

GOLDWIN SMITH AS AN HISTORIAN

Thesis submitted to the Faculty
of Graduate Studies, University of
Manitoba as a partial requirement
for a Master of Arts Degree
in the Department of History

Sharon Anne Babaian

March, 1984



GOLDWIN SMITH AS AN HISTORIAN

by

Sharon Anne Babaian

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of
the University of Manitoba in partial fulfillment of the requirements
of the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

© 1984

Permission has been granted to the LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA to lend or sell copies of this thesis, to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film, and UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS to publish an abstract of this thesis.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

Abstract

The purpose of this thesis is to contribute to a more accurate and complete understanding of the intellectual outlook of Goldwin Smith through an examination of some of his historical works. (Though neglected in the past, these writings are an valuable source of Smith's views both because of the special importance he personally assigned to historical studies and because he believed that history provided powerful and persuasive proof of the truth of the essential tenets of Christianity upon which he based his whole philosophical outlook.) This examination requires more than simple narrative. It requires an interpretation and analysis of the internal coherence of the beliefs which underlie the body of Smith's historical work. Thus while it attempts, where necessary, to compare Smith to his contemporaries, it is mainly a study of the intellectual life and historical corpus of one man, of how he responded to and assessed the events of the past, the experiences of his own time, and the promise of the future in an age of transition.

The structure of the thesis is quite straight-forward. The opening chapter is biographical while chapters two, three, and four deal with his theory of history and his interpretations of English, American, and Canadian history. The approach is selective and intended to highlight general themes and tendencies in Smith's outlook rather than to discuss his specific opinions in great detail.

Table of Contents

	Acknowledgements	I
	Introduction	1
I	Goldwin Smith at Oxford	15
II	The Greatness of England	46
III	England's Glory: America	96
IV	The Canadian Question	133
	Conclusion	174
	Appendix	180
	Bibliography	189

To Mildred and Albert Babaian
Abiding Liberals

Acknowledgements

The writing of this thesis has been a long and difficult task and many people have contributed to its successful completion. I cannot possibly mention the names of each and every friend that gave me strength and support at crucial times, but I am sure that they know who they are and how grateful I am for their assistance. There are, however, a few people whose names and special contributions I must mention. My advisor, Professor Brian McKillop not only introduced me to the field of Canadian intellectual history and convinced me to pursue graduate work on Goldwin Smith, but he also provided the necessary guidance to see the research and writing of my thesis through to the end. Special thanks are also due to Jackie McIntyre who has been both an excellent typist in the most difficult circumstances and a good friend. I owe a great deal to Erna Buffie who read countless drafts of my work often scribbled on bits of scrap paper and who always listened attentively to and sympathized with my many troubles, real and imagined. While in Edmonton, I came to depend heavily upon the support of Denise and Gerhard Ens who typed and read much of my work for me and, when necessary, distracted me from it. To my family, especially my parents to whom I have dedicated this thesis, I owe a huge debt of gratitude not only for taking care of me for so many years but also for encouraging all of my academic pursuits and tolerating my intellectual arrogance. Last, but certainly not least, I would like to thank Major Bob Caldwell whose great enthusiasm for history revived mine when it was fading fast and whose constant support over the past year and a half made the completion of this thesis a reality rather than a distant hope.

Introduction

Goldwin Smith has been studied from a variety of perspectives, but he has yet to be examined in the context of his own life-long interest: history. (Smith was, after all, an historian by profession.) This thesis attempts to contribute to a more accurate understanding of his thought by a systematic treatment of some of his historical writings. In doing so, it is hoped that light will be shed on the principles that shaped his outlook not only upon history but also upon life. Fortunately, Smith has left historians a wide variety of published and unpublished sources upon which to base such an investigation. Of these sources his historical works are one of the most revealing.

(Smith's history has been widely criticized, dismissed as unimportant, and passed over by historians who, in attempting to grasp his ideas, looked instead to his political journalism. Yet his historical writings clearly reflect his outlook more accurately and completely than any of his other many works. The reasons for this are obvious. In the first place, Smith considered himself an historian and though he did not produce what might, by modern standards, be called a professional or academic work, he read and wrote history all of his life and devoted most of his major works to historical subjects. Indeed, some of his best writing appeared in the form of historical review essays in the New York Nation from 1869 to 1884 and for ten years after 1890.¹ As well, in his countless essays and articles on non-historical topics he relied heavily on historical examples and allusions to reinforce his arguments. Moreover, he taught history in both England and

America and he attributed great importance to the study of the past.

