

**Theodore Koditschek****Supplementary Notes to Chapter Five****Greater Britain and the ‘Lesser Breeds’, liberalism race and evolutionary history**

**Note to Reader:** These supplementary notes consist primarily of extended references and explanations that were cut from the original book manuscript for reasons of space. In a few instances, however, they constitute more extended subordinate narratives (with accompanying references), which are related to the book’s themes, but were left out because they would have deflected from the central argument and analysis of the volume. These supplementary notes are coordinated to the footnote numbers for chapter five of *Liberalism, Imperialism and the Historical Imagination: Nineteenth Century Visions of a Greater Britain*, (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2011).

2. According to Colin Matthew, *The Liberal Imperialists: The Ideas and Politics of a Post-Gladstonian Elite*, (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1973), 163, only six of the eighty-three M.P.s on the council of the Imperial Federation League were Liberals. However, the League was always officially bipartisan and Duncan Bell, *The Idea of Greater Britain: Empire and the Future of World Order, 1860-1900*, (Princeton University Press, Princeton, 2007), 17, emphasizes its Liberal character during its early days.

5. Dilke’s ambivalence was very telling in this respect. Since his book deliberately struck a tone of ambiguity as to whether the Greater Britain of the future was to be a global federation of Anglo-Saxons, or whether it would encompass such other parts of the Empire as India, the American South, or the West Indies, where other “English speaking” races might be expected to assume increasingly enlarged civic roles.

9. For classic examples of post-Darwinian efforts to carve out an alternative approach to race during the 1860s that might be described as ‘modified monogenism,’ see the essays by Alfred Russell Wallace and Thomas Huxley, reprinted in Michael D. Biddiss ed., *Images of Race*, (Holmes and Meier, New York, 1979), 37-54, 157-170.

12. Though Froude's proposal was explicitly aimed at Black tribesmen, he pointed out that the "law may be general and apply equally to whites and blacks." "The apprentice system," he further noted, "was the old education of the English nation under which we grew to be what we are." Similarly, Froude thought, that racial exclusions in the franchise ought to be cast in an ostensibly race-neutral way. Froude to Carnarvon, British Library, London, Add Mss 60798, 12/1/1875, Pg. 13.

22. Froude also used the family metaphor on occasion, but it was always in the context of advocating 'tough love.' "Wait I am told till the Kaffirs discover for themselves the superiority of the white mans ways of life," he replied to those who counseled kindness to the savage. "Wait you may as well say to educate your son till he has discovered for himself the difference between a noun and a verb the beauty of a mathematical demonstration and the superiority of industry over idleness. Industry is the ABC of education – but the first step taken in it is always an unwilling one." Froude to Carnarvon, 12/1/1875.

25. The most prominent advocate of neo-Lamarckism in Victorian Britain was Herbert Spencer, "The Inadequacy of Natural Selection," *Contemporary Review*, 43, (1893), 743-60. Derek Freeman and his critics, "The Evolutionary Theories of Charles Darwin and Herbert Spencer," *Current Anthropology*, 15/3, (1974), 211-37 examine the differences and similarities between Darwin and Spencer on the mechanisms of inheritance. Lamarckism is placed in its long historical context by Conway Zirkle, "The Early Idea of the Inheritance of Acquired Characteristics and Pangenesis," *Transactions N.S. XXXV*, Pt. II, (American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia, 1946); Loren Eiseley, *Darwin's Century*, (Doubleday, Garden City, 1961), 175-204; George Stocking, *Race, Culture and Evolution*, (New York, 1968), 234-69; Adrian Desmond and James Moore, *Darwin: The Life of a Tormented Evolutionist*, (Times, Warner, New York, 1991), 24-2, 120-4, 139, 531-2, 617-20, 632. For the continued vogue of Lamarckism, even after the Darwinian revolution, see Peter Bowler, *The Eclipse of Darwinism: Anti-Darwinian Evolution Theories in the Decades Around 1900*, (Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, 1983), 38-106.

27. It will be recalled from chapter four, *infra*, that Froude thought the process of civilizing West Indian Negroes would take more than a century, and that it had taken Anglo-Saxons over a thousand years to achieve modern civilization on their own.

28. But see also Douglas Lorimer, *Colour Class and the Victorians; English Attitudes to the Negro in the Mid Nineteenth Century*, (Leicester University Press, 1978), 15-16, who argues that the new racism was not so much the result of scientific theories, or imperial challenges, but rather the consequence of changing social relations at home.

38. The indenture system, as practiced in India, had already revealed a shocking pattern of abuse. "Some of the officers and sailors" in immigrant ships "hardly seem to regard coloured passengers in the same light as those who are white." George Campbell, *The British Empire*, (London, 1887), 152. Although Campbell contended that "Indian immigrants after their indentures should be entitled to all the privileges of free British subjects, independent of race or colour" his argument implied that they would continue to be marked by their servile history, and would: "be at least as free as in India." Campbell, *British Empire*, 155.

