

UC Berkeley

UC Berkeley Previously Published Works

Title

The Long Nineteenth Century in Intellectual History

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/2q25k638>

Journal

Journal of Victorian Culture, 6

Author

Bevir, Mark

Publication Date

2001

Peer reviewed

THE LONG NINETEENTH CENTURY IN INTELLECTUAL HISTORY

By

Mark Bevir

Department of Political Science

University of California, Berkeley

Berkeley

CA 94720-1950

USA

Email: mbevir@socrates.berkeley.edu

THE LONG NINETEENTH CENTURY IN INTELLECTUAL HISTORY

Historiographies

Railways and canals, children cleaning chimneys, Dickensian Christmases, cheeky cockneys, gas-lit streets, smog, formal drawing rooms, heavy furniture, and imperial adventures. Nineteenth-century Britain readily calls to mind certain images. Behind the images there lurks a historiography in which this era represents a time of unprecedented growth and modernization. During the early nineteenth century, the Industrial Revolution brought a sudden and rapid take-off to modernity: it wrought a decisive break with traditional society, inaugurating a world of factories, urbanization, the bourgeoisie, political reform, an organized working class, and class conflict and accommodation.¹ The images of the nineteenth century are thus over-whelmingly of industry, cities, a self-satisfied middle-class, and urban poverty.

Intellectual histories of the nineteenth century have long been subservient to this historiography and its images. Recently, however, a complex variety of linguistic turns have freed intellectual and cultural history from the hegemony of social history, and they have also encouraged social and economic historians to challenge the old historiography of the nineteenth century.² Within both of these trends, we find a revisionist insistence on powerful continuities between the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.³ Intellectual historians have followed into the nineteenth century political languages such as a popular radicalism committed to the people and political reform as opposed to the working-class and economic justice, or a discourse of commercial society that was concerned with the relationship between civility and trade.⁴ Social and economic historians have begun to

highlight the long, slow, and ambivalent nature of the Industrial Revolution, and the persistence of traditional technologies and workshop production.⁵

John Burrow and Donald Winch have been at the forefront of moves to rethink the intellectual history of the nineteenth century in Britain.⁶ As two volumes of essays recently published in their honor indicate, their work prompts us to move from a narrow focus on Queen Victoria's reign to a long view stretching from 1750 to 1950.⁷ How might we periodize intellectual history? What is at stake here in historiographic terms? And what can we learn here from Burrow, Winch, and their colleagues?

Before we answer these questions, we usefully might reflect very briefly on the nature of questions of periodization. Most intellectual historians today are suspicious of any appeal to Platonic forms or a Hegelian logic informing concrete historical particulars. Certainly I favor the nominalist view that history consists solely of particular utterances, texts, and beliefs, albeit that these are produced and understood in constant dialogue and interaction with one another. A similar nominalism appears, moreover, to inform, at least to some extent, the historicism of the Cambridge School with which Burrow and Winch are loosely associated.⁸ Anyway, if we take nominalism seriously, as I think we should, we will conclude that historical periods do not come in ready individuated parcels with clear boundaries. Rather, we individuate history into chunks of time or intellectual traditions for our purposes, so the way we seek to justify our periods or traditions should be by reference to that which we want to use them to explain.⁹ Nominalism suggests that every utterance represents a beginning in the sense of being a moment of creativity, but no utterance represents a beginning in the sense of being entirely uninfluenced by social traditions. When historians clump utterances, beliefs, or thinkers into traditions or when

they highlight moments when traditions underwent especially notable change in response to dilemmas, they can define and justify the relevant clumps only by reference to their purposes – to that which they wish to explain. When, as now, we do not want to explain anything in particular, but rather to survey an era, we should avoid reifying any one way of splitting time or of clumping thinkers as if it had a definite beginning, a monolithic content, or a precise end. We should explore the long intellectual history of the nineteenth century as a series of over-lapping beginnings, contents, and endings.

Beginnings

Burrow and Winch focus on the human sciences – history, economics, politics, and sociology – while remaining sensitive to the impact thereon of other domains of thought – the natural sciences as well as philosophy and theology. The Enlightenment, of course, profoundly influenced all these domains. Indeed, when Burrow and Winch reach back before 1800, they characteristically do so in order to draw out the debt of later social thinkers to themes emanating from the Scottish Enlightenment. The Enlightenment thus represents one prominent beginning to the long nineteenth century; one we might locate around 1750.

The Cambridge School has traced two main political languages through early modern Britain – natural jurisprudence and civic humanism. When Winch and others reread the Scottish Enlightenment in relation to these languages, they challenge the teleological reading of classical political economy in which Adam Smith appears as the founding father of modern economics.¹⁰ Adam Smith, as Winch and others remind us, sought to develop “the science of the statesman or legislator”: he examined the operation

of sympathy and prudence in the context of moral and psychological theories that are clearly contrary to the selfish, individualistic, and utilitarian assumptions of the modern economist. In addition, the Cambridge School has thus made us aware of the diverse contexts and contents of Enlightenment. The Parisian philosophes with their fervent secularism appear now as just one strand with a plurality of enlightenments that included protestant and ecclesiastical moments, such as the Scottish one and even an English one associated with Edward Gibbon.¹¹ This emphasis on the particularity and diversity of enlightenment thought should not obscure the fairly dramatic changes it wrought in what had gone before.¹² Metropolitan life and commerce posed dilemmas for the traditions of natural jurisprudence and civic humanism, and Enlightenment thinkers transformed both traditions in response to these dilemmas. So, for example, liberty became associated less with self-sufficiency than with sociability and exchange, where the Enlightenment science of society then understood sociability in terms of a conjectural “stadial” historiography, and exchange in terms analogous to the movement of the planets.

Duncan Forbes, a precursor of the Cambridge School, distinguished between the rationalism of the Scottish Enlightenment and the romanticism of Liberal Anglicans such as Thomas Arnold.¹³ The work of Winch and others on the Enlightenment has been seen as a critique of this dichotomy in that it problematizes the rationalism of the former by emphasizing both its moral aspects and its continuities with natural jurisprudence and civic humanism. Yet we might rescue a version of Forbes’s distinction – understood now as two waves of fairly dramatic change – if we expand our concept of romanticism in the same way as the Cambridge School have our concept of Enlightenment.¹⁴ Indeed when historians such as Winch rescue the Enlightenment from the crude rationalism with which

a simple contrast with the romantics used to associate it, they often set their histories up in explicit opposition to one we associate with romanticism. For example, when Mark Philips provides us with a richer understanding of enlightenment ideas of historical distance, he contrasts them with the romantic ideas of sympathy and identification.¹⁵ Romanticism thus represents a second beginning to the long nineteenth century; one we might locate around 1790.

