became national secretary on a full-time basis in January 1884. See Barry McGill, 'Francis Schnadhorst'.
127. See *ibid.*, pp. 23–4.

128. Francis Schnadhorst, 'The Caucus and Its Critics', p. 13, a reply to 'The Birmingham Caucus' in the *Nineteenth Century* in June 1882 by W.T. Marriott, a Liberal Member of Parliament for Brighton.
129. Francis Adams, *History of the Elementary School Contest*, p. 264.
130. See Chapter 4.
131. Francis Adams, *History of the Elementary School Context*, p. 252.
132. See D.A. Hamer, *John Morley*, pp. 127–8; T.A. Jenkins, *Gladstone, Whiggery and the Liberal Party*, p. 192.
133. T.H.S. Escott, 'The Future of the Radical Party', p. 6.
134. The series of articles was published as a book under the same title in 1885, for which see the introduction to the edition by D.A. Hamer. See also Peter T. Marsh, *Joseph Chamberlain*, pp. 167–8.
135. T.H. Escott, 'The Radical Programme', p. 294.
136. *Ibid.*, pp. 293–4.
137. Millicent Garret Fawcett, 'Women and Representative Government', p. 287. See also T.H.S. Escott, 'The Future of the Radical Party', p. 1.
138. *The Times*, 15 October 1883, p. 6.
139. *The Times*, 20 October 1883, p. 7. The letter is dated 16 October 1883.
140. See William A. Hayes, *The Background and Passage of the Third Reform Act*, pp. 73–4. See also Andrew Jones, *The Politics of Reform 1884*, pp. 3–4.
141. *The Times*, 19 October 1883, p. 4.
142. *Ibid.*
143. See E.R. Russell, *Minority Representation*.
144. *The Times*, 30 October 1883, p. 6.
145. Joseph Chamberlain to Kate Courtney, 31 October 1883, Chamberlain Papers, JC 5/18/3.
146. *The Times*, 3 November 1883, p. 10.
147. Diary of Kate Courtney (25 October 1875–28 August 1885), p. 106, Courtney Papers, XXI.
148. *The Times*, 9 November 1883, p. 10.
149. *The Times*, 16 November 1883, p. 10.
150. *Manchester Guardian*, 21 November 1883, p. 5.
151. Joseph Chamberlain, *Mr Chamberlain's Speeches*, I, p. 112.
152. *Ibid.*
153. *Ibid.*, p. 113.
154. *Ibid.*
155. G.P. Gooch, *Life of Lord Courtney*, p. 195.
156. On Lubbock see Mark Patton, *Science, Politics and Business in the Work of Sir John Lubbock*; Horace G. Hutchinson, *Life of Sir John Lubbock*, which includes selections from his letters and diaries; Horace G. Hutchinson, *Portraits of the Eighties*, pp. 133–44; Ursula Grant Duff, ed., *The Life-Work of Lord Avebury*; R.J. Pumphrey, 'The Forgotten Man'; Eynon Smart, 'Bank Holidays and Much Else'.
157. Horace G. Hutchinson, *Life of Sir John Lubbock*, I, pp. 15, 23. See also Adrian Desmond and James Moore, *Darwin*, pp. 302–3, 361.
158. Horace G. Hutchinson, *Life of Sir John Lubbock*, I, pp. 36–7.
159. *Ibid.*, p. 44–5.
160. *Ibid.*, pp. 49–50; Adrian Desmond, *Huxley*, p. 279; J. Vernon Jensen, *Thomas Henry Huxley*, p. 74; J.R. Lucas, 'Wilberforce and Huxley', p. 323. See also Fred Somkin, 'The Contributions of Sir John Lubbock, F.R.S., to the *Origin of Species*'.

161. Horace G. Hutchinson, *Life of Sir John Lubbock*, I, pp. 63–4; Adrian Desmond, *Huxley*, pp. 327–9. On the X-Club see also J. Vernon Jensen, *Thomas Henry Huxley*, pp. 143–65; Roy M. MacLeod, 'The X-Club'; Ruth Barton, '"Huxley, Lubbock, and Half a Dozen Others"'; Ruth Barton, '"An Influential Set of Chaps"'.
162. See Glyn Daniel, *A Hundred and Fifty Years of Archaeology*, pp. 85–6; Bruce G. Trigger, *A History of Archaeological Thought*, pp. 147–8, 171–6.
163. See John Stuart Mill to Herbert Spencer, 9 April 1865, in Frances E. Mineka and Dwight N. Lindley, eds, *The Later Letters of John Stuart Mill, Collected Works*, XVI, p. 1029.
164. *The Times*, 21 April 1865. See also John Stuart Mill to Thomas Hare, 29 May 1865, in Frances E. Mineka and Dwight N. Lindley, eds, *The Later Letters of John Stuart Mill, Collected Works*, XVI, p. 1060.
165. Horace G. Hutchinson, *Life of Sir John Lubbock*, I, pp. 98–9, 102–3.
166. *Ibid.*, pp. 100–2; Alan Willard Brown, *The Metaphysical Society*, pp. 22–8; Priscilla Metcalf, *James Knowles*, pp. 214–22; James R. Moore, *The Post-Darwinian Controversies*, pp. 95–8.
167. See Glyn Daniel, *The First Civilizations*, pp. 16–17; George W. Stocking, Jr., *Victorian Anthropology*, pp. 150–6; J.W. Burrow, *Evolution and Society*, pp. 228–9, 274–5; Idus L. Murphey, 'The Evolutionary Anthropologists'.
168. Horace G. Hutchinson, *Life of Sir John Lubbock*, I, pp. 119–21. See also Jonathan Parry, *The Rise and Fall of Liberal Government in Victorian Britain*, pp. 231, 233, 235.
169. See Urusla Grant Duff, ed., *The Life-Work of Lord Avebury*, pp. 254–5.
170. See John Morley, *The Life of William Ewart Gladstone*, II, pp. 561–2; H.C.G. Matthew, ed., *The Gladstone Diaries*, IX, p. 199. This first meeting between Gladstone and Morley took place on 10 March, and this only meeting between Gladstone and Darwin took place on 11 March.
171. Horace G. Hutchinson, *Life of Sir John Lubbock*, I, p. 184.
172. *Ibid.*, pp. 169–73.
173. See J.F.C. Harrison, *A History of the Working Men's College*, pp. 112–16; C.P. Lucas, 'The Working Men's College'. See also John Westlake, 'Personal Notes'.
174. *Hansard*, Third Series, CCXLIV, col. 253.
175. *The Times*, 6 December 1883, p. 4.
176. Invitation by Sir John Lubbock (draft), 24 December 1883, Proportional Representation Society Papers.
177. *The Times*, 17 January 1884, p. 7; *Manchester Guardian*, 18 January 1884, p. 5.

6 The Proportional Representation Society and the Third Reform Act, 1884–1888

1. John Westlake to Sir John Lubbock, 14 January 1884, Proportional Representation Society Papers.
2. This was recorded in the diary of Sir John Lubbock, Avebury Papers, Add MSS. 62683, and in the diary of Albert Grey, Grey Papers, contrary to

- the comment on Hare by Andrew Jones in *The Politics of Reform 1884*, pp. 101–2, repeated by Jenifer Hart in *Proportional Representation*, pp. 103–4.
3. George Howell to Sir John Lubbock, 9 January 1884, Proportional Representation Society Papers.
 4. Henry Fawcett to Sir John Lubbock, 6 January 1884, Proportional Representation Society Papers.
 5. See *The Times*, 28 January 1884, p. 7.
 6. Proportional Representation Society, *Second Report*, p. 12.
 7. See his obituary in *The Times*, 22 March 1884, p. 12.
 8. Henry Richmond Droop to Sir John Lubbock, 4 January 1884, Proportional Representation Society Papers.
 9. Henry Richmond Droop to unidentified correspondent (probably A. Cromwell White), 15 February 1884, Proportional Representation Society Papers. For the Naville pamphlet and the Droop paper see Chapter 4.
 10. Carl Andrae to Sir John Lubbock, 17 August 1885, and Victor d'Hondt to Sir John Lubbock, 13 September 1885, in Horace G. Hutchinson, *Life of Sir John Lubbock*, I, pp. 203–4, 214–15. For Andrae see Chapter 2. For d'Hondt see Clarence Gilbert Hoag and George Hervey Hallett, Jr., *Proportional Representation*, pp. 418–24; Andrew McLaren Carstairs, *A Short History of Electoral Systems*, pp. 50–1. The d'Hondt system was adopted in Switzerland by E. Hagenbach-Bischoff, a professor at the University of Basel, for whom see John H. Humphreys, *Proportional Representation*, pp. 181–91, 386–94.
 11. For Grey see T.A. Jenkins, *Gladstone, Whiggery and the Liberal Party*, pp. 147–75, 300–3, and for his role in the Proportional Representation Society see Andrew Jones, *The Politics of Reform 1884*, pp. 97–109, 173–4. See also A.B. Cooke and J.R. Vincent, *The Governing Passion*, pp. 98–115; Jonathan Parry, *Democracy and Religion*, pp. 61–3. Harold Begbie, *Albert, Fourth Earl Grey*, is of slight value.
 12. Albert Grey, *Reform*, p. 6. See also Dudley W.R. Bahlman, ed., *The Diary of Sir Edward Walter Hamilton*, II, p. 523.
 13. Grey, *Reform*, p. 14.
 14. *Ibid.*, p. 16.
 15. For the Fawcett speech at Hackney see Chapter 5.
 16. *Manchester Guardian*, 8 January 1884, p. 5.
 17. *Manchester Guardian*, 15 January 1884, p. 5. The suggestion by Ted R. Bromund in 'Uniting the Whole People', p. 82, that the leaders of the Proportional Representation Society such as Lubbock and Grey shared a 'coherent ideology of communitarian liberalism' is not convincing.
 18. For Seebohm see J.W. Burrow, '“The Village Community” and the Uses of History', pp. 273–5.
 19. Frederic Seebohm, 'Proportionate Representation', p. 912.
 20. *Ibid.*, p. 913.
 21. For the joint-candidate system see Sir John Lubbock, *Representation*, pp. 59–61; Albert Grey, 'Proportional versus Majority Representation', pp. 961–4. On Naville see Chapter 3.
 22. See Albert Grey, 'Proportional versus Majority Representation', p. 961.
 23. *Spectator*, 10 November 1883, pp. 1444–5; *The Times*, 23 November 1883, p. 10.

24. J. Parker Smith, 'Parliamentary Reform', p. 175.
25. Proportional Representation Society, *First Annual Report*, p. 3. See also Jenifer Hart, *Proportional Representation*, p. 100.
26. Diary of Albert Grey, 16 January 1884, Grey Papers.
27. *The Times*, 17 January 1884, p. 7; *Manchester Guardian*, 18 January 1884, p. 5.
28. John Chapman to Sir John Lubbock, 28 January 1884, Proportional Representation Society Papers.
29. *Pall Mall Gazette*, 3 January 1884, p. 2. See also Andrew Jones, *Politics of Reform 1884*, pp. 13–14, 99.
30. *Pall Mall Gazette*, 15 January 1884, p. 2.
31. *Pall Mall Gazette*, 30 January 1884, p. 11.
32. *Ibid.*
33. Thomas Hare, 'A Plea for Minority Representation', p. 1.
34. *Ibid.*, p. 2.
35. Thomas Hare, 'An Ideal Reform Bill', p. 2.
36. J. Parker Smith, 'University Representation: II', p. 155. This was a sequel to a survey of the history of the parliamentary representation of university constituencies that he contributed to the *Law Magazine and Review* in November 1883.
37. J. Parker Smith, *Preferential Voting*, p. 2. See also J. Parker Smith, *An Amendment of Mr Hare's Quota*, a short pamphlet on the Droop quota dated January 1884.
38. Sir John Lubbock to Albert Grey, 10 May 1884, Grey Papers.
39. Circular by Sir John Lubbock (draft), 2 February 1884, Proportional Representation Society Papers.
40. Lord Richard Grosvenor to A. Cromwell White, 27 February 1884, Proportional Representation Society Papers.
41. *The Times*, 28 February 1884, p. 7. See also Jenifer Hart, *Proportional Representation*, pp. 101–2, 105. Of twelve Home Rulers who had seceded from the Irish party in January 1881, eight were on the list of members of Parliament in the Proportional Representation Society in 1884: Blennerhassett, Collins, Colthurst, Errington, Mitchell Henry, Meldon, O'Beirne, and Shaw. See Conor Cruise O'Brien, *Parnell and His Party*, p. 56. See also *The Times*, 11 March 1884, p. 10.
42. Evan Rowland Jones, *The Life and Speeches of Joseph Cowen*, pp. 251–2. On Cowen and his opposition to the caucus see Nigel Todd, 'The Militant Democracy', pp. 126–36; Eugenio Biagini, *Liberty, Retrenchment and Reform*, pp. 359–68; Eugenio Biagini, *British Democracy and Irish Nationalism*, pp. 176–9; Jon Lawrence, *Speaking for the People*, pp. 175–6.
43. Joseph Cowen to Charles Gavan Duffy (copy), 29 February 1884, Cowen Papers, F50/9G.
44. For an early speech on proportional representation by Balfour, whose support was of the 'platonian' nature, see the debate on the Blennerhassett resolution on 8 March 1878, *Hansard*, Third Series, CCXXXVIII, cols. 1003–5. That Lowther was a member of the Proportional Representation Society is of significance with reference to his subsequent chairmanship of the Speaker's Conference of 1916–17, for which see Martin Pugh, *Electoral Reform in War and Peace*, p. 82.

45. See William A. Hayes, *The Background and Passage of the Third Reform Act*, pp. 123–4; H.C.G. Matthew, *Gladstone*, II, pp. 173–7.
46. *Hansard*, Third Series, CCLXXXV, col. 449.
47. *Ibid.*, col. 452. In the 1874 general election, in which the Conservatives received a majority of the seats with a minority of the votes, 79 uncontested Conservative constituencies accounted for 125 seats whereas 57 uncontested Liberal and Home Rule constituencies accounted for 63 seats. In 1880, 33 uncontested Conservative constituencies accounted for 58 seats whereas 44 uncontested Liberal and Home Rule constituencies accounted for 51 seats. See Trevor Lloyd, 'Uncontested Seats', p. 262.
48. *Hansard*, Third Series, CCLXXXV, col. 451.
49. *Ibid.*, col. 452.
50. *Ibid.*
51. *Ibid.*, col. 453. This view had been taken in 1869 in the report of a United States Senate Select Committee on Representative Reform, the chairman of which, Charles Buckalew, a Democrat from Pennsylvania, was an advocate of proportional representation. See Clarence Gilbert Hoag and George Hervey Hallett, Jr., *Proportional Representation*, pp. 30, 184.
52. *Hansard*, Third Series, CCLXXXV, col. 455.
53. *Ibid.*, cols. 455–6. See also Jenifer Hart, *Proportional Representation*, p. 106.
54. Proportional Representation Society, *First Annual Report*, p. 2. The Liberals were Michael Biddulph (Herefordshire), Arthur Cohen (Southwark), James Cropper (Kendal), Daniel Grant (Marylebone), and William Rathbone (Carnarvonshire); the Conservatives were Edward George Clarke (Plymouth), William Folkestone (South Wiltshire), John Henry Kennaway (East Devonshire), Matthew White Ridley (North Northumberland), and Charles Stuart-Wortley (Sheffield). On Blennerhassett see Chapter 5.
55. *Ibid.*, p. 5. In the first year of the society, the leading financial contributor was Morrison, who donated £200, followed by Lubbock, who donated £130. The *Manchester Guardian* donated £100. The total income from January 1884 to March 1885 was £1291.5s. The largest expense was salaries and wages (£238.8s.), and more was spent on public meetings (£145.4s.) than on publications (£112.12s). Funds were granted to the Manchester branch (£73.12s.) and to branches in Newcastle-upon-Tyne (£50) and Glasgow (£40). *Ibid.*, pp. 14–15.
56. Cabinet minutes, 5 March 1884, in H.C.G. Matthew, ed., *The Gladstone Diaries*, XI, p. 121.
57. National Liberal Federation, *Seventh Annual Report*, p. 14.
58. See William A. Hayes, *The Background and Passage of the Third Reform Act*, p. 127.
59. *Hansard*, Third Series, CCLXXXVI, col. 712. On Hartington see William A. Hayes, *The Background and Passage of the Third Reform Act*, pp. 127–8; Andrew Jones, *The Politics of Reform 1884*, pp. 44–5; T.A. Jenkins, *Gladstone, Whiggery and the Liberal Party*, pp. 187–8; Patrick Jackson, *The Last of the Whigs*, pp. 172–3.
60. Thomas Hare, 'Eighty Members for London', p. 2.
61. John Westlake, 'Proportional Representation', p. 417.

62. See William A. Hayes, *The Background and Passage of the Third Reform Act*, p. 129.
63. *Pall Mall Gazette*, 10 April 1884, p. 3.
64. *Daily News*, 15 April 1884, p. 2. See also *Daily News*, 15 May 1884, p. 5.
65. See Thomas J. Spunner, *George Joachim Goschen*, pp. 95–6. See also the discussion of Goschen in A.B. Cooke and J.R. Vincent, *The Governing Passion*, pp. 84–98.
66. Sir John Lubbock, 'Proportional Representation', p. 703. See also Andrew Jones, *The Politics of Reform 1884*, pp. 99, 193; T.A. Jenkins, *Gladstone, Whiggery and the Liberal Party*, pp. 175–6.
67. Sir John Lubbock, 'Proportional Representation', p. 703.
68. *Ibid.*, p. 712.
69. *Ibid.*, pp. 713–15.
70. See H.O. Arnold-Forster, 'Proportional Representation: A Test Election'.
71. Proportional Representation Society, *First Annual Report*, pp. 6–7.
72. John Westlake to A. Cromwell White, 20 April 1884, Proportional Representation Society Papers.
73. *Saturday Review*, 19 April 1884, p. 494.
74. *Ibid.*
75. 'Representation and Misrepresentation', p. 419.
76. See A.C. Sellar, 'The Coming Reform', p. 581. See also A.C. Sellar, 'Parliamentary Reform', p. 277. On Sellar see A.B. Cooke and J.R. Vincent, *The Governing Passion*, p. 98.
77. Lord Randolph Churchill, *Speeches*, I, p. 139. See also R.F. Foster, *Lord Randolph Churchill*, pp. 145–7.
78. For Churchill and the caucus see Roland Quinault, 'Lord Randolph Churchill and Tory Democracy', pp. 160–1, and for his policy of electoral districts see R.F. Foster, *Lord Randolph Churchill*, pp. 164–5.
79. On Shaw-Lefevre see T.A. Jenkins, *Gladstone, Whiggery and the Liberal Party*, pp. 90–1, 96–7.
80. G.J. Shaw-Lefevre, 'The Representation of Minorities', pp. 714–18. For his remarks in opposition to the Lowe amendment in 1867 see *Hansard*, Third Series, CLXXXVIII, cols. 1068–73.
81. G.J. Shaw-Lefevre, 'The Representation of Minorities', p. 719.
82. *Ibid.*, p. 721.
83. *Ibid.*, p. 720.
84. *Ibid.*, p. 721.
85. *Ibid.*
86. *Ibid.*, p. 722.
87. *Ibid.*, p. 728.
88. *Ibid.*, p. 729.
89. *Ibid.*, p. 731.
90. *Ibid.*, p. 733.
91. *Ibid.*
92. *Hansard*, Third Series, CCLXXXIX, col. 611.
93. *Ibid.*, cols. 616–17.
94. *Ibid.*, cols. 614–15, 617–18.
95. *Ibid.*, cols. 613–14.
96. *Ibid.*, col. 617.

97. *Ibid.*, col. 620.
98. See John Davis, *Reforming London*, p. 77.
99. Proportional Representation Society, *First Annual Report*, p. 7.
100. Diary of Lubbock, 2 July 1884, Avebury Papers, Add MSS. 62683.
101. See John Davis, *Reforming London*, p. 93.
102. See William A. Hayes, *The Background and Passage of the Third Reform Act*, pp. 152–6; Mary E.J. Chadwick, 'The Role of Redistribution', p. 667. See also Jenifer Hart, *Proportional Representation*, pp. 107–8.
103. Charles L. Dodgson to Lord Salisbury, 10 July 1884, in Morton N. Cohen, ed., *The Letters of Lewis Carroll*, I, p. 544.
104. See Chapter 2.
105. The letters were published on 15 May 1884, 19 May 1884, 27 May 1884, and 5 June 1884; the article was published on 5 July 1884. On the electoral writings of Dodgson see Morton N. Cohen, *Lewis Carroll*, pp. 423–9; Duncan Black, *The Theory of Committees and Elections*, pp. 189–38; Duncan Black, *A Mathematical Approach to Proportional Representation*, pp. 45–75.
106. Charles L. Dodgson to Lord Salisbury, 8 July 1884, in Morton N. Cohen, ed., *The Letters of Lewis Carroll*, I, p. 544. On Dodgson and Salisbury see also Jenifer Hart, *Proportional Representation*, pp. 109–11.
107. Lord Salisbury to Charles L. Dodgson, 9 July 1884, in Morton N. Cohen, ed., *The Letters of Lewis Carroll*, I, p. 544.
108. Charles L. Dodgson to Lord Salisbury, 10 July 1884, in *ibid.*, pp. 544–5.
109. Charles L. Dodgson to Lord Salisbury, 2 November 1884, in *ibid.*, p. 554. See also Charles L. Dodgson to Alexander Macmillan, 12 October 1884, in Morton N. Cohen and Anita Gandolfo, eds, *Lewis Carroll and the House of Macmillan*, pp. 186–7.
110. Charles L. Dodgson, *The Principles of Parliamentary Representation*, pp. 29–30.
111. *Ibid.*, pp. 29–32, 34. On Baily see Chapter 4.
112. In Roger Lancelyn Green, ed., *The Diaries of Lewis Carroll*, II, p. 430.
113. See Charles L. Dodgson, *The Principles of Parliamentary Representation: Supplement*, dated 1885. See also Roger Lancelyn Green, ed., *The Diaries of Lewis Carroll*, II, p. 431. Dodgson also wrote in 1885 a 'postscript' to the supplement.
114. See Mary E.J. Chadwick, 'The Role of Redistribution', p. 670. See also Stephen Gwynn and Gertude M. Tuckwell, *The Life of the Rt Hon. Sir Charles Dilke*, II, p. 64, and H.C.G. Matthew, ed., *The Gladstone Diaries*, XI, p. 174.
115. *Parliamentary Papers*, 1876, XII, pp. 359–623.
116. See Mary E.J. Chadwick, 'The Role of Redistribution', p. 670; P.F. Clarke, 'Electoral Sociology of Modern Britain', p. 33.
117. See William A. Hayes, *The Background and Passage of the Third Reform Act*, pp. 218–24; Mary E.J. Chadwick, 'The Role of Redistribution', pp. 670–2; H.C.G. Matthew, *Gladstone*, II, pp. 179–80.
118. See Andrew Roberts, *Salisbury*, pp. 300–1.
119. Lord Salisbury, 'The Value of Redistribution', p. 157.
120. *Ibid.*, p. 160.
121. *Ibid.*, pp. 148–9.
122. *Ibid.*, p. 157.