40. During his time as Lt. Governor of Bengal (1868-70), Campbell specified that Bengali candidates for government positions had not only to sit the exam that tested their intellect, they had also to produce a medical certificate, and demonstrate that they could ride a horse for twelve miles, at a fast pace, George Campbell, *Memoirs of my Indian Career*, 2 vols. (London, 1893), II, 266-7

41. "My own opinion has been that an entirely free press is inconsistent with a despotic form of government, even if it be a paternal despotism. In such circumstances press writers are always inclined to be 'agin' the government, and there is no opposing press to answer them. No doubt, criticism is useful in bringing abuses to light, but a government whose position largely depends on the sort of moral force due to a belief in its unassailable power, can hardly afford to be constantly held up to the ridicule of its subjects." Campbell concludes however by observing that prosecutions for libel should be applied sparingly, since they often result in giving the libeler even greater notoriety. Campbell, *Indian Career*, II, 314. Campbell's reluctance to promote qualified Bengalis to responsible positions in the service also caused bad blood with the Calcutta bhadralok. J.N.Gupta, *Life and Work of Romesh Chunder Dutt*, CIE (London, 1911), 6-8.

42. "As long as the British Government is in the eyes of the natives a great mysterious power, in whose overwhelming strength and energy they believe, its weakest representative is clothed with immense power, and we do not require a large army." Campbell, *British Empire*, 73. But the bhadralok did not challenge either the government or the army. Their goals were to run the first, and control the second. Campbell's worry was less with the integrity of Greater Britain than with the status of his own class of professional administrators, who owed their positions to racial 'prestige'. "If you succeed in inspiring me with the idea that you are stronger than I am, you exercise prestige over me," Campbell wrote. "When the people see and hear that Government [the Anglo-run Raj] abused and derided and misrepresented," he cautioned, "when all that happens to its disadvantage (and unfortunately a good many such things do happen) is paraded and made the most of, that kind of prestige must be very much weakened. Nowadays the educated natives are becoming so many missionaries of these ideas to the classes, which are not themselves educated." Campbell, *British Empire*, 73-4. Without going quite so

far as to support government censorship of the media, Campbell wrote; “With an absolute Government we have imported into India the utmost freedom of writing and speaking which prevails in England, only a good deal more so, for that freedom is not subject to the same restraints which we have in England. It is more like the freedom which prevails in Ireland when there are no special laws in force. There must be friction when absolute and ultra-free institutions are thus brought into contact.” Campbell, *British Empire*, 73-4.

43. Campbell himself became friends with Maine when they were both in Calcutta between 1862 and 1867. “I think his intellect,” Campbell avowed, “was upon the whole the most acute of any with whom I had familiar conversation.” *Indian Career*, II, 96.

45. Without disputing the importance of philology and post-utilitarianism, it should be noted that Maine himself drew the geological analogy in *Ancient Law*, when he noted that “these rudimentary ideas [ancient laws] are to the jurist what the primary crusts of the earth are to the geologist.” Henry Maine, *Ancient Law: Its Connection with the Early History of Society and its Relation to Modern Ideas*, [1861] (n.p., 1986), 2. If this betrays no direct influence from the recently published Darwin, there is good reason to think that Darwinism did have an impact on Maine in later years. As a close friend of Francis Galton, he was certainly exposed to Darwinian thinking and, by the time he wrote *Village Communities*, he was using Darwinian language in his own works. See Henry Maine, *Village Communities and Miscellanies*, (Henry Holt, New York, [1871], 1876), 226; Henry Maine, “South Slavonians and Rajpoots,” *The Nineteenth Century*, 2/10, (December, 1877), 812; as well as George Feaver, *From Status to Contract: A Biography of Sir Henry Maine, 1822-1888*, (London, 1969), 136-48.

The analogy with Darwin was drawn by many of Maine’s readers. Leslie Stephen, for one, described him as the socio-historical analogue to the founding father of “The Origin of Species’ having “introduced a correlative method into the history of institutions.” *Dictionary of National Biography*, 22 vols. (London and New York, 1908-9), XII, 790. John Fiske, a Harvard historian, waxed even more eloquent, announcing to his fiancé that he had read the book in one sitting and “entered upon a new Epoch of my life!” “No novel ever enchained me more. I consider it almost next to Spencer. It has thrown all my ideas of law into a definite shape. It has suggested to me many new and startling views of social progress. . . . O my dear! . . . there is nothing in this world like SCIENCE, nothing as divine as the life of a scholar.” Quoted in Feaver, *Status to Contract*, 44.

47. For general discussions of Aryanism as a British imperial ideology in the nineteenth century see Joan Leopold, “British Applications of the Aryan Theory of Race to India, 1850 -1870,” *English Historical Review*, XXXIX, 352 (July, 1974), 578-

603; Thomas Trautmann, *Aryans and British India*, (University of California Press, Berkeley, 1997); Tony Ballantyne, *Orientalism and Race: Aryanism and the British Empire*, (Palgrave, New York, 2002). Given the publishing priority of Maine over Lubbock, one might ask if the direction of the influence might have run in that way. I know of no evidence that Lubbock saw the similarities between his work and what Maine would retrospectively call “the comparative method,” although eventually both men became familiar with one another’s writings.