The impact of romanticism brought concerns with agency, imagination, creativity, and the inner life of the mind, and it thereby challenged historiographical assumptions embedded in the Scottish Enlightenment. To some extent, romanticism represents a response by those with religious faith to the secular histories of Enlightenment. Yet, as J. G. A. Pocock's study of Gibbon reminds us, the English, and we might add the Scottish, Enlightenment contained within it greater latitude of belief than was found among the philosophes. To grasp the nature of the beginning associated with romanticism, we have to relate it less to a narrow counter-enlightenment and more to a broad concern with the organic. The romantics rejected the Enlightenment view of mind as passive and inert. They emphasized the living nature of the inorganic – at times even assimilating the organic to the inorganic – and thus the ability of living things to create a fluid, changing order for themselves through activity infused with purpose, thought, and imagination. To grasp the nature of the beginning associated with romanticism, we also have to recognize the particularity and diversity of national romanticisms, just as the Cambridge School do with Enlightenment. For example, even if British thought remained more universalistic and monogenetic than did German or French, it still broke with the Enlightenment in its concern with the organic, change, and imagination.¹⁶ The broad shift here associated

with romanticism appears throughout the sciences in the first half of the nineteenth century when questions of time, dynamics, and evolution challenged those of system, statics, and balance. So understood, of course, romanticism brought in its wake not only a new emphasis on imaginative sympathy with the inner lives of agents but also the rise of evolutionary approaches to the human sciences as discussed in Burrow's Evolution and Society.

While the Enlightenment and romanticism, with their inner diversities, represent the two great pan-European beginnings to the modern age, Britain also experienced more parochial beginnings.¹⁷ Perhaps the most important of these – a third beginning to the long nineteenth century – was evangelicalism, which we might date around 1800. As Boyd Hilton has shown, the social and economic thought associated with evangelicalism had much in common with that emerging out of the Scottish Enlightenment.¹⁸ It too represented a response to dilemmas such as commercialism and trade cycles, although it was also a response to new concerns posed by the French Revolution and English Jacobinism. Evangelical moralists sought to make sense of these dilemmas in explicitly theological terms. Characteristically they understood the commercial upheavals of the day alongside other calamities such as wars, revolutions, famines, and pestilence – they were sufferings that reflected God's justice. While such distinctions are rarely neat and tidy, Hilton does well to suggest that while Whigs often draw on enlightenment ideas, Tories owed more to evangelicalism, and that, within the later group, the extreme evangelicals – notably Lord Shaftsbury – believed God intervened continuously in human affairs, whereas Liberal Tories – notably the Clapham Sect – saw nature as more regular in a way which enabled them to adopt enlightenment ideas of economy.

Evangelicalism revolved around Atonement theology. Liberal Tories believed God had made the world so that natural laws operated to reward virtue and punish sin. From this perspective, for example, Malthusian economics represented the discovery of the laws established by a benevolent God.¹⁹ While the idle pursuit of pleasure would bring disaster and poverty, to recognize God's will (and Malthus's truths) and then act in a prudent manner would bring rewards. Hence, any attempt to protect improvident workers or businessmen who went bankrupt from the natural consequences of their sin was regarded not only as bad economics but also as contrary to the will of God. Poverty constituted a form of atonement by which one paid for one's sins. While evangelicalism thus overlapped with enlightenment economy, it also constituted a distinct movement of thought wedded to Protestant notions of character, duty, sacrifice, and truth. It linked economic concepts to these Protestant ones far more strongly than to those of sociability, manners, and sympathy. Evangelicalism also established a distinct domestic ideology. Social order and individual character depended on sacrifice and duty, both of which had to be defined by the Church and instilled by the family. Strict notions of appropriateness thus defined familial roles, such that, for instance, women were generally restricted to being obedient daughters, wives, and mothers.²⁰

Contents

Much of the intellectual history of the nineteenth century consists of the gradual development and transformation of enlightenment, romantic, and evangelical ideas. Burrow and Winch have been at the forefront of a turn away from "canonical" thinkers to an exploration of languages and traditions, including natural jurisprudence, philosophic

history, Paleyite theology, Toryism, and varieties of Whiggism. Their work exhibits, in particular, a sensitivity to themes, concepts, and vocabularies that were formulated during the Scottish Enlightenment, and that then echo through diverse contexts in which they serve varied purposes at different moments and in different debates. That Noble Science of Politics, written by Stefan Collini, Burrow, and Winch, for example, explores how later thinkers deployed themes derived from the Scottish Enlightenment to conceive of the political.²¹ But that is not quite the right way to describe their book, for while it begins with early nineteenth century economists who clearly were indebted to “the system of Edinburgh”, it goes on to consider later political thinkers, such as Walter Bagehot, who expressed hostility to just this system – it is these later thinkers who inspire their most nuanced, but also most awkward, readings. The historical issue here is the relationship of the liberalism of the middle of the nineteenth century to the variety of Whiggism that emerged out of the Scottish Enlightenment. Collini, Burrow, and Winch want to stress the continuities between the two.

Whatever we make of the relationship of Liberalism to Whiggism, we should think about the content of nineteenth century thought in relation to all our beginnings, evangelicalism and romanticism as well as the Scottish Enlightenment. For a start, Hilton seems to be pretty much right when he suggests evangelical thought played a more important role than classical political economy, let alone utilitarianism, in inspiring the loosely laissez-faire, free-trade individualism that proved so prevalent in the first half of the nineteenth-century. Winch, of course, has devoted considerable attention to figures such as Malthus in a way that has helped to direct historians of economic theory away from a simplistic lineage running from Smith through Ricardo to J. S. Mill.²² Yet it is

from Boyd Hilton we learn to suspect that too great an emphasis on the Enlightenment's legacy might obscure themes found in much of the political economy of the nineteenth century. Notions of catastrophe and of God's plan were at least as significant as those of economic rationality, sociability, or a natural system. In addition, we are, I believe, only starting to appreciate the ways in which a romantic organicism played itself out through much of the social thought of the nineteenth century. Burrow, of course, has drawn our attention to the attempts by Herbert Spencer, Sir Henry Maine, and E. B. Tylor to explore cultural diversity, and he has thereby helped to direct historians of evolutionary thinking away from a simplistic focus on Darwin. Yet it is from historians of science that we learn to locate such evolutionary thinking in the context of the broad concern with the organic I have linked to romanticism.²³ A narrow romantic lineage runs through nineteenth century thought from S. T. Coleridge and William Wordsworth to John Ruskin and William Morris. A broader organicism appears in the concepts of time, change, variety, and life that spread through the sciences into social theory, literature, and popular culture.

A recognition of the impact of evangelicalism and romanticism on nineteenth century thought might prompt us to insist on a greater discontinuity between Liberalism and Whiggism than does Burrow. We might even suggest the appearance of Liberalism stands as a fourth beginning, located around 1835, and signaling the impact of French rationalism and romantic organicism on the Whiggism of the Scottish Enlightenment. While the early nineteenth century witnessed a confrontation between romanticism and Enlightenment, the middle of the century finds them becoming far more intermingled largely as a result of attempts to restate themes drawn from theorists such as Adam Smith and Jeremy Bentham within the context of a more organic way of thinking concerned

with cultural variety, evolution, and human agency. Liberalism stands as a distinct beginning informed by this intermingling, as well as lingering aspects of evangelicalism.