(At Oxford he claimed that history was an indispensable tool in educating the future leaders of society,² while at Cornell he went as far as to argue that "a knowledge of the history of humanity is essential to a right view of any question effecting man."³)

(More importantly, Smith's whole philosophical outlook rested upon the basic tenets of Christianity and he was convinced that history had helped to prove the truth of those principles and had demonstrated that their evolution and the expansion of their influence in society over the ages was the key to human progress.) He believed that the significance of this Christian ideal could not be overstated, particularly in an era of rapid and profound change when a confused, insecure population needed some proven principle to guide it. (Smith, therefore, devoted his career to promoting this ideal and his historical writings played a central role in carrying his message to society.) In them, he attempted to establish the validity of his Christian ideal and then to teach his audiences how to work towards its achievement. (He used history as "a repository of moral lessons"⁴ out of which could be drawn specific examples applicable to particular present-day problems, and their possible solution. Thus in Smith's historical works we see not only his basic principles as they take shape, but also their development from basic precepts into specific views and opinions relating to Victorian society.) Few, if any, of his other works reveal this relationship with such clarity and provide such a valuable tool for reassessing his intellectual outlook.

II

Such a reassessment of Goldwin Smith and his ideas is important because, although most historians of Canada are familiar with his name and one or two of his more famous works, Smith has not been a popular subject for investigation. The reasons for his unpopularity among our historians are obvious: (he was a relentless and incisive critic of Canadian society in a time of great national uncertainty and he became the single most influential advocate of continental union with the United States.) As Carl Berger has noted, "Canada's historians have all been nationalists of various hues," preoccupied with our development as a nation and the emergence and character of our nationality.⁵ On the whole, they have tended to emphasize our common heritage, experiences, and aspirations - those things which have given us unity and strength - and they have generally avoided any prolonged and thorough discussion of the many sources of division, disunity, and conflict in our past.⁶ Writers with these interests can scarcely be blamed for neglecting a man who claimed that Canada would never become an independent nation and that her destiny was to become part of the United States.⁷ Moreover, until recent years, Canadian historians have shown little interest in thinkers and writers such as Smith, concerning themselves instead with drawing and filling in the basic political outlines of Canada's past and with investigating the lives of the major figures involved. Unlike John A. Macdonald or Louis Riel, Smith had no direct or tangible impact on the primary events that make up these outlines and therefore his place in our history books is negligible. His presence is limited, for the most part, to brief passing comments or footnotes spread through the pages of works about other people, places, and events.

Yet despite this general neglect, Smith has not been completely ignored by Canadian historians, and, although his memory has been kept alive by one unpublished PhD thesis, one full length biography, and a mere handful of articles, it seems that his importance in our past has been established. (It is generally agreed that Smith exerted a profound and positive influence on journalism in Canada.) F.H. Underhill claimed that it would be difficult to "read for long in Canadian journalism from the 1870's to the early 1900's without realizing how much higher a standard of writing the Bystander provided than most of his Canadian contemporaries."⁸ His broad intellectual background and wide range of interests was unequalled in Canada, such that Malcolm Ross asserted that "no other ten men together did half as much to challenge and displace the backwoods colonial mentality of the early years"⁹ of Canadian nationhood. Elisabeth Wallace, author of the only major published biography of Smith agreed, calling Smith a "master journalist in the great age of modern journalism"¹⁰ whose influence as a writer was felt in England and the U.S.A. as well as in Canada. She further maintained that "the encouragement he gave Canadian letters and the standard he set Canadian journalism can scarcely be over-estimated."¹¹