48. Though Maine’s social theory centers on an analysis of the role of progress as solvent of tradition, he has remarkably little to say about the original source of that progress. Indeed, in his Rede Lecture of 1875, he indicates that, with the exception of the ancient Greeks, no other culture (including his own) would have broken out of primitive traditionalism by themselves. In this scenario, primitive society is depicted as the ground of a Darwinian struggle, not between individuals, but between primordial ‘status’ based groups. “Each fierce little community is perpetually at war with its neighbor, tribe with tribe, village with village.” But even amidst all this cruelty and carnage the ‘status’ groups are internally harmonious, ordered by the presumption that members “believed themselves to be kinsmen in the most literal sense of the word.” It was only with the Greeks that the dynamic of progress enters in, catapulting the Darwinian struggle onto a completely different ground. “Not one of those intellectual excellences which we regard as characteristic of the great progressive races of the world – not the law of the Romans, nor the philosophy and sagacity of the Germans, not the luminous order of the French, not the political aptitude of the English, not that insight into physical nature to which all races have contributed – would apparently have come into existence if those races had been left to themselves. To one small people, in its original seat no more than a handsbreadth of territory, it was given to create the principle of Progress. . . . That people was the Greek. Except the blind forces of nature, nothing moves in this world which is not Greek in its origin.” Maine, *Village Communities*, 238.

50. It is worth quoting Maine’s general argument at length. “The movement of the progressive societies has been uniform in one respect. Through all its course it has been distinguished by the gradual dissolution of family dependency, and the growth of individual obligation in its place. The Individual is steadily substituted for the Family, as the unit of which the civil laws take account. The advance has been accomplished at varying rates of celerity, and there are societies, not absolutely stationary in which the collapse of the ancient organization can only be perceived by careful study of the phenomena they present. But, whatever its pace, the change has not been subject to reaction or recoil, and apparent retardations will be found to have been occasioned by the absorption of archaic ideas from some entirely foreign source.” “Nor is it difficult to see what is the tie between man and man which replaces by degrees those forms of reciprocity in rights and duties which have their origin in the Family. It is Contract. Starting, as from one terminus of history, from a condition of society in which all relations of Persons are summed up in the relations

of Family, we seem to have steadily moved towards a phase of social order in which all these relations arise from the free agreement of Individuals. In Western Europe, the progress achieved in this direction has been considerable. Thus the status of the Slave has disappeared – it has been superseded by contractual relation of the servant to his master. The status of Female under tutelage, if the tutelage be understood of persons other than her husband, has also ceased to exist; from her coming of age to her marriage all the relations she may form are relations of contract. So too, the status of Son under power has no true place in the law of modern European societies.” ...

“The word Status may be usefully employed to construct a formula expressing the law of progress thus indicated, which, whatever be its value, seems to me sufficiently ascertained. All the forms of Status taken notice of in the Law of Persons were derived from, and to some extent are still coloured by, the powers and privileges anciently residing in the Family. If then we employ Status, agreeably with the usage of the best writers, to signify those personal conditions only, and avoid applying the term to such conditions as are the immediate or remote result of agreement, we may say that the movement of the progressive societies has hitherto been a movement *from Status to Contract.*” Maine, *Ancient Law*, 139-41.

52. The contemporary perception that Indian peasants were exceptionally stressed during the later Victorian period runs counter to the findings of recent historians, who have seen the period 1865-90 as a period of economic recovery in India, when agrarian incomes rose, and relative prosperity returned the countryside. Maine and the Anglo-Indians were inclined to focus on the dark side of the equation, envisioning the danger of agrarian revolt at every turn. C.A. Bayly, *Indian Society and the Making of the British Empire*, (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1988), 136-50, 155-68, 197-9. Also see the contributions of G. Johnson and C.A. Bayly to A. Diamond ed., *The Victorian Achievement of Sir Henry Maine: A Centennial Reappraisal*, (Cambridge, 1991), 376-97.

54. If these arguments succeeded in persuading other policy-makers, it was partly because of the lucidity with which they were presented, but also because they came at a propitious moment, when ideas were changing among the metropolitan intelligentsia. At the same time, conditions in India were perceived as posing intractable challenges – peasant indebtedness, planter exploitation, and the erosion of popular deference – that caused the authorities to reconsider the earlier Liberal orthodox view. No less a figure than John Stuart Mill -- who had formerly canonized Ricardian economics in his *Principles of Political Economy* (1848) -- was persuaded by his own engagement with Indian policy that private property might be inappropriate for peasant societies like India or Ireland. In such places, the laws of supply and demand were not the sole regulators of rents, prices and wages, and a moral element had to be added to temper the primacy of *homo economicus* in the official point of view. See John Stuart Mill, *Essays on England, Ireland and the*

*Empire*, (University of Toronto Press, Toronto, 1982). For further analysis of Maine's contribution to this discussion see Karuna Mantena, "Law and 'Tradition': Henry Maine and the Theoretical Origins of Indirect Rule," in Andrew Lewis and Michael Lobban eds., *Law and History*, VI (Oxford, 2004), 159-88, and Sandra den Otter, "The Political Economy of Empire: Freedom of Contract and 'Commercial Civilization' in Colonial India," in Martin Daunton and Frank Trentmann eds., *Worlds of Political Economy: Knowledge and Power in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries*, (London, 2004), 69-94.