Liberalism, I am suggesting, differed significantly from earlier Whig ideas, in large part because of the influence of a romantic organicism but also because of the impact of a more radical enlightenment best represented by Jeremy Bentham.²⁴ To say this is not to deny the persistence of Scottish Enlightenment and Whig thought late in nineteenth century, nor that Whig thought offered an alternative to utilitarianism, nor yet that there is some continuity of themes between such thought and Liberalism. It is, rather, to draw our attention to the extent and manner in which Liberalism broke with such thought.²⁵ One aspect of this break arises from the debt Liberalism owed utilitarianism and its individualistic psychology.²⁶ Even if we now recognize James Mill as a student of Dugald Stewart who developed a philosophical history of India very much in keeping with the Whiggism of the Scottish Enlightenment, we should not lose sight of his debt to Bentham. He was, after all, a utilitarian who believed rational argument typically led people to make rational assessments and then to act upon these.²⁷ Similarly, we cannot read J. S. Mill adequately unless we grasp how he grappled with a utilitarian legacy as well as that of classical political economy.²⁸ J. S. Mill's psychological theory, like that of most Liberals, remained far more individualistic than that of the Scottish Enlightenment. Utilitarianism, with its individualistic psychology, could generate a general presumption against state intervention and arguments for democratic reform in ways classical political economy could not. Throughout the middle of the nineteenth century, then, Liberals and radicals often explored liberty and democracy in terms of individuals recognizing and safeguarding their own interests as much as a security and regularity based on sociability,

commerce, the rule of law, and Whig constitutionalism.²⁹ Similarly, J. S. Mill's ethical theory remained utilitarian in inspiration even as he sought to modify it to allow that self-interest was insufficient as a criterion of goodness. Even after he rejected Bentham's formulation of utilitarianism, he continued to "regard utility as the ultimate appeal on all ethical questions," adding only that "it must be utility in the largest sense, grounded on the permanent interests of man as a progressive being."³⁰ Throughout the middle and late nineteenth century, Liberals and radicals – including academics such as Henry Sidgwick, public intellectuals such as Herbert Spencer, and activist popularizers such as Annie Besant – couched their moral theorizing in the framework of a formal utilitarianism that had been absent from the Scottish Enlightenment.

Liberalism represents a clear departure from earlier modes of thought. One obstacle to recognizing this arises perhaps from the confusion created by the conflation of utilitarianism with classical political economy by the Culture and Society thesis. Really Liberals derived their political economy from the Scottish Enlightenment in a way that typically bypassed utilitarianism: James Mill and Ricardo had doubts about Bentham's soundness as a political economist.³¹ Yet Liberals derived much of their psychology and ethics from Benthamite utilitarianism in a way that left little space for the Whiggism associated with the Scottish Enlightenment. While Burrow and Winch usefully remind us of the Whig influence on liberal political economy, we should not be seduced thereby into ignoring the clear differences between Liberals and Whigs in psychology and ethics.

Another aspect of the break wrought by liberals arises from the organicist or romantic twist they gave to the political economy of the Scottish Enlightenment as well as utilitarianism. In political economy, we find as early as Ricardo a shift in the concept

of labor toward a notion that has a more intimate relationship to life conceived as organic and creative.³² Whereas Smith had treated labor largely as representing a certain amount of value, Ricardo understood labor in terms of the toil, energy, and time of living people. Whereas Smith saw labor as a unit common to all commodities and so a measure of value, Ricardo defined labor as the activity that produces things and so the source of value. Hence, Ricardo opened the door to a more dynamic political economy depicting less an equilibrium brought about by a hidden hand than slumps and booms brought about by shifts in the amount of labor at work in society. A similar organicist twist appears, of course, in J. S. Mill's psychological, ethical, and historical theorizing. When J. S. Mill pondered the accusation that he had a naively individualistic view of human nature, he considered he had avoided this not by remaining true to a Whig heritage but by studying the cultural theories of Coleridge and other romantics. More generally, when he spoke of the "revolt of the nineteenth century against the eighteenth", he referred to the widespread accommodation of romantic notions of cultural diversity, social embeddedness, and creative imagination in contrast to earlier universal, individualistic, and materialistic theories of human nature.³³ J. S. Mill thus set romantic insights to play within a broadly Benthamite framework. His departures from philosophic radicalism toward, say, a concern with national character reflect principally the impact of the romantics. Likewise, the limits to his romanticism – say, his analysis of national character in terms of laws and the physical environment as opposed to a national or racial spirit – reflect principally his clear debt to philosophic radicalism. We should not be surprised, therefore, to find that Liberals less firmly rooted in Benthamism often took a

more romantic line, including, at least among the University Liberals, a belief in biological or racial characters apparent in national histories.³⁴

Liberalism represents a fourth beginning, quite distinct from, though infused by, the Scottish Enlightenment and romanticism. As a beginning, moreover, it played an integral part in defining the content of nineteenth-century thought. We might even suggest that the dominant intellectual current of the middle and late nineteenth century was Liberalism combined with evangelical notions of truth, duty, and a related concern to raise the moral tone of the individual members of society.³⁵ We also might suggest that this intellectual combination found a loose political expression in the popular liberalism of Gladstone's times that so dislocated the Whigs. Hence, whereas Burrow concludes, "the Whig line was held" against romanticism even if this was a tight thing, we might suggest that romantic organicism – especially when located alongside utilitarianism – decisively transformed the Whig line thereby leading to a rupture associated with Liberalism.³⁶ Of course, to recognize that Liberalism differs from Whiggism, and that it does so because it has roots in utilitarianism, romanticism, and evangelicalism, is not to imply nineteenth-century Liberals believed in markets and democracy understood in the terms since bequeathed to us, and read into them, by neoliberal apologists such as F. A. Hayek. Far from believing in pure markets, nineteenth-century Liberals remained very ambivalent about the inroads the market economy seemed to be making in civil society. J. S. Mill argued, "the most serious danger to the future prospects of mankind is in the unbalanced influence of the commercial spirit."³⁷ Similarly, instead of treating all democratic citizens equally, nineteenth-century Liberals were moral or intellectual elitists, often fairly contemptuous of the common people. We might think here of J. S.

Mill's sympathetic treatment of Samuel Coleridge's notion of a clerisy, and also of his proposals for plural voting.³⁸

While historians such as Burrow and Winch have done much to transform our understanding of large parts of the high culture of the nineteenth century, there have been equally significant developments in the study of other aspects of nineteenth-century history. Much might be gained, I believe, from juxtaposing these developments with those pioneered by Burrow, Winch, and their colleagues. One significant development within the study of nineteenth-century society has been the surge of interest in popular culture brought about in large part by the impact of various linguistic turns on social history. Among the intellectual history this has inspired, some draws on the Cambridge School's work on the Scottish Enlightenment. Indeed, historians such as Greg Claeys and Gareth Stedman Jones have examined the legacy of traditions such as civic humanism and natural jurisprudence, with their use respectively of conjectural history and contractarianism, on nineteenth century radicalism and socialism. The ways in which the thinkers of the Scottish Enlightenment responded to commercialism from within these traditions influenced not only later Whigs but also agrarian republicans, chartists, and socialists. While Thomas Paine is a major figure here, we now have studies that take the story forward to radicals and socialists throughout the nineteenth century.³⁹ Nineteenth century popular radicals and socialists, we now know, continued to regard political reform as a means of transforming a corrupt state so as to ensure the well-being of a virtuous people. Concerns with class and economic exploitation often came later, and even then they often did so in a framework of civic humanism. We also have studies that

explore the influence of traditions such as civic humanism and natural jurisprudence upon popular Toryism and loyalism in the early nineteenth century.⁴⁰

