CHAPTER 1

Introduction
Mill and international politics

> And whenever he has rushed into mistakes in matters of foreign policy, it has been only when his naturally acute and steady vision was obscured by the halo which the word Liberty, however misapplied, never fails to spread around it.[1]
>
> How accurate is this portrayal of Hobbes's theory of international relations? It appears to be based, for the most part, on a handful of passages in one or two of his works (ignoring many comments on international affairs elsewhere in his writings); and even those few passages have been misunderstood.[2]

1. MILL AND THE HISTORY OF INTERNATIONAL POLITICAL THOUGHT

In 2007, while the fall-out from the second Iraq War was still raging in the United States, Michael Walzer argued that John Stuart Mill 'speaks directly to current U.S. debates about foreign policy and international society'. According to the American political theorist, '[h]e is our contemporary'.[3] Such claims about the eminent Victorian are not rare. John Stuart Mill (1806–73) is widely regarded as the preeminent liberal thinker.[4] Those who wish to establish, and then take issue with, what they see as the 'liberal' position on a range of issues often tend to focus on what they take Mill's attitudes on these issues to have been and extrapolate from them the broader 'liberal' stance. Thus, Mill has been, time and again,

[1] 'J. S. Mill on the American Contest', *The Economist*, 8 February 1862, pp. 143–5, at p. 144.
[2] Noel Malcolm, 'Hobbes's theory of international relations', in: Noel Malcolm, *Aspects of Hobbes* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2002), pp. 432–56, at p. 435.
[3] Walzer also wrote that 'whenever we need to argue about whether it is right or wrong, just or unjust, to send an army across a border, it is useful to return to Mill's "few words" [on non-intervention].' Michael Walzer, 'Mill's "A Few Words on Non-intervention": a commentary', in: Nadia Urbinati and Alex Zakaras (eds), *J. S. Mill's Political Thought: A Bicentennial Reassessment* (Cambridge University Press, 2007), pp. 347–56, at pp. 348–9.
[4] For a striking example – among innumerable others – see: George Morlan, *America's Heritage from John Stuart Mill* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1935).

seen as the paradigmatic liberal, whose pronouncements on various issues (such as on nationality) have been said to 'have passed almost unchallenged for . . . generations as the pure milk of Liberal doctrine'.[5] Yet, as we will see in the following chapters, there were, even in his own time, several divergent and often conflicting 'liberal' positions on some of the most important questions of international politics addressed by Mill. Mill was often at odds on such issues with those who were supposedly on his side or party. One of the things this book attempts to show is just how wide the divergences among liberals or radicals were on international issues and how broad a church Victorian liberal thought on foreign affairs was.

Despite Mill's status as an iconic liberal, there was, up until the late 1990s, very little commentary on his thought on international relations. This state of affairs has changed dramatically of late. Mill now has a prominent place in anthologies of political thought on international relations or international ethics. In recent years, he has been accorded the status of one of the 'leading international thinkers', who are set apart by 'the fact that their thought retains its intellectual force long after it was written down and the events that provoked it have faded into history'.[6] In other words, in the last decade or so Mill has been 'canonised' in the emerging literature of 'international political theory', even if his insights remain undigested.[7]

What complicates matters is that Mill never wrote a book on international politics. This means that any attempt to study his international outlook has to piece his thoughts together, from his youthful utterances in the 1820s to his death in 1873, from diverse sources. These sources include periodical articles dedicated to particular foreign affairs issues, chapters in some of his books, scattered remarks in various other books, his speeches and interventions as a Member of Parliament or as a 'public moralist', his handwritten marginal annotations on books in his possession and the extensive discussion of international subjects in his correspondence. In addition, a major part of the sources used in this book is constituted of

[5] Alfred E. Zimmern, *Nationality and Government: With Other War-Time Essays* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1918), p. 46. See also ibid., p. 64.

[6] Robert Jackson, *Classical and Modern Thought on International Relations: From Anarchy to Cosmopolis* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), p. 14.