55. Maine seems to have visited only a handful of actual villages, which may have been atypical, as B.H. Baden Powell pointed out. B.H. Baden Powell, *The Indian Village Community*, (Longmans, London, 1896). See also Ronald Inden, *Imagining India*, (Blackwell, Oxford, 1990), 131-161. Nevertheless, it was Maine who introduced the notion to the British reading public that the Indian Village was a living fossil of the original Aryan ur-community, which exhibited striking similarities with the ancient Teutonic mark that "were much too strong and numerous to be accidental." Maine, *Village Communities*, 12.

56. In *Village Communities*, 13-4, Maine claims that "each individual in India is a slave to the customs of the group to which he belongs." However he also recognizes that this 'slavery' to the group was rapidly coming to an end. "In modern India, the growth of wealth has greatly stimulated the spirit of individualism; buyers and sellers alike become impatient of the necessity for obtaining the consent of the villagers to their bargain." This pattern replicated the same one that had already played itself out in the history of the west. In the west, however, Maine noted that this process of individuation had played itself out very slowly, leading eventually to changes of the law that reduced the regulatory inertia of status and increased the scope for contract. In the end "even jurisprudence itself cannot escape the great law of evolution." M.E. Grant Duff, *Sir Henry Maine: A Brief Memoir of his Life*, (New York, 1892), 59-60.

59. "Everyone who has used his eyes in India," warns Maine more typically, "will be on his guard against certain extravagances of the modern theory of Race." The great physical diversity of India attested to "the power of absorption which the village may from many indications be inferred to have possessed." Maine, *Village Communities*, 128.

60. Maine did not object to "a Bengal Legislative Council half-filled with Bengal civilians and educated Bengal Natives," appointed by the British "to legislate for that . . . wealthy and civilized province." Such people however were unfit to govern the vast expanse of rural India, which was still too deeply sunk in the anonymity of 'status' to be represented by anyone but the British *ultra-Patria Potestas*, i.e. himself.

Quoted in Duff, *Maine*, 40. Yet Maine's categorical refusal to let India be represented by educated Indians got him into trouble with his own categories. In 1866, the Supreme Legislative Council was considering a relatively mild proposal to limit the most extreme and egregious instances of polygamy. Maine alone among the Britons on this body, refused to dismiss this proposal out of hand as a threat to social stability. He was all for delaying the day when women and non-European men would enter the realms of self-determining 'contract', but rampant polygamy did not merely delay this outcome. It brought any possibility of future improvement to an end. "Polygamy proceeds upon and assumes not only the debasement of half the Hindu race, the women, but their complete incapacity for improvement." A few Bengali men had confidentially told him that all private efforts at female education ground to a halt the minute a second wife entered the joint-family compound. Failure to act would be "a complete abnegation of any theory upon which the existence of our Empire can be justified." Maine's only objection to the bill under consideration was that it had been drafted by an Indian liberal member of the Council. The proposal should be watered down and its provenance covered up. If it were presented as a moderate British measure for incremental regulation of a still-sanctioned institution, the Indian populace would be more likely to accept it than if it came under the reforming banner of a native elite. India Office Minute, 10/14, 1866.

61. A graduate in Bengal "may be a young man who has an unpleasantly good opinion of himself," Maine opined, while acknowledging that "he has really proved that he possesses a considerable amount of genuine knowledge." Duff, *Maine*, 388.

65. In the Raj of his own day, Dutt expressed qualified support for the educational policies of George Campbell, which prioritized vernacular education for the masses, and which, Dutt hoped, would embolden the ryot to stand up for his rights. Pauline Rule, *The Pursuit of Progress: A Study of the Intellectual Development of Romesh Chunder Dutt, 1848-1888*, (Calcutta, 1977), 46-55.

66. Working from the foundations of Buckle's climate theory, Dutt developed an embryonic sketch of what might, in a more supportive intellectual environment, have become an entirely new evolutionary theory of his own, in which racial determinism would be explicitly refuted. The backwardness of the Bengali masses was not a sign of racial inferiority, or even of evolutionary delay, Dutt argued, in his sketch for such a work. On the contrary, it was a functionally adaptive response to a tropical, torrential environment that fostered lassitude, early marriage, low caloric intake and fatalistic passivity. To gain some distance from the freighted Anglo-Indian comparison, he began his own comparative ethnology with a discussion of the Americas; two continents that had been recently populated by a single race. Since there was little racial difference between the Red Indian of the United States, Arctic Eskimo, the Aztec, or Incan, their cultural differences were attributable to

climate and other environmental factors. It was no accident, Dutt contended, that there were striking parallels between Aztec, Egyptian and Bengali society, since each developed around an alluvial plain, situated between 10° and 30° latitude. Such environments fostered fertile agriculture and early civilization, but also degeneration into political despotism, overpopulation and fatalistic passivity. R.C. Dutt, "Modern Researches into the Origin and Early Phases of Civilization," *Calcutta Review*, LXXV (1882), 132-151; R.C. Dutt, "Progress in India," *Calcutta Review*, CXCIX (1895) 121-32; Rule, *Pursuit of Progress*, 94.