123. Salisbury based his figures on a pamphlet published in 1884 by Henry F. Bernard, *Redistribution by Proportional Representation*, which was not about electoral systems as the title implied. See Lord Salisbury, 'The Value of Redistribution', p. 150.
124. *Ibid.*, p. 157.
125. See William A. Hayes, *The Background and Passage of the Third Reform Act*, p. 222; Andrew Jones, *The Politics of Reform 1884*, p. 193; Mary E.J. Chadwick, 'The Role of Redistribution', pp. 672, 676; James Cornford, 'The Transformation of Conservatism', pp. 52–3; Henry Pelling, *Social Geography of British Elections*, p. 9.
126. Lord Salisbury, 'The Value of Redistribution', p. 157.
127. Charles Dilke to Joseph Chamberlain, 2 October 1884, Chamberlain Papers, JC5/24/71.
128. *The Times*, 8 October 1884, p. 6.
129. *Ibid.*
130. *Ibid.*
131. Albert Grey to Sir John Lubbock, 8 October 1884, Avebury Papers, Add. MSS 49647, fols 88–9.
132. *The Times*, 11 October 1884, p. 6.
133. *Ibid.*
134. Joseph Chamberlain to Sir John Lubbock, 14 October 1884, Avebury Papers, Add. MSS 49647, fol. 90.
135. *The Times*, 9 October 1884. See also G.P. Gooch, *Life of Lord Courtney*, pp. 198–9.
136. *The Times*, 14 October 1884, p. 8. See also Lawrence Goldman, 'Introduction: "An Advanced Liberal"', p. 35.
137. *Hansard*, Third Series, CCXCIII, col. 56.
138. *Ibid.*, col. 265.
139. *Ibid.*
140. Dudley W.R. Bahlman, ed., *The Diary of Sir Edward Walter Hamilton*, II, p. 720.
141. Leonard Courtney to William Gladstone, 8 November 1884, Gladstone Papers, Add. MSS 44488, fols 50–7.
142. *Ibid.*, fols 60–1.
143. Dairy of Kate Courtney (25 October 1875–28 August 1885), pp. 119–20, Courtney Papers XXI.
144. Leonard Courtney to Richard Potter, 14 November 1884, in G.P. Gooch, *Life of Lord Courtney*, p. 200.
145. William Gladstone to Leonard Courtney, 20 November 1884, in *ibid.*, p. 205.
146. Jonathan Parry, 'Gladstone and the Disintegration of the Liberal Party', p. 393. See also Jenifer Hart, *Proportional Representation*, p. 112.
147. Dudley W.R. Bahlman, ed., *The Diary of Sir Edward Walter Hamilton*, II, pp. 739–40.
148. See William Gladstone to Lord Rosebery, 30 September 1884, in H.C.G. Matthew, ed., *The Gladstone Diaries*, XI, pp. 216–17. The article had been published on 25 September, for which see Peter T. Marsh, *The Discipline of Popular Government*, p. 64, n.26.
149. See Mary E.J. Chadwick, 'The Role of Redistribution', pp. 671–2.

150. See John D. Fair, *British Interparty Conferences*, pp. 35–55; Mary E.J. Chadwick, 'The Role of Redistribution', pp. 675–7; H.C.G. Matthew, *Gladstone*, II, pp. 179–80; E.D. Steele, *Lord Salisbury*, pp. 164–5.
151. See John D. Fair, *British Interparty Conferences*, p. 51; Mary E.J. Chadwick, 'The Role of Redistribution', p. 676.
152. Joseph Chamberlain to John Morley, 27 November 1884, in J.L. Garvin, *The Life of Joseph Chamberlain*, I, p. 486.
153. For the text of the 'Arlington Street Compact' of 28 November 1884 see William A. Hayes, *The Background and Passage of the Third Reform Act*, pp. 301–2.
154. Executive committee minutes, 22 November 1884, Proportional Representation Society Papers.
155. *The Times*, 4 December 1884, p. 10.
156. See G.P. Gooch, *Life of Lord Courtney*, pp. 207–8; William A. Hayes, *The Background and Passage of the Third Reform Act*, p. 259. See also Jenifer Hart, *Proportional Representation*, pp. 113–14.
157. H.C.G. Matthew, ed., *The Gladstone Diaries*, XI, pp. 253–4; Dudley W.R. Bahlman, ed., *The Diary of Sir Edward Walter Hamilton*, II, p. 745.
158. *The Times*, 4 December 1884, p. 10.
159. Millicent Garrett Fawcett to Leonard Courtney, 2 December 1884, in G.P. Gooch, *Life of Lord Courtney*, pp. 209–10. See also Lawrence Goldman, 'Introduction: "An Advanced Liberal"', p. 35.
160. In Herbert Paul, ed., *Letters of Lord Acton to Mary Gladstone*, p. 10.
161. *The Times*, 4 December 1884, p. 10.
162. *Hansard*, Third Series, CCXCIV, col. 678. See also Jenifer Hart, *Proportional Representation*, pp. 114–15.
163. *Hansard*, Third Series, CCXCIV, cols. 681–2.
164. See H.C.G. Matthew, ed., *The Gladstone Diaries*, XI, p. 256.
165. Albert Grey, 'Proportional versus Majority Representation', pp. 940–1.
166. *Ibid.*, pp. 951–2.
167. *Ibid.*, p. 964.
168. *Hansard*, Third Series, CCXCIV, col. 686.
169. *Ibid.*, col. 734.
170. *Ibid.*, col. 740. See also Jenifer Hart, *Proportional Representation*, pp. 115–16.
171. R.A.J. Walling, ed., *The Diaries of John Bright*, p. 521.
172. See William A. Hayes, *The Background and Passage of the Third Reform Act*, pp. 260–1; Jenifer Hart, *Proportional Representation*, pp. 116–17.
173. *The Times*, 16 December 1884, p. 5. See also the leading article in *ibid.*, p. 7.
174. *The Times*, 17 December 1884, p. 10, and 18 December 1884, p. 4. See also William Gladstone to Sir William Harcourt, 18 December 1884, in H.C.G. Matthew, ed., *The Gladstone Diaries*, XI, p. 260.
175. *The Times*, 14 January 1885, and 15 January 1885, pp. 5–6.
176. *The Times*, 4 February 1885, p. 10.
177. Beatrice Potter to Richard Potter, 1885, in Norman MacKenzie, ed., *The Letters of Sidney and Beatrice Webb*, I, p. 32.
178. *Ibid.*, p. 33.
179. See A.M. McBriar, *Fabian Socialism and English Politics*, pp. 78, 334.

180. *Justice*, 20 December 1884, p. 1. In 1909, Hyndman was to speak in defence of proportional representation by the Hare or d'Hondt electoral systems as a witness before the Royal Commission on Systems of Election, for which see *Parliamentary Papers*, 1910, XXVI, cols. 493–9.
181. *The Times*, 23 January 1885, p. 7.
182. *The Times*, 19 February 1885, p. 7.
183. Arthur Sidgwick and Eleanor Mildred Sidgwick, *Henry Sidgwick*, p. 400. For the relationship between Sidgwick and Hare see Chapter 1.
184. Quoted in Arthur Sidgwick and Eleanor Mildred Sidgwick, *Henry Sidgwick*, p. 393. See also his sceptical opinion of Hare's electoral system in 1861 in *ibid.*, p. 66.
185. George Howell to Albert Grey, 2 December 1884, Grey Papers.
186. Joseph Cowen to Albert Grey, 17 January 1885, Grey Papers.
187. A manuscript report by Samuel Neil, in the Grey Papers, dates the league from 13 December 1884 to 31 March 1885. See also Andrew Jones, *The Politics of Reform 1884*, p. 97.
188. See his evidence before the Select Committee on School Board Elections (Voting), *Parliamentary Papers*, 1884–1885, XI, pp. 634–5.
189. See A. Kadish, 'University Extension and the Working Classes', pp. 191, 199, 202. Letters from Samuel Neil to Albert Grey, in the Grey Papers, begin in 1880 which coincides with the beginning of the university extension movement in Northumberland.
190. Samuel Neil to Albert Grey, 16 July 1882 and 14 January 1884, Grey Papers.
191. Samuel Neil to Albert Grey, 10 July 1884 and 12 July 1884, Grey Papers.
192. Samuel Neil to Albert Grey, 10 August 1884 and 19 August 1884, Grey Papers.
193. Sir John Lubbock to Albert Grey, 28 August 1884, Grey Papers.
194. *Manchester Guardian*, 15 September 1884, pp. 5–6.
195. Report by Samuel Neil, Grey Papers.
196. *The Times*, 31 December 1884, p. 7, and 26 January 1885, p. 4. For further details concerning the test elections see the evidence given by Neil before the Select Committee on School Board Elections (Voting), *Parliamentary Papers*, 1884–1885, XI, pp. 645–8.
197. Report by Samuel Neil, Grey Papers. See also Proportional Representation Society, *First Annual Report*, p. 9.
198. *Newcastle Chronicle*, 29 February 1884, p. 5, quoted in Eugenio F. Biagini, *Liberty, Retrenchment and Reform*, p. 317.
199. See Proportional Representation Society, *First Annual Report*, pp. 12–13.
200. Executive committee minutes, 6 December 1884, Proportional Representation Society Papers. See also Andrew Jones, *The Politics of Reform 1884*, p. 95.
201. Leonard Courtney, 'Redistribution by Different Lights: The Seats Bill', p. 31.
202. *Ibid.*, p. 34.
203. *Ibid.*, pp. 35–6.
204. Sir John Lubbock, Leonard Courtney, Albert Grey, and John Westlake, 'Proportional Representation: Objections and Answers', p. 320.
205. Lonsdale Broderick, 'Proportional Representation', p. 100. See also Proportional Representation Society, *Second Report*, p. 11, listing Broderick as a member.

206. Lonsdale Broderick, 'Proportional Representation', p. 100.
207. Executive committee minutes, 28 January 1885, Proportional Representation Society Papers. For the Reform League meeting in 1867 see Chapter 4.
208. See G. Shaw-Lefevre, 'Representation and Misrepresentation, I'.
209. Thomas Hare, 'Representation and Misrepresentation, II', p. 219. For the association of Hare with Liverpool see Chapter 1.
210. Thomas Hare, 'Representation and Misrepresentation, II', p. 221.
211. *Ibid.*, pp. 221–2.
212. *Ibid.*, p. 222.
213. See Andrew Reid, ed., *Why I am a Liberal*, p. 55, quoted in Chapter 1. Other contributors were Lubbock and John and Alice Westlake.
214. See Thomas Hare, 'Le Système Actuel et Ses Résultats'.
215. Thomas Hare to Sir John Lubbock, 23 October 1885, Avebury Papers, Add. MSS 49648, fol. 114. See also Horace G. Hutchinson, *Life of Sir John Lubbock*, I, pp. 213–14.
216. *Hansard*, Third Series, CCXCIV, cols. 1806–15.
217. *Ibid.*, cols. 1827–32.
218. *Ibid.*, cols. 1815–20, 1832–7.
219. *Ibid.*, cols. 1921–32.
220. *Ibid.*, cols. 1937–8. See also Jenifer Hart, *Proportional Representation*, pp. 117–19; William A. Hayes, *The Background and Passage of the Third Reform Act*, p. 264; Jonathan Parry, *The Rise and Fall of Liberal Government in Victorian Britain*, p. 284.
221. Executive committee minutes, 6 March 1884, Proportional Representation Society Papers.
222. See the cabinet minutes for 20 March 1885 in H.C.G. Matthew, ed., *The Gladstone Diaries*, XI, p. 309.
223. *Hansard*, Third Series, CCXCVI, col. 517. See also Jenifer Hart, *Proportional Representation*, pp. 126–7.
224. *Parliamentary Papers*, 1884–1885, XI.
225. *Ibid.*, p. 635.
226. Sir John Lubbock, *Representation*, p. 27.
227. See J.L. Garvin, *The Life of Joseph Chamberlain*, II, p. 123. The Conservatives had 41.5 per cent of the votes. See Christopher Green, 'Birmingham's Politics', p. 96. Other than in London, Birmingham, Leeds, Liverpool, Manchester, and Sheffield, Liberal borough seats declined in 1885 while Conservative borough seats increased. See Henry Pelling, *Social Geography of British Elections*, p. 16; Michael Barker, *Gladstone and Radicalism*, p. 257.
228. *Daily News*, 22 December 1885, p. 2. The Irish Nationalists in 1885 won 82 seats with 6.9 per cent of the votes, the Liberals 335 seats with 49.6 per cent of the votes, and the Conservatives 249 seats with 43.5 per cent of the votes. See W.C. Lubenow, *Parliamentary Politics and the Home Rule Crisis*, p. 47.
229. Executive committee minutes, 14 January 1886, Proportional Representation Society Papers.
230. See Gordon L. Goodman, 'Liberal Unionism', p. 186.
231. Proportional Representation Society, *Deputation to Lord Salisbury and Mr Ritchie*, pp. 3–4.
232. *Ibid.*, pp. 18–19. See also Jenifer Hart, *Proportional Representation*, pp. 129–30.

233. For the block vote see Enid Lakeman, *How Democracies Vote*, pp. 36–40; John H. Humphreys, *Proportional Representation*, pp. 32–4. For the Local Government Act see John Davis, *Reforming London*, pp. 96–114; J.P.D. Dunbabin, 'The Politics of the Establishment of County Councils'; J.P.D. Dunbabin, 'The Expectations of the New County Councils'.
234. *Hansard*, Third Series, CCCXXIV, col. 1352.
235. *Ibid.*
236. *Ibid.*, col. 1355.
237. *Hansard*, Third Series, CCCXXVI, cols. 1859–62, 1864–5.
238. *Ibid.*, cols. 1869–71, 1878–81.
239. *Ibid.*, cols. 1886–9. See also Jenifer Hart, *Proportional Representation*, pp. 130–1.
240. Executive committee minutes, 25 June 1888, Proportional Representation Society Papers. For the revival of the society in 1905 see Martin Pugh, *Electoral Reform in War and Peace*, p. 5.
241. *The Times*, 7 May 1891, p. 5.

Conclusion

1. On discussion of proportional representation in twentieth-century Britain see Jenifer Hart, *Proportional Representation*, pp. 145–286; Vernon Bogdanor, *The People and the Party System*, pp. 119–74; Martin Pugh, *Electoral Reform in War and Peace, 1906–1918*; David Butler, *The Electoral System in Britain Since 1918*; Robert Blackburn, *The Electoral System in Britain*, pp. 362–430; David M. Farrell, *Electoral Systems*, pp. 121–52; John Curtice, 'The Electoral System'; John Curtice, 'The British Electoral System'. See also Enid Lakeman, *How Democracies Vote*; S.E. Finer, ed., *Adversary Politics and Electoral Reform*; Enid Lakeman, *Power to Elect*; Vernon Bogdanor, *What is Proportional Representation?*. Also of relevance remain Peter G.J. Pulzer, *Political Representation and Elections in Britain*, pp. 31–61; Cornelius O'Leary, *Irish Elections, 1918–1977*.
2. See Quentin Skinner, *Liberty before Liberalism*, pp. 116–19.
3. Relevant in this regard is John Garrard, *Democratisation in Britain*, in particular the introduction and Chapters 2 and 3. Garrard discusses parliamentary reform and virtual representation but without reference to Hare or personal representation.
4. Thomas Hare, *The Machinery of Representation*, p. 42.
5. See William Gladstone, 'The Declining Efficiency of Parliament', p. 560.
6. *Hansard*, Third Series, CCXCIV, cols. 681–2.
7. Thomas Hare, *A Treatise on the Election of Representatives*, pp. 9–10.
8. See in this regard E.J. Feuchtwanger, 'Electoral Systems', pp. 195–6; E.J. Feuchtwanger, 'The Development of the Electoral System in Britain', pp. 372–3. See also Josep M. Colomer, 'It's Parties That Choose Electoral Systems'; Bernard Grofman and Arend Lijphart, eds, *Electoral Laws and Their Political Consequences*.

Bibliography

This bibliography is divided into the following sections:

Manuscript sources	244
Printed primary sources	245
Official publications	245
Periodicals and newspapers	245
Writings by Thomas Hare	245
Contemporary writings and speeches	249
Editions of letters and diaries	256
Secondary sources	256
Books and articles	256
Reference works	273

Manuscript sources

Avebury Papers: Papers of Sir John Lubbock, 1st Baron Avebury, British Library, London.

Chamberlain Papers: Papers of Joseph Chamberlain, University of Birmingham Library.

Katherine Clayton manuscript memoir: Courtesy of David Roberts, Old Windsor.

Courtney Papers: Papers of Leonard Courtney and Kate Courtney, British Library of Political and Economic Science, London.

Cowen Papers: Papers of Joseph Cowen, Tyne and Wear Archives Service, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

Katherine Esdaile typescript memoir: Courtesy of David Roberts, Old Windsor.

Gladstone Papers: Papers of William Gladstone, British Library, London.

Grey Papers: Papers of Henry, 3rd Earl Grey and Albert, 4th Earl Grey, University of Durham Library.

Hare Papers (Add. MSS 43773): Letters to Thomas Hare, British Library, London.

Hare Papers (MS. 356): Letters to Thomas Hare, St John's College Library, Oxford.

Howell Collection: Papers of George Howell, Bishopsgate Institute, London.

Huskisson Papers: Papers of William Huskisson, British Library, London.

Mill-Taylor Collection: Papers of John Stuart Mill, British Library of Political and Economic Science, London.

Proportional Representation Society Papers: Electoral Reform Society, London.

Salisbury Papers: Papers of Lord Salisbury, Hatfield House, Hertfordshire.

Printed primary sources

Official publications

Hansard Parliamentary Debates

Parliamentary Papers

Periodicals and newspapers

Academy

Bee-hive

Brighton Guardian

Contemporary Review

Cornhill Magazine

Daily News

Economist

Edinburgh Review

Fortnightly Review

Fraser's Magazine

Journal des Économistes

Journal of Social Science

Journal of the Statistical Society

Justice

Law Magazine and Review

Macmillan's Magazine

Manchester Guardian

National Review

New Quarterly Magazine

Nineteenth Century

North American Review

Pall Mall Gazette

Papers Read before the Juridical Society

Quarterly Review

La Représentation Proportionnelle

Saturday Review

Sessional Proceedings of the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science

Spectator

The Times

Transactions of the Manchester Statistical Society

Transactions of the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science

Westminster Review

Working Men's College Magazine

Writings by Thomas Hare

'Charitable Endowments in Their Relation to the State and to Public Taxation',
Fortnightly Review, New Series, 2 (August 1867), pp. 129–42.

'Charitable Trusts', *Law Magazine and Law Review*, 11 (May to August 1861),
pp. 305–13.

- 'The Claims of Co-operative Societies to the Use of Public Land for Agricultural and Building Purposes', in J.M. Ludlow, ed., *Proceedings of the Co-operative Congress Held in London, 1869* (London, 1869).
- 'The Construction of a Municipality for the Metropolis', *Sessional Proceedings of the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science* (1874–1875), pp. 1–10, 10–39.
- 'Eighty Members for London: Why Not?', *Pall Mall Gazette* (26 March 1884), pp. 1–2.
- 'An Electoral Reform', *Fortnightly Review*, 2 (October 1865), pp. 439–42.
- 'Estates of Endowments as Instruments of Industrial and Political Education, Co-operative Labour, and Economical Improvement', *Fortnightly Review*, New Series, 7 (March 1870), pp. 309–17.
- 'A Grouping of Parliamentary Electors that Combines a Just and Equal Distribution of Seats and the Free Expression both of Individual and Public Opinion with the Smallest Degree of Disturbance from Corrupt Influences', *Transactions of the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science* (1866), pp. 202–8, 268–76.
- 'Ideal of a Local Government for the Metropolis', *Macmillan's Magazine*, 7 (April 1863), pp. 441–7.
- 'An Ideal Reform Bill', *Pall Mall Gazette* (28 February 1884), pp. 1–2.
- 'An Improved Constitution of Local Governing Bodies, and on the Legislation on Local Subjects which may be Safely and Beneficially Transferred to Them', *Sessional Proceedings of the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science* (1865–1866), pp. 137–46, 146–54.
- 'Individual Responsibility in Representative Government', *Fortnightly Review*, 4 (March 1866), pp. 350–8.
- 'The Injustice and Impolicy of Exempting the Income of Property, on the Ground of Its Charitable or Meritorious Employment, from the Taxation to which Other Like Property is Subject', *Transactions of the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science* (1863), pp. 733–9.
- 'John Stuart Mill', *Westminster Review*, New Series, 45 (January 1874), pp. 122–59.
- 'The Keystone of Parliamentary Reform', *Fortnightly Review*, 3 (January 1866), pp. 559–65.
- 'The Laws Controlling or Regulating the Perpetual Dedication of Property for Public or Charitable Purposes', *Transactions of the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science* (1862), pp. 158–64.
- 'A Letter to the Mayor of the City of Salisbury, from Thomas Hare, Esq., Barrister-at-Law, and Inspector of Charities, with a Proposed Scheme for the Future Administration of the Local Charitable Endowments; with a Tabular Statement of the Annual Income thereof' (1856), in Newcastle Commission on Popular Education: Minutes of Evidence, in *Parliamentary Papers*, 1861, XXI, Vol. 6, pp. 485–514.
- London Municipal Reform: A Reprint, with Additions, of Several Papers Thereon* (London, 1882).
- The Machinery of Representation* (London, 1857).
- The Machinery of Representation*, 2nd edn (London, 1857).
- The Maritime Policy of Great Britain, Or, An Inquiry into the Real Merits of the Late, and the Objections to the Present, Navigation System* (Liverpool, 1827).