[7] There is no book-length account of Mill's thought on international relations. Despite its title, Eddy M. Souffrant's *Formal Transgression: John Stuart Mill's Philosophy of International Affairs* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2000) is a rather idiosyncratic essay on Mill's justification of imperialism (one of many produced in the last two decades), but by no means a thorough study of Mill's thought and pronouncements on international politics. For a brief account of the changing fates of commentary and scholarship on Mill on international relations, see: Georgios Varouxakis, 'The international political thought of John Stuart Mill', in: Ian Hall and Lisa Hill (eds), *British International Thinkers from Hobbes to Namier* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), pp. 117–36, at pp. 117–18.

the reactions of Mill's contemporaries to his proposals and interventions or their articulation of alternative proposals. These, again, are found in a variety of articles in quarterly reviews, monthly magazines, weekly and daily newspapers, books, pamphlets, speeches, diaries, memoirs and letters. Given all this, the major problem with the current literature on Mill's international thought is the tendency of most commentators to attach undue weight to isolated remarks and statements, without a grasp of the full context in which they belong. What is missing is a comprehensive study of the whole range of Mill's thoughts and pronouncements on international politics. Any lesser attempt would be liable to the charge raised by Noel Malcolm's comment used as an epigraph above.

This book endeavours to analyse Mill's contributions with particular attention to the historical context in which they were produced, the political as well as the philosophical preoccupations that prompted Mill to write them, the immediate aims he had in writing them, the reception of his pronouncements among Mill's contemporaries, as well as the main alternatives proposed by others in each case. This historical approach is the book's major distinctive feature and makes possible the first comprehensive study of Mill's contributions to international theorising. The contextual approach adopted in this book is the only way of avoiding the pitfalls arising from what Quentin Skinner has called 'the mythology of doctrines' (the mythology 'created by historians working with the expectation that each classic writer . . . will be found to enunciate some doctrine on each of the topics regarded as constitutive of the subject'. According to Skinner, it is 'a dangerously short step from being under the influence . . . of such a paradigm to "finding" a given author's doctrine on the mandatory themes').[8] The subject matter of this book is determined by what Mill discussed, what exactly he meant and wished to achieve, how his interventions were received by his contemporaries and what his role in theorising on international issues was.

One of the distinctive features of Victorian intellectual life was the proliferation of periodical reviews and magazines, with particular audiences, agendas and styles.[9] The way in which international issues (and the particular debates and questions that were taken up by Mill) were discussed in the pages of these periodicals, the linguistic innovations and shifts that arose during the period (the meaning of 'international', the meaning and

[8] Quentin Skinner, 'Meaning and understanding in the history of ideas', in: Quentin Skinner, *Visions of Politics* Vol. I: *Regarding Method* (Cambridge University Press, 2002), pp. 57–89, at p. 59.
[9] See Joanne Shattock and Michael Wolff (eds), *The Victorian Periodical Press: Samplings and Soundings* (Leicester University Press, 1982).

status of 'international law', the battle for the appropriation of 'patriotism', the changing fates of 'nationality' and 'the principle of nationality', divergent attitudes towards 'cosmopolitanism' and 'humanity', the confusions and debates as to the meaning of 'non-intervention', to name but a few), the frequency with which particular issues were debated and the degree of consensus or discord that emerged with regard to each issue are among the preoccupations of this book.

Similarly, the newspaper press underwent major transformations during the period in which Mill lived and wrote. The abolition of paper duty and other 'taxes on knowledge' in the mid 1850s led to a proliferation of cheap daily and weekly newspapers. These transformations led to changes in the reporting of foreign affairs and these changes were in turn important factors influencing the parameters of debate on international politics.[10] As will become obvious by the frequency with which they appear in the pages of the following chapters, leading articles in newspapers, either daily or weekly, were extremely important for discussion on international issues. A great number of new weekly and daily papers made their appearance during the time focused upon in this book. Some of them published articles by authors with particular interest in international issues or in theoretical questions related to international morality or international law. The *Saturday Review* stood out among weeklies from its emergence in 1855,[11] and the *Pall Mall Gazette* was an evening daily paper with great influence in the London clubs (at which it was specially aimed).[12] We will see in subsequent chapters that they both had much to say on international relations in general and on Mill's pronouncements in particular. As one of the most prolific and important writers for both these publications commented, '[r]eally good leading articles are remarkable productions'. For in the 'state of society' of the time, they formed 'the greater part of the reading even of the most educated part of the adult members of the busy classes'. Men in his time lived, he wrote, 'like bees in a hive'. They were 'constantly occupied in ingenious efforts'. This left them very little time to use their minds upon any other subjects than 'those which their daily

[10] Lucy Brown, *Victorian News and Newspapers* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985), pp. 210–43; Stephen Koss, *The Rise and Fall of the Political Press in Britain* (London: Fontana Press, 1990).