74. Stubbs put it best; "Great men may forestall or delay such critical changes; the greatest men aspire to guide nations through them; sometimes great men seem to be created by or for such conjunctures; and without a careful examination of the lives of such men, history cannot be written. But they do not create the conjunctures: and the history which searches no deeper is manifestly incomplete. . . . In a very comprehensive summary of the drama, even the great works of Henry II and Edward I appear as secondary influences." William Stubbs, *The Constitutional History of England*, 3 vols. [1874, 1875, 1878], I,II, 3<sup>rd</sup> edn. (Oxford, 1880); III, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn. (Oxford, 1878), III, 501-2.

76. In Duncan Bell's *Idea of Greater Britain*, the Anglo-Saxonist conception of empire is presented as largely innocent of racial supremacist imputations. On the basis of material in this chapter, I would argue that it entailed an exclusionary abjection of non Anglo-Saxon peoples, whom the very terms of this discourse necessarily consigned to some subordinate place on a hierarchy of 'lesser breeds'.

78. In fairness to Freeman, he added "I don't want to wallop anybody, even jews." W.R.W. Stephens, *Life and Letters of Edward A. Freeman*, 2 vols. (Macmillan, London, 1895), II, 428. There is perhaps an element of self-parody in such comments, which pepper Freeman's correspondence, and betray the impulse of a provocateur. While a distinction needs to be made between private correspondence and published books, Christopher Parker, "The Failure of Liberal Racialism: The Racial Ideas of E.A. Freeman," *Historical Journal*, 24/4 (1981), 825-46, shows that many of Freeman's journalistic writings were almost as virulently racist as his private correspondence. Moreover, the fact that Freeman's letters were published only a few years after his death suggests that his biographer, W.R.W. Stephens did not think that there was anything untoward in the stream of racial invective "Jews", and "Niggers" that litter Freeman's correspondence.

81. Along with the Greek Achaian League, Freeman ranks the United States as "the most perfect development of the federal principle which the world has ever seen." E.A. Freeman, *The History of the Federal Government*, (London, 1863), 6. The Greek city-state "gave the members of the ruling body (whether the whole people, or only

a part of the people) such an apolitical education as no other political system can give." Freeman, *Federal Government*, 47. "This intensity of local patriotism is closely connected with all that is noblest and all that is basest in the history of city-commonwealths." Freeman, *Federal Government*, 50. Large, unified states under the direction of a monarch did not provide a favorable environment for civic freedom to take root. Federalism, however, was "a third system, intermediate between the two, borrowing something from each of them, and possessing many both of the merits and the faults inherent in the two." Freeman, *Federal Government*, 89. The United States was the pre-eminent example of what such a compromise could accomplish, and Freeman was not daunted by the prospect that the American Civil War might reveal any inherent weakness in the federal idea. "The southern states have, in their very secession paid the highest tribute that could be paid to the general principle of federalism. They have seceded from one federal government only to set up another." Freeman, *Federal Government*, 74.

82. In *Federal Government*, using the Swiss as an example, Freeman briefly entertains the possibility that the federal principle can be applied to bring union to an ethnically and racially polyglot polity. "Under the Federal system, the catholic and the protestant, the aristocrat and the democrat can meet side by side as free and equal confederates . . . The Federal system, in short, has here, out of the most discordant ethnological, political and religious elements, raised up an artificial nation, full of as true and heroic national feeling as ever animated any people of the most un-mixed blood." In the preface to the first volume of his/ E.A. Freeman, *The History of the Norman Conquest of England*, 5 vols. (Oxford, 1867-78); I, II, 3<sup>rd</sup> edn. (Oxford, 1877); III, IV, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn. (Oxford, 1875, 1876), xiv, Freeman implies that he abandoned a projected history of the medieval German Confederation because Bismarck's program of national unification was rendering it a dead-end as historical teleology, and demonstrating that federation was not the destiny of the Germanic race. Six years later, in *Comparative Politics*, Freeman explicitly retracted the claim that federalism could form the basis for a viable modern state. In contrast to the fissiparous Greeks, "The Teuton passed from the tribal stage, without ever going through the city stage at all." The result was a unified nation-state. E.A. Freeman, *Comparative Politics*, (London, 1873), 65.

84. "Our forefathers appeared in the Isle of Britain purely as destroyers; nowhere else in Western Europe were the existing men and the existing institutions so utterly swept away. The English wiped out everything Celtic and everything Roman." Freeman, *Norman Conquest*, I, 20. "We may now be thankful for the barbarism and ferocity of our forefathers," he concludes. "Had we stayed in our earlier land we should have remained undistinguished from the mass of Low Dutch kinfolk. . . . As it was, we were a colony sent forth while our race was still in a state of healthy barbarism. We won a country for ourselves, and we grew up, a new people in a new land bringing with us ideas and principles common to us with the rest of our race. . .