(In addition to this general literary and journalistic influence, Goldwin Smith made a more specific contribution to Canadian intellectual life by inspiring and fuelling a constant debate on the nature of the Canadian nation and its future.) Frank Underhill argued that Smith's incisive commentaries challenged Canadians, in Smith's day and in his

own, to think more clearly and intelligently about "the fundamental question" confronting any student of Canadian affairs - "the problem of our Canadian nationality, of the conditions that have determined its development in the past, of the possibilities which lie before it in the future."¹² According to Malcolm Ross, the "troublesome" questions he asked about Canada have not been "really and finally answered."¹³ In 1971, Carl Berger echoed these sentiments, claiming not only that Smith's Canada and the Canadian Question was "one of the most effective and challenging critiques of Canada ever penned,"¹⁴ but also that his ideas are "supremely important in Canadian nationalist thought because he asked the question which all Canadian nationalists have since tried to answer: what positive values does the country embody and represent that justifies her existence?"¹⁵ Elisabeth Wallace thought that Smith's "perception was unrivalled" when it came to discussing the relationship between Canada, England, and the United States and the common traditions, interests, and problems that they shared. His numerous writings on this subject offered Canadians a wider, less insular view of their nation and its place in the world.¹⁶ Wallace was so thoroughly convinced of the importance of Smith's contribution to Canadian politics that she devoted five chapters to the discussion of his Canadian career and his theories on Canada.

Many historians tend to lose interest in Smith after discussing his Canadian political writings; yet these constitute only a relatively minor aspect of his life's work. He was, after all, a Victorian intellectual whose experiences and ideas reflect to some extent the

character of a complex and confusing age. Most historians who have commented on Smith have in some way acknowledged this. F.H. Underhill noted Smith's preoccupation with typically Victorian issues and his involvement with the important political movements of the age.¹⁷

Carl Berger offered similar observations,¹⁸ yet neither he nor Underhill were interested in pursuing this Victorian intellectual aspect of Smith's career, concentrating instead on his Canadian political thought.

Elisabeth Wallace, Malcolm Ross, and Wayne Roberts, however, understood the importance of Smith's relationship to his age. (Wallace called her biography of Smith, Goldwin Smith: Victorian Liberal and argued that his significance derived from the fact that he was "an intelligent liberal and on many subjects a representative Victorian" who "speculated with unflagging interest on the problems of his day." Although his ideas were often unpopular, "they reflected characteristic strains in nineteenth-century liberal thought, and in particular the Victorian concern about questions raised by the two great forces of democracy and imperialism."¹⁹) Her book was an attempt to investigate the nature of Smith's particular brand of Victorian liberalism and, in so doing, to demonstrate some of the subtleties and complexities of the political and intellectual life of the time.

Malcolm Ross shared Wallace's interest in Smith's place within the nineteenth-century world of the intellect. He asserted that if Smith was "not quite an eminent then he was certainly a representative Victorian," and that the conflicts and contradictions evident in his own thought, offered the historian useful insight into the problems of the

Victorian mind.²⁰ Writing more recently, Wayne Roberts supported this basic contention. Dismissing the strictly political interpretation of Smith's importance, he maintained that Smith's special contribution had been in allowing "us to be more sensitive to several intellectual developments of his time" and in helping us recognize the complexities of some of the major strands of thought prior to the First World War.²¹

The study of a man such as Goldwin Smith clearly has a great deal to offer historians, particularly those who are interested in unravelling the tangled threads of Victorian intellectual life. After all, to understand Smith's ideas is to learn something of the concerns and preoccupations of a unique and important age. In Smith we have a well-educated, politically and socially active middle class Victorian intellectual who felt the major issues and ideas of the day as keenly as if each and every one affected him directly, and who has left us a well-written and comprehensive record of what he thought about each. Yet before we can appreciate or assess Smith's place in Victorian society we must be confident that our knowledge of the man and his ideas is sound. Unfortunately, given what has been written to date about Smith, it is apparent that our understanding of him is both inaccurate and incomplete. F.H. Underhill and Carl Berger saw Smith as primarily a political thinker preoccupied for the most part with the accomplishment of practical political gains such as continental union. The works of others (Wallace, Ross, and Roberts) have clearly demonstrated the weakness of an approach which fails to see Smith's thoughts on Canada as a product of larger concerns characteristic of the Victorian age.