No doubt the neglect of popular culture by Burrow, Winch, and their colleagues derives from a natural concern to study “what one finds interesting.”⁴¹ Yet maybe it also reflects, at least to some extent, the hegemony of social history over the study of popular practices and movements, a hegemony that encourages intellectual historians to restrict their studies to high culture. Whether or not this is so, it seems clear that we can hope to deploy the work of Burrow, Winch, and their colleagues to offer a new historiography of the nineteenth century taken as some kind of whole only by exploring popular culture. We need to know not only about the intellectual and political elite, but also about how their ideas, and the policies they fought for, both played to and impacted on other groups in society.⁴² We need to bring the work of Burrow, Winch, and their colleagues together with similar work on popular liberalism, feminism, and, for that matter, popular religious movements, scientific thought, and popular political economy.⁴³

So far I have deliberately neglected the postmodern strand in recent readings of popular culture.⁴⁴ Although the postmodernists explore intellectual or cultural history as do Burrow, Winch, and Stedman Jones, they do so from a notably different theoretical position. Although social contexts often have an enormous influence on the ideas and actions of individuals, this does not imply we should cease to treat ideas as the properties of individuals or cultural practices as the products of human agency; it means only that the ideas and actions individuals adopt exhibit the influence of social forces rather than being the products of autonomous reasoning. All too often, however, postmodernists treat ideas and culture as fixed by a quasi-structure in a way that appears to rule out

agency as well as autonomy. As a result, postmodern histories of nineteenth-century culture, for all their energy and all their verve, characteristically remain blind to two significant issues. The first is the diverse beliefs people hold on any topic: because postmodernists postulate quasi-structures, they tend to look for shared conventional or linguistic meanings, often conceived as binary oppositions, rather than the diverse beliefs agents express in speech and action using these conventions. The second blind-spot of postmodernism covers the ways discourses, ideas, or beliefs change over time: the postmodernists suspicion of the real precludes their appealing to social or economic experience as a source of change, and their reduction of meanings to quasi-structures precludes their explaining change in terms of agency. One might hope that historians such as Burrow and Winch will help to draw attention to these blind-spots.

Another significant development within the study of nineteenth-century culture has been the surge of interest in issues of race and Empire. These issues have been addressed mainly from within quasi-structural perspectives such as postmodernism.⁴⁵ As such, they provide a good example of areas in which we might hope Burrow, Winch, and their colleagues might draw attention to the diverse and changing nature of nineteenth-century beliefs. To some extent, they already have begun to do so. Peter Mandler, for example, has explored notions of race and nation in the Whiggism that emerged out of the Scottish Enlightenment – by concentrating on the historians and anthropologists about whom Burrow has written so extensively.⁴⁶ Throughout the nineteenth-century, historical and Whig thought led, according to Mandler, to a civilizational perspective that remained hostile to organic concepts of race and nation and that possessed instead a universalist character.

There are, I suspect, partially hidden ethical debates at play here. Postcolonialists want to condemn the civilizational perspective as racist, and they do so by assimilating it to the organic one. If this is so, then their hidden ethical argument ignores the sorts of subtleties explored in Jacques Derrida's discussion of Martin Heidegger's spiritual racism – which resembles the civilizational perspective – in relation to the biological racism of the Nazi's – which had a more organic quality.⁴⁷ As Derrida shows, we can recognize a certain similarity between the two, and we can thus pose awkward questions to the former, without thereby conflating them. We can recognize the dangers lurking in the civilizational perspective whilst allowing that these are not as great as those of biological racism, and even that more is lost than gained by suggesting otherwise. Besides, surely we should at least distinguish the two as different modes of thought before exploring how and why they do or do not lead to similar ethical dangers? Surely we should not elide the two because of some naïve assumption that thought on race and on nation is inevitably structured by binary oppositions and the possibilities that these provide? Indeed, because postcolonial historians have taught us to think about the impact of western discourses on colonial and postcolonial thought, it is worth pointing out that to neglect the civilizational perspective is to miss one of the main sets of arguments that nationalists used against the Empire.⁴⁸

Instead of reading-off a monolithic nineteenth-century discourse on race and nation from some quasi-structural, binary opposition, Mandler examines the actual beliefs people expressed. Unfortunately, however, he does not adequately bring out the diversity of these beliefs because, like several of Burrow and Winch's colleagues, he takes British culture to be the almost exclusive preserve of Whigs. Here, then, our earlier insistence on

romanticism, evangelicalism, and Liberalism as distinct beginnings might lead us to modify Mandler's argument. Even while we allow that a civilizational perspective remained dominant over any attempt to think an organic and racial nationalism, we should not let this obscure either the virulent hostility of many evangelicals and utilitarian Liberals to other cultures, or the extent to which strands of nineteenth century thought drew on romanticism and organicism to sustain theories of social evolution, at times even an abrasive social Darwinism. Nineteenth-century thought included strong biological strands of racism, in, for example, the eugenics movement.⁴⁹ One way of making such hostilities and racism clearer might be, once again, to extend the approach of Burrow and Winch to areas over which social history long held sway, such as the everyday practices of Empire. After all, as Mandler rightly observes, "in practice, imperial responsibilities might elicit harsher and more pessimistic responses, in which the image was not so much of a 'superior race' converting others 'into efficient members of a free community' . . . but rather the superior race making its superiority felt by discipline, violence, and even extermination."⁵⁰

Endings

The endings of the long nineteenth century, like its contents, reflect its beginnings in the Enlightenment, romanticism, evangelicalism, and Liberalism. Yet Burrow, Winch, and their colleagues, are less useful guides to the endings than to the beginnings and contents. Of course, this principally reflects the temporal span of the bulk of their work. Nonetheless, their work can give rise to misleading impressions of twentieth century thought. Their focus on the persistence of an elite Whig tradition fed by the universities

becomes increasingly myopic as that tradition fades out.⁵¹ Sometimes, moreover, their radar screens do not pick up other intellectual movements until they have an influence on Whiggish types with strong links to the universities. So, for example, to treat Anglo-Marxism as something that emerges around 1930 when various university intellectuals pick it up and read it alongside Whiggism is to neglect its emergence in the 1880s when H. M. Hyndman, William Morris, and others read Marx from within various British traditions.⁵²

Having sought to rescue Liberalism as a distinct beginning, I want immediately to bury it. Liberalism merged classical political economy with utilitarianism while also modifying them both to allow for a more organic outlook. In the 1860s, however, J. S. Mill renounced the wages fund doctrine, which had been integral to classical political economy since Ricardo.⁵³ More generally, classical political economists confronted uncomfortable statistical evidence that during the 1850s and 1860s trade unions had expanded, wages and living conditions had risen, and there had been a population boom. This evidence combined to undermine the two leading doctrines of the classical theory of distribution. On the one hand, the idea that trades unions could raise wages challenged the wages-fund theory according to which there is in the short term a fixed amount of savings to pay wages. On the other, the concurrence of rising living standards and a population boom challenged the Malthusian idea that population growth responded to wages so as to ensure a “natural” tendency to subsistence wages. Classical political economy, and with it Liberalism, thus came to an end around 1875.