. Severed from the old stock, and kept aloof from intermixture with any other . . . we developed a new system for ourselves.” Freeman, *Norman Conquest*, I, 21.

85. “I cannot in this Chapter, lay claim to the same originality which I hope I may fairly claim in the narrative parts of this history. The early political and legal antiquities of England have been treated of by so many eminent writers that there is really little more to be done than to test their different views by the standards of inherent probability and of documentary evidence.” Freeman particularly praises the works of Palgrave and Kemble, though “I cannot call myself an unreserved follower of either.” Freeman, *Norman Conquest*, I, 69.

88. Freeman is concerned to strike a balance between asserting that the germ of what would become the English Constitution was already present at the beginning of recorded history, and recording the ways in which this Constitution adapted to change.

90. “There can be little doubt that this original community of blood really had an important practical effect, and that the speedy fusion of Normans and English was greatly promoted by the fact that the conquerors and conquered were in truth kinsmen.” Freeman, *Norman Conquest*, I, 149.

91. “When we compare our history with the history of kindred lands beyond the sea, with Germany or with Denmark, we shall see that the final effect of conquest by the stranger was to enable us to preserve more of the spirit and institutions of earlier times, to keep up a more unbroken continuity with earlier times than fell to the lot of our kinsfolk who never underwent such a momentary scourge.” Freeman, *Norman Conquest*, V, 334. “Normandy taught England to become a continental power; she taught her to become the special rival of France; and, having done this, she gave up as it were her own separate being, and herself sank into a French province. . . . Our insular position, combined with the career which was fixed for us by our Norman Conqueror, has given England a special position of her own in Europe. She can choose, almost at pleasure, in a way in which hardly any other European state can choose, whether she will take a part in the affairs of the continent or stand aloof from them.” Freeman, *Norman Conquest*, V, 351.

93. “Without the operation of any law, without any general act of emancipation, the slave class rose to the rank of villainage.” Contrasting this organic emancipation of racial kin from the negro emancipations of the nineteenth century, Freeman notes that “the great difficulties which have arisen from the emancipation of slaves who are as unlike their masters in every respect in which man can be unlike man is a

difficulty with which Wulfstan and William were not called upon to grapple.” Freeman, *Norman Conquest*, V, 481.

94. “The English people learned to use and to know its own strength, in the process, first of supporting a foreign King against foreign barons, and then of supporting foreign barons against a foreign King. By so doing, it turned both the foreign King and the foreign barons into Englishmen.” Freeman, *Norman Conquest*, V, 459.

95. “The influences which were at work over all Western Europe . . . would doubtless have gone on working” even under a continued line of Anglo-Saxon kings. “But under foreign rule they worked faster and more fiercely.” Freeman, *Norman Conquest*, V, 504-5.

96. For Freeman’s disappointment at the reception of his work, see John Burrow, *A Liberal Descent: Victorian Historians and the English Past*, (Cambridge, 1981), 200, 213.

100. While Freeman deemed most Europeans to be substantially Aryan in blood, he thought they were the products of countless crossings and re-crossings that had left many layers of cultural super-positioning – the residues of many migrating groups. The small patches of Aryan purity that he had discovered in the alpine fastnesses of Switzerland seemed to reappear in the late 1870s, when he took up the cause of national liberation for the Greeks, Serbs and Italians. The emotional temperatures of all these crusades were raised in Freeman’s mind by the belief that he was defending Aryan cousins who were suffering under the yoke of evil empires; Bonapartist France, multi-national Austro-Hungary, and (worst of all) the perfidious Turk. That modern Greeks or Italians were only dimly related to the ancient Hellenes and Romans was a minor detail that did not dampen Freeman’s effusions. Stephens, *Life of Freeman*, II, 101-70; Burrow, *Liberal Descent*, 166, 188-92.

104. Although Freeman cared little for Britain’s colored dependencies, he was never an outright opponent of Empire. On the contrary, he saw imperialism as deeply rooted in English history. Imperial claims had been made by virtually all English monarchs. “Their sphere has gradually been enlarged; as nearer dependencies have been incorporated with the central state, another more distant circle of dependencies has arisen beyond them. Wessex held the supremacy over England; England held it over Great Britain; Great Britain held it over Ireland and a crowd of smaller islands and colonies; the United Kingdom holds it over colonies and dependencies of every kind, from [the Isle of] Man to New Zealand. Since the days of the Roman Commonwealth, no other land has had so large an experience of the

relations between a central power and half-incorporated states of various kinds.” Freeman, *Norman Conquest*, I, 145-6.

105. Freeman’s vitriol, it must be acknowledged, sometimes extended to subjects other than race. Consider the following, for example. “I believe I hate the British army more than any institution in being. . . . In our army every man, officer and private is there by his own choice. He is not consulted about that particular war; but he chose the man-slaying trade, when he might have chosen some other, so he is, what the conscript or *landwehr* man is not, responsible for being there. I grant this is rather ideal; and as circumstances go I don’t rate the responsibility very high, if only they keep quiet. But when they come back strutting and swaggering, talking as if they had done something to be proud of instead of ashamed, I hold that they make themselves accomplices with the Jew in the murder of the Zulus . . . I don’t value skill or bravery, any more than height, strength, or beauty, unless they are used to a good purpose.” Stephen, *Life of Freeman*, II, 198-9.