Wallace's book, due to its length, detail, and approach, is the most complete survey of Smith's ideas. (In it, she demonstrated that there was more to Smith than politics, claiming that he was "even more interested in religious issues" than in political ones and that his religious and moral attitudes "imbued" his approach to certain political issues. As well, she suggested that religion played a crucial role in the solutions Smith proposed for the political and social problems of his time.²²) Moreover, she acknowledged the importance of Smith's extensive social activities and ideas and how they denied the possibility of an accurate account of the man based strictly on traditional political categories.²³ Nevertheless, despite the fact that she produced a remarkably comprehensive overview of what Smith thought about countless issues, events, and ideas and that she suggested important connections between the various themes in his work, her interpretation is inadequate. She was convinced that, as a "busy publicist," and devoted journalist, Smith had neither the time nor the desire "to present an integrated political creed."²⁴ Having taken this stand, Wallace was not really interested in investigating the philosophical links she, herself, implied. Politics, she suggested, were only one aspect of a wide-ranging world view that took in all the crucial issues of the age; yet her attempts to show how and where the political or any of the many other aspects of his thought fit into the whole, were severely limited if not non-existent. Thus, despite her assertions about the fundamental importance of Smith's religious attitudes, she still argued that his "conception of (liberalism) may be

illustrated by his views on free trade and democracy,"²⁵ without 9
attempting to show how his religious beliefs might have shaped
those views.

Malcolm Ross attempted to investigate some of these unexplored
connections in his article on Smith, arguing that "we have always
paid insufficient attention to the strange and revealing interplay
of his [Smith's] political, historical and religious attitudes."²⁶
Working from this assertion, Ross not only demonstrated the great
significance of Smith's religious attitudes but also the quasi-religious
character of his notion of Anglo-Saxon unity, and how these
two factors shaped and influenced the development of his liberalism.²⁷
Unfortunately these insights did not go far enough. Ross stressed
Smith's political attitudes, claiming that as his religious beliefs
became "more heterodox," as his "Christian sense of the meaning and
purpose of history" was diluted, this new, narrow faith, Anglo-Saxonry,
took over and his "political attitudes became more unstable, more
perverse."²⁸ Yet Anglo-Saxon unity was a lifelong preoccupation of
Smith, articulated clearly and decisively early in his career. Moreover,
his Christian faith had thrived along with this idea throughout
his career and had remained firm to the end of his life,²⁹ even though
he had moved far away from established religion and theology. Because
he saw one 'faith' as a replacement for the other, Ross failed to
investigate the basis of Smith's particular brand of Anglo-Saxonry
(a widely used term with a variety of meanings and interpretations in
the nineteenth-century context) and thus did not discover that it was
based on and derived its meaning from the very Christian faith that it
was supposed to have replaced.

To date, only Wayne Roberts has successfully penetrated the philosophical base of Smith's thought. In an article aptly entitled "Goldwin's Myth," he set out "to define Smith as a social rather than an economic thinker, to place Protestant evangelism and non-conformity, rather than (liberal) economics at the core of this thought."

He saw Smith's career and writings as "an unrequited search for a moral basis of community in a world where precapitalist props of hierarchy and cohesion had been obliterated."³⁰ It is only in this context, he maintained, that we could fully and accurately understand Goldwin Smith's views, on Canada or any other subject. According to Roberts, all Smith's concerns and preoccupations were derived from and informed by his Christianity. By stressing the religious basis of Smith's thought Roberts provided a starting point for a more complete reassessment of Smith.

This thesis is an attempt to contribute to that reassessment by investigating Smith's outlook as it is expressed in his historical writings. Little attention has been paid to these works even though Smith, in his own day, enjoyed "a tremendous reputation" as an historian and "would have had no difficulty at all in filling several scrapbooks with statements proclaiming the excellence of his historian-ship."³¹ The unfavourable judgements of his contemporary critics, men such as Charles H. Andrews, Lord Acton, and Edward P. Cheyney, have prevailed, however, and have led modern observers to neglect Smith, the historian. Andrews, historian of colonial America, deplored his "partisanship, his fiery vocabulary, his habit of judging historical

individuals and institutions as if they were present day individuals and institutions, his moralistic intrusions, his inability, in short, to separate the past from the present."³² Lord Acton held a similar opinion of Smith's work, labelling him a panegyrist, an advocate and an accuser "whose fondness for sweeping and positive assertions[and] the glaring illustrations of his striking and often lofty rhetoric are not favourable to the display of exactness in the investigation of the facts."³³ Edward P. Cheyney added that his works were generally "based on an excess of prejudice and an insufficiency of original and laborious research."³⁴