- Memorandum on the History, Working, and Results of Cumulative Voting* (London, 1871).
- 'Minority Representation in Europe', *Journal of Social Science*, 3 (1871), pp. 185–91.
- 'A Note on Representative Government', *Fortnightly Review*, New Series, 18 (July 1875), pp. 102–7.
- A Note to the Machinery of Representation* (London, 1857).
- 'On the Application of Endowed Charities in the Improvement of the Education and Condition of the Poor', *Transactions of the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science* (1857), pp. 232–41.
- 'On the Application of a New Statistical Method to the Ascertainment of the Votes of Majorities in a More Exhaustive Manner', *Journal of the Statistical Society*, 23 (September 1860), pp. 337–56.
- 'On the Constitution of Municipalities and Local Governing Bodies for London and Other Towns and Districts', *Sessional Proceedings of the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science* (1869–1870), pp. 453–60, 461–70.
- 'On the Development of the Wealth of India', *Macmillan's Magazine*, 3 (April 1861), pp. 417–26.
- 'On the Election of Representatives or Governing Bodies by Exhaustive Majorities and Unanimous Quotas of the Constituencies', *Transactions of the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science* (1862), pp. 110–23, 204–6.
- 'On Endowments Created for the Apprenticeship of Children, and on the Application of Such Funds by way of Premiums or Rewards, as an Encouragement in the Education of the Poor, and for Promoting Their Continuance at School, and on the Employment of Other Charities Founded for Undefined Purposes in Aid of the Same Objects', in A. Hill, ed., *Essays upon Educational Subjects Read at the Educational Conference of June 1857* (London, 1857).
- 'On the Frame of a Bill for Enabling Parliamentary Electors Voluntarily to Withdraw Their Names from the Local Registry, and Form Unanimous Constituencies', *Transactions of the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science* (1865), pp. 163–71.
- 'On Lands Held by Corporations, and on the Policy Either of Their Alienation or of Providing for Their Management with Regard to Public Utility', *Sessional Proceedings of the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science* (1872–1873), pp. 147–60, 160–7.
- 'On the Means of Manifesting Public Opinion in Election of Representatives to Parliament', *Sessional Proceedings of the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science* (1868–1869), pp. 59–75.
- 'On the Study of the Condition and Capacity of the Lands of Endowments and Other Public Estates, as a Means of Teaching History, Topography, and Political and Social Economy, and of Introducing Technical Instruction', *Transactions of the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science* (1870), pp. 323–9.
- On Such an Organisation of the Metropolitan Elections as would Call into Existence the Greatest Amount of Knowledge and Judgment of the Constituencies and as far as possible Discourage All Corrupt and Pernicious Influences* (London, 1865).
- 'On the Suggestions Afforded by the Application of the Cumulative Vote and by the Other Incidents of the School Board Elections for Improvement in the Constitution of Municipal and Local Governing Bodies', *Sessional Proceedings of the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science* (1870–1871), pp. 215–35.

- 'The Personal Life of George Grote', *Westminster Review*, New Series, 44 (July 1873), pp. 129–72.
- 'A Plea for Minority Representation', *Pall Mall Gazette* (1 February 1884), pp. 1–2.
- 'Public and Private Property Considered as to Its Legal Conditions: I. Public Property', *Fortnightly Review*, New Series, 5 (March 1869), pp. 284–97.
- 'Public and Private Property Considered as to Its Legal Conditions: II. Private Property', *Fortnightly Review*, New Series, 5 (June 1869), pp. 732–47.
- 'The Reform Bill of the Future', *Fortnightly Review*, New Series, 23 (January 1878), pp. 75–84.
- Reports of Cases Adjudged in the High Court of Chancery*, 11 Vols (London, 1843–1858).
- 'Representation and Misrepresentation, II: The Coming Steps in Representation', *Fortnightly Review*, New Series, 37 (February 1885), pp. 216–22.
- 'Representation in Practice and Theory', *Fraser's Magazine*, 61 (February 1860), pp. 188–204.
- 'Representation of Every Locality and Intelligence', *Fraser's Magazine*, 61 (April 1860), pp. 527–43.
- The Study of the Condition and Capacity of the Lands and Property of Endowments, and Other Public Estates* (London, 1871).
- 'Suggestions for the Improvement of Our Representative System: The University Elections Act of Last Session', *Macmillan's Magazine*, 5 (February 1862), pp. 295–301.
- 'A System of Election which Provides for a Just and Permanent Distribution of Seats in Parliament among All the Counties, Cities, and Boroughs of the United Kingdom', *Transactions of the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science* (1879), pp. 218–28.
- Le Système Actuel et Ses Résultats*, *La Représentation Proportionnelle*, 8 (Aout 1885), pp. 223–31.
- A Treatise on the Discovery of Evidence by Bill and Answer in Equity* (London, 1836).
- A Treatise on the Discovery of Evidence in the High Court of Justice: Being a Second Edition of a Treatise on the Discovery of Evidence by Bill and Answer in Equity, Adapted to the Supreme Court of Judicature Acts and Rules, 1873 and 1875, by Sherlock Hare* (London, 1876).
- A Treatise on the Election of Representatives, Parliamentary and Municipal* (London, 1859).
- A Treatise on the Election of Representatives, Parliamentary and Municipal*, 2nd edn (London, 1861).
- A Treatise on the Election of Representatives, Parliamentary and Municipal*, 3rd edn (London, 1865).
- A Treatise on the Election of Representatives, Parliamentary and Municipal*, 4th edn [*The Election of Representatives, Parliamentary and Municipal: A Treatise*] (London, 1873).
- Usque ad Coelum: Thoughts on the Dwellings of the People, Charitable Estates, Improvement, and Local Government of the Metropolis* (London, 1862).
- 'What Conditions or Limitations Ought to be Imposed upon the Power of Disposing in Perpetuity of Property, Real or Personal, for Charitable or Other Purposes?', *Transactions of the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science* (1866), pp. 189–94, 265–8.

'What Limits Ought to be Placed by Law to Charitable Endowments?', *Transactions of the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science* (1869), pp. 132–7, 142–52.

'What Ought to be the Legal and Constitutional Relations between England and Her Colonies?', *Transactions of the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science* (1869), pp. 100–6, 120–32.

In Reid, A., ed., *Why I am a Liberal* (London, 1885).

With Henry Iltid Nicholl and John Monson Carrow, *Cases Relating to Railways and Canals Argued and Adjudged in the Courts of Law and Equity*, 2 Vols (London, 1840–1843).

Contemporary writings and speeches

Acton, Lord, 'Sir Erskine May's *Democracy in Europe*', *Quarterly Review*, 145 (January 1878), pp. 112–42.

Adams, F., *History of the Elementary School Contest in England* [1882], A. Briggs, ed. (Brighton, 1972).

Annual Register, 1870 (London, 1871).

Arnold-Forster, H.O., 'Proportional Representation: A Test Election', *Nineteenth Century*, 15 (April 1884), pp. 716–20.

Austin, J., *A Plea for the Constitution* (London, 1859).

Bagehot, W., 'Considerations on Representative Government', *Economist* (18 May 1861), pp. 540–1.

———, 'The English Constitution: VI. The House of Commons', *Fortnightly Review*, 4 (March 1866), pp. 257–83.

———, 'Parliamentary Reform', *National Review*, 8 (January 1859), pp. 228–73.

———, 'Present Aspects of Parliamentary Reform', *National Review*, 8 (April 1859), pp. 538–62.

Baily, W., *Proportional Representation in Large Constituencies* (London, 1872).

———, *A Scheme for Proportional Representation* (London, 1869).

Bentham, J., *Plan of Parliamentary Reform, in the Form of a Catechism* (London, 1817).

Bernard, H.F., *Redistribution by Proportional Representation* (London, 1884).

Block, M., 'Congrès International des Sciences Sociales', *Journal des Économistes*, Deuxieme Serie, 44 (Octobre 1864), pp. 66–87.

Broderick, L., 'Proportional Representation', *Transactions of the Manchester Statistical Society* (1884–1885), pp. 89–104.

Bullock, T.H., 'A Blue Mutiny', *Fraser's Magazine*, 63 (January 1861), pp. 98–107.

Burke, E., *On Conciliation with America* [1775], in *Pre-Revolutionary Writings*, I. Harris, ed. (Cambridge, 1993).

Cecil, R. See Lord Salisbury.

Chamberlain, J., 'The Caucus', *Fortnightly Review*, New Series, 24 (November 1878), pp. 721–41.

———, 'The Liberal Party and Its Leaders', *Fortnightly Review*, New Series, 14 (September 1873), pp. 287–302.

———, 'A New Political Organization', *Fortnightly Review*, New Series, 22 (July 1877), pp. 126–34.

———, 'The Next Page of the Liberal Programme', *Fortnightly Review*, New Series, 16 (October 1874), pp. 405–29.

- , *Mr Chamberlain's Speeches*, 2 Vols, C.W. Boyd, ed. (London, 1914).
- Churchill, R., *Speeches of the Right Honourable Lord Randolph Churchill*, 2 Vols (London, 1889).
- Coleridge, S.T., *Biographia Literaria, or Biographical Sketches of My Literary Life and Opinions* [1817], G. Watson, ed. (London, 1975).
- , *Coleridge's Writings: On Politics and Society*, J. Morrow, ed. (Princeton, 1991).
- , *The Political Thought of Samuel Taylor Coleridge*, R.J. White, ed. (London, 1938).
- Co-operative Congress, *The Fourth Annual Co-operative Congress Held at Bolton, 1872*, G.J. Holyoake, ed. (Manchester, 1872).
- , *The Fifth Annual Co-operative Congress Held at Newcastle-upon-Tyne, 1873*, G.J. Holyoake, ed. (Manchester, 1873).
- , *The Sixth Annual Co-operative Congress Held at Halifax, 1874*, E.V. Neale, ed. (Manchester, 1874).
- Courtney, L., 'Political Machinery and Political Life', *Fortnightly Review*, New Series, 20 (July 1876), pp. 74–92.
- , 'Public Affairs', in *Memories of John Westlake* (London, 1914).
- , 'Redistribution by Different Lights: The Seats Bill', *Fortnightly Review*, New Series, 37 (January 1885), pp. 26–36.
- , 'The Representation of Minorities', *Nineteenth Century*, 6 (July 1879), pp. 141–56.
- , 'Thomas Hare', *Athenaeum* (16 May 1891), pp. 635–6.
- , see also Lubbock, J.
- Crosskey, H.W., 'The Birmingham Liberal Association and Its Assailants', *Macmillan's Magazine*, 39 (December 1878), pp. 151–7.
- , 'The Liberal Association – the "600" – of Birmingham', *Macmillan's Magazine*, 35 (February 1877), pp. 299–307.
- The Cumulative Method of Voting: Its Nature, Operation, and Effects as Exhibited in the Late School Board Elections* (Birmingham, 1871).
- Dilke, C.W., *Parliamentary Reform* (London, 1879).
- Dodgson, C.L., *The Principles of Parliamentary Representation* (London, 1884).
- , *The Principles of Parliamentary Representation: Supplement* (Oxford, 1885).
- , *The Principles of Parliamentary Representation: Postscript to Supplement* (Oxford, 1885).
- Droop, H.R., *On Methods of Electing Representatives* (London, 1868).
- , 'On Methods of Electing Representatives', *Journal of the Statistical Society*, 44 (June 1881), pp. 141–96, 197–202.
- , 'On the Political and Social Effects of Different Methods of Electing Representatives', *Papers Read before the Juridical Society*, 3 (March 1869), pp. 469–507.
- , *Proportional Representation as Applied to the Election of Local Governing Bodies* (London, 1871).
- The Educational Franchise* (London, 1853).
- Escott, T.H.S., 'The Future of the Radical Party', *Fortnightly Review*, New Series, 34, (July 1883), pp. 1–11.
- , 'The Radical Programme: Machinery', *Fortnightly Review*, New Series, 34 (August 1883), pp. 290–7.
- Essays on Reform* (London, 1867).

- Fawcett, H., *Mr Hare's Reform Bill Simplified and Explained* (London, 1860).
- , 'Mr Mill's Treatise on Representative Government', *Macmillan's Magazine*, 4 (June 1861), pp. 97–103.
- , 'The Next Reform Bill', *Nineteenth Century*, 7 (March 1880), pp. 443–63.
- , 'The Present Position of the Government', *Fortnightly Review*, New Series, 10 (November 1871), pp. 544–58.
- Fawcett, M.G., 'An American on Representation', *Fraser's Magazine*, New Series, 5 (February 1872), pp. 234–41.
- , 'Proportional Representation', *Macmillan's Magazine*, 22 (September 1870), pp. 376–82.
- , 'A Short Explanation of Mr Hare's Scheme of Representation', *Macmillan's Magazine*, 23 (April 1871), pp. 481–7.
- , 'Women and Representative Government', *Nineteenth Century*, 14 (August 1883), pp. 285–91.
- Field, D.D., 'Representation of Minorities', *Journal of Social Science*, 3 (1871), pp. 133–47.
- Frisby, A., 'The Next Reform Bill', *Fortnightly Review*, New Series, 32 (August 1882), pp. 241–54.
- , *A Practical Scheme of Fair Representation* (Leicester, 1881).
- Gladstone, W., 'The County Franchise and Mr Lowe Thereon', *Nineteenth Century*, 2 (November 1877), pp. 537–60.
- , 'The Declining Efficiency of Parliament', *Quarterly Review*, 99 (September 1856), pp. 521–70.
- , 'Last Words on the County Franchise', *Nineteenth Century*, 3 (January 1878), pp. 196–208.
- , 'The New Parliament and Its Work', *Quarterly Review*, 101 (April 1857), pp. 541–84.
- Grece, C.J., 'Upon Negative Voting', *Sessional Proceedings of the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science* (1868–1869), pp. 647–66.
- Greg, W.R., 'The Expected Reform Bill', *Edinburgh Review*, 95 (January 1852), pp. 213–80.
- , 'Parliamentary Purification', *Edinburgh Review*, 98 (October 1853), pp. 566–624.
- , 'Representative Reform', *Edinburgh Review*, 106 (July 1857), pp. 254–86.
- Grey, A., 'Proportional versus Majority Representation', *Nineteenth Century*, 16 (December 1884), pp. 935–64.
- , *Reform: Speech of Mr Albert Grey, M.P., to His Constituents at Hexham, 5 January 1884* (London, 1884).
- , see also Lubbock, J.
- Grey, 3rd Earl, *Colonial Policy of Lord John Russell*, 2 Vols (London, 1853).
- , *Parliamentary Government Considered with Reference to a Reform of Parliament* (London, 1858).
- , *Parliamentary Government Considered with Reference to Reform*, 2nd edn (London, 1864).
- Hare, S., *Proportional Representation* (London, 1904).
- , *A Short Summary of the Election of Representatives* (London, 1901).
- Harris, G., *Autobiography* (London, 1888).
- , *The True Theory of Representation in a State*, 2nd edn (London, 1857).

- Harrison, F., *Order and Progress* [1875], M.S. Vogeler, ed. (Hassocks, 1975).
- , 'Our Venetian Constitution', *Fortnightly Review*, New Series, 1 (March 1867), pp. 261–83.
- , 'The Revolution of the Commune', *Fortnightly Review*, New Series, 9, (May 1871), pp. 556–79.
- Hill, A., ed., *Essays upon Educational Subjects Read at the Educational Conference of June 1857* (London, 1857).
- Hill, F., *An Autobiography of Fifty Years in Times of Reform* (London, 1894).
- , *Parliamentary Reform: How the Representation May be Amended Safely, Gradually, and Efficiently* (London, 1865).
- , 'Principles and Functions of Government', *Transactions of the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science* (1868), pp. 260–8.
- Hobhouse, A., *A Lecture on the Characteristics of Charitable Foundations in England* (London, 1868).
- Howell, G., 'The Caucus System and the Liberal Party', *New Quarterly Magazine*, 10 (October 1878), pp. 579–90.
- Kinnear, J.B., 'Practical Considerations on the Representation of Minorities', *Fortnightly Review*, 4 (February 1866), pp. 49–64.
- , 'Redistribution of Seats', in *Essays on Reform* (London, 1867).
- Knatchbull-Hugessen, E.H., 'Redistribution of Political Power', *Macmillan's Magazine*, 27 (November 1872), pp. 67–76.
- Lewis, G.C., 'History and Prospects of Parliamentary Reform', *Edinburgh Review*, 109 (January 1859), pp. 264–92.
- , 'Marshall on the Representation of Minorities', *Edinburgh Review*, 100 (July 1854), pp. 226–35.
- , *Remarks upon the Use and Abuse of Some Political Terms* (London, 1832).
- Litchfield, R.B., 'Mr J.S. Mill on Representative Government', *Working Men's College Magazine*, 3 (August 1861), pp. 113–6.
- Locke, J., *Two Treatises of Government* [1698], P. Laslett, ed. (Cambridge, 1988).
- Lorimer, J., *Political Progress Not Necessarily Democratic* (London, 1857).
- Lowe, R., *Middle Class Education: Endowment or Free Trade* (London, 1868).
- , 'Mr Gladstone on Manhood Suffrage', *Fortnightly Review*, New Series, 22 (December 1877), pp. 733–46.
- , 'A New Reform Bill', *Fortnightly Review*, New Series, 22 (October 1877), pp. 437–52.
- Lubbock, J., 'Proportional Representation', *Nineteenth Century*, 15 (April 1884), pp. 703–15.
- , *Representation* (London, 1885).
- , Courtney, Leonard; Grey, Albert; and Westlake, John, 'Proportional Representation: Objections and Answers', *Nineteenth Century*, 17 (February 1885), pp. 312–20.
- Ludlow, J.M., ed., *Proceedings of the Co-operative Congress Held in London, 1869* (London, 1869).
- Macaulay, T.B., 'Bentham's Defence of Mill: Utilitarian Logic and Philosophy', *Edinburgh Review*, 49 (June 1829), pp. 273–99.
- , 'Mill's Essay on Government: Utilitarian Logic and Politics', *Edinburgh Review*, 49 (March 1829), pp. 159–89.
- , 'Utilitarian Theory of Government and the "Greatest Happiness Principle"', *Edinburgh Review*, 50 (October 1829), pp. 99–125.

- Mackintosh, J., 'Parliamentary Reform', *Edinburgh Review*, 34 (November 1820), pp. 461–501.
- , 'Universal Suffrage', *Edinburgh Review*, 31 (December 1818), pp. 165–203.
- Marriott, W.T., 'The Birmingham Caucus', *Nineteenth Century*, 11 (June 1882), pp. 949–65.
- Marshall, J.G., *Minorities and Majorities: Their Relative Rights: A Letter to the Lord John Russell on Parliamentary Reform* (London, 1853).
- Martin, J.B., 'The Elections of 1868 and 1874', *Journal of the Statistical Society*, 37 (June 1874), pp. 193–229.
- Maurice, F.D., 'The Suffrage Considered in Relation to the Working Class and to the Professional Class', *Macmillan's Magazine*, 2 (June 1860), pp. 89–97.
- , *The Workman and the Franchise: Chapters from English History on the Representation and Education of the People* (London, 1866).
- Mill, J., 'Edinburgh Review', *Westminster Review*, 1 (January 1824), pp. 206–49.
- , 'Edinburgh Review on Parliamentary Reform', *Westminster Review*, 4 (July 1825), pp. 194–233.
- , *Essay on Government* [1820], in *Political Writings*, T. Ball, ed. (Cambridge, 1992).
- , 'Reply to Macaulay from A Fragment on Mackintosh' [1835], in B. Terence, ed., *Political Writings*, (Cambridge, 1992).
- Mill, J.S., *Autobiography* [1873], J.M. Robson, ed. (Harmondsworth, 1989).
- , 'Bentham', *London and Westminster Review*, 7 and 29 (August 1838), pp. 467–506.
- , 'Civilization', *London and Westminster Review*, 3 and 25 (April 1836), pp. 1–28.
- , 'Coleridge', *London and Westminster Review*, 33 (March 1840), pp. 257–302.
- , *Considerations on Representative Government* (London, 1861).
- , 'De Tocqueville on Democracy in America' [I], *London and Westminster Review*, 1 and 30 (October 1835), pp. 85–129.
- , 'De Tocqueville on Democracy in America' [II], *Edinburgh Review*, 72 (October 1840), pp. 1–47.
- , 'Endowments', *Fortnightly Review*, New Series, 5 (April 1869), pp. 377–90.
- , *Essays on Economics and Society*, J.M. Robson, ed., in J.M. Robson, ed., *Collected Works of John Stuart Mill*, Vols IV–V (Toronto, 1967).
- , *On Liberty* [1859], S. Collini, ed. (Cambridge, 1989).
- , *Public and Parliamentary Speeches*, J.M. Robson and B.L. Kinzer, eds, in J.M. Robson, ed., *Collected Works of John Stuart Mill*, Vols XXVIII–XXIX (Toronto, 1988).
- , 'Rationale of Representation', *London and Westminster Review*, 1 and 30 (July 1835), pp. 341–71.
- , 'Recent Writers on Reform', *Fraser's Magazine*, 59 (April 1859), pp. 489–508.
- , *Thoughts on Parliamentary Reform* (London, 1859).
- , *Thoughts on Parliamentary Reform*, 2nd edn (London, 1859).
- Morin, A., *De la représentation des minorités* (Genève, 1862).
- , *Un nouveau système électoral* (Genève, 1861).
- 'Mr Mill on Representative Government', *Westminster Review*, New Series, 20 (July 1861), pp. 91–114.