107. In a review of Freeman’s *Norman Conquest*, Green criticized the elitist, political bias of that work. “He [Freeman] passes silently by religion, intellect, society. He admires the people gathered in its witan, but he never takes us to the thegn’s hall or to the peasant’s hut. Of the actual life, manners, tastes of our forefathers the book tells us nothing.” J.R. Green, *Historical Studies*, Alice Stopford Green ed., (Macmillan, London, 1903), 105.

108. Leslie Stephen described Green’s approach to history as an effort “to bring out the unity and continuity of great religious or literary movements or of economic changes, such as the growth of town life.” “He had,” Stephen continued, “written within a brief compass, nothing less than the first history of England which would enable his countrymen to gain a vivid and continuous perception of the great processes by which the nation had been built up, and which had been overlooked or incidentally noticed in the histories which adhere rigidly to sequences of outward political fact.” Leslie Stephen ed., *Letters of John Richard Green*, (Macmillan, London, 1901), 211-2.

112. Over the years, Alice Green became increasingly conscious of the importance of history in the self-conception of a nation. Whenever conquerors have marched in “to depress and subjugate a race,” she argued in one of her later writings, “they have slammed the doors” on the history of the subjugated, “and left them alone, spiritless, and forlorn, passed by and forgotten by the Ages, despised of themselves and of their neighbors.” Shorn of all possibility of civilization and achievement, this historical erasure of the colonized other became an “immense void,” which the imperialists filled with epithets of his backwardness; “‘savage’, ‘primeval’, ‘lawless’,

'brutish' and the rest." Alice Stopford Green, *The Old Irish World*, (Gill, Dublin, 1912), 34, 94.

113. A long indigenous tradition of education, poetry and learning was reinforced by the connection with Spain, Italy, and the Mediterranean centers of Renaissance thought. A vibrant international trade opened the way to economic expansion based on a healthy foundation of fishing, timber, linen and woolen production, as well as fine craftsmanship. Even the English colonists who arrived as agents of royal authority, according to Green, quickly adapted to Irish ways, which they infused with their entrepreneurial spirit, thereby quickening the development of towns and trade. Alice Stopford Green, *The Making of Ireland and its Undoing*, (Macmillan, London, 1909), 235-259.

114. Exactly why these new imperialists were so much more destructive than their predecessors is a question Alice Green never adequately addresses. At times, she attributes their relentlessness to a newfound spirit of capitalism, at other times, to the cupidity of the King (Henry VIII) and the Tudor state. Conspicuously absent is any discussion of the role of religion, or the paradox that the most ruthless of seventeenth century Ireland's ethnic cleansers were often the most aggressive promoters of English liberty. Green, *Making and Undoing*, 360-494.

115. It would be interesting to explore the relationship between John and Alice Green in more detail, since it was unclear whether his premature death forestalled a historiographical rupture that would have sent them in opposite directions, or whether they would have coalesced into another distinguished husband/wife partnership on the order of the Hammonds or the Webbs. At the age of twenty-two, John enumerated for his friend Boyd Dawkins, the qualities that he anticipated in an ideal wife. "Some quiet, demure little party . . . who will never invade my study or pop in on my musings with some vapid suggestion to visit the Blinks or some bothering inquiry about papering and painting. Some one who won't talk of her love, or expect demonstrations in return, but whose love will be like sunshine, cheering and warming and comforting, and lighting up all the corners of one's morbid temperament. Some one who can decipher my horrible scrawl and copy my manuscripts for the printer. Some one who can pet our little ones without spoiling them, who will care for me without overcaring for me, who will be charitable without any anxiety for the niggers of Timbuctoo." Stephen, *Letters of Green*, 31-3. Getting more than he bargained for with Alice seems to have pleased Green, and he grew ever more dependent on her as his health declined. Indeed, "he was so much pleased with her notes that he promoted her to co-operate in his own task," presumably writing. Stephen, *Letters of Green*, 396. After Green's death, Alice took control of his manuscripts, and engaged in an extensive correspondence with Stubbs, before striking out on her own into the much less charted waters of Irish history. W.H. Hutton ed., *Letters of William Stubbs*, (London, 1904), 190-1, 193-5,

275. Still, it does not augur entirely well for the scenario of collaboration to learn that John Green had once contemplated writing a history of Ireland, but “abandoned the idea because the continuous record of misery and misgovernment was too painful to contemplate.” Stephen, *Letters of Green*, 391.