Twentieth century analysts of Smith have tended to agree with these critical assessments of Smith's work. Writing shortly after Smith's death for the Dictionary of National Biography, Sidney Lee asserted that Smith had "devoted most of his energies to polemics" and that the "detachment of mind which is essential to great history or philosophy was denied him." His history was "little more than first rate pamphleteering." He showed "no aptitude" for original research and "he failed to make any addition to historical knowledge."³⁵ Frank Underhill shared this view, maintaining that because of his failure to research his subjects he had "left behind him no great work which recreated or reinterprets for us a past period of history."³⁶ Herman Ausubel claimed that Smith was too "immersed in his own times and too little immersed in the ages whose history he sought to recount" to produce a work of enduring value. Moreover, he "could not judge individuals in the light of their own times without recourse to

moralizations."³⁸ Even Elisabeth Wallace, who was generally sympathetic to Smith and his work, admitted that his defects as an historian were too "obvious" to be ignored.

To the sum of human knowledge he added little. He had no taste for painstaking research into primary sources and little capacity for objectivity. A violent partisan, he carried into the past, as Dicey once observe, the animosities of the present. He dealt freely in defence and condemnation, depending on whether he approved of those whose history he was writing . . . History, politics, and literature alike, Goldwin Smith subjected to a moral test . . . Every topic he discussed he treated from a modern Liberal point of view, using the present to interpret the past, in a manner startling to more orthodox students of history.³⁹

The flaws in Smith's historical work are, indeed, obvious and it would be foolhardy to dispute the validity of the criticisms levelled against him in an attempt to rehabilitate him as an important historian. Yet it is these very flaws that make Smith's historical works so important to the intellectual historian. Because they are partisan, opinionated, and preoccupied with the present at the expense of the past, they provide obvious sources of insight into Smith's thought and their neglect in the past by historians helps explain our inadequate understanding of the man.

In a very basic sense Goldwin Smith is inseparable from his historical writings and, in order to understand him and his place in Victorian society, it is important to understand his view of history. On the surface this may seem a simple task — a mere summary of the many thousands of pages he wrote — but it requires more than straight narrative. It requires an interpretation and an analysis of the internal coherence of the beliefs and values which underlie the body of his historical work. Smith's ideas must be examined in and of themselves before we can discuss their place in a wider social context. Such a first step may seem less sophisticated and less relevant than the second because it seldom generates any sweeping new assertions about society. Without it, however, the social history of ideas could not be written. This thesis attempts where necessary to compare Smith to his contemporaries, but it is mainly a study of the intellectual life and historical corpus of one man, of how he responded to and assessed the events of the past, the experiences of his own time, and the promise of the future in an age of transition.

The structure of this thesis is quite straightforward. The opening chapter is biographical and deals with the experiences and ideas that appear to have shaped Smith's outlook, particularly during his years at Oxford. Chapters two, three, and four are primarily devoted to Smith's theory of history and his interpretations of English, American, and Canadian historical development. Smith's historical works were certainly not limited to these three fields but because he tended to be preoccupied with the history and development of Anglo-Saxon civilization in England and in

her colonies, these seemed the most appropriate national histories with which to begin a reassessment of Smith. It seemed important, nevertheless, also to include a brief discussion of Smith's view of Irish history because, Ireland, with all its problems, presented a significant challenge to Smith's belief in the greatness of the Anglo-Saxon accomplishment. This section is included as an appendix following the conclusion.