Bagehot famously pronounced political economy dead “in the public mind.”⁵⁴ With classical political economy removed, Liberalism had little content left other than a

formal utilitarianism and a series of evangelical concerns. As a political movement, the popular liberalism of Gladstone's early ministries collapsed into a series of special issues and fads with no over-arching program other than a vague tone of non-conformity. The collapse of classical political economy pushed Liberals initially towards forms of historical theorizing parallel to those of the Whigs, and before long to new economic theories parallel to themes in social democracy. The new liberalism of J. A. Hobson and L. T. Hobhouse was, therefore, quite different from that of the middle of the nineteenth century.⁵⁵ It drew more on historical and sociological ideas than on the old conjunction of utilitarianism and classical political economy.

When political economy finally reasserted itself in the early twentieth century, it did so as economics, and with a very different relationship to Liberalism. The emergence of economics occurred in large part due to the rise of marginal analysis as pioneered by W. S. Jevons's Theory of Political Economy (1871). Jevons, unlike the classical political economists, extended the utilitarian theory of rationality to economics. He interpreted all costs in terms of disutility thereby making them substitutable for one another and making the price of commodities products of their final degree of utility. Economics, unlike classical political economy, thus focused on the static analysis of a system in equilibrium. For many later economists, then, the market was an inherently efficient way of allocating resources within the frame of a stable equilibrium. Neoclassical economics thus provided neoliberals with a novel argument, on purely economic grounds, against intervention by the state. When economists, following J. M. Keynes, advocated state intervention, they did so because they thought the operation of the market led to an imperfect equilibrium and the state could put this right by appropriate, periodic interventions.

The next ending to the long nineteenth century, one we might date around 1880, was that of evangelicalism.⁵⁶ Late Victorians increasingly responded to dilemmas such as geology, historical criticism of the Bible, and the theory of evolution by moving from an Atonement theology to an Incarnational one and also to other forms of immanentist thought. The Victorian crisis of faith arose in part because of Darwin's presentation of the theory of evolution. Recently historians of science have taught us to push back the date of Darwin's discovery, locating it more firmly in the context of existing biological thought.⁵⁷ Burrow had earlier taught us that theories of social evolution were up and running before Darwin, and that they often neglected the distinctive ideas Darwin did introduce. Together these teachings suggest we think of evolutionary theory as a product of the romantic organicism that begun around 1790. Equally, we might see the Victorian crisis of faith not as an inexorable secularization but as the fall of evangelicalism under pressure from organic romanticism. We then could take on board all the recent work that suggests the crisis of faith did not lead to secularization so much as complex shifts in religious thought and practice.⁵⁸ Geological discoveries, historical studies of the Bible, moral doubts, and evolutionary theory all combined to prompt a shift from a view of God as a transcendent judge to one of God as present in the world and working through evolution processes so as to realize his will.

Religious thought thus came to emphasize God's immanent presence in the world. Christians, for example, stressed his incarnation in Jesus, the importance of the Church he established, and the basis for faith provided by our inner moral voice. Immanentists as diverse as the Anglican J. R. Illingworth, the Congregationalist R. J. Campbell, and Besant in her theosophical guise believed in the existence of an inner reality, the unity of

all things, and the purposive nature of evolution: God was in each of us, uniting us in a single spiritual whole, and guiding this whole towards a spiritual fulfillment consisting largely of a self-conscious awareness of divine unity. Such immanentism replaced the evangelical stress on a transcendent God who had instituted static, natural laws to reward virtue and punish sin. It also promoted a new ethic. God's presence in us, immanentists believed, unites us in a universal fellowship that requires us to look to the material as well as moral uplift of the unfortunate. Increasingly cooperative and social moralities thus augmented or replaced evangelical individualism. At times, moreover, the state came to stand as an expression of our unity and so a vehicle for social reform in a way that gradually eroded the almost entirely formal role given to the state by earlier thinkers. Although evangelical notions such as truth, duty, and sacrifice continued to retain a hold on the ethical imagination, their content changed dramatically in ways suggested by Beatrice Webb when she wrote of the "transference of the emotion of self-sacrificing service from God to man."⁵⁹

In some respects, then, we can date the end of the long nineteenth century around 1890. The decline of Liberalism and evangelicalism saw the rise of various movements that were at odds with the cultures of the beginning and the middle of the long nineteenth century, movements such as philosophical idealism, theosophy, Christian socialism, and the new liberalism. In other respects, however, these new movements – this new culture – still exhibits clear continuities with romantic organicism and Enlightenment Whiggism. Thus, we might delay the end of the long nineteenth century until modernism and World War One end these continuities.

We might date the ending of romanticism, together with emergence of Bloomsbury, around 1910.⁶⁰ While the Victorian crisis of faith inspired an immanentism that reflected the impact of evolutionary, organic, and romantic thought, it also gave rise to modernist forms of skepticism that were contrary to this immanentism. It could make nineteenth-century narratives of universal progress appear too optimistic and ambitious. And it could make nineteenth-century notions of truth and duty appear too rigid and too austere, perhaps even hypocritical shams. Modernism thus embodied more cautious and more constrained, less self-confident, ways of knowing and being.⁶¹ Scientists and social thinkers shifted their focus from wholes and their evolution to atomistic and analytical studies of discrete, discontinuous elements and their assemblage. Graham Wallas called for a political science based on the quantitative study of actual behavior, not deductions from assumptions about reason, character, and social evolution.⁶² Similarly, artists and moralists, notably the Bloomsbury group, turned from individual and social duties to good states of mind and personal relations. Keynes recalled how his acceptance of G. E. Moore's view about the good in relation to oneself "made morals unnecessary" at least with respect to social duty.⁶³ At the edge of such modernism, moreover, we find ideas of self-reference, incompleteness, and radical subjectivity that were almost entirely absent from earlier thinking.

The experience of World War One decisively reinforced the modernist break with romantic and Enlightenment thinking. The War shattered belief in progress and reason. It undermined the romantic belief in the role of spirit or purpose within the organic, the Enlightenment conviction of the triumph of reason, and a Whig view of character and social evolution. History and social life could scarcely be seen any longer as expressions

of moral character or the philosophical and historical evolution of reason. Action had been conduct infused with reason, morality, and purpose. Now it increasingly became behavior to be analyzed either apart from any assumptions about mind or in relation to hidden desires and depths that often overpowered reason and morals. The final end of the long nineteenth century thus coincides with the rise of new approaches to the human sciences such as structuralism, behaviorism, and psychoanalysis. Even when political scientists pursued the study of comparative institutions in a way made familiar by James Bryce, they increasingly began to treat each institution as a discrete atom to be compared and classified with similar atoms in other systems, rather than as part of a whole political system to be understood in terms of its historical evolution. What is more, because the loss of faith in progress and reason left many people morally adrift, the final end of the long nineteenth century also coincides with the rise of new ethics, including not only the private values of art and friendship, but also utopias premised on an absolute revolutionary break with existing social life.