- National Liberal Federation, *First Annual Report Presented at a Meeting of the Council Held in Leeds, 1879* (Birmingham, 1879).
- , *Seventh Annual Report Presented at a Meeting of the Council Held in Birmingham, 1884* (Birmingham, 1884).
- Naville, E., *Les élections de Genève: mémoire présenté au Conseil fédéral et au peuple suisse* (Lausanne, 1864).
- , *La patrie et les parties, discours sur le réforme électorale* (Genève, 1865).
- , *On the Theory and Practice of Representative Elections*, H.R. Droop, ed. (London, 1872).
- Newman, F.W., 'Party Government', *Westminster Review*, New Series, 13 (April 1858), pp. 402–28.
- Proportional Representation Society, *First Annual Report, 1884–1885* (London, 1885).
- , *Second Report, 1885–1888* (London, 1888).
- , *Deputation to Lord Salisbury and Mr Ritchie: Proportional Representation and the County Government Bill* (London, 1888).
- Questions for a Reformed Parliament* (London, 1867).
- The Radical Programme* [1885], D.A. Hamer, ed. (Hassocks, 1971).
- Rae, W.F., 'Political Clubs and Party Organization', *Nineteenth Century*, 3 (May 1878), pp. 908–32.
- Reid, A., ed., *Why I am a Liberal* (London, 1885).
- Reeve, H., 'Earl Grey on Parliamentary Government', *Edinburgh Review*, 108 (July 1858), pp. 217–97.
- 'Representation and Misrepresentation', *Westminster Review*, New Series, 65 (April 1884), pp. 392–420.
- Representative Reform: Report of the Committee Appointed by the Conference of Members of the Reform League, and Others, on Mr Hare's Scheme of Representation, Held 28th February, and 7th and 21st March, 1868* (London, 1868).
- Robinson, D., 'The Shipping Interest', *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*, 20 (September 1826), pp. 442–68.
- Rogers, J.E.T., 'Bribery', in *Questions for a Reformed Parliament* (London, 1867).
- , *Cobden and Modern Political Opinion: Essays on Certain Political Topics* (London, 1873).
- Russell, E.R., *Minority Representation: A Paper Read at the Parliamentary Reform Conference Held at Leeds, 1883* (London, 1883).
- Russell, J., *An Essay on the History of the English Government and Constitution*, 3rd edn (London, 1865).
- Salisbury, Lord, 'The House of Commons', *Quarterly Review*, 116 (July 1864), pp. 245–81.
- , 'Representation of Minorities', *Saturday Review* (10 September 1864), pp. 322–3.
- , 'The Theories of Parliamentary Reform', in *Oxford Essays*, Vol. IV: 1858 (London, 1858).
- , 'The Value of Redistribution: A Note on Electoral Statistics', *National Review*, 4 (October 1884), pp. 145–62.
- Schnadhorst, F., 'The Caucus and Its Critics', *Nineteenth Century*, 12 (July 1882), pp. 8–28.
- Seebohm, F., 'Proportionate Representation', *Contemporary Review*, 44 (December 1883), pp. 905–15.

- Seeley, J., 'Milton's Political Opinions', *Macmillan's Magazine*, 17 (February 1868), pp. 299–311.
- Sellar, A.C., 'The Coming Reform', *Edinburgh Review*, 159 (April 1884), pp. 560–87.
- , 'Parliamentary Reform', *Edinburgh Review*, 159 (January 1884), pp. 264–96.
- Shaw-Lefevre, G.J., 'Representation and Misrepresentation, I: The Crusade for Proportional Representation', *Fortnightly Review*, New Series, 37 (February 1885), pp. 202–15.
- , 'The Representation of Minorities', *Contemporary Review*, 45 (May 1884), pp. 714–33.
- Smith, A., *The Wealth of Nations: Books IV–V* [1776], A. Skinner, ed. (Harmondsworth, 1999).
- Smith, J.P., *An Amendment of Mr Hare's Quota* (London, 1884).
- , 'Parliamentary Reform: Minority Representation', *Westminster Review*, New Series, 65 (January 1884), pp. 163–75.
- , *Preferential Voting: The Transfer of Surplus Votes* (London, 1884).
- , 'University Representation: I', *Law Magazine and Review*, 250 (November 1883), pp. 21–41.
- , 'University Representation: II', *Law Magazine and Review*, 251 (February 1884), pp. 143–58.
- Spence, C.H., 'An Australian's Impressions of England', *Cornhill Magazine*, 13 (January 1866), pp. 110–20.
- , *Autobiography* (Adelaide, 1910).
- , *Mr Hogarth's Will*, 3 Vols (London, 1865).
- , *A Plea for Pure Democracy: Mr Hare's Reform Bill Applied to South Australia* (Adelaide, 1861).
- , 'Principles of Representation', *Fortnightly Review*, 4 (April 1866), pp. 421–36.
- Spencer, H., 'Parliamentary Reform: The Dangers and the Safeguards', *Westminster Review*, New Series, 17 (April 1860), pp. 486–507.
- , 'Representative Government: What Is It Good For?', *Westminster Review*, New Series, 12 (October 1857), pp. 454–86.
- Stapleton, A.G., *Suggestions for a Conservative and Popular Reform in the Commons House of Parliament* (London, 1850).
- Stephen, L., 'On the Choice of Representatives by Popular Constituencies', in *Essays on Reform* (London, 1867).
- , 'Order and Progress', *Fortnightly Review*, New Series, 17 (June 1875), pp. 820–34.
- , 'The Political Situation in England', *North American Review*, 107 (October 1868), pp. 543–67.
- , 'Reform', *Macmillan's Magazine*, 15 (April 1867), pp. 529–36.
- , 'The Value of Political Machinery', *Fortnightly Review*, New Series, 18 (December 1875), pp. 836–52.
- Sterne, S., *Representative Government and Personal Representation* (Philadelphia, 1871).
- , *Representative Government: Its Evils and Their Reform* (New York, 1869).
- Tocqueville, A.de, *Democracy in America* [1835 and 1840], H.C. Mansfield and D. Winthrop, eds (Chicago, 2000).
- Torrens, W.M., 'The London School Board', *Contemporary Review*, 16 (February 1871), pp. 374–89.

- Trevelyan, G.O., 'A Few Remarks on Mr Hare's Scheme of Representation', *Macmillan's Magazine*, 5 (April 1862), pp. 480–6.
- Ware, W.R., 'Application of Mr Hare's System of Voting to the Nomination of Overseers of Harvard College', *Journal of Social Science*, 3 (1871), pp. 192–8.
- , *The Machinery of Politics and Proportional Representation* (London, 1872).
- Westlake, J., 'Personal Notes', in J.L. Davies, ed., *The Working Men's College, 1854–1904* (London, 1904).
- , 'Proportional Representation: A Practical Proposal', *Contemporary Review*, 45 (March 1884), pp. 417–23.
- , 'Thomas Hare', *Academy* (16 May 1891), pp. 465–6.
- , see also Lubbock, J.
- Wigram, J., *Points in the Law of Discovery* (London, 1836).

Editions of letters and diaries

- Bahlman, D.W.R., ed., *The Diary of Sir Edward Walter Hamilton, 1880–1885*, 2 Vols (Oxford, 1972).
- Bicknell, J.W., ed., *Selected Letters of Leslie Stephen*, 2 Vols (London, 1996).
- Cohen, M.N., ed., *The Letters of Lewis Carroll*, 2 Vols (London, 1979).
- and Gandolfo, A., eds, *Lewis Carroll and the House of Macmillan* (Cambridge, 1987).
- Green, R.L., ed., *The Diaries of Lewis Carroll*, 2 Vols (London, 1953).
- MacKenzie, N., ed., *The Letters of Sidney and Beatrice Webb*, Vol. I: *Apprenticeships, 1873–1892* (Cambridge, 1978)
- Matthew, H.C.G., ed., *The Gladstone Diaries*, Vol. V: *1855–1860* (Oxford, 1978).
- , ed., *The Gladstone Diaries*, Vol. VI: *1861–1868* (Oxford, 1978).
- , ed., *The Gladstone Diaries with Cabinet Minutes and Prime-Ministerial Correspondence*, Vol. VII: *January 1869–June 1871* (Oxford, 1982).
- , ed., *The Gladstone Diaries with Cabinet Minutes and Prime-Ministerial Correspondence*, Vol. VIII: *July 1871–December 1874* (Oxford, 1982).
- , ed., *The Gladstone Diaries with Cabinet Minutes and Prime-Ministerial Correspondence*, Vol. IX: *January 1875–December 1880* (Oxford, 1986).
- , ed., *The Gladstone Diaries with Cabinet Minutes and Prime-Ministerial Correspondence*, Vol. XI: *July 1883–December 1886* (Oxford, 1990).
- Mineka, F.E. and Lindley, D.N., eds, *The Later Letters of John Stuart Mill, 1848–1873*, in J.M. Robson, ed., *Collected Works of John Stuart Mill*, Vols XIV–XVII (Toronto, 1972).
- Paul, H., ed., *Letters of Lord Acton to Mary Gladstone* (London, 1904).
- Russell, B. and Russell, P., eds, *The Amberley Papers: The Letters and Diaries of Lord and Lady Amberley*, 2 Vols (London, 1937).
- Vincent, J.R., ed., *Disraeli, Derby and the Conservative Party: Journals and Memoirs of Edward Henry, Lord Stanley, 1849–1869* (Hassocks, 1978).
- Walling, R.A.J., ed., *The Diaries of John Bright* (London, 1930).

Secondary sources

Books and articles

- Allen, C.J.W., *The Law of Evidence in Victorian England* (Cambridge, 1997).
- Allen, P., *The Cambridge Apostles: The Early Years* (Cambridge, 1978).

- , 'F.D. Maurice and J.M. Ludlow: A Reassessment of the Leaders of Christian Socialism', *Victorian Studies*, 11 (1968), pp. 461–82.
- , 'Morrow on Coleridge's *Church and State*', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 49 (1989), pp. 485–9.
- , 'S.T. Coleridge's *Church and State* and the Idea of an Intellectual Establishment', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 46 (1985), pp. 89–106.
- Andrae, P., *Andrae and His Invention: The Proportional Representation Method* (Philadelphia, 1926).
- Annan, N., 'The Intellectual Aristocracy', in J.H. Plumb, ed., *Studies in Social History: A Tribute to G.M. Trevelyan* (London, 1955).
- , *Leslie Stephen: The Godless Victorian* (London, 1984).
- Anschutz, R.P., *The Philosophy of John Stuart Mill* (Oxford, 1953).
- Auspos, P., 'Radicalism, Pressure Groups, and Party Politics: From the National Education League to the National Liberal Federation', *Journal of British Politics*, 20 (1980), pp. 184–204.
- Backstrom, P.N., *Christian Socialism and Co-operation in Victorian England: Edward Vansittart Neale and the Co-operative Movement* (London, 1974).
- Bailyn, B., *The Ideological Origins of the American Revolution*, 2nd edn (Cambridge, MA, 1992).
- Baker, J.H., *An Introduction to English Legal History*, 4th edn (London, 2002).
- Ball, T., 'Utilitarianism, Feminism, and the Franchise', in Terence Ball, *Reappraising Political Theory: Revisionist Studies in the History of Political Thought* (Oxford, 1995).
- Barker, M., *Gladstone and Radicalism: The Reconstruction of Liberal Policy in Britain, 1885–1894* (Hassocks, 1975).
- Baron, H., *The Crisis of the Early Italian Renaissance: Civic Humanism and Republican Liberty in an Age of Classicism and Tyranny*, 2nd edn (Princeton, 1966).
- Barton, R., '"Huxley, Lubbock, and Half a Dozen Others": Professionals and Gentlemen in the Formation of the X Club, 1851–1864', *Isis*, 89 (1998), pp. 410–44.
- , '"An Influential Set of Chaps": The X-Club and Royal Society Politics, 1864–1885', *British Journal for the History of Science*, 23 (1990), pp. 53–81.
- Bayly, C.A., *Indian Society and the Making of the British Empire* (Cambridge, 1988).
- Beales, D.E.D., 'History and Biography: An Inaugural Lecture', in T.C.W. Blanning and D. Cannadine, eds, *History and Biography: Essays in Honour of Derek Beales* (Cambridge, 1996).
- , 'Parliamentary Parties and the "Independent" Member, 1810–1860', in R. Robson, ed., *Ideas and Institutions of Victorian Britain: Essays in Honour of George Kitson Clark* (London, 1967).
- Bebbington, D., *The Mind of Gladstone: Religion, Homer, and Politics*, (Oxford, 2004).
- Beccattini, G., 'Henry Fawcett and the Labour Question in Mid-Victorian Britain', in L. Goldman, ed., *The Blind Victorian: Henry Fawcett and British Liberalism* (Cambridge, 1989).
- Beer, S.H., *Modern British Politics: A Study of Parties and Pressure Groups* (London, 1965).
- , 'The Representation of Interests in British Government: Historical Background', *American Political Science Review*, 51 (1957), pp. 613–50.
- Begbie, A.C., *Albert, Fourth Earl Grey: A Last Word* (London, 1917).

- Bell, H.C., 'Palmerston and Parliamentary Representation', *Journal of Modern History*, 4 (1932), pp. 186–213.
- Benson, A.C., *The Life of Edward White Benson, Sometime Archbishop of Canterbury*, 2 Vols (London, 1899).
- , *Memories and Friends* (London, 1924).
- Bentley, M., *Lord Salisbury's World: Conservative Environments in Late-Victorian Britain* (Cambridge, 2001).
- , 'Party, Doctrine, and Thought', in M. Bentley and J. Stevenson, eds, *High and Low Politics in Modern Britain: Ten Studies* (Oxford, 1983).
- Berrington, H., 'Partisanship and Dissidence in the Nineteenth-Century House of Commons', *Parliamentary Affairs*, 21 (1968), pp. 338–74.
- Biagini, E.F., *British Democracy and Irish Nationalism, 1876–1906* (Cambridge, 2007).
- , 'Liberalism and Direct Democracy: John Stuart Mill and the Model of Ancient Athens', in E.F. Biagini, ed., *Citizenship and Community: Liberals, Radicals and Collective Identities in the British Isles, 1865–1931* (Cambridge, 1996).
- , *Liberty, Retrenchment and Reform: Popular Liberalism in the Age of Gladstone, 1860–1880* (Cambridge, 1992).
- , 'Radicalism and Liberty', in P. Mandler, ed., *Liberty and Authority in Victorian Britain* (Oxford, 2006).
- Birch, A.H., *Representation* (London, 1971).
- , *Representative and Responsible Government: An Essay on the British Constitution* (London, 1964).
- Black, D., *A Mathematical Approach to Proportional Representation: Duncan Black on Lewis Carroll*, I. McLean, A. McMillan, and B.L. Monroe, eds (Norwell, 1966).
- , *The Theory of Committees and Elections* (Cambridge, 1958).
- Blackburn, H., *Women's Suffrage: A Record of the Women's Suffrage Movement in the British Isles* (London, 1902).
- Blackburn, R., *The Electoral System in Britain* (Houndmills, 1995).
- Blair, G.S., 'The Adoption of Cumulative Voting in Illinois', *Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society*, 67 (1954), pp. 373–84.
- Blake, R., *Disraeli* (London, 1966).
- Bock, K.E., 'History and a Science of Man: An Appreciation of George Cornewall Lewis', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 12 (1951), pp. 599–608.
- Bogdanor, V., *The People and the Party System: The Referendum and Electoral Reform in British Politics* (Cambridge, 1981).
- , *What is Proportional Representation?* (Oxford, 1984).
- Bose, S., *Peasant Labour and Colonial Capital: Rural Bengal since 1770* (Cambridge, 1993).
- Bowler, S., Donovan, T., and Farrell, D.M., 'Party Strategy and Voter Organization under Cumulative Voting in Victorian England', *Political Studies*, 47 (1999), pp. 906–17.
- Bradley, I., *The Optimists: Themes and Personalities in Victorian Liberalism* (London, 1980).
- Brewer, J., *Party Ideology and Popular Politics at the Accession of George III* (Cambridge, 1976).
- , 'Rockingham, Burke and Whig Political Argument', *Historical Journal*, 18 (1975), pp. 188–201.
- Brock, M., *The Great Reform Act* (London, 1973).

- Brogan, H., *Alexis de Tocqueville: A Biography* (London, 2006).
- Bromund, T.R., 'Uniting the Whole People: Proportional Representation in Great Britain, 1884–1885', *Historical Research*, 74 (2001), pp. 77–94.
- Brown, A.W., *The Metaphysical Society: Victorian Minds in Crisis, 1869–1880* (New York, 1947).
- Buchanan, A., *The Spare Chancellor: The Life of Walter Bagehot* (London, 1959).
- Burn, W.L., *The Age of Equipoise: A Study of the Mid-Victorian Generation*, (London, 1964).
- Burns, J.H., 'J.S. Mill and Democracy, 1829–1861: I', *Political Studies*, 5 (1957), pp. 157–75.
- , 'J.S. Mill and Democracy, 1829–1861: II', *Political Studies*, 5 (1957), pp. 281–94.
- Burrow, J.W., *Evolution and Society: A Study in Victorian Social Theory*, (Cambridge, 1966).
- , 'Henry Maine and Mid-Victorian Ideas of Progress', in A. Diamond, ed., *The Victorian Achievement of Sir Henry Maine: A Centennial Reappraisal* (Cambridge, 1991).
- , *A Liberal Descent: Victorian Historians and the English Past* (Cambridge, 1981).
- , 'Sense and Circumstances: Bagehot and the Nature of Political Understanding', in S. Collini, D. Winch, and J. Burrow, eds, *That Noble Science of Politics: A Study in Nineteenth-Century Intellectual History* (Cambridge, 1983).
- , '"The Village Community" and the Uses of History in Late Nineteenth Century England', in N. McKendrick, ed., *Historical Perspectives: Studies in English Thought and Society in Honour of J.H. Plumb* (London, 1974).
- , *Whigs and Liberals: Continuity and Change in English Political Thought* (Oxford, 1988).
- Butler, D., *The Electoral System in Britain since 1918*, 2nd edn (Oxford, 1963).
- Campbell, P., *French Electoral Systems and Elections, 1789–1957* (London, 1958).
- Cannadine, D., *Class in Britain* (New Haven, 1998).
- Cannon, J., *Parliamentary Reform, 1640–1832* (Cambridge, 1973).
- Capaldi, N., *John Stuart Mill: A Biography* (Cambridge, 2004).
- Carr, W.R., 'James Mill's Politics: A Final Word', *Historical Journal*, 15 (1972), pp. 315–20.
- , 'James Mill's Politics Reconsidered: Parliamentary Reform and the Triumph of Truth', *Historical Journal*, 14 (1971), pp. 553–80.
- Carstairs, A.M., *A Short History of Electoral Systems in Western Europe* (London, 1980).
- Chadwick, M.E.J., 'The Role of Redistribution in the Making of the Third Reform Act', *Historical Journal*, 19 (1976), pp. 665–83.
- Chadwick, O., *The Victorian Church*, Pt I, 3rd edn (London, 1971).
- Clapham, J.H., *An Economic History of Modern Britain*, Vol. I: *The Early Railway Age, 1820–1850*, 2nd edn (Cambridge, 1930).
- Clark, J.C.D., *English Society, 1660–1832: Religion, Ideology and Politics During the Ancien Régime* (Cambridge, 2000).
- , 'How Ideologies are Born: The Case of Radicalism', in J.C.D. Clark, *Our Shadowed Present: Modernism, Postmodernism and History* (London, 2003).
- , 'On Hitting the Buffers: The Historiography of England's Ancien Régime', *Past and Present*, 117 (1987), 195–207.