1. Elisabeth Wallace, Goldwin Smith Victorian Liberal, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1957), p. 95.
2. Goldwin Smith made this point in several discussions on the theory and purpose of history but he gave it special and repeated emphasis in his "Inaugural Lecture," in Lectures on Modern History, (Oxford: J.H. and Jas. Parker, 1861), pp. 3-40.
3. Goldwin Smith, "The Study of History," Atlantic Monthly, 25 (January, 1870), p. 47.
4. Malcolm Ross, "Goldwin Smith," in Our Living Tradition, ed., Claude T. Bissell, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1957), p. 37.
5. Carl Berger, The Writing of Canadian History, (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1976), p. 259.
6. Ibid., p. 263.
7. Ross, p. 29.
8. Frank H. Underhill, In Search of Canadian Liberalism, (Toronto: The Macmillan Company of Canada Ltd., 1960), p. 97.
- ✓ 9. Ross, p. 31.
10. Wallace, p. v.
11. Ibid., p. vi.
For further comments on Smith's journalistic ability see Wallace p. vi and pp. 286-7 and Karl F. Klinck, ed., The Literary History of Canada, 3 vols., (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1965), vol. 1, pp. 174-76.
12. Underhill, p. 101.
13. Ross, p. 30.
14. Carl Berger, Introduction to Canada and the Canadian Question by Goldwin Smith, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1971), p. vii.
15. Ibid., p. xvi.
16. Wallace, pp. v-vi.
17. Underhill, pp. 87-88, 90-91, and 97-98.
18. Berger, Introduction to Canada and the Canadian Question, pp. viii-ix.

19. Wallace, p. v.
20. Ross, pp. 32-33 and 47.
21. Wayne Roberts, "Goldwin's Myth," Canadian Literature, 83(Winter, 1979), pp. 66-7.
22. Wallace, pp. 212-14.
23. Ibid., pp. 162-82.
24. Ibid., p. 282.
25. Ibid., p. 136.
26. Ross, p. 36.
27. Ibid., p. 45.
28. Ibid., p. 40.
29. Wallace, p. 224.
- (21) 30. Roberts, p. 51.
31. Herman Ausubel, "Goldwin Smith," in Some Modern Historians of Britain, eds., Herman Ausubel, J. Bartlet Brebner, and Erling M. Hunt, (New York: The Dryden Press, 1951), p. 93.
32. Ibid., p. 94.
33. John Dalberg-Acton, Essays on Church and State, ed., Douglas Woodruff, (London: Hollis and Carter, 1952), p. 406.
34. Ausubel, p. 94.
35. The Dictionary of National Biography, 2nd Supplement 1901-1911, vol. 1, 1920 ed., s.v. "Smith, Goldwin," by Sidney Lee, p. 339.
36. Underhill, p. 87.
37. Ausubel, p. 98.
38. Herman Ausubel, Historians and their Craft, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1951), p. 275.
39. Wallace, pp. 17-18.

CHAPTER I
Goldwin Smith at Oxford

The Victorian age has often been characterized as an age of transition, in which men, probably for the first time, "thought of their own time as an era of change from the past to the future." This conception has been derived from the comments of various Victorian writers who, like Goldwin Smith, witnessed the great transformation of British society in the nineteenth century, and, as a result became preoccupied with change, its purpose, its process, and its effects.¹ Change had been forced on British society by the technological and economic effects of the Industrial Revolution and by the political, social, and intellectual influences unleashed by the revolutions in France and America. Yet while these movements promised great improvements for British society, their immediate results were economic hardship, social unrest, and war.² Consequently, in the early decades of the nineteenth century, the attitude of the vast majority of the British population toward change was one of fear, anxiety, and dismay.³

By the late 1820's, however, a new outlook began to emerge. The government passed substantial religious reforms in 1828 and 1829, and, in 1830 it began to consider major political change. Its initiatives were reinforced by the agitation of both the lower and middle classes whose leaders had recognized that the best means by which to control and to benefit from change was political power.⁴ At the same time, in the intellectual sphere the idea of change was being presented in a decidedly positive light by writers like Thomas Carlyle and John Stuart

Mill, who rejected the conventional ideological pessimism of the day in favour of an optimistic notion of progress. Based on a belief in the perfectability of man, the idea of progress had been at the ideological centre of the French Revolution and had suffered as a result of the excesses of the Terror and of Napoleon. Nevertheless, it retained important adherents in Britain and after 1820, they set out to convince their fellow countrymen that change was essential to the improvement of man and society, and that it should be understood and promoted rather than feared.⁵

Throughout the thirties and forties, progress acquired more and