[11] See Merle Mowbray Bevington, *The Saturday Review 1855–1868: Representative Educated Opinion in Victorian England* (New York: AMS Press, 1966 [1941]).

[12] An evening daily paper such as the *Pall Mall Gazette* was particularly influential because it was published with the latest news as well as with commentary on the day's morning papers at the time of gentlemen's leisure (spent in clubs at the eponymous Pall Mall, not least). J. W. Robertson Scott, *The Story of the Pall Mall Gazette: of Its First Editor Frederick Greenwood and of Its Founder George Murray Smith* (Oxford University Press, 1950).

round of duties' presented, and accordingly they were forced 'to live upon intellectual mince-meat'. 'Their food must be chopped up small before they eat it; and it must be so prepared as at once to tempt the appetite, and assist the digestion.'[13]

The presence in London at the time of a great number of continental European exiles (greatly enhanced after 1848) increased the prominence of interest in foreign affairs that everyone was commenting on. This was the London of Mazzini and Herzen, Marx and Ledru-Rollin, to say nothing of the propagandists of the two sides during the American Civil War. Mill was in contact with many of the exiles (and a hyperactive leader of the pro-North minority agitation during the Civil War) and tried to assist them and their causes in various ways. The increased interest in international affairs in Britain in the 1850s and 1860s is well documented.[14] Unlike those who first became excited about Italy, or Napoleon III, or nationalities and the like in the late 1850s and 1860s, Mill had a sustained interest in international politics throughout his life. But there was an unmistakeable increase of focus during the last two decades of his life related to particular international events.

Unsurprisingly, given the extraordinary interest in foreign affairs during the late 1850s and 1860s, international questions loomed large in Mill's electoral campaign (of sorts) for the Westminster parliamentary seat in 1865 (he was asked repeatedly in particular about his doctrine on 'non-intervention'). Although Mill's electoral campaign and subsequent parliamentary career have been examined in an excellent study, the extent of preoccupation with foreign affairs during both the campaign and Mill's time in the House of Commons has not received enough attention.[15] One

[13] [James Fitzjames Stephen], 'Journalism', *Cornhill Magazine*, VI (1862), pp. 52–63, at pp. 53–4.

[14] 'From 1815 to the Revolution of '48 foreign affairs had engaged but a small share of the public attention . . . But from 1850 onwards the focus of interest was overseas; the soldier, the emigrant, and the explorer, the plots of Napoleon III and the red shirt of Garibaldi, take and fill the imagination.' G. M. Young (ed.), *Early Victorian England* (2 vols, Oxford University Press, 1934), Vol. II, p. 482. As Garibaldi was being fêted in England during his visit in 1864, Cobden complained to a correspondent: 'When will the masses of this country begin to think of home politics? Our friend Bright observed, as he gazed from a window in Parliament Street on the tens of thousands that cheered the Italian, "If the people would only make a few such demonstrations for themselves, we could do something for them." But nothing except foreign politics seems to occupy the attention of the people, press, or parliament.' R. Cobden to T. B. Potter, 10 May 1864, quoted in: John Morley, *The Life of Richard Cobden* (9th, one-volume, edn, London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1903), p. 911n. See also Christopher Kent, *Brains and Numbers: Elitism, Comtism, and Democracy in Mid-Victorian England* (University of Toronto Press, 1978), pp. 23–33; Christopher Harvie, *The Lights of Liberalism: University Liberals and the Challenge of Democracy 1860–86* (London: Allen Lane, 1976), pp. 97–115.