- , 'Religion and the Origins of Radicalism in Nineteenth-Century Britain', in G. Burgess and M. Festenstein, eds, *English Radicalism, 1550–1850* (Cambridge, 2007).
- Clarke, P.F., 'Electoral Sociology of Modern Britain', *History*, 57 (1972), pp. 31–55.
- Clive, J., *Macaulay: The Shaping of the Historian* (New York, 1973).
- Cocks, R.C.J., *Sir Henry Maine: A Study in Victorian Jurisprudence* (Cambridge, 1988).
- , 'Maine, Progress and Theory', in A. Diamond, ed., *The Victorian Achievement of Sir Henry Maine: A Centennial Reappraisal* (Cambridge, 1991).
- Cohen, M.N., *Lewis Carroll: A Biography* (London, 1995).
- Collini, S., *Absent Minds: Intellectuals in Britain* (Oxford, 2006).
- , 'Democracy and Excitement: Maine's Political Pessimism', in A. Diamond, ed., *The Victorian Achievement of Sir Henry Maine: A Centennial Reappraisal* (Cambridge, 1991).
- , '"Manly Fellows": Fawcett, Stephen and the Liberal Temper', in L. Goldman, ed., *The Blind Victorian: Henry Fawcett and British Liberalism* (Cambridge, 1989).
- , *Public Moralists: Political Thought and Intellectual Life in Britain, 1850–1930* (Oxford, 1991).
- Colmer, J., *Coleridge: Critic of Society* (Oxford, 1959).
- Colomer, J.M., 'It's Parties That Choose Electoral Systems (or, Duverger's Laws Upside Down)', *Political Studies*, 53 (2005), pp. 1–21.
- Conacher, J.B., *The Aberdeen Coalition, 1852–1855: A Study in Mid-Nineteenth-Century Party Politics* (Cambridge, 1968).
- , 'Party Politics in the Age of Palmerston', in P. Appleman, W.A. Madden, and M. Wolff, eds, *1859: Entering an Age of Crisis* (Bloomington, 1959).
- , *The Peelites and the Party System, 1846–1852* (Newton Abbot, 1972).
- Cooke, A.B. and Vincent, J.R., *The Governing Passion: Cabinet Government and Party Politics in Britain, 1885–1886* (Brighton, 1974).
- Cornford, J., 'The Transformation of Conservatism in the Late Nineteenth Century', *Victorian Studies*, 7 (1963), pp. 35–66.
- Courtney, W.P., 'Thomas Hare', in S. Lee, ed., *Dictionary of National Biography*, Supplement, Vol. II (London, 1901).
- Cowling, M., *1867: Disraeli, Gladstone, and Revolution: The Passing of the Second Reform Bill* (Cambridge, 1967).
- , *Mill and Liberalism* (Cambridge, 1963).
- Cox, G.W., *The Efficient Secret: The Cabinet and the Development of Political Parties in Victorian England* (Cambridge, 1987).
- Crook, D.P., *American Democracy in English Politics, 1815–1850* (Oxford, 1965).
- Crowell, F.R., *The Athenaeum: Club and Social Life in London, 1824–1974* (London, 1975).
- Cullen, M.J., *The Statistical Movement in Early Victorian Britain: The Foundations of Empirical Social Research* (Hassocks, 1975).
- Curtice, J., 'The British Electoral System: Fixture without Foundation', in D. Kavanagh, ed., *Electoral Politics* (Oxford, 1992).
- , 'The Electoral System', in V. Bogdanor, ed., *The British Constitution in the Twentieth Century* (Oxford, 2003).
- Daniel, G., *The First Civilizations: The Archaeology of Their Origins* (London, 1968).
- , *A Hundred and Fifty Years of Archaeology* (London, 1975).

- Dasent, A.I., *John Thaddeus Delane, Editor of The Times: His Life and Correspondence*, 2 Vols (London, 1908).
- Daunton, M., *House and Home in the Victorian City: Working-Class Housing, 1850–1914* (London, 1983).
- , 'Housing', in F.M.L. Thompson, ed., *The Cambridge Social History of Britain, 1750–1950*, Vol. II: *People and Their Environment* (Cambridge, 1990).
- , *Trusting Leviathan: The Politics of Taxation in Britain, 1799–1914* (Cambridge, 2001).
- Davies, J.L., ed., *The Working Men's College, 1854–1904* (London, 1904).
- Davis, J., *Reforming London: The London Government Problem, 1855–1900* (Oxford, 1988).
- and Tanner, D., 'The Borough Franchise after 1867', *Historical Research*, 69 (1996), pp. 306–27.
- Dawson, G., 'Walter Morrison', *National Review*, 78 (1922), pp. 854–66.
- De Dijn, A., *French Political Thought from Montesquieu to Tocqueville: Liberty in a Levelled Society?* (Cambridge, 2008).
- Desmond, A., *Huxley: The Devil's Disciple* (London, 1994).
- and Moore, J., *Darwin* (London, 1991).
- Dinwiddy, J.R., 'Bentham's Transition to Political Radicalism, 1809–1810', in J.R. Dinwiddy, *Radicalism and Reform in Britain, 1780–1850* (London, 1992).
- , 'Burke and the Utilitarians: A Rejoinder', in J.R. Dinwiddy, *Radicalism and Reform in Britain, 1780–1850* (London, 1992).
- , 'Early-Nineteenth-Century Reactions to Benthamism', in J.R. Dinwiddy, *Radicalism and Reform in Britain, 1780–1850* (London, 1992).
- , 'James Mill on Burke's Doctrine of Prescription', in J.R. Dinwiddy, *Radicalism and Reform in Britain, 1780–1850* (London, 1992).
- Duman, D., *The English and Colonial Bars in the Nineteenth Century* (London, 1983).
- , 'Pathway to Professionalism: The English Bar in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries', *Journal of Social History*, 3 (1980), pp. 615–28.
- Dunbabin, J.P.D., 'Expectations of the New County Councils and Their Realization', *Historical Journal*, 8 (1965), pp. 353–79.
- , 'The Politics of the Establishment of County Councils', *Historical Journal*, 6 (1963), pp. 226–52.
- Duncan, G., *Marx and Mill: Two Views of Social Conflict and Social Harmony* (Cambridge, 1973).
- Duncombe, T.H., *The Life and Correspondence of Thomas Duncombe, Late M.P. for Finsbury*, 2 Vols (London, 1868).
- Dunn, J., 'Consent in the Political Theory of John Locke', in John Dunn, *Political Obligation in Its Historical Context: Essays in Political Theory*, (Cambridge, 1980).
- , 'The Identity of the History of Ideas', in John Dunn, *Political Obligation in Its Historical Context: Essays in Political Theory* (Cambridge, 1980).
- , *The Political Thought of John Locke: An Historical Account of the Argument of the 'Two Treatises of Government'* (Cambridge, 1969).
- Dyos, H.J., 'Railways and Housing in Victorian London', in D. Cannadine and D. Reeder, eds, *Exploring the Urban Past: Essays in Urban History by H.J. Dyos* (Cambridge, 1982).
- , 'The Slums of Victorian London', in D. Cannadine and D. Reeder, eds, *Exploring the Urban Past: Essays in Urban History by H.J. Dyos* (Cambridge, 1982).

- and Reeder, D.A., 'Slums and Suburbs', in H.J. Dyos and M. Wolff, eds, *The Victorian City: Images and Realities*, Vol. I (London, 1973).
- Eastwood, D., 'Contesting the Politics of Deference: The Rural Electorate, 1820–1860', in J. Lawrence and M. Taylor, eds, *Party, State and Society: Electoral Behaviour in Britain since 1820* (Aldershot, 1997).
- , 'Tories and Markets: Britain, 1800–1850', in M. Bevir and F. Trentmann, eds, *Markets in Historical Contexts: Ideas and Politics in the Modern World* (Cambridge, 2004).
- Edsall, N.C., *Richard Cobden: Independent Radical* (Cambridge, MA, 1986).
- Edwards, P., *The Statesman's Science: History, Nature, and Law in the Political Thought of Samuel Taylor Coleridge* (New York, 2004).
- Everett, E.M., *The Party of Humanity: The Fortnightly Review and Its Contributors, 1865–1874* (Chapel Hill, 1939).
- Fair, J.D., *British Interparty Conferences: A Study of the Procedure of Conciliation in British Politics, 1867–1921* (Oxford, 1980).
- Farrell, D.M., *Electoral Systems: A Comparative Introduction* (Houndmills, 2001).
- Fasnacht, G.E., *Acton's Political Philosophy: An Analysis* (London, 1952).
- Fenn, R.A., *James Mill's Political Thought* (New York, 1987).
- Feuchtwanger, E.J., 'The Development of the Electoral System in Britain in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries and Its Impact on the Structure of Politics: Problems and Research', *Tijdschrift voor Geschiedenis*, 92 (1979), pp. 361–76.
- , 'Electoral Systems: An Anglo-German Comparison, 1867–1933', *Historical Research*, 65 (1992), pp. 194–200.
- Finer, S.E., ed., *Adversary Politics and Electoral Reform* (London, 1975).
- Fontana, B., *Rethinking the Politics of Commercial Society: The Edinburgh Review, 1802–1832* (Cambridge, 1985).
- , 'Whigs and Liberals: the *Edinburgh Review* and the "Liberal Movement" in Nineteenth-Century Britain', in R. Bellamy, ed., *Victorian Liberalism: Nineteenth-Century Political Thought and Practice* (London, 1990).
- Foord, J., *The Life and Public Services of Simon Sterne* (London, 1903).
- Forbes, D., 'James Mill and India', *Cambridge Journal*, 5 (1951), pp. 19–33.
- Foster, R.F., *Lord Randolph Churchill: A Political Life* (Oxford, 1981).
- Fox, J.C., *A Handbook of English Law Reports from the Last Quarter of the Eighteenth Century to the Year 1865 with Biographical Notes of Judges and Reporters* (London, 1913).
- Francis, M., *Herbert Spencer and the Invention of Modern Life* (Stocksfield, 2007).
- and Morrow, J., *A History of English Political Thought in the Nineteenth Century* (London, 1994).
- Fraser, D., *Urban Politics in Victorian England: The Structure of Politics in Victorian Cities* (Leicester, 1976).
- Gallagher, T., 'The Second Reform Movement, 1848–1867', *Albion*, 12 (1980), pp. 147–63.
- Gambles, A., *Protection and Politics: Conservative Economic Discourse, 1815–1852* (Woodbridge, 1999).
- , 'Rethinking the Politics of Protection: Conservatism and the Corn Laws, 1830–1852', *English Historical Review*, 113 (1998), pp. 928–52.
- Garrard, J., *Democratisation in Britain: Elites, Civil Society and Reform since 1800* (Houndmills, 2002).

- Garvin, J.L., *The Life of Joseph Chamberlain*, Vol. I: *Chamberlain and Democracy, 1836–1885* (London, 1932).
- , *The Life of Joseph Chamberlain*, Vol. II: *Disruption and Combat, 1885–1895* (London, 1933).
- Gash, N., *Politics in the Age of Peel: A Study in the Technique of Parliamentary Representation, 1830–1850*, 2nd edn (Hassocks, 1977).
- Gauldie, E., *Cruel Habitations: A History of Working-Class Housing, 1780–1918* (London, 1974).
- Gerlach, M., *British Liberalism and the United States: Political and Social Thought in the Late Victorian Age* (Houndmills, 2001).
- Ghosh, P.R., 'Macaulay and the Heritage of the Enlightenment', *English Historical Review*, 112 (1997), pp. 358–95.
- , 'Towards the Verdict of History: Mr Cowling's Doctrine', in M. Bentley, ed., *Public and Private Doctrine: Essays in British History Presented to Maurice Cowling* (Cambridge, 1993).
- Goldman, L., 'The Defection of the Middle Class: The Endowed Schools Act, the Liberal Party, and the 1874 Election', in P. Ghosh and L. Goldman, eds, *Politics and Culture in Victorian Britain: Essays in Memory of Colin Matthew* (Oxford, 2006).
- , 'Henry Fawcett and the Social Science Association: Liberal Politics, Political Economy and the Working Class in Mid-Victorian Britain', in L. Goldman, ed., *The Blind Victorian: Henry Fawcett and British Liberalism* (Cambridge, 1989).
- , 'Introduction: "An Advanced Liberal": Henry Fawcett, 1833–1884', in L. Goldman, ed., *The Blind Victorian: Henry Fawcett and British Liberalism* (Cambridge, 1989).
- , *Science, Reform, and Politics in Victorian Britain: The Social Science Association, 1857–1886* (Cambridge, 2002).
- Gooch, G.P., *Life of Lord Courtney* (London, 1920).
- Goodman, G.L., 'Liberal Unionism: The Revolt of the Whigs', *Victorian Studies*, 3 (1959), pp. 173–89.
- Gordon, B., *Economic Doctrine and Tory Liberalism, 1824–1830* (London, 1979).
- Grant Duff, U., ed., *The Life-Work of Lord Avebury (Sir John Lubbock), 1834–1913* (London, 1924).
- Green, C., 'Birmingham's Politics, 1873–1891: The Local Basis of Change', *Midland History*, 2 (1973), pp. 84–98.
- Griffiths, P., 'Pressure Groups and Parties in Late Victorian England: The National Education League', *Midland History*, 3 (1976), pp. 191–205.
- Groffman, B. and Lijphart, A., eds, *Electoral Laws and Their Political Consequences* (New York, 1986).
- Gurowich, P.M., 'The Continuation of War by Other Means: Party and Politics, 1855–1865', *Historical Journal*, 27 (1984), pp. 603–31.
- Gwynn, S. and Tuckwell, G.M., *The Life of the Rt Hon. Sir Charles Dilke*, 2 Vols (London, 1917).
- Haakonssen, K., *Natural Law and Moral Philosophy: From Grotius to the Scottish Enlightenment* (Cambridge, 1996).
- , *The Science of a Legislator: The Natural Jurisprudence of David Hume and Adam Smith* (Cambridge, 1981).
- Halévy, E., *The Growth of Philosophic Radicalism* (London, 1972).

- Hamburger, J., 'James Mill on Universal Suffrage and the Middle Class', *Journal of Politics*, 24 (1962), pp. 167–90.
- , *Macaulay and the Whig Tradition* (Chicago, 1976).
- , 'Mill and Tocqueville on Liberty', in J.M. Robson and M. Laine, eds, *James and John Stuart Mill: Papers of the Centenary Conference* (Toronto, 1976).
- Hamer, D.A., *John Morley: Liberal Intellectual in Politics* (Oxford, 1968).
- , *Liberal Politics in the Age of Gladstone and Rosebery: A Study in Leadership and Policy* (Oxford, 1972).
- Hampsher-Monk, I., *A History of Modern Political Thought: Major Political Thinkers from Hobbes to Marx* (Oxford, 1992).
- Hanham, H.J., *Elections and Party Management: Politics in the Time of Disraeli and Gladstone*, 2nd edn (Hassocks, 1977).
- Harrison, B., 'Philanthropy and the Victorians', in Brian Harrison, *Peaceable Kingdom: Stability and Change in Modern Britain* (Oxford, 1982).
- , 'The Rhetoric of Reform in Modern Britain: 1780–1918', in Brian Harrison, *Peaceable Kingdom: Stability and Change in Modern Britain* (Oxford, 1982).
- Harrison, J.F.C., *A History of the Working Men's College, 1854–1954* (London, 1954).
- Harrison, R., *Before the Socialists: Studies in Labour and Politics, 1861–1881* (London, 1965).
- Hart, J., *Ask Me No More: An Autobiography* (London, 1998).
- , *Proportional Representation: Critics of the British Electoral System, 1820–1945* (Oxford, 1992).
- Harvie, C., 'Fawcett as Professional Politician', in L. Goldman, ed., *The Blind Victorian: Henry Fawcett and British Liberalism* (Cambridge, 1989).
- , *The Lights of Liberalism: University Liberals and the Challenge of Democracy, 1860–1886* (London, 1976).
- Haskell, T.L., *The Emergence of Professional Social Science: The American Social Science Association and the Nineteenth-Century Crisis of Authority*, 2nd edn (Baltimore, 2000).
- Hawkins, A., *Parliament, Party and the Art of Politics in Britain, 1855–1859*, (London, 1987).
- , '"Parliamentary Government" and Victorian Political Parties, c.1830–c.1880', *English Historical Review*, 104 (1989), pp. 638–69.
- Hayes, W.A., *The Background and Passage of the Third Reform Act* (New York, 1982).
- Hennock, E.P., *Fit and Proper Persons: Ideal and Reality in Nineteenth-Century Urban Government* (London, 1973).
- Herrick, F.H., 'The Origins of the National Liberal Federation', *Journal of Modern History*, 17 (1945), pp. 116–29.
- , 'The Second Reform Movement in Britain, 1850–1865', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 9 (1948), pp. 174–92.
- Hill, G.B., *The Life of Sir Rowland Hill and the History of the Penny Postage*, 2 Vols (London, 1880).
- Hilton, B., *The Age of Atonement: The Influence of Evangelicalism on Social and Economic Thought, 1795–1865* (Oxford, 1988).
- , 'Chalmers as Political Economist', in A.C. Cheyne, ed., *The Practical and the Pious: Essays on Thomas Chalmers* (Edinburgh, 1985).
- , *Corn, Cash, Commerce: The Economic Policies of the Tory Governments, 1815–1830* (Oxford, 1977).

- , *A Mad, Bad, and Dangerous People?: England, 1783–1846* (Oxford, 2006).
- , 'Manliness, Masculinity and the Mid-Victorian Temperament', in L. Goldman, ed., *The Blind Victorian: Henry Fawcett and British Liberalism* (Cambridge, 1989).
- Hoag, C.G. and Hallett, G.H., Jr., *Proportional Representation* (New York, 1926).
- Hofstadter, R., *The American Political Tradition and the Men Who Made It*, 2nd edn (New York, 1973).
- Holdsworth, W., *A History of English Law*, Vol. XV, A.L. Goodhart and H.G. Hanbury, eds (London, 1965).
- , 'Law reporting in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries', in W. Holdsworth, *Essays in Law and History*, A.L. Goodhart and H.G. Hanbury eds (Oxford, 1946).
- Hollis, P., *Ladies Elect: Women in English Local Government, 1865–1914* (Oxford, 1987).
- Holmes, R., *Coleridge* (Oxford, 1982).
- , *Coleridge: Darker Reflections* (London, 1998).
- Hoppen, K.T., 'The Franchise and Electoral Politics in England and Ireland, 1832–1885', *History*, 70 (1985), pp. 202–17.
- , *The Mid-Victorian Generation, 1846–1886* (Oxford, 1998).
- Horton-Smith, L.G.H., *The Baily Family of Thatcham and Later of Speen and of Newbury all in the County of Berkshire* (Leicester, 1951).
- Hough, G., 'Coleridge and the Victorians', in H. Sykes Davies and G. Watson, eds, *The English Mind: Studies in the English Moralists Presented to Basil Willey* (Cambridge, 1964).
- Hume, L.J., *Bentham and Bureaucracy* (Cambridge, 1981).
- Humphreys, J.H., *Proportional Representation: A Study in Methods of Election* (London, 1911).
- Hutchinson, H.G., *Life of Sir John Lubbock, Lord Avebury*, 2 Vols (London, 1914).
- , *Portraits of the Eighties* (London, 1920).
- Innes, J., 'Jonathan Clark, Social History and England's "Ancien Regime"', *Past and Present*, 115 (1987), pp. 165–200.
- Jackson, P., *Education Act Forster: A Political Biography of W.E. Forster, 1818–1886* (Cranbury, NJ, 1997).
- , *The Last of the Whigs: A Political Biography of Lord Hartington, Later Eighth Duke of Devonshire, 1833–1908* (Cranbury, NJ, 1994).
- Jardin, A., *Tocqueville: A Biography* (Baltimore, 1998).
- Jay, R., *Joseph Chamberlain: A Political Study* (Oxford, 1981).
- Jenkins, T.A., *Gladstone, Whiggery and the Liberal Party, 1874–1886* (Oxford, 1988).
- , *The Liberal Ascendancy, 1830–1886* (Houndmills, 1994).
- Jensen, J.V., *Thomas Henry Huxley: Communicating for Science* (London, 1991).
- Jones, A., *The Politics of Reform 1884* (Cambridge, 1972).
- Jones, E.R., *The Life and Speeches of Joseph Cowen* (London, 1886).
- Jones, H.S., *Victorian Political Thought* (Houndmills, 2000).
- Jones, W.D. and Erickson, A.B., *The Peelites, 1846–1857* (Columbus, 1972).
- Kadish, A., 'University Extension and the Working Classes: The Case of the Northumberland Miners', *Historical Research*, 60 (1987), pp. 188–207.
- Kahan, A.S., *Aristocratic Liberalism: The Social and Political Thought of Jacob Burckhardt, John Stuart Mill, and Alexis de Tocqueville* (New York, 1992).

- , *Liberalism in Nineteenth-Century Europe: The Political Culture of Limited Suffrage* (Houndmills, 2003).
- Keith-Lucas, B., *The English Local Government Franchise: A Short History* (London, 1952).
- Kent, C., *Brains and Numbers: Elitism, Comtism, and Democracy in Mid-Victorian England* (Toronto, 1978).
- Kern, P.B., 'Universal Suffrage without Democracy: Thomas Hare and John Stuart Mill', *Review of Politics*, 34 (1972), pp. 306–22.
- Kinzer, B.L. *The Ballot Question in Nineteenth-Century English Politics* (New York, 1982).
- , *J.S. Mill Revisited: Biographical and Political Explorations* (Houndmills, 2007).
- , Robson, A.P. and Robson, J.M., *A Moralism In and Out of Parliament: John Stuart Mill at Westminster, 1865–1868* (Toronto, 1992).
- Knights, B., *The Idea of the Clerisy in the Nineteenth Century* (Cambridge, 1978).
- Krouse, R.W., 'Two Concepts of Democratic Representation: James and John Stuart Mill', *Journal of Politics*, 44 (1982), pp. 509–37.
- Lakeman, E., *How Democracies Vote: A Study of Electoral Systems*, 4th edn (London, 1974).
- , *Power to Elect: The Case for Proportional Representation* (London, 1982).
- Lang, T., *The Victorians and the Stuart Heritage: Interpretations of a Discordant Past* (Cambridge, 1995).
- Langford, P., 'Property and "Virtual Representation" in Eighteenth-Century England', *Historical Journal*, 31 (1988), pp. 83–115.
- , *Public Life and the Propertied Englishman, 1689–1789* (Oxford, 1991).
- Lawrence, J., *Speaking for the People: Party, Language and Popular Politics in England, 1867–1914* (Cambridge, 1998).
- Leavis, F.R., 'Introduction', in *Mill on Bentham and Coleridge* (London, 1950).
- Lerner, R., 'Calhoun's New Science of Politics', *American Political Science Review*, 57 (1963), pp. 918–32.
- Leventhal, F., *Respectable Radical: George Howell and Victorian Working Class Politics* (London, 1971).
- Lloyd, T., *The General Election of 1880* (Oxford, 1968).
- , 'Uncontested Seats in British General Elections, 1852–1910', *Historical Journal*, 8 (1965), pp. 260–5.
- Lubenow, W.C., *The Cambridge Apostles, 1820–1914: Liberalism, Imagination, and Friendship in British Intellectual and Professional Life* (Cambridge, 1998).
- , *Parliamentary Politics and the Home Rule Crisis: The British House of Commons in 1886* (Oxford, 1988).
- Lucas, C.P., 'The Working Men's College', in *Memories of John Westlake* (London, 1914).
- Lucas, J.R., 'Wilberforce and Huxley: A Legendary Encounter', *Historical Journal*, 22 (1979), pp. 313–30.
- McBriar, A.M., *Fabian Socialism and English Politics, 1884–1918* (Cambridge, 1962).
- McCord, N., 'Cobden and Bright in Politics, 1846–1857', in R. Robson, ed., *Ideas and Institutions of Victorian Britain: Essays in Honour of George Kitson Clark* (London, 1967).
- , 'Some Difficulties of Parliamentary Reform', *Historical Journal*, 10 (1967), pp. 376–90.