118. “The study of modern and medieval history is . . . the process of the acquisition of at once a stock of facts, the ignorance of which unfits a man from playing the very humblest part of citizen. . . . Scarcely a single movement now visible in the current of modern affairs but can be traced back with some distinctness to its origin in the early middle ages.” William Stubbs, *Seventeen Lectures on the Study of Medieval and Modern History*, (Oxford, 1887) 2, 17. Similarly, “the study of medieval history, that is of the ages in which the things that are precious to us were rooted and sprang up, but had not yet entered into the phases in which controversy is most bitter or in which political questions of the day are most directly engaged, has always seemed to me to furnish very good training.” Stubbs, *Seventeen Lectures*, 108-9. Finally, “We try to train the judgment by investigating causes, effects, ideas and results, rights and wrongs in a subject sufficiently akin to modern life to engage lively feeling and yet sufficiently apart from it to prevent party views from being predominant.” Stubbs, *Seventeen Lectures*, 238-9.

119. “It was not my work to make men Whigs or Tories, but to do my best having Whigs and Tories . . . to make the Whigs good sensible Whigs, and the Tories good and sensible Tories.” Stubbs, *Seventeen Lectures*, 35.

120. “Independently of the agency of the church,” Stubbs asserted, “I can see no general progress of the kind in the world’s history at all, nothing whatever that entitles us to regard the most advanced portion of mankind as representative of the whole race, the majority of nations and ages lying outside the sphere of the assumed process of the second.” Yet Stubbs clearly believed that the history of England was exceptional, worthy of study both because it was essential to English identity, and because it was the history of progress, at least over the *longue durée*. “The history of our country is in one way of looking at it the history of ourselves; it is the history of our mind and body – of our soul and spirit also – for it tells how our fathers before us became what they were, and how our ways depart from or resemble theirs – how they won the liberties in which we have grown to be what we are – how they received and modified and handed down to us the inheritance of the old time before them – how the true history of a people is the history of its laws and institutions, more especially of its manners; and manners, as we know, maketh man.” William Stubbs, *Lectures on Early English History*, (London, 1906) 1, 195.

121. “In working through the history of our own country, we should come, no doubt, upon many lines of inquiry as to institutions that have long been obsolete,

and influences that have no direct representative among the influences of the day; we shall trace the progress of extinct families, and the growth and disuse of worn-out fashions of thought, dress and manners; but without such reading we cannot trace the origin of existing influences and institutions with anything like an appreciation of their proportion and relation to national life. . . . The tree that has stood for centuries bears to the microscopic investigator marks of every winter that has passed over it; it has not cast aside one dead leaf or rotten branch which would not, had it remained, have made the tree something different from what it has become." Stubbs, *Seventeen Lectures*, 118.

122. In a letter to Freeman, dated November 8, 1857 Stubbs wrote, "Have you seen Buckle on Civilization, volume I? There are to be ten. I do not believe in the Philosophy of History, and so do not believe in Buckle. I fear you will make me out a heretic indeed after such a confession." Stubbs, *Letters*, 41-2. In his *Constitutional History*, Stubbs showed that he had thought the matter through more carefully, and did not so much object to theory in history as to its application in a unilateral or one dimensional way. "No theory or principle works in isolation," he avowed. "The most logical conclusions from the truest principles are practically false, unless in drawing them allowance is made for the counter-working of other principles, equally true in theory and equally dependent for practical truth on co-ordination with the first." Stubbs, *Constitutional History*, I, 32. "We cannot study history without generalisation," he concluded in his *Early English History*, "but it is a great and fatal error to depend on such generalisations as a perfect and sufficient reading of history, still more to exalt them into laws, into necessary conditions of the moral government of the world." Stubbs, *Early English History*, 195. It was indeed, by establishing the proper relationship between the general and the particular that History could be made genuinely scientific. The historian's method was "like that of the astronomer who, when from calculating the perturbations and so on of the heavenly bodies he has inferred the existence of a hitherto unknown planet." It would then be a moment of triumph when on "some bright evening and with a new improved glass he discovers the real planet of which he had been thinking, and sees in it not only a great new fact of science, but a proof of the correctness of his computations, a substantial reward for his efforts." Stubbs, *Seventeen Lectures*, 91, 93, 105.

123. "History repeats itself we know, parallels and cycles recur, the speculative mind can evaluate the curve in which political progress moves, trace the contortions of the unruly spiral, and eschew a cusp as a historic anomaly. But the dealings of human wills, in countless combinations, and circumstances which no theory can ever exhaustively calculate, are not the field for dogmatic assumption or speculative classification." Stubbs, *Seventeen Lectures*, 104.

126. "As the national customs which belong to the lowest range of machinery [at the local level] are subject to the fewest organic changes, these [local] courts have continued to exist until the present day. In the vestry meeting, the freemen of the township, the ratepayers still assemble for purposes of local interest." Stubbs, *Constitutional History*, I, 91. By contrast, political institutions at the national level were loci of constant struggle between kings, nobles, people and foreign powers. For this reason, they were sites of rapid selection, in which institutions were subject to constant evolutionary development and change. Stubbs, *Constitutional History*, I, 337.

139. "While municipal institutions on the European model were here of recent date, they had in Europe an almost unbroken history of two thousand years." "Considering how society was divided into castes and sects and religions and races," he observed, "it was surprising that there should be practicable anywhere a system of municipal election at once fair and free." Duff, *Maine*, 263-4.