[15] Bruce L. Kinzer, Ann P. Robson and John M. Robson, *A Moralist In and Out of Parliament: John Stuart Mill at Westminster 1865–1868* (University of Toronto Press, 1992). See also

of the other Liberal candidates who gave speeches to the electors of Westminster in support of Mill in July 1865 was a politician with the most remarkable expertise in foreign affairs, M. E. Grant Duff.[16] Grant Duff singled out a few issues regarding which Mill, if elected, would make a unique contribution to the British public's education, and one of them was 'the whole subject of our foreign policy': 'To that Mr. Mill has given very great attention, and there is nothing on which the House of Commons stands more in need of an authoritative guide – of a man who will boldly take his stand upon a principle, and who has at the same time a competent knowledge of the actual state of Europe, understanding what is possible and what impossible.'[17]

II. THE DANGERS OF 'RELEVANCE'

But what Mill's contemporaries saw and what our contemporaries (and several generations in between) have been seeing are often quite different things. The 'mythology of doctrines' that Quentin Skinner complained of is a serious pitfall for commentators writing about Mill, if they are not sufficiently interested in the historical context of his pronouncements. Mill has very often been asked questions 'on each of the topics regarded as constitutive of the subject' (in this case 'the subject' being 'international political thought'). Sometimes questions have been asked which Mill did not intend to answer, doctrines he did not profess have been 'found', or equivocations, vacillations and changes of mind have been overlooked in order for a coherent 'doctrine' or 'theory' to emerge.[18] This is perhaps the only way for him to be 'our contemporary' and to '[speak] directly to current U.S. debates about foreign policy and international society' and other debates where his thought is deemed relevant today.[19] Thus, in the most influential treatment of Mill's pronouncements on non-intervention, what is taken as Mill's theory is based on the perusal of the latter (shorter) part of one short article written by Mill.[20] That the article was published in

Dennis F. Thompson, 'Mill in parliament: When should a philosopher compromise?', in: Urbinati and Zakaras (eds), *J. S. Mill's Political Thought*, pp. 166–99.

[16] For a contemporary reference (one of many) to Grant Duff's peculiar expertise in foreign politics see, e.g., [Anon.], 'Elgin speeches', *Saturday Review*, 26 August 1871, pp. 263–4.

[17] Mountstuart E. Grant Duff, *Some Brief Comments on Passing Events, made between February 4th, 1858, and October 5th, 1881* (Madras: Printed by R. Hill, at the Government Press, 1884), p. 230.

[18] Cf.: K. E. Miller, 'J. S. Mill's theory of international relations', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, Vol. 22, No. 4 (1961), pp. 493–514, at p. 495.

[19] Walzer, 'Mill's "A Few Words on Non-Intervention": a commentary', pp. 348–9.

[20] Michael Walzer, *Just and Unjust Wars: A Moral Argument with Historical Illustrations*, (4th edn, New York: Basic Books, 2006 [1977]).

December 1859 in a British periodical,[21] was sent to French periodicals for review with particular practical aims in mind, and immediately generated reviews and debates in newspapers and periodicals both in Britain and in France, are details that do not detain Michael Walzer and several others who wrote on the subject. The reader of Walzer's (otherwise brilliant) *Just and Unjust Wars* is told that 'A Few Words on Non-Intervention' was 'published in the same year as the treatise *On Liberty* (1859)', and that the article is 'especially useful to us because the individual/community analogy was very much in Mill's mind as he wrote'.[22] But it is more likely that other things were in Mill's mind. For *On Liberty* – written a couple of years earlier in any case – was published in February 1859. The evidence in Mill's correspondence is that, on 5 October 1859, he had not yet decided what the topic of his next article for *Fraser's Magazine* would be.[23] Thus, 'A Few Words' was conceived some time after early October and was ready and sent to the editor (from Avignon) in mid-November,[24] to be published in early December. His correspondence during the previous months shows that Mill had other – and pressing – concerns in mind. Walzer (like most commentators on Mill on intervention) does not mention that 1859 was a particularly tumultuous year in Europe's international affairs (and there was a sense that the following year would carry on in the same vein).[25] Nor is there any hint of how strongly Mill felt on some of the international issues of that year, not least the Italian question and Napoleon III's intervention in Italy. That he was more or less convinced in the preceding months that Britain was in imminent danger of involvement in a major European war for its very existence seems to have weighed rather heavier in Mill's considerations than 'the individual/community analogy'.[26] The context is indispensible for making sense of Mill's 1859 text, to say nothing of Mill's overall thought on the question of foreign intervention between the early 1830s and the late 1860s. I do not for a moment wish to diminish the importance of analysing what is written in a text, and I find much to praise in Walzer's and others' analyses of Mill's 'A Few Words'. But scrutinising

[21] See J. S. Mill, *The Collected Works of John Stuart Mill*, general editor F.E.L. Priestley and subsequently John M. Robson (The University of Toronto Press, 1963–1991) [hereafter referred to as: *CW*, followed by volume number in Roman numerals and by page number/s in Arabic numerals], XV, pp. 652, 655. For details on the reviews and reception see *infra*, Chapter 4.