Of course, the end of the long nineteenth century did not happen all at once. Up until at least 1940 aspects of Enlightenment Whiggism, romanticism, evangelicalism, and Liberalism remained prominent within British culture. Keynes, a member of Bloomsbury and an analytical economist, was in many respects as much a Victorian as a modernist.⁶⁴ Nonetheless, the long nineteenth-century had come to an end by 1918, and those aspects of its culture that persisted thereafter are generally full of self-doubt and nostalgia.⁶⁵

Nineteenth Centuries

Burrow, Winch, and their colleagues suggest questions about the periodization of the intellectual history of the nineteenth century. They do so because they have traced into the nineteenth century languages and concerns the Cambridge School have taught us to see as integral parts of the Scottish Enlightenment.

A committed nominalism, I have suggested, prompts us to treat questions of periodization in a pragmatic manner, so that if we are seeking to characterize a period as a whole, we will do so in terms of a series of over-lapping beginnings, contents, and endings. In the case of the long nineteenth century, moreover, we fruitfully might characterize the beginnings, contents, and endings as the Enlightenment, romanticism, evangelicalism, and Liberalism. To do so, of course, is to take a broader perspective than that implicit in the emphasis Burrow, Winch, and their colleagues characteristically place on Whiggism. Indeed, I have suggested that in so far as we can postulate a dominant nineteenth-century culture, it was probably a Liberalism infused with evangelicalism. Alongside such liberalism, however, we need to set not only Whiggism as it emerged out of the Scottish Enlightenment, but also other expressions of both romantic organicism and evangelicalism. Equally, we should recognize that strands of the ending of each of these modes of thought can be found weaving its way back through nineteenth-century culture. Doubts about the political economy are already widespread by the late 1860s. At the same time, F. D. Maurice is promoting an Incarnational theology of a type that becomes increasingly influential through the 1880s and 1890s. And by the outbreak of World War One we find clear expressions of the modernism that displaced much enlightenment and romantic thought.

Collectively these endings led to an intellectual world very different from that of the long nineteenth century. For a start, the immanentist break with Atonement theology inspired a shift from notions of individual duty to community. In addition, the shift from romanticism and enlightenment thought to modernism inspired a shift from the study of the organic conceived in terms of reason to the analysis of atomized units in relation to hidden patterns and forces. Of course, the twentieth century, like the long nineteenth, contained diverse traditions with varied beginnings, contents, and endings. Still, while the dominant tone for much of the nineteenth century was perhaps a Liberalism infused with evangelical notions of truth, duty, and a related concern to raise up the moral tone of individuals, that which dominated much of the twentieth century was perhaps a social welfarism infused with specialist notions of expertise spread over constantly growing and more finely divided areas of society. The transition from the former to the latter was drawn out and gradual. But it did occur, and its doing so says much about why the world of 1950 looked so different from that of 1850.

¹ A. Briggs, The Age of Improvement, 1783-1867 (London: Longman, 1959) G. Kitson Clark, The Making of Victorian England (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1962); H. Perkin, Origins of Modern English Society, 1780-1880 (London: Routledge, 1969); and G. M. Young, Victorian England: Portrait of an Age (London: Oxford University Press, 1936).

² Overviews include M. Bevir and F. Trentmann, “Social Justice and Modern Capitalism: Historiographical Problems, Theoretical Perspectives”, European Legacy (forthcoming); R. Price, “Historiography, Narrative, and the Nineteenth Century”, Journal of British Studies 35 (1996), 220-256; and J. Thompson, “After the Fall: Class and Political Language, 1780-1900”, Historical Journal 39 (1996), 785-806.

³ An attempt to generate a new synthesis out of such continuities is R. Price, British Society, 1688-1880: Dynamism, Containment, and Change (Cambridge; Cambridge University Press, 1999).

⁴ On popular radicalism see P. Joyce, Visions of the People: Industrial England and the Question of Class, 1840-1914 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991); and G. Stedman Jones, “Rethinking Chartism”, in Languages of Class: Studies in English Working-class History, 1832-1982 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983). On republicanism and commercial society also see G. Claeys, Citizens and Saints: Politics and Anti-Politics in Early British Socialism (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989); and G. Claeys, “The Origins of the Rights of Labour: Republicanism, Commerce, and the Construction of Modern Social Theory in Britain 1796-1805”, Journal of Modern History 66 (1994), 249-90.

⁵ M. Berg, The Age of Manufactures, 1700-1820 (London: Fontana, 1985); M. Daunton, Progress and Poverty: An Economic and Social History of Britain, 1750-1850 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995); R. Samuel, "The Workshop of the World: Steam-Power and Hand-technology in Mid-Victorian Britain", History Workshop 3 (1977), 6-72.

⁶ Their most important works here are perhaps J. Burrow, Evolution and Society: A Study in Victorian Social Theory (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966); J. Burrow, A Liberal Descent: Victorian Historians and the English Past (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981); J. Burrow, Whigs and Liberals: Continuity and Change in English Political Thought (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988); S. Collini, D. Winch, and J. Burrow, That Noble Science of Politics: A Study in Nineteenth-Century Intellectual History (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983); D. Winch, Adam Smith's Politics: An Essay in Historiographic Revision (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978); and D. Winch, Riches and Poverty: An Intellectual History of Political Economy in Britain, 1750-1834 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

⁷ S. Collini, R. Whatmore, and B. Young, eds., History, Religion, and Culture: British Intellectual History 1750-1950 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000); and S. Collini, R. Whatmore, and B. Young, eds., Economy, Polity, and Society: British Intellectual History 1750-1950 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).

⁸ Q. Skinner, "Meaning and Understanding in the History of Ideas", in J. Tully, ed., Meaning and Context: Quentin Skinner and his Critics (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1988), pp. 29-67.

⁹ M. Bevir, The Logic of the History of Ideas (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), pp. 187-218.

¹⁰ Winch, Adam Smith's Politics; Winch, Riches and Poverty. For natural jurisprudence also see D. Forbes, "Sceptical Whiggism, Commerce, and Liberty", in A. Skinner & T. Wilson, eds. Essays on Adam Smith (Oxford, 1976), pp. 179-201; and K. Haakonssen, The Science of a Legislator: The Natural Jurisprudence of David Hume and Adam Smith (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981). For civic humanism also see I. Hont & M. Ignatief, Wealth and Virtue: The Shaping of Political Economy in the Scottish Enlightenment (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983); J. Pocock, Virtue, Commerce and History (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985); and D. Wooton, Republicanism, Liberty and Commercial Society, 1649-1776 (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1994). For related discussions see the contributions of E. J. Hundert, Dario Castiglione, Nicholas Phillipson, and Richard F. Teichgraeber III to Collini et. al., eds., Economy.