- McGill, B., 'Francis Schnadhorst and Liberal Party Organization', *Journal of Modern History*, 34 (1962), pp. 19–39.
- Machin, G.I.T., *Politics and the Churches in Great Britain, 1832–1868* (Oxford, 1977).
- , *Politics and the Churches in Great Britain, 1869 to 1921* (Oxford, 1987).
- , *The Rise of Democracy in Britain, 1830–1918* (Houndmills, 2001).
- Mack, E.C. and Armytage, W.H.G., *Thomas Hughes: The Life of the Author of Tom Brown's Schooldays* (London, 1952).
- McLean, I., 'Forms of Representation and Systems of Voting', in D. Held, ed., *Political Theory Today* (Cambridge, 1991).
- MacLeod, R.M., 'The X-Club: A Social Network of Science in Late-Victorian England', *Notes and Records of the Royal Society of London*, 24 (1969), pp. 305–22.
- McMillan, A., 'The Limited Vote in Britain: A Failed Attempt at PR', *Representation*, 33 (1995), pp. 85–90.
- Majeed, J., 'James Mill's *The History of British India: A Reevaluation*', in M.I. Moir, D.M. Peers, and L. Zastoupil, eds, *J.S. Mill's Encounter with India* (Toronto, 1999).
- Mandler, P., *Aristocratic Government in the Age of Reform: Whigs and Liberals, 1830–1852* (Oxford, 1990).
- Marchand, L.A., *The Athenaeum: A Mirror of Victorian Culture* (Chapel Hill, 1941).
- Marsh, P.T., *The Discipline of Popular Government: Lord Salisbury's Domestic Statecraft, 1881–1902* (Hassocks, 1978).
- , *Joseph Chamberlain: Entrepreneur in Politics* (New Haven, 1994).
- Martin, G., 'Empire Federalism and Imperial Parliamentary Union, 1820–1870', *Historical Journal*, 16 (1973), pp. 65–92.
- Matthew, H.C.G., *Gladstone*, Vol. I: 1809–1874 (Oxford, 1986).
- , *Gladstone*, Vol. II: 1875–1898 (Oxford, 1995).
- , 'Rhetoric and Politics in Great Britain, 1860–1950', in P.J. Waller, ed., *Politics and Social Change in Modern Britain: Essays Presented to A.F. Thompson* (Brighton, 1987).
- Memories of John Westlake* (London, 1914).
- Metcalf, P., *James Knowles: Victorian Editor and Architect* (Oxford, 1980).
- Miller, J.J., 'J.S. Mill on Plural Voting, Competence and Participation', *History of Political Thought*, 24 (2003), pp. 647–67.
- Mitchell, L., *Bulwer Lytton: The Rise and Fall of a Victorian Man of Letters* (London, 2003).
- Moore, D.C., *The Politics of Deference: A Study of the Mid-Nineteenth Century English Political System* (Hassocks, 1976).
- Moore, J.R., *The Post-Darwinian Controversies: A Study of the Protestant Struggle to Come to Terms with Darwin in Great Britain and America, 1870–1900* (Cambridge, 1979).
- Morgan, E.S. and Morgan, H.M., *The Stamp Act Crisis: Prologue to Revolution*, 3rd edn (Chapel Hill, 1995).
- Morley, J., *The Life of Richard Cobden*, 2 Vols (London, 1881).
- , *The Life of William Ewart Gladstone*, 3 Vols (London, 1903).
- Morrow, J., *Coleridge's Political Thought: Property, Morality and the Limits of Traditional Discourse* (Houndmills, 1990).
- , 'The National Church in Coleridge's *Church and State*: A Response to Allen', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 47 (1986), pp. 640–52.
- , *Thomas Carlyle* (London, 2006).

- Murphey, I.L., 'The Evolutionary Anthropologists: The Progress of Mankind: The Concepts of Progress and Culture in the Thought of John Lubbock, Edward B. Tylor, and Lewis H. Morgan', *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, 105 (1961), pp. 265–300.
- Naville, H., *Ernest Naville: sa vie et sa pensée*, 2 Vols (Genève, 1917).
- Newbould, I., *Whiggery and Reform, 1830–1841: The Politics of Government* (London, 1990).
- Newsome, D., *On the Edge of Paradise: A.C. Benson: The Diarist* (London, 1980).
- , *Two Classes of Men: Pluralism and English Romantic Thought* (London, 1974).
- Nicholls, D., *The Lost Prime Minister: A Life of Sir Charles Dilke* (London, 1995).
- Norman, E., *The Victorian Christian Socialists* (Cambridge, 1987).
- Nossiter, T.J., *Influence, Opinion and Political Idioms in Reformed England: Case Studies from the North-east, 1832–1874* (Hassocks, 1975).
- O'Brien, C.C., *Parnell and His Party, 1880–1890* (Oxford, 1957).
- O'Gorman, F., *Voters, Patrons, and Parties: The Unreformed Electoral System of Hanoverian England, 1734–1832* (Oxford, 1989).
- O'Leary, C., *Irish Elections, 1918–1977: Parties, Voters and Proportional Representation* (Dublin, 1979).
- Osborne, J.W., *John Cartwright* (Cambridge, 1972).
- Ostrogorski, M., *Democracy and the Organization of Political Parties*, 2 Vols (London, 1902).
- Owen, D., 'The City Parochial Charities: The "Dead Hand" in Late Victorian London', *Journal of British Studies*, 1 (1962), 115–35.
- , *English Philanthropy, 1660–1960* (Cambridge, MA, 1965).
- , *The Government of Victorian London, 1855–1889: The Metropolitan Board of Works, the Vestries, and the City Corporation*, R. MacLeod, ed. (Cambridge, MA, 1982).
- Packe, M.St.J., *The Life of John Stuart Mill* (London, 1954).
- Palmer, S., *Politics, Shipping and the Repeal of the Navigation Laws*, (Manchester, 1990).
- Pappé, H.O., 'Mill and Tocqueville', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 25 (1964), pp. 217–34.
- Parry, J., *Democracy and Religion: Gladstone and the Liberal Party, 1867–1875* (Cambridge, 1986).
- , 'Gladstone and the Disintegration of the Liberal Party', *Parliamentary History*, 10 (1991), pp. 392–404.
- , 'Past and Future in the Later Career of Lord John Russell', in T.C.W. Blanning and D. Cannadine, eds, *History and Biography: Essays in Honour of Derek Beales* (Cambridge, 1966).
- , *The Politics of Patriotism: English Liberalism, National Identity and Europe, 1830–1886* (Cambridge, 2006).
- , *The Rise and Fall of Liberal Government in Victorian Britain* (New Haven, 1993).
- Parsons, F.D., 'Ignis Fatuus vs. Pons Asinorum: William Gladstone and Proportional Representation, 1867–1885', *Parliamentary History*, 21 (2002), pp. 374–85.
- Patton, M., *Science, Politics and Business in the Work of Sir John Lubbock: A Man of Universal Mind* (Aldershot, 2007).
- Pelling, H., *America and the British Left: From Bright to Bevan* (London, 1956).

- , *The Origins of the Labour Party, 1880–1900*, 2nd edn (Oxford, 1965).
- , *Social Geography of British Elections, 1885–1910* (London, 1967).
- Perkin, H., *The Origins of Modern English Society, 1780–1880*, London, 1969.
- Phillips, J.A., *The Great Reform Bill in the Boroughs: English Electoral Behaviour, 1818–1841* (Oxford, 1992).
- Pinto-Duschinsky, M., *The Political Thought of Lord Salisbury, 1854–1868* (London, 1967).
- Pitkin, H.F., *The Concept of Representation* (Berkeley, 1967).
- Pocock, J.G.A., 'Burke and the Ancient Constitution: A Problem in the History of Ideas', in J.G.A. Pocock, *Politics, Language, and Time: Essays on Political Thought and History* (Chicago, 1989).
- , 'Machiavelli, Harrington and English Political Ideologies in the Eighteenth Century', in J.G.A. Pocock, *Politics, Language, and Time: Essays on Political Thought and History* (Chicago, 1989).
- , *The Machiavellian Moment: Florentine Political Thought and the Atlantic Republican Tradition* (Princeton, 1975).
- , 'The Varieties of Whiggism from Exclusion to Reform: A History of Ideology and Discourse', in J.G.A. Pocock, *Virtue, Commerce, and History: Essays on Political Thought and History, Chiefly in the Eighteenth Century* (Cambridge, 1985).
- Pole, J.R., *Political Representation in England and the Origins of the American Republic* (London, 1966).
- Pombeni, P., 'Starting in Reason, Ending in Passion: Bryce, Lowell, Ostrogorski and the Problem of Democracy', *Historical Journal*, 37 (1994), pp. 319–41.
- Prest, J., *Lord John Russell* (London, 1972).
- , *Politics in the Age of Cobden* (London, 1977).
- Pugh, M., *Electoral Reform in War and Peace, 1906–1918* (London, 1978).
- Pulzer, P.G.J., *Political Representation and Elections in Britain*, 3rd edn (London, 1975).
- Pumphrey, R.J., 'The Forgotten Man: Sir John Lubbock, F.R.S.', *Notes and Records of the Royal Society of London*, 13 (1958), pp. 49–58.
- Quagliariello, G., *Politics Without Parties: Moisei Ostrogorski and the Debate on Political Parties on the Eve of the Twentieth Century* (Aldershot, 1996).
- Quinault, R., 'Democracy and the Mid-Victorians', in M. Hewitt, ed., *An Age of Equipoise?: Reassessing Mid-Victorian Britain* (Aldershot, 2000).
- , 'Gladstone and Parliamentary Reform', in D. Bebbington and R. Swift, eds, *Gladstone Centenary Essays* (Liverpool, 2000).
- , 'John Bright and Joseph Chamberlain', *Historical Journal*, 28 (1985), pp. 623–46.
- , 'Joseph Chamberlain: A Reassessment', in T.R. Gourvish, ed., *Later Victorian Britain, 1867–1900* (London, 1988).
- , 'Lord Randolph Churchill and Tory Democracy, 1880–1885', *Historical Journal*, 22 (1979), pp. 141–66.
- Raphael, D.D., *Adam Smith* (Oxford, 1985).
- Rashid, S., 'David Robinson and the Tory Macroeconomics of *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*', *History of Political Economy*, 10 (1978), pp. 258–70.
- Reeves, R., *John Stuart Mill: Victorian Firebrand* (London, 2007).
- Reid, T.W., *Life of the Right Honourable William Edward Forster*, 2 Vols (London, 1888).
- Rice, D.H., 'John C. Calhoun', *History of Political Thought*, 12 (1991), pp. 317–28.

- Richards, N.J., 'Religious Controversy and the School Boards, 1870–1902', *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 18 (1970), pp. 180–96.
- Robbins, K., *John Bright* (London, 1979).
- Roberts, A., *Salisbury: Victorian Titan* (London, 1999).
- Robson, A.P.W., 'The Founding of the National Society for Women's Suffrage, 1866–1867', *Canadian Historical Journal*, 8 (1973), pp. 1–22.
- Robson, J.M., *The Improvement of Mankind: The Social and Political Thought of John Stuart Mill* (London, 1968).
- Rodgers, B., 'The Social Science Association, 1857–1886', *Manchester School of Economic and Social Studies*, 20 (1952), pp. 283–310.
- Rokkan, S., *Citizens, Elections, Parties: Approaches to the Comparative Study of the Processes of Development* (Oslo, 1970).
- Roper, J., *Democracy and Its Critics: Anglo-American Democratic Thought in the Nineteenth Century* (London, 1989).
- Rosen, F., *Jeremy Bentham and Representative Democracy: A Study of the Constitutional Code* (Oxford, 1983).
- , 'Jeremy Bentham's Radicalism', in G. Burgess and M. Festenstein, eds, *English Radicalism, 1550–1850* (Cambridge, 2007).
- , 'The Method of Reform: J.S. Mill's Encounter with Bentham and Coleridge', in N. Urbinati and A. Zakaras, eds, *J.S. Mill's Political Thought: A Bicentennial Reassessment* (Cambridge, 2007).
- Ross, J.F.S., *Elections and Electors: Studies in Democratic Representation* (London, 1955).
- Rubinstein, D., *A Different World for Women: The Life of Millicent Garrett Fawcett* (Hemel Hempstead, 1991).
- , 'Victorian Feminists: Henry and Millicent Garrett Fawcett', in L. Goldman, ed., *The Blind Victorian: Henry Fawcett and British Liberalism* (Cambridge, 1989).
- Ryan, A., *J.S. Mill* (London, 1974).
- , 'Two Concepts of Politics and Democracy: James and John Stuart Mill', in M. Fleischer, ed., *Machiavelli and the Nature of Political Thought* (London, 1972).
- Salmon, P., *Electoral Reform at Work: Local Politics and National Parties, 1832–1841* (Woodbridge, 2002).
- Saunders, R., 'Lord John Russell and Parliamentary Reform, 1848–1867', *English Historical Review*, 120 (2005), pp. 1289–1315.
- , 'The Politics of Reform and the Making of the Second Reform Act, 1848–1867', *Historical Journal*, 50 (2007), pp. 571–91.
- Scherer, P., *Lord John Russell: A Biography* (Cranbury, 1999).
- Schlesinger, A.M., Jr., *The Age of Jackson* (Boston, 1945).
- Schofield, P., *Utility and Democracy: The Political Thought of Jeremy Bentham* (Oxford, 2006).
- Seymour, C., *Electoral Reform in England and Wales: The Development and Operation of the Parliamentary Franchise, 1832–1885* [1915] (Newton Abbot, 1970).
- Shannon, R., *Gladstone*, Vol. I: 1809–1865 (London, 1982).
- , *Gladstone*, Vol. II: *Heroic Minister, 1865–1898* (London, 1999).
- , *Gladstone and the Bulgarian Agitation 1876*, 2nd edn (Hassocks, 1975).
- , 'John Robert Seeley and the Idea of a National Church: A Study in Churchmanship, Historiography, and Politics', in R. Robson, ed., *Ideas and Institutions of Victorian Britain: Essays in Honour of George Kitson Clark* (London, 1967).
- Sidgwick, A. and Sidgwick, E.M., *Henry Sidgwick: A Memoir* (London, 1906).

- Siedentop, L., 'Introduction', in François Guizot, *The History of Civilization in Europe*, L. Siedentop, ed. (Harmondsworth, 1997).
- , *Tocqueville* (Oxford, 1994).
- Skinner, Q., *Liberty before Liberalism* (Cambridge, 1998).
- , 'Meaning and Understanding in the History of Ideas', in Quentin Skinner, *Visions of Politics*. Vol. I: *Regarding Method* (Cambridge, 2002).
- Smart, E., 'Bank Holidays and Much Else', *History Today*, 21 (1971), pp. 870–6.
- Smith, F.B., *The Making of the Second Reform Bill* (Cambridge, 1966).
- Smith, P., 'Editor's Introduction', in *Lord Salisbury on Politics: A Selection from His Articles in the Quarterly Review, 1860–1883*, P. Smith, ed., (Cambridge, 1972).
- Somkin, F., 'The Contributions of Sir John Lubbock, F.R.S., to the *Origin of Species*: Some Annotations to Darwin', *Notes and Records of the Royal Society of London*, 17 (1962), pp. 183–91.
- Spinner, T.J. Jr., *George Joachim Goschen: The Transformation of a Victorian Liberal* (Cambridge, 1973).
- Stedman Jones, G., *Outcast London: A Study in the Relationship between Classes in Victorian Society* (Oxford, 1971).
- , 'Rethinking Chartism', in Gareth Stedman Jones, *Languages of Class: Studies in English Working Class History, 1832–1982* (Cambridge, 1983).
- Steed, M., 'The Evolution of the British Electoral System', in S.E. Finer, ed., *Adversary Politics and Electoral Reform* (London, 1975).
- Steele, E.D., *Irish Land and British Politics: Tenant-Right and Nationality, 1870–1895* (Cambridge, 1974).
- , *Lord Salisbury: A Political Biography* (London, 1999).
- , *Palmerston and Liberalism, 1855–1865* (Cambridge, 1991).
- Stenfor, B.D., *Signs of the Times: Leslie Stephen's Letters to The Nation from 1866–1873* (New York, 1996).
- Stephen, L., *The English Utilitarians*, Vol. III: *John Stuart Mill* (London, 1900).
- , *Life of Henry Fawcett* (London, 1885).
- Stocking, G.W., Jr., *Victorian Anthropology* (New York, 1987).
- Stokes, E., *The English Utilitarians and India* (Oxford, 1959).
- Sutherland, L.S., 'Edmund Burke and the Relations between Members of Parliament and Their Constituents: An Examination of the Eighteenth-Century Theory and Practice in Instructions to Representatives', *Studies in Burke and His Time*, 10 (1968–1969), pp. 1005–21.
- Tarn, J.N., 'The Peabody Donation Fund: The Role of a Housing Society in the Nineteenth Century', *Victorian Studies*, 10 (1966), pp. 7–38.
- Taylor, M., 'Colonial Representation at Westminster, c. 1800–1865', in J. Hoppit, ed., *Parliaments, Nations and Identities in Britain and Ireland, 1660–1850* (Manchester, 2003).
- , *The Decline of British Radicalism, 1847–1860* (Oxford, 1995).
- , 'Empire and Parliamentary Reform: The 1832 Reform Act Revisited', in A. Burns and J. Innes, eds, *Rethinking the Age of Reform: Britain 1780–1850* (Cambridge, 2003).
- , *Ernest Jones, Chartism, and the Romance of Politics, 1819–1869* (Oxford, 2003).
- , 'Interests, Parties and the State: The Urban Electorate in England, c. 1820–1872', in J. Lawrence and M. Taylor, eds, *Party, State and Society: Electoral Behaviour in Britain since 1820* (Aldershot, 1997).

- , 'Rethinking the Chartists: Searching for Synthesis in the Historiography of Chartism', *Historical Journal*, 39 (1996), pp. 479–95.
- , 'The Six Points: Chartism and the Reform of Parliament', in O. Ashton, R. Fyson, and S. Roberts, eds, *The Chartist Legacy* (Rendlesham, 1999).
- Tholfsen, T.R., 'The Origins of the Birmingham Caucus', *Historical Journal*, 2 (1959), pp. 161–84.
- Thomas, W., 'James Mill's Politics: The 'Essay on Government' and the Movement for Reform', *Historical Journal*, 12 (1969), pp. 249–84.
- , 'James Mill's Politics: A Rejoinder', *Historical Journal*, 14 (1971), pp. 735–50.
- , *Mill* (Oxford, 1985).
- , *The Philosophic Radicals: Nine Studies in Theory and Practice, 1817–1841* (Oxford, 1979).
- , *The Quarrel of Macaulay and Croker: Politics and History in the Age of Reform* (Oxford, 2000).
- Thompson, D.F., *John Stuart Mill and Representative Government* (Princeton, 1976).
- Thompson, E.P., *The Making of the English Working Class* (London, 1963).
- Thompson, R., *The Charity Commission and the Age of Reform* (London, 1979).
- Todd, N., *'The Militant Democracy': Joseph Cowen and Victorian Radicalism* (Tyne and Wear, 1991).
- Trigger, B.G., *A History of Archaeological Thought*, 2nd edn (Cambridge, 2006).
- Tsuzuki, C., *The Life of Eleanor Marx, 1855–1898: A Socialist Tragedy* (Oxford, 1967).
- Tulloch, H., *Acton* (London, 1988).
- Turk, C., *Coleridge and Mill: A Study of Influence* (Aldershot, 1988).
- Urbinati, N., *Mill on Democracy: From the Athenian Polis to Representative Government* (Chicago, 2002).
- Vincent, J.R., 'The Effect of the Second Reform Act in Lancashire', *Historical Journal*, 11 (1968), pp. 84–94.
- , *The Formation of the British Liberal Party, 1857–1868*, 2nd edn (Hassocks, 1976).
- , *Pollbooks: How Victorians Voted* (Cambridge, 1968).
- Vogeler, M.S., *Frederic Harrison: The Vocations of a Positivist* (Oxford, 1984).
- Wahrman, D., *Imagining the Middle Class: The Political Representation of Class in Britain, c. 1780–1840* (Cambridge, 1995).
- Walker, R.B., 'Catherine Helen Spence and South Australian Politics', *Australian Journal of Politics and History*, 15 (1969), pp. 35–46.
- , 'Catherine Helen Spence: Unitarian Utopian', *Australian Literary Studies*, 5 (1971), pp. 31–41.
- Watson, G., 'Acton's "History of Liberty"', in George Watson, *Politics and Literature in Modern Britain* (London, 1977).
- , *The English Ideology: Studies in the Language of Victorian Politics* (London, 1973).
- Wilentz, S., *The Rise of American Democracy: Jefferson to Lincoln* (New York, 2005).
- Wiley, B., *Nineteenth Century Studies: Coleridge to Matthew Arnold* (London, 1949).
- Williams, R., *Culture and Society, 1780–1950* (London, 1958).
- Wiltshire, D., *The Social and Political Thought of Herbert Spencer* (Oxford, 1978).
- Winch, D., *Adam Smith's Politics: An Essay in Historiographic Revision* (Cambridge, 1978).