[22] Walzer, *Just and Unjust Wars*, p. 87.

[23] *CW*, XV, p. 638.

[24] Mill to Alexander Bain, 14 November: *CW*, XV, p. 646.

[25] Well into 1860, Mill was praising the resurgence of the military spirit in Britain, which would thwart, he hoped, the aggressive designs of the French Emperor (*CW*, XV, p. 700; ibid., p. 667). For the broader context see: Jonathan Parry, *The Politics of Patriotism: English Liberalism, National Identity and Europe, 1830–1886* (Cambridge University Press, 2006), pp. 221–75.

[26] *CW*, XV, p. 619. See *infra*, Chapter 4.

what is in the text is evidently not enough if an understanding of Mill's thoughts on intervention (or other international relations issues) is the true aim.

III. THE WAGES AND PERILS OF IMPERIAL GUILT

Another cluster of issues over which Mill's pronouncements on international affairs have been most prominently discussed are those related to empire. A great number of publications dealing with Mill's attitudes towards imperialism and the British Empire have appeared in the last two decades. Mill is usually seen as the iconic liberal, and criticisms of his attitudes are very often used as generic indictments of a whole tradition called 'liberalism' – this latter being more often referred to than defined. The whole enterprise has many pitfalls as far as the attempt to attack 'liberalism' is concerned.[27] And it is no less fraught with difficulties as far as its contribution to our understanding of Mill's thought is concerned. The commentary on these issues that has emerged in the last few years spans a great gamut of works, from some of serious scholarship and extremely sharp analytical reflection to writings displaying low scholarly standards and little analytical rigour. Some of the 'post-colonial' criticisms of Mill have obviously raised very important questions regarding the degree of prejudice, ignorance and Euro-centrism, and the arbitrary lumping together of very different cultures and historical periods in much of what J. S. Mill wrote. But some of them have also indulged in highly anachronistic misreadings of what Mill said and wrote, even to the extent that many academics have presented Mill as a kind of arch-racist, an accusation that is particularly misplaced.[28] More importantly, it is the very indulgence in the 'blame game' that mars the discussion. And, as always, one extreme feeds another, so the excesses of *some* post-colonial critics have led to the slow emergence

[27] See the criticisms raised in: Duncan Bell, 'Empire and international relations in Victorian political thought', *Historical Journal*, Vol. 49 (2006), 281–98; Jennifer Pitts, 'Free for all' [review of Domenico Losurdo, *Liberalism: A Counter-history*], *TLS*, 23 September 2011, pp. 8–9.

[28] See some criticisms of such claims in: H. S. Jones, 'The early utilitarians, race, and empire: The state of the argument', in: Bart Schultz and Georgios Varouxakis (eds), *Utilitarianism and Empire* (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2005), pp. 179–87; Peter Mandler, '"Race" and "nation" in mid-Victorian thought', in: Stefan Collini, Richard Whatmore and Brian Young (eds), *History, Religion, and Culture: British Intellectual History 1750–1950* (Cambridge University Press, 2000), pp. 224–44; Georgios Varouxakis, 'John Stuart Mill on race', *Utilitas*, Vol. 10, No. 1 (1998), pp. 17–32; Georgios Varouxakis, 'Empire, race, Euro-centrism: John Stuart Mill and his critics', in: Schultz and Varouxakis (eds), *Utilitarianism and Empire*, pp. 137–53.

of a body of work that is in danger of underestimating the problems with Mill's attitude towards the extra-European world.[29]

Instead of projecting various cherished or resented 'liberal' positions onto Mill, this book aims to establish what exactly the historical Mill thought and wrote on empire and on international politics more generally, explain why he did so, and evaluate as much as possible the reception and impact of what he said among his contemporaries.