¹¹ See especially J. Pocock, Barbarism and Religion, 2 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999). For shorter studies of Gibbon in this vein see the contributions of J. G. A. Pocock and David Womersley to Collini, et. al., eds., History. Of course, if we take nominalism seriously, we will recognize the Enlightenment can be no more than an abstraction based on the diverse beliefs of particular thinkers within various national and social contexts.

¹² Some recognition of this change appears in most of the works already mentioned. Hundert and Castiglione highlight the dilemmas of metropolitan life and commerce as sources of change in their respective contributions to Collini et. al., Economy. On Adam Smith also see J. Robertson, "Scottish Political Economy Beyond the Civic Tradition:

Government and Economic Development in the Wealth of Nations”, History of Political Thought 2 (1983), 451-82.

¹³ D. Forbes, The Liberal Anglican Idea of History (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1952).

¹⁴ Compare M. Bevir, “English Political Thought in the Nineteenth Century”, History of Political Thought 17 (1996), 114-27. My differences with the Cambridge School reflect a concern that they seem to replace a fluid, philosophical nominalism with a more rigid methodological contextualism. Compare Bevir, Logic, pp. 31-77.

¹⁵ See Mark Philips’s contribution to Collini et. al., History. A similar point applies to Winch’s own critique (in Collini et. al. Economy) of the romantic conflation of simplified versions of classical economics and utilitarianism within the Culture and Society thesis.

¹⁶ See the contributions of Boyd Hilton and John Burrow to Collini et. al., History.

¹⁷ These two waves of change correspond somewhat to those highlighted in M. Foucault, The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences (New York: Vintage Books, 1994). For discussion along these lines see M. Bevir, “Humanism in and against The Order of Things”, Configurations 7 (1999), 191-209.

¹⁸ B. Hilton, The Age of Atonement: The Influence of Evangelicalism on Social and Economic Thought, 1785-1865 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991). Also see P. Mandler, “Tories and Paupers: Christian Political Economy and the Making of the New Poor Law”, Historical Journal 33 (1990), 81-103.

¹⁹ On Malthus’s own views see the extensive discussion in Winch, Riches and Poverty.

²⁰ Compare C. Hall, “The Early Formation of Victorian Domestic Ideology”, in S. Burman, ed., Fit Work for Women (New York, 1979), 15-32.

²¹ Collini et. al., Noble Science. The clearest examples of continuity are those explored by B. Fontana, Rethinking the Politics of Commercial Society: The Edinburgh Review 1802-32 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985).

²² This is true from his first book onward: D. Winch, Classical Political Economy and the Colonies (London: G. Bell, 1965).

²³ Yet for such histories of science, see now the contributions of Hilton and Burrow to Collini, et. al., eds., History.

²⁴ Whiggery and Liberalism led to the very different political formations discussed respectively in P. Mandler, Aristocratic Government in the Age of Reform: Whigs and Liberals, 1830-1852 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990); and E. Biagini, Liberty, Retrenchment, and Reform: Popular Liberalism in the Age of Gladstone (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992).

²⁵ The emphasis on the persistence of Whig thought thus represents a valuable corrective to the classic accounts of the nineteenth century by A. V. Dicey and Leslie Stephen. The recent attention given to Whigs is here complimented by the more restricted role ascribed to the Benthamites by W. Thomas, The Philosophic Radicals: Nine Studies in Theory and Practice, 1817-1841 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979).

²⁶ For a reading of Bentham that locates him in the new historiography while allowing for his differences with Whiggism see David Lieberman's contribution to Collini et. al, eds., Economy.

²⁷ James Mill is discussed in Collini, Burrow, and Winch, Noble Science, chap. 3. Also see, for his relation to utilitarianism, S. Stimson & M. Milgate, "Utility, Property, and

Political Participation: James Mill on Democratic Reform”, American Political Science Review 87 (1993), 901-11.

²⁸ On J. S. Mill’s engagement with the utilitarian psychology see T. Haskell, “Persons as Uncaused Causes: John Stuart Mill, the Spirit of Capitalism, and the ‘Invention’ of Formalism”, in Objectivity is not Neutrality: Explanatory Schemes in History (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998), pp. 318-67. On his utilitarianism see M. Stasser, The Moral Philosophy of John Stuart Mill (Wakefield, NH: Longwood Academic, 1991). And on how this Benthamite legacy interacted with that of classical political economy in his views on liberty see S. Stimson & M. Milgate, “Contested Liberties in 19th Century Political Thought: Mill, Liberty and the Facts of Life”, Political Studies (forthcoming).

²⁹ Here too we might distinguish between strands within Liberalism deriving from classical political economy and from utilitarianism. A liberal such as Ricardo could quite easily defend political liberty solely from the principles of political economy. See M. Milgate & S. Stimson, Ricardian Politics (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991).

³⁰ J. S. Mill, “On Liberty”, in The Collected Works of John Stuart Mill (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1963-91), vol. 18, p. 224.

³¹ We also might note how small a part political economy played in Bentham’s science of legislation. See Lieberman’s contribution to Collini et. al., eds., Economy.

³² Compare Foucault, Order of Things, pp. 253-63.

³³ J. S. Mill to C. Dupont-White, 6 April 1860, in Collected Works, vol. 15, p. 691.

³⁴ C. Harvie, The Lights of Liberalism: University Liberals and the Challenge of Democracy, 1860-86 (London: Allen Lane, 1976); and C. Parker, “The Failure of Liberal Racialism: The Racial Ideas of E. A. Freeman”, Historical Journal 24 (1981), 825-46. On

organic notions of English nationalism among Liberals also see J. Stapleton, “James Fitzjames Stephen: Liberalism, Patriotism, and English Liberty”, Victorian Studies 41 (1997-8), 243-63; and Stapleton’s contribution to Collini et. al., eds., History.

³⁵ See especially S. Collini, Public Moralists: Political Thought and Intellectual Life in Britain, 1850-1930 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991).

³⁶ Burrow, Liberal Descent, p. 241.

³⁷ J. S. Mill, “De Tocqueville on Democracy in America [II]”, in Collected Works, vol. 18, p. 198.

³⁸ J. S. Mill, “Considerations on Representative Government”, in Collected Works, vol. 19, p. 535. This elitism appears in the recent tendency to insert the word aristocratic before Liberal. See A. Kahan, Aristocratic Liberalism: The Social and Political Thought of Jacob Burckhardt, John Stuart Mill, and Alexis de Tocqueville (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992); and P. Ironside, The Social and Political Thought of Bertrand Russell: The Development of an Aristocratic Liberalism (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

³⁹ See footnote 4 above. Also see, on Paine, Richard Whatmore’s contribution to Collini et. al., eds., Economy; on the chartists, J. Bronstein, “The Homestead and the Garden Plot: Cultural Pressures on Land Reform in Nineteenth-Century Britain and the United States”, European Legacy (forthcoming); on the period after the chartists, M. Finn, After the Chartists: Class and Nation in English Radical Politics (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993); and on the transformation of such radicalisms during the socialist revival of the 1880s, M. Bevir, “Republicanism, Socialism, and Democracy in Britain: The Origins of the Radical Left”, Journal of Social History 34 (2000), 351-68.