- , 'The Cause of Good Government: Philosophic Whigs and Philosophic Radicals', in S. Collini, D. Winch, and J. Burrow, *That Noble Science of Politics: A Study in Nineteenth-Century Intellectual History* (Cambridge, 1983).
- Windschettel, A., *Popular Conservatism in Imperial London, 1868–1906* (Woodbridge, 2007).
- Winter, J., *Robert Lowe* (Toronto, 1976).
- Wohl, A.S., *The Eternal Slum: Housing and Social Policy in Victorian London* (London, 1977).
- , 'Unfit for Human Habitation', in H.J. Dyos and M. Wolff, eds, *The Victorian City: Images and Realities*, Vol. II (London, 1973).
- Wood, G., *The Creation of the American Republic, 1776–1787*, 2nd edn (Chapel Hill, 1998).
- Wormell, D., *Sir John Seeley and the Uses of History* (Cambridge, 1980).
- Worth, G.J., *Macmillan's Magazine, 1859–1907: 'No Flippancy or Abuse Allowed'* (Aldershot, 2003).
- Wright, T.R., *The Religion of Humanity: The Impact of Comtean Positivism on Victorian Britain* (Cambridge, 1986).
- Young, D., *F.D. Maurice and Unitarianism* (Oxford, 1992).
- Zastoupil, L., *John Stuart Mill and India* (Stanford, 1994).
- Zimmerman, K., 'Liberal Speech, Palmerstonian Delay, and the Passage of the Second Reform Act', *English Historical Review*, 118 (2003), pp. 1176–207.

Reference works

- Boase, F., *Modern English Biography*, Vol. I (Truro, 1892).
- Cook, C. and Keith, B., *British Historical Facts, 1830–1900* (London, 1975).
- Craig, F.W.S., *British Parliamentary Election Results, 1832–1885*, 2nd edn (Aldershot, 1989).
- Houghton, W.E., ed., *The Wellesley Index to Victorian Periodicals, 1824–1900*, 4 Vols (Toronto, 1966–1987).
- Matthew, H.C.G. and Harrison, B., eds, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, 60 Vols (Oxford, 2004).
- Stenton, M., ed., *Who's Who of British Members of Parliament*, Vol. I: 1832–1885 (Hassocks, 1976).
- Stenton, M. and Lees, S., eds, *Who's Who of British Members of Parliament*, Vol. II: 1886–1918 (Hassocks, 1979).
- Stephen, L., ed., *Dictionary of National Biography*, 63 Vols (Oxford, 1885–1900).

Index

- Acton, Lord, 146, 178
 Adams, Francis, 155
 Adelaide, South Australia, 56, 97
 Adullamites, 105, 106, 108
 Amberley, Lady, 40, 107
 Amberley, Viscount, 40
American Law Review, 133
 American Revolution, 12–13
 American Social Science Association, 123
Ancient Law: Its Connection with the Early History of Society and Its Relation to Modern Ideas (Maine), 28
 Andrae, Carl, 56, 96, 102, 121, 162
 Annan, Noel, 38
Annual Register, 126
 Anson, William, 180
 'Application of Endowed Charities in the Improvement of the Education and Condition of the Poor, On the' (T. Hare), 22
 'Application of a New Statistical Method to the Ascertainment of the Votes of Majorities in a More Exhaustive Manner, On the' (T. Hare), 88–9
 apprenticeship of children, reform of, 21
 'Arlington Street Compact', 177
 Arnold-Forster, H.O., 168
 Athenaeum (Liverpool), 10, 193(n.7)
 Athenaeum (London), 23, 142
 Austin, John, 76
Autobiography (J.S. Mill), 62–3, 136
 Avebury, 1st Baron, *see* Lubbock, John
 Bagehot, Walter, 4, 73, 91–2, 103, 170, 187
 Bailly, Walter, 121, 132–3, 143, 154, 172, 188
 Bain, Alexander, 86
 Balfour, Arthur, 38, 165, 171
 ballot, the
 adoption of, 122, 136
 opposition to, 54, 67, 73, 79, 82, 84, 91, 99–100, 102, 112, 115
 Ballot Act (1872), 136
 Ballot Society, 99
 Bank Holidays Act, 159
 Bateson, W.H., 62
 Beale, James, 35
 Beales, Edmund, 111
 Beaumont, Gustave de, 64
 Belgium, electoral system, 162
 Benson, A.C., 38–40
 Benson, Edward White, 9
 Benson, Eleanor Bowes, *see* Hare, Eleanor
 Bentham, Jeremy, 14, 50, 57, 60, 62–4, 66–7, 99, 187
 Berkeley, Francis Henry, 99
 Biagini, Eugenio, 2, 224(n.5)
Biographia Literaria, or Biographical Sketches of My Literary Life and Opinions (Coleridge), 63
 Birch, A.H., 1
 Birmingham
 and caucus, 5, 147, 149, 150, 155, 169, 188–9
 Liberals in, 118, 129–31, 131, 138, 156
 minority representation in, 147, 188
 school board elections, 128, 132, 136
 as threat to pluralism, 146
 Birmingham Liberal Association, 118, 144, 155, 164
 'Birmingham Liberal Association and Its Assailants, The' (Crosskey), 149
 Blackstone, William, 129
Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine, 11

- Blanc, Louis, 40
 Blennerhassett, Rowland, 146–7, 150, 168
 Bogdanor, Vernon, 1
 Bompas, Henry, 162, 168
 Bradlaugh, Charles, 114, 179–80
 Bradley, Ian, 1
 Bright, John, 44, 74, 153, 156, 164
 and cumulative vote, 108–9, 130, 135–6
 and Hare's electoral system, 109
 and limited vote, 109, 118
 British Association for the
 Advancement of Science, 22, 158
 British National Association for the
 Promotion of Social Science, *see*
 Social Science Association
 Broderick, Lonsdale, 182
 Brougham, Lord, 62
 Brussels, electoral system, 162
 Burke, Edmund, 13, 28, 49, 50, 53, 57, 59, 60, 71, 89
 Burrow, J.W., 1
- Cairns amendment, 109, 111, 123, 124, 172
 Cairns, Lord, 4, 109, 111, 123, 124, 172
 Calhoun, John C., 71
 Canning, George, 14
 Capaldi, Nicholas, 1
 Carlyle, Thomas, 82
 Carrow, John Monson, 17
 Cartwright, John, 49
Cases Relating to Railways and Canals Argued and Adjudged in the Courts of Law and Equity (T. Hare, Nicholl and Carrow), 17
- caucus
 American, 147, 148
 Birmingham, 5, 147, 149, 150, 155, 169, 188–9
 defence of, 148, 149, 155
 and Liberals, 147, 173
 Newcastle, 165
 opposition to, 134, 135, 148, 153, 155, 164, 169, 173
 'Caucus, The' (Chamberlain), 148
 'Caucus and Its Critics, The' (Schnadhorst), 155
 'Caucus System and the Liberal Party, The' (Howell), 148
 Cavendish, Frederick, 126, 153
 Cecil, Robert
 and bill for local government reform, 184
 and constituencies, 71, 173–4, 189
 and Franchise Bill (1884), 6, 172
 and Hare's electoral system, 94, 107
 and Laing amendment, 108
 and Lowe amendment, 109
 and minority representation, 173
 and voting papers, 55
 Chalmers, Thomas, 18, 196(n.57)
 Chamberlain, Joseph
 and caucus, 148, 188–9
 and cumulative vote, 5, 129
 and minority representation, 174
 in Parliament, 143–4, 153
 and proportional representation, 150, 157–8, 168, 175
 Chapman, John, 163
 'Charitable Endowments in Their Relation to the State and to Public Taxation' (T. Hare), 27
 Charitable Trusts Act, 17
 charities, 17, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 25, 27, 31
 Charity Commission, 17, 24
 'Choice of Representatives by Popular Constituencies, On the' (Stephen), 106
Christian and Civic Economy of Large Towns, The (Chalmers), 18
 Christ's Hospital, 26
 Church of England, 9
 Churchill, Randolph, 168–9
 civic humanism, 58–9
 'Claims of Co-operative Societies to the Use of Public Land for Agricultural and Building Purposes, The' (T. Hare), 30
 Clayton, Charles, 38
 Clayton, Katherine, 38, 40, 192(n.3)
 Clayton, Lewis, 38
 Clayton, Lydia, 38

- clerisy
 - defence of, 113, 134
 - endorsement of, 64, 101
 - influence of, 60
 - protection of, 67, 90–1, 95, 187, 206–7(n.109), 219(n.264)
 - representation in House of Commons, 61
- Cobden and Modern Political Opinion* (Rogers), 136
- Cobden, Richard, 4, 43–4, 98–9, 108
- Colenso, John William, 40
- Coleridge, Samuel Taylor, 3, 59–65, 67, 74, 83
- Collini, Stefan, 1
- Collins, Thomas, 124, 135, 170–1
- colonies, representation of, 36–7, 49
- 'Coming Reform, The' (Sellar), 168
- Commission on Popular Education, 23
- Commonwealth of Oceana, The* (Harrington), 59
- Conciliation with America, On* (Burke), 13
- consent, tacit/express, 48
- Considérant, Victor, 97
- Considerations on Representative Government* (J.S. Mill), 4, 90–1, 92
- constituencies
 - multi-member, 89
 - single-member, 174, 177, 184–5
 - size of, 88, 111, 143, 170
 - three-cornered, 140, 160
- Constitutional Code* (Bentham), 60
- Constitution of the Church and State, According to the Idea of Each, On the* (Coleridge), 59, 74
- 'Constitution of Municipalities and Local Governing Bodies for London and Other Towns and Districts, On the' (T. Hare), 35
- 'Construction of a Municipality for the Metropolis, The' (T. Hare), 35, 137, 142
- Contemporary Review*, 159, 162, 167, 169
- contingent voting, 89
- co-operative associations, 29–30
- Co-operative Congress, 30, 133, 137
- Cooper Union, New York, 123
- Corn Laws, 43, 56, 102
- corruption, electoral, 115–16
- 'County Franchise and Mr Lowe Thereon, The' (Gladstone), 145
- Courtney, Kate, 157, 176
- Courtney, Leonard
 - in House of Commons, 5, 153, 184
 - and Local Government Bill, 185
 - and minority representation, 147, 150–2, 154, 157, 181
 - and proportional representation, 37, 141–3, 162, 175–6, 178, 183
- Cowen, Joseph, 165
- Cowling, Maurice, 2, 190
- Cox, G.W., 47
- Cranborne, Viscount, *see* Cecil, Robert
- Crosskey, Henry W., 149
- Cumulative Method of Voting: Its Nature, Operation and Effects as Exhibited in the Late School Board Elections, The*, 129
- cumulative vote
 - bill for application to municipal elections, 137
 - debate on, 108–9
 - opposition to, 129–30, 155, 157
 - and school boards, 126–33, 135–6, 183
 - support for, 68–9, 94–5, 138, 150, 219(n.264)
 - and town councils, 22, 26
- Daily News*, 98, 111, 147, 167, 184
- Darwin, Charles, 39, 158, 159
- Davies, Emily, 40
- 'Declining Efficiency of Parliament, The' (Gladstone), 56
- De la Démocratie en Amérique* (Tocqueville), 64–5, 67
- De la représentation des minorités* (Morin), 97–8
- democracy, 60, 65, 67, 80–1, 178–9, 185, 211(n.23)
- Democracy in Europe: A History* (May), 146
- Denmark, elections in, 56, 96
- Derby, 14th Earl, 4, 105
- 'Development of the Wealth of India, On the' (T. Hare), 35

- d'Hondt, Victor, 162–3
- Dilke, Charles W., 37, 112, 115, 116, 125, 129, 134, 144, 151, 183
and redistribution, 135, 138, 150, 173, 177
- Discourses Concerning Government* (Sidney), 49
- Disquisition on Government* (Calhoun), 71
- Disraeli, Benjamin, 4–5, 43, 74, 105–6, 108, 117, 125, 136, 138
- Dixon, George, 118, 128, 132, 138, 155
- Dodgson, Charles Lutwidge (Lewis Carroll), 172–3
- Droop, Henry Richmond, 4, 96, 120–1, 128, 130, 133, 137, 143, 153–4, 161–3, 168, 188
- Droop quota, 96, 121, 163, 168, 188
- dualism, 57, 142–3, 188
see also pluralism
- Dulaney, Daniel, 49
- Duncombe, Thomas Slingsby, 47
- East India Company, 14–16, 44
- Ebrington, Viscount, 57
- Economist*, 70, 79, 85, 119
- Edinburgh Review*, 14, 51–2, 67, 69–70, 73, 168, 179
- education
of poor, 20, 26
technical, 19–20
universal elementary, 29
- Education Act (1870), 5, 29, 155
- Educational Franchise, The*, 62
- Edwards, John Passmore, 112
- 'Eighty Members for London: Why Not?' (T. Hare), 167
- 'Election of Representative or Governing Bodies by Exhaustive Majorities and Unanimous Quotas of the Constituencies, On the' (T. Hare), 93
- elections
Adelaide, South Australia, 56
conduct of, 84
Finsbury, 47–8
Rigsraad, Denmark, 56
school boards, 169–70, 188
test, 168, 181
- electoral reform, 23, 44–8, 118
- 'Electoral Reform, An' (T. Hare), 100
- Electoral Reform Association, 135
- Elementary Education Bill, 125
- elitism, 187
- endowed schools, 26
- Endowed Schools Act, 29
- endowments, 28
- English Constitution, The* (Bagehot), 4, 103
- English Village Community, The* Seebohm, 162
- Escott, T.H.S., 155–6
- Esdaile, Katherine, 10, 39, 192–3(n.4)
- Essay on Government* (J. Mill), 14, 51
- Essay on the History of the English Government and Constitution from the Reign of Henry VII to the Present Time, An* (J. Russell), 95, 105
- Essays on Reform*, 106
- 'Estates of Endowments as Instruments of Industrial and Political Education, Co-operative Labour, and Economical Improvement' (T. Hare), 29
- Fabian Society, 180
- Fawcett, Henry, 40, 80, 176–7
and cumulative vote, 130, 137
and democracy, 80–1
and Hare's electoral system, 3, 91, 114, 115
and limited vote, 110
and minority clause/representation, 125, 144, 153
and proportional representation, 133, 157, 162, 167, 175
and Proportional Representation Society, 161
and quota, 82, 90
and redistribution, 138, 153
and Reform League, 112
and universal suffrage, 115
- Fawcett, Millicent Garrett, 40, 126–7, 131, 133, 156, 161, 178
- 'Few Remarks on Mr Hare's Scheme of Representation, A' (Trevelyan), 93

- Field, David Dudley, 98, 117, 123
 Finsbury election, 47–8
 Fitzmaurice, Edmond, 144–5
 Forster, W.E., 125
Fortnightly Review, 27, 29, 100–3, 139,
 141–5, 148, 155, 181–2
 franchise, the, 73
 extension of, 78–9, 133
 lowering, 85, 88, 110
 and redistribution, 104, 143, 144,
 163
 Franchise Bill (1884), 165, 167, 170,
 172–3, 176–7, 182
 Francis, Mark, 1, 71
Fraser's Magazine, 76, 86, 133
 free trade, 10, 13, 14
 Frisby, Alfred, 154
 Froude, James Anthony, 62
 'Future of the Radical Party, The'
 (Escott), 155

 Garrett, Elizabeth, 128
 Garrett, Millicent, *see* Fawcett,
 Millicent Garrett
 general elections
 1857, 23, 43, 46–8, 54, 61, 96
 1865, 4
 1868, 5, 117, 118
 1874, 5, 136, 170
 1880, 5, 153, 170
 1885, 184
 1886, 184
 Geneva, minority representation in,
 97–8
 Germany, minority representation in,
 93
 gerrymandering, 113, 154, 174
 Gladstone, Mary, 178
 Gladstone, William
 and Corn Laws, 43
 criticism of, 140
 and cumulative vote, 108
 and efficiency of Parliament, 56
 and election of school boards, 126,
 132
 and electoral reform, 74, 122
 and franchise reform, 4–6, 104, 145
 and limited vote, 4–6, 110
 ministries of, 5–6, 153, 189
 and political representation, 124–5
 and proportional representation,
 165, 178
 and redistribution, 6, 171
 and virtual representation, 4–6, 110,
 124
 Goldman, Lawrence, 2
 Gooch, G.P., 158
 Goschen, G.J., 167
 Great Reform Act (1832), 44, 45, 54
 Grece, Clair J., 122
 Greg, William Rathbone, 69–71
 Grey, 3rd Earl, 68, 71, 81, 94–5, 104,
 134, 138, 162
 Grey, Albert, 5, 162–3, 166, 174,
 178–81, 189
 Grey Committee, 88
 Grote, George, 40
 'Grouping of Parliamentary Electors
 that Combines a Just and Equal
 Distribution of Seats, and the Free
 Expression both of Individual and
 Public Opinion, with the Smallest
 Degree of Disturbance from
 Corrupt Influences, A' (T. Hare),
 105
 Guizot, François, 64, 71

 Hallam, Henry, 45
 Hamilton, Edward, 176
 Hampsher-Monk, Iain, 1
 Hanham, H.J., 2
 Harcourt, William Vernon, 123, 126,
 132
 Hardcastle, J.A., 123–4
 Hare, Alfred, 38
 Hare, Alice, 38, 40, 128, 141,
 225(n.134)
 Hare, Anne, 10
 Hare, Christopher, 38
 Hare, Eleanor, 38, 40, 192–3(n.4)
 Hare, Herbert, 38
 Hare, Katherine, 38, 40, 192(n.3)
 Hare, Lancelot, 38
 Hare, Lydia, 38
 Hare, Marian, 38, 40
 Hare, Mary Eleanor, 38
 Hare, Sherlock, 38

- Hare, Thomas
 assistant charity commissioner, 17
 birth, 9
 career, 17
 charity inspector, 17
 children of, 38
 Court of Chancery lawyer, 17
 death, 9, 40, 185
 early life, 10
 education, 10
 employment, 17
 home (Gosbury Hill), 39–40
 Inner Temple, 14, 17
 marriage to Eleanor Bowes Benson, 38
 and Proportional Representation Society, 161
 religion, 39
see also personal representation; Representative Reform Association
- Harrington, James, 59
 Harris, George, 61–2, 118
 Harrison, Frederic, 114, 139
 Harrington Committee, 122
 Harrington, marquess of, 122, 144, 150, 151, 167, 173
 Hart, Jenifer, 1
 Harvie, Christopher, 1
 Hayes, William A., 2
 Herbert, Auberon, 115
 Heygate, William Unwin, 137–8
 Hill, Frederic, 56, 98, 119–20
 Hill, Rowland, 55–6
 Hill, Thomas Wright, 55
History of British India, The (J. Mill), 16
History of the Elementary School Contest in England (Adams), 155
History of England from the Accession of James II, The (Macaulay), 45
 Hobhouse, Arthur, 29
 Hoppen, K. Theodore, 2
 ‘House of Commons, The’ (Bagehot), 103
 housing, reform of, 31–4
 Howell, George, 4, 111–12, 114, 116–18, 122, 126, 133, 135–6, 148–9, 161, 180, 184
- Hughes, Thomas, 100, 105, 108, 110, 133
 Humphreys, John H., 1
 Huskisson, William, 10, 14–15, 16–17
 Huxley, Thomas Henry, 158
 Hyndman, H.M., 180
- ‘Ideal of a Local Government for the Metropolis’ (T. Hare), 34, 94
 ‘Ideal Reform Bill, An’ (T. Hare), 164
 ‘Improved Constitution of Local Governing Bodies, and on the Legislation on Local Subjects which may be Safely and Beneficially Transferred to Them, An’ (T. Hare), 35
 India, trade, 14–17, 35–6
 ‘Individual Responsibility in Representative Government’ (T. Hare), 102
 ‘Injustice and Impolicy of Exempting the Income of Property, on the Ground of its Charitable or Meritorious Employment, from the Taxation to Which Other Like Property is Subject, The’ (T. Hare), 25
Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations, An (A. Smith), 13
 ‘intellectual aristocracy’, 38
 Ireland, 164–6, 170, 176, 184
 Irish Loyalists, 162
 Irish Nationalists, 162
 Irish party, 235(n.41)
 ‘Is Proportional Representation a Puzzle?’, 181
- Jackson, Andrew, 64
 Jenkins, T.A., 2
 ‘John Stuart Mill’ (T. Hare), 136
 joint-candidate system, 163
 Jones, Andrew, 2
 Juridical Society, 161
Justice, 180
- Kant, Immanuel, 63
 ‘Keystone of Parliamentary Reform, The’ (T. Hare), 101

- King, Locke, 54, 73
Kingsley, Charles, 62, 83
King, Thomas, 10
Kinnear, John Boyd, 102, 103, 106, 112, 114, 115
Kinzer, Bruce L., 1
Knatchbull-Hugessen, E.H., 135
Knowles, James, 159
- Labour Party, 148
Labour Representation League, 126, 148
Laing amendment, 108
Laing, Samuel, 108
Lakeman, Enid, 1
Lambert, John, 173
‘Lands Held by Corporations, and on the Policy Either of Their Alienation or of Providing for Their Management with Regard to Public Utility, On’ (T. Hare), 30
land tenure reform, 31
Land Tenure Reform Association, 30
Langford, Paul, 49
La patrie et les parties, discours sur le réforme électorale (Naville), 98
La Représentation Proportionnelle, 161, 183
L’Association Réformiste Belge pour l’Adoption de la Représentation Proportionnelle, 161–2
L’Association Réformiste (Geneva), 98, 117
‘Last Words on the County Franchise’ (Gladstone), 145
Law Amendment Society, 24
Law Magazine and Review, 164
‘Laws Controlling or Regulating the Perpetual Dedication of Property for Public or Charitable Purposes, The’ (T. Hare), 24
Lecky, W.E.H., 40
Leeds conference, 156–7
Les élections de Genève, mémoire présenté au Conseil fédéral et au peuple suisse (Naville), 98
Lewis, George Cornewall, 53, 70, 73, 76
- Liberal party
 formation of, 56
 and personal representation, 187
‘Liberal Party and Its Leaders, The’ (Chamberlain), 143
Liddel, H.G., 62, 172
limited vote, 69, 72, 84, 85, 104, 109–10
 see also minority clause
list system, 97–8, 162–3
Liverpool, 2nd Earl, 10, 14
Liverpool Daily Post, 156
Liverpool, and redistribution, 182, 193(n.7)
Local Government Bill, 184–5
local government reform, 31, 34
Locke, John, 48
London Government Bill, 171
London Liberal Registration Association, 44
London, metropolitan constituencies, 98
London municipal government, 34
London Municipal Reform (T. Hare), 154
London National Society for Women’s Suffrage, 23
London School Board, 131
London School Board Election Campaign Committee of Elizabeth Garrett, 128
London and Westminster Review, 63–6
Lorimer, James, 61, 73, 76
Lowe amendment, 108–9
Lowe, Robert, 4, 29, 105, 106, 108–10, 145, 159
Lowther, James, 165, 171
Loyalists, Irish, 162
Lubbock, John
 career, 158–9
 and Franchise Bill (1884), 165
 and Irish Home Rule, 184
 member of Parliament, 158–9
 and proportional representation, 5–7, 164, 166–8, 171, 174–5, 177–9, 181, 184–5
 and Proportional Representation Society, 5–6, 37, 160–3, 165–6, 171, 178–9, 181, 183–5

- and Redistribution Bill (1884–1885), 175–6, 180, 183–4
- and representation of minorities, 158–60, 162
- Ludlow, J.M., 30
- Lytton, Edward Bulwer, 85–6
- Lytton, Robert, 96–7

- Macaulay, Thomas Babington, 14, 45, 52–3
- Machiavelli, Niccoló, 59
- ‘Machinery’ (Escott), 155
- Machinery of Representation, The* (T. Hare)
 - and 1857 election, 3, 23, 43, 44
 - and Corn Laws, 56
 - and democracy, 60
 - and Great Reform Act, 45
 - and limited vote, 70
 - and organisation of political parties, 145
 - and personal representation, 58–9, 186
 - and pluralism, 57
 - and poll books, 55
 - and proportional system, 182
 - and real/virtual representation, 48, 54
- McLean, Iain, 1
- Mackintosh, James, 14, 50–1
- Macmillan’s Magazine*, 34–6, 89, 91–2, 94, 106, 113, 126, 131, 135, 149
- Maine, Henry, 28
- majority representation/rule, 69, 73
- Manchester, branch of Proportional Representation Society, 166
- Manchester Guardian*, 157, 162, 166, 181
- Manchester Statistical Society, 182
- manhood suffrage, 50–2, 54
- Manners, John, 167
- Mantle, George, 111
- Maritime Policy of Great Britain, Or, An Inquiry into the Real Merits of the Late, and the Objections to the Present, Navigation System* (T. Hare), 10–11, 13–14, 16
- Marshall, James Garth, 68–9, 95, 110
- Maurice, Frederick Denison, 62, 89–91, 104, 141
- Mayo, August Frederick, 80, 93–4
- May, Thomas Erskine, 146
- ‘Means of Manifesting Public Opinion in Election of Representatives to Parliament, On the’ (T. Hare), 119
- Memorandum on the History, Working, and Results of Cumulative Voting* (T. Hare), 131–2
- memorial to Palmerston, 62, 69, 82, 84, 95
- Metaphysical Society, 159
- Methods of Electing Representatives, On* (Droop), 120
- Metropolitan Association for the Improvement of the Dwellings of the Industrious Classes, 31–2
- Metropolitan Board of Works, 33
- Metropolitan Municipal Reform Association, 35
- Mill, James, 14, 16, 51–2
- Mill, John Stuart
 - and cumulative vote, 68
 - and Hare, 40
 - and Hare’s electoral system, 4, 76–9, 90–1, 98, 104, 106–7, 109, 114, 117
 - influences upon, 62–7
 - and limited vote, 109–10
 - member of Parliament, 35, 100
 - ‘tyranny of the majority’, 3, 74, 187, 219(n.264)
- Milton, John, 113
- Minorities and Majorities: Their Relative Rights: A Letter to the Lord John Russell on Parliamentary Reform* (Marshall), 69
- minority clause
 - adoption of, 109–10
 - and Birmingham caucus, 155
 - defence of, 119, 125, 142, 159
 - and Liberal advantage, 222(n.56)
 - opposition to, 118, 119, 156–7, 169, 173
 - repeal of, 123, 189
 - see also limited vote

- minority representation
 - debate on, 123, 125, 138, 153
 - defence of, 103–5
 - opposition to, 74, 129, 157, 163, 167
 - resistance to, 106–7
- 'Mode of Electing Representatives in Parliament and Municipalities, On the' (T. Hare), 79
- Monteagle, Lord, 68
- 'Moral and Intellectual Effects of Mr Hare's Plan for Improving the Machinery of Representation, On the' (Mayo), 80
- Morin, Antoine, 97–8
- Morley, John, 40, 143, 148, 155, 156, 157, 159, 177
- Morrison, Walter
 - and cumulative vote, 132, 135
 - defence of clerisy, 134
 - defence of minority clause, 125
 - and electoral reform, 114
 - and Hare's electoral system, 107–8
 - and limited vote, 110
 - and proportional representation, 133, 134, 161
 - and Representative Reform Association, 4, 117, 136
 - and single transferable vote, 118
- Morrow, John, 1
- Mr Hare's Reform Bill Simplified and Explained* (H. Fawcett), 81
- Mr Hogarth's Will* (Spence), 97
- municipal councils, 34

- National Education League, 5, 128–30, 144
- nationalism, Irish, 170
- National Liberal Federation, 5, 144, 147, 155
 - conference on parliamentary reform, 156
 - and minority representation, 150, 167, 189
 - sixth annual meeting, Bristol, 157
- national party organizations, 141
- National Review*, 73
- National Union of Conservatives, 169
- Navigation Acts, 10

- Naville, Ernest, 98, 107, 117, 121, 133, 161, 163
- Neale, Edward Vansittart, 137
- Neil, Samuel, 180–1, 183
- Newcastle Chronicle*, 181
- Newcastle-upon-Tyne, test elections, 181
- Newman, Francis, 71
- 'New Parliament and Its Work, The' (Gladstone), 44
- 'New Political Organization, A' (Chamberlain), 144
- New Quarterly Magazine*, 148
- New York County Democratic Committee (Tammany Hall), 98
- 'Next Reform Bill, The' (Frisby), 154
- 'Next Reform Bill, The' (H. Fawcett), 153–4
- Nicholl, Henry Iltid, 17
- Nineteenth Century*, 145, 147, 151, 153, 155–6, 167, 178, 181
- North of England Proportional Representation League, 180
- Northumberland Miners' Political Reform Association, 181
- Northumberland Political Reform Association, 183
- Note to the Machinery of Representation, A* (T. Hare), 55
- 'Note on Representative Government, A' (T. Hare), 139

- Odger, George, 111
- On Liberty* (J.S. Mill), 74, 91
- Order and Progress* (Harrison), 139
- 'Order and Progress' (Stephen), 139
- Origin of Civilisation and the Primitive Condition of Man, The* (Lubbock), 159
- Origin and Metamorphoses of Insects, The* (Lubbock), 159
- Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection, On the* (Darwin), 39, 158
- Owen, David, 2, 18, 28
- Oxford Essays*, 71

- Packe, Michael St John, 1
- Pakington, John, 104
- Pall Mall Gazette*, 163–4, 167

- Palmerston, Viscount, 4, 43
Parliamentary Government Considered with Reference to a Reform of Parliament (3rd Earl Grey), 71, 94
 'Parliamentary Reform: Its Dangers and Safeguards' (Spencer), 87–8
 'Parliamentary Reform: Minority Representation' (J. Smith), 163
 Parnell, Charles, 164, 166, 168
 Parnellites, 184
 Parochial Charities Act, 17
 Parry, Jonathan, 2, 177
 party organization, 141, 147, 153
 party 'tickets', 92, 95
 Peabody, George, 31
 Peabody Trust, 31–2
 Peelites, 44
 Peel, Robert, 43
 Pelling, Henry, 2
 People's Charter, 54
 permanence/progression, in political theory, 64
 personal representation
 advantages of, 57–9, 95
 defeat of, 187
 defence of, 106–7, 114–15
 obstacles to, 55
 and pluralism, 3
 in popular discussion, 99
 and single transferable vote, 23
 Personal Representation Society of New York, 98, 117, 133
 Pitkin, Hanna Fenichel, 1
Plan of Parliamentary Reform, in the Form of a Catechism (Bentham), 50, 99
 Playfair, Lyon, 19
 'Plea for the Constitution, A' (Austin), 76
 'Plea for Minority Representation, A' (T. Hare), 164
Plea for Pure Democracy: Mr Hare's Reform Bill Applied to South Australia, A (Spence), 97
 pluralism, 3, 57, 145, 186–7
 see also dualism
 plurality system of voting, 110, 211(n.23)
Points in the Law of Discovery (Wigram), 17
 'Political Clubs and Party Organization' (Rae), 147
 Political Economy Club, 23, 142
 'Political Machinery and Political Life' (Courtney), 141–2
 political parties, organization of, 145
Political Progress Not Necessarily Democratic (Lorimer), 61, 73
 'Political and Social Effects of Different Methods of Electing Representatives, On the' (Droop), 121
 poll books, 55, 121
 Poor Law Amendment Act, 57
 Potter, Beatrice, 179
 Potter, Thomas Bayley, 98–9
 'Practical Considerations on the Representation of Minorities' (Kinneer), 102
Practical Scheme of Fair Representation, A (Frisby), 154
 Praed, Winthrop Mackworth, 69–70
Preferential Voting (J. Smith), 164, 172
Prehistoric Times as Illustrated by Ancient Remains and the Manners and Customs of Modern Savages (Lubbock), 158
Principles of Parliamentary Representation, The (Dodgson), 172–3
Principles of Political Economy with Some of Their Applications to Social Philosophy (J.S. Mill), 18
Principles of Political Economy and Taxation, On the (Ricardo), 14
Principles of Reform, Political and Legal (Kinneer), 102
 property, 89
 public/private, 29
 'Proportional versus Majority Representation' (A. Grey), 178
 proportional representation
 bill, 133–4
 debate on, 132–3, 157
 opposition to, 144, 164, 168–9
 preclusion of, 177

- proportional representation –
 - continued*
 - and single transferable vote, 23
 - support for, 147, 166–7
 - term, 98, 121–2
 - twentieth century, 186
 - see also* Proportional Representation Society; single transferable vote
- ‘Proportional Representation as Applied to the Election of Local Governing Bodies’ (Droop), 130
- Proportional Representation in Large Constituencies* (Baily), 132–3
- ‘Proportional Representation’ (Lubbock), 167–8
- ‘Proportional Representation’ (M. Fawcett), 126–7, 162–3, 167
- ‘Proportional Representation: Objections and Answers’ (Lubbock, Courtney, A. Grey, and Westlake), 181–2
- ‘Proportional Representation: A Practical Proposal’ (Westlake), 167
- Proportional Representation Society
 - formation of/membership, 37, 161, 164–6, 168, 176, 235(n.41)
 - last meeting of, 185
 - and London Government Bill, 171
 - publications of, 181
 - and school board elections, 183
 - and single transferable vote, 178, 179
 - and trade unions, 180
 - see also* proportional representation
- ‘Proportional Representation: A Test Election’ (Arnold-Forster), 168
- ‘Proportionate Representation’ (Seeböhm), 162–3
- Province of Jurisprudence Determined, The* (Austin), 76
- ‘Public and Private Property Considered as to Its Legal Condition’ (T. Hare), 27–8
- Quarterly Review*, 44, 56, 146
- Questions for a Reformed Parliament*, 106, 139
- quota, calculation of, 120
- Radical Club, 23, 142, 151
- ‘Radical Programme, The’, 155
- Rae, W. Fraser, 147, 148
- ‘Recent Writers on Reform’ (J.S. Mill), 76–9
- redistribution, 138, 144–6, 152–3, 163, 167, 171, 177
- Redistribution Act (1885), 6, 185, 189
- Redistribution Bill (1866), 104
- Redistribution Bill (1884–1885), 174–84
- ‘Redistribution by Different Lights’ (Courtney), 181
- ‘Redistribution of Political Power’ (Knatchbull-Hugessen), 135
- ‘Redistribution of Seats’ (Kinnear), 106
- Reeve, Henry, 67, 71
- Reeves, Richard, 1
- Reflections on the Revolution in France* (Burke), 28
- Reform Bill (1860), 85
- Reform Bill (1867), 105–6
- ‘Reform Bill of the Future, The’ (T. Hare), 145
- reform demonstrations (1866), 105
- Reform League, 105, 111–16
- ‘Reform’ (Stephen), 106
- Remarks on the Use and Abuse of Some Political Terms* (Lewis), 53
- Reports of Cases Adjudged in the High Court of Chancery* (T. Hare), 17
- representation
 - actual, 50
 - class, 73–4
 - of colonies, 36–7, 49
 - criticisms of Hare’s electoral system, 93–4
 - majority, 69
 - of minorities, 69, 72–4, 76–9, 104–5
 - of minorities: other countries, 93, 97
 - personal, *see* personal representation
 - political, 2–6, 43
 - proportional, *see* proportional representation
 - real/actual/direct, 53
 - support of Hare’s electoral system, 93–4
 - territorial, 60

- virtual, *see* virtual representation
- of working class, 54
- 'Representation of Every Locality and Intelligence' (T. Hare), 86
- Representation* (Lubbock), 184
- 'Representation of Minorities, The' (Courtney), 151
- 'Representation of Minorities, The' (Shaw-Lefevre), 169
- 'Representation and Misrepresentation: I' (Shaw-Lefevre), 182
- 'Representation and Misrepresentation: II' (T. Hare), 182
- 'Representation in Practice and Theory' (T. Hare), 84–5
- Representative Government and Personal Representation, On* (Sterne), 133
- Representative Reform*, 119
- Representative Reform Association
 - and cumulative vote, school board elections, 126, 128, 132
 - dissolution of, 136
 - formation/membership, 4–5, 23, 117, 188
 - and Hartington Committee, 122
- Ricardo, David, 14
- Robinson, David, 11
- Robinson, Frederick, 10
- Robson, John M., 1
- Rogers, James E. Thorold, 136
- Rokkan, Stein, 1
- Roman Catholics, as minority, 165
- Roper, Jon, 1
- Ross, J.F.S., 1
- Royal City Parochial Charities Commission, 17
- Royal Commission on the City of London Livery Companies, 18
- Royal Commission on Housing of the Working Classes, 37
- Ruskin, John, 62, 83
- Russell, Edward, 156
- Russell, John, 4, 43–4, 70, 72, 85, 95, 105
- St James Gazette*, 172
- Salisbury, Lord, *see* Cecil, Robert
- Salisbury, reform of charities in, 18
- Samson, Mary, 38
- Saturday Review*, 73, 94, 168
- Scheme for Proportional Representation, A* (Baily), 121, 172
- Schnadhorst, Francis, 155, 164
- school board elections, 125–33, 131–2, 135–6, 169–70, 183, 188
- schools, endowed, 26
- Scott, C.P., 166
- second ballot, 149–50
- Second Reform Act (1867), 4, 23, 110, 112, 117, 122, 188
- sectarianism, Irish, 170
- Seebohm, Frederic, 162–3, 166, 171
- Seeley, John, 113
- Seghill, test elections, 181
- Select Committee on Metropolitan Local Government, 104
- Select Committee on Parliamentary and Municipal Elections, 122
- Sellar, A.C., 168
- Shaftsbury, Lord, 62
- Shaw-Lefevre, J.G., 169–70, 173, 182–3
- Sidgwick, Henry, 38, 180
- Sidney, Algernon, 49
- single transferable vote
 - conception of, 55–6
 - and Droop, 121
 - and Droop quota, 168
 - at Harvard College, 123
 - and Mill, J.S., 35, 74, 76–7
 - and Morrison, 118
 - and personal representation, 23, 59, 187
 - and Proportional Representation Society, 37, 178–9
 - support for, 60, 72, 85–6, 166
 - see also* proportional representation
- Skinner, Quentin, 186
- Smith, Adam, 13–14, 25, 36, 47
- Smith, F.B., 2
- Smith, J. Parker, 163–4, 166
- Social Democratic Federation, 180
- Social Science Association, 22, 23–5, 101, 187
- and clerisy, 101, 187
- congress 1859, 79–80
- congress 1862, 24, 93

- Social Science Association – *continued*
 congress 1863, 25
 congress 1866, 27, 34–5, 105
 congress 1868, 119
 congress 1869, 28, 36
 congress 1870, 30, 35
 congress 1874, 137, 142
 congress 1879, 152
 formation of/membership,
 22, 23
 South Australia, elections in,
 56, 97
 South Australian Political Association,
 97
 Spence, Catherine Helen, 97, 98,
 103
 Spencer, Herbert, 71, 87–8
 Stanley, Lord, 98
 Stapleton, Augustus, 62
State in Its Relations with the Church,
The (Gladstone), 86
 Statistical Society, 89, 153
 Steed, Michael, 1
 Stephen, Leslie, 80–1, 106, 139–41
 Sterne, Simon, 40, 98, 112, 116–17,
 121, 123, 133
 ‘Study of the Condition and Capacity
 of the Lands of Endowments and
 Other Public Estates, as Means of
 Teaching History, Topography,
 and Political and Social Economy,
 and of Introducing Technical
 Instruction, On the’ (T. Hare), 30
 suffrage, 84
 universal, 67, 115–16
 women’s, 156
 ‘Suggestions Afforded by the
 Application of the Cumulative
 Vote, On the’ (T. Hare), 128–9
 ‘Suggestions for the Improvement of
 Our Representative System: The
 University Elections Act of Last
 Session’ (T. Hare), 92
 Switzerland, proportional
 representation in, 98
 Taunton Schools Inquiry Commission,
 29
 Taylor, Helen, 40, 82, 84
 Taylor, Miles, 2
 Taylor, Peter, 94
 ‘Theories of Parliamentary Reform,
 The’ (Cecil), 71
*Theory and Practice of Representative
 Elections, On the* (Naville),
 226(n.176)
 Third Reform Act (1884), 6, 23, 189
 Thomasson, John Pennington, 166
 Thompson, Dennis F., 1
Thoughts on Parliamentary Reform
 (J.S. Mill), 68, 73, 79, 81, 89–90
The Times, 62, 141–2, 156, 165, 174,
 178, 185
 Tocqueville, Alexis de, 3, 64–5, 66–7,
 86, 187
 Torrens, William, 98, 130
 town councils and cumulative vote,
 135
 Tractarian Movement, 39
 trade unions, and proportional
 representation, 180
*Treatise on the Discovery of Evidence by
 Bill and Answer in Equity, A*
 (T. Hare), 17, 38
*Treatise on the Election of
 Representatives, Parliamentary and
 Municipal* (T. Hare), 3–4, 23, 34,
 71–3, 76, 79, 95, 136, 152
 Trevelyan bill, 138
 Trevelyan, George Otto, 93, 133, 135,
 138, 144, 150–1, 159
True Theory of Representation in a State,
The (Harris), 61
Two Treatises of Government (Locke), 48
 ‘tyranny of the majority’, 65–6, 74,
 146, 187, 219(n.264)
 United States of America
 and Hare’s electoral system, 123
 and minority representation, 93, 98,
 116
 universal suffrage, 67, 115–16
 University Elections Act (1861), 92–3
Un nouveau système électoral (Morin),
 97

- Usque ad Coelum: Thoughts on the Dwellings of the People, Charitable Estates, Improvement, and Local Government of the Metropolis* (T. Hare), 31, 37, 94
- 'Value of Political Machinery, The' (Stephen), 141
- 'Value of Redistribution: A Note on Electoral Statistics, The' (Cecil), 173
- View of the State of Europe during the Middle Ages* (Hallam), 45
- virtual representation, 48–52, 71–2, 82, 87, 93, 100, 108–11, 114, 117, 119, 124–5, 127, 146–7, 158, 164, 166–7, 169, 173, 186
- votes, surplus, 55
- Ware, W.R., 123, 133
- Wellington, 1st Duke, 14
- Westlake, Alice, 38, 40, 128, 141, 225(n.134)
- Westlake, John
 and collegiate will, 122
 and Courtney, 141–2
 and Hare, 38, 40
 and proportional representation, 161, 167
 and Proportional Representation Society, 161, 166
 and school board elections, 128
 and single transferable vote, 171
 and Social Science Association, 105, 137
 and virtual representation, 114
- Westminster Review*, 51–2, 71, 87, 92, 136, 163, 168
- 'What Conditions or Limitations Ought to be Imposed upon the Power of Disposing in Perpetuity of Property, Real or Personal, for Charitable or Other Purposes?' (T. Hare), 27
- Whately, Thomas, 48
- 'What Limits Ought to be Placed by Law to Charitable Endowments?' (T. Hare), 28
- 'What Ought To Be the Legal and Constitutional Relations between England and Her Colonies' (T. Hare), 36
- Whig tradition, 59
- White, A. Cromwell, 163
- Why I am a Liberal*, 37, 183
- Wigram, James, 17, 71
- Wilberforce, Samuel, 158
- 'Women and Representative Government' (M. Fawcett), 156
- Wordsworth, William, 63
- working class
 and cumulative vote, 129
 and democracy, 67
 and franchise, 100
 representation of, 54
- Working Men's College, 62, 100, 159
- Working Men's College Magazine*, 91
- Workman and the Franchise, The* (Maurice), 104
- X-Club, 158