IV. LIBERAL NATIONALIST OR COSMOPOLITAN PATRIOT?

There is a third subject where Mill's thought has attracted considerable attention (increasingly so since the 1990s). His attitudes towards nationality, patriotism and cosmopolitanism constitute a complex set of questions over which serious misconceptions have arisen.[30] Mill is often seen as the paradigmatic 'liberal nationalist'.[31] And it is common to see him presented as someone who did not 'envisage how powerful and dangerous militant nationalism would become as a mass phenomenon, and how much hatred of the foreigner it would generate'.[32] Received wisdom has been that Mill was a staunch supporter of nationalism. This view is based on *some* of Mill's statements in Chapter XVI of *Considerations on Representative Government* (1861).[33] It is true that he wrote there that representative government was next to impossible in a country composed of different nationalities. However, it should be remembered that in that chapter Mill discussed nationality in its relation to representative government, not the merits and demerits of nationality in the abstract. The gist of his argument in that context was that, where the sentiment of nationality existed in any force, and the population of a country was composed of different nationalities, the working of representative government was almost impossible. Instead of there being a united public opinion, a common *agora* where political discussion

[29] For an example see: Mark Tunick, 'Tolerant imperialism: John Stuart Mill's defense of British rule in India', *The Review of Politics*, Vol. 68 (2006), pp. 586–611.

[30] For a fuller treatment of the existing literature and a more detailed assessment of nationality in Mill's thought see: Georgios Varouxakis, *Mill on Nationality* (London: Routledge, 2002); and Georgios Varouxakis, 'Cosmopolitan patriotism in J. S. Mill's political thought and activism', in: Urbinati and Zakaras (eds), *J. S. Mill's Political Thought*, 277–97.

[31] 'Mill is a liberal nationalist not a liberal cosmopolitan.' John Skorupski, *Why Read Mill Today?* (London: Routledge, 2006), p. 90.

[32] William Stafford, 'John Stuart Mill on war', in Keith Dockray and Keith Laybourn (eds), *The Representation and Reality of War: The British Experience. Essays in Honour of David Wright* (Thrupp, Gloucestershire: Sutton Publishing, 1999), pp. 84–103, at p. 89.

[33] Hereafter referred to as: *Representative Government*.

would take place, the central government would instead be able to play one nationality against another, and, what was more, the army and the people would not see themselves as of the same people. For these reasons, Mill wrote, representative government had a better chance of succeeding if – wherever possible – each nation had its own state and each state was composed of one nationality. He then went on, however, to spend most of the chapter explaining why this neat one-nation one-state model was impossible to implement in many parts of Europe where populations were too intermingled. Moreover, he also stressed that the coexistence and merger through mutual influences and *heterosis* of different ethnic groups within the same people offered major civilisational and moral advantages. Mill was adamant – both in the 'Vindication of the French Revolution of February 1848' (1849) and in *Representative Government* (1861) – that people's tribal attachment to their 'racial' (what we would term 'ethnic') group was 'characteristic of barbarians' and most deplorable. But where it was a fact on the ground, and different nationalities had developed such 'barbarous' feelings and hated each other, it could not be wished away and ignored. That is already a picture considerably more complex than what the received wisdom of Mill as a 'nationalist' would have us believe.

But it is nothing compared to the picture that emerges if one looks at Mill's statements on nationality, patriotism and cosmopolitanism throughout his life. A thorough analysis of Mill's views and pronouncements yields much more than Mill, the naïve supporter of nationalism. His attitude certainly evolved and changed as a result of his observation of events during crucial decades of the nineteenth century. In statements before the revolutions of 1848, he did speak of nationality in positive terms because of its conduciveness to the cohesion of societies.[34] During the revolutionary period itself, in the 'Vindication' (April 1849), he was still asserting the importance of nationality and its claims on liberals' support, though also clearly showing signs of disillusionment with the way nationalist feelings were manifesting themselves in Central Europe.[35]

But his concerns and doubts apparently only increased as events unfolded in Continental Europe in the aftermath of the revolutions of 1848. We find him in October 1851 being wary of using the word 'patriotism' because of its association with 'narrowness' and preferring 'public spirit, and intelligent

[34] Cf. Mill, 'The Opening of the Prussian Diet' (1847), *CW*, XXIV, pp. 1079–80. For a subtle analysis of Victorian political thought on nationality, see: H. S. Jones, 'The idea of the national in Victorian political thought', *European Journal of Political Theory*, Vol. 5, No. 1 (2006), pp. 12–21; and H. S. Jones, *Victorian Political Thought* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 2000), pp. 22, 48–50, 52–63, and *passim*.

[35] *CW*, XX, pp. 346–8; Varouxakis, 'Cosmopolitan patriotism', pp. 279–80.