⁴⁰ M. Philp, “Vulgar Conservatism”, English Historical Review 110 (1995), 42-69. We should note also that romanticism had an impact on Toryism similar to that it had on utilitarianism and political economy. See D. Eastwood, “Robert Southey and the Intellectual Origins of Romantic Conservatism”, English Historical Review 104 (1989), 308-31.

⁴¹ S. Collini, “General Introduction”, in Collini et. al., eds., History, p. 21.

⁴² On the state’s entanglement with cultural education as a means of creating suitable citizens see D. Lloyd & P. Thomas, Culture and the State (New York: Routledge, 1998).

⁴³ Relevant examples include, for popular liberalism, E. Biagini & A. Reid, eds., Citizenship and Community: Liberals, Radicals, and Collective Identities in the British Isles, 1865-1931 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996); for feminism, S. Holton, Feminism and Democracy: Women’s Suffrage and Reform Politics in Britain, 1900-1918 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986); for religious and scientific thought, Hilton, Age of Atonement; and for popular political economy, F. Trentmann, Civil Society, Commerce, and the ‘Citizen-Consumer’”, in F. Trentmann, ed., Paradoxes of Civil Society: New Perspectives on Modern German and British History (New York: Berghahn Books, 2000), 283-305; and F. Trentmann, “Free Trade and Popular Political Economy”, in P. O’Brien & D. Winch, eds., The Political Economy of British Economic Experience, 1688-1914 (forthcoming).

⁴⁴ See P. Joyce, Visions of the People: Industrial England and the Questions of Class, 1840-1914 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991); and P. Joyce, Democratic Subjects: The Self and the Social in Nineteenth-Century England (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994).

⁴⁵ A. Burton, Burdens of History: British Feminists, Indian Women, and Imperial Culture, 1865-1915 (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1994); and A. McClintock, Imperial Leather: Race, Gender and Sexuality in the Colonial Context (New York: Routledge, 1995).

⁴⁶ See Peter Mandler's contribution to Collini et. al., eds., History. For another recent study of Whig thought on these issues see S. den Otter, "Rewriting the Utilitarian Market: Colonial Law and Custom in Mid-nineteenth Century British India", European Legacy (forthcoming). Although it was written long before the postmodern surge, we should also mention Winch, Classical Political Economy and the Colonies.

⁴⁷ J. Derrida, Of Spirit: Heidegger and the Question, trans. G. Bennington & R. Bowlby (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989); and for discussion see M. Bevir, "Derrida and the Heidegger Controversy: Global Friendship Against Racism", Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy 3 (2000), 121-138.

⁴⁸ Compare M. Bevir, "In Opposition to the Raj: Annie Besant and the Dialectic of Empire", History of Political Thought 19 (1998), 61-77.

⁴⁹ On evangelical views of India and its culture see Brian Young's contribution to Collini et. al., eds., History. On utilitarian views see Thomas, Philosophic Radicals, pp. 98-119. On romantic views see N. Leask, British Romantic Writers and the East: Anxieties of Empire (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1992). And on the eugenics movement see M. Freedon, "Eugenics and Progressive Thought: A Study in Ideological Affinity", Historical Journal 22 (1979), 645-71.

⁵⁰ Mandler, "Race and Nation", p. 231.

⁵¹ On the fading out of not only the Whig tradition but the elite culture that fed it see J. Stapleton, “Political Thought, Elites, and the State in Modern Britain”, Historical Journal 42 (1999), 251-68.

⁵² Contrast Stapleton, “Political Thought, Elites, and the State in Modern Britain”, 256-8.

⁵³ J. S. Mill, “Thornton on Labour and its Claims”, in Collected Works, vol. 5, pp. 631-68.

⁵⁴ W. Bagehot, The Collected Works of Walter Bagehot, 15 vols., ed. N. St John Stevas (London: Economist, 1965-86), Vol. 11: Economic Studies, p. 224. Examples of economists decrying the state of their discipline include W. Cunningham, “Political Economy as a Moral Science”, Mind 3 (1878), 369-83; and H. Foxwell, “The Economic Movement in England”, Quarterly Journal of Economics 2 (1888), 84-103.

⁵⁵ On the new liberalism see P. Clark, Liberals and Social Democrats; and M. Freedon, The New Liberalism: An Ideology of Social Reform (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978); and for its eventual disintegration into special issues and fads see M. Freedon, Liberalism Divided: A Study in British Political Thought (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986).

⁵⁶ In Age of Atonement, Hilton suggests 1880 represents the end of the Age of the Incarnation. I think this a mistake. Although F. D. Maurice wrote earlier, his dismissal from his chair in London indicates how few of his contemporaries accepted his views. His Incarnational theology, and a more general immanentism, only became truly influential around 1880, soon after which, moreover, they began to inspire new forms of political thought in much the same way as Hilton has taught us to see Atonement theology doing. See M. Bevir, “Welfarism, Socialism, and Religion: On T. H. Green and Others”, Review of Politics 55 (1993), 639-661.

⁵⁷ D. Ospovat, The Development of Darwin's Theory (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981). Also see the location of Darwin within an already formed modern episteme that owed much to organicism in Foucault, Order of Things.

⁵⁸ See, for example, J. Harris, Private Lives, Public Spirit: A Social History of Britain, 1870-1914 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993); J. Moore, The Post-Darwinian Controversies: A Study of the Protestant Struggle to Come to Terms with Darwin in Great Britain and America, 1870-1900 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979); and F. Turner, Between Science and Religion: The Reaction to Scientific Naturalism in Late Victorian Britain (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974).

⁵⁹ B. Webb, My Apprenticeship (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1938), p. 153.

⁶⁰ P. Stansky, On or About December 1910: Early Bloomsbury and Its Intimate World (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1996).

⁶¹ Modernism is, of course, a complex term, about which there are many debates among literary historians in particular. My attempt to broaden the range of the term to cover the atomistic and analytical trends in the natural and human sciences draws on the W. Everdell, The First Moderns (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997).

⁶² See M. Bevir, "Prisoners of Professionalism: On the Construction and Responsibility of Political Studies", Public Administration (forthcoming).

⁶³ J. Keynes, "My Early Beliefs", in The Collected Writings of John Maynard Keynes, Vol. X: Essays in Biography, p. 436.

⁶⁴ P. Clark, "J. M. Keynes, 1883-1946: 'The Best of Both Worlds'", in S. Pederson & P. Mandler, eds., After the Victorians: Private Conscience and Public Duty in Modern Britain (London: Routledge, 1994), pp. 171-85. Most of the essays in this collection

make similar points about the people they concern. For a study that extends the Whiggism central to Burrow and Winch's work into the twentieth century see J. Stapleton, Englishness and the Study of Politics: The Social and Political Thought of Ernest Barker (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994).

⁶⁵ It is perhaps significant that the only substantial work by Burrow or Winch to reach beyond 1920 concerns the impact of economic ideas on public policy, rather than the intellectual culture that otherwise preoccupies them. See especially D. Winch, Economics and Policy: A Historical Study (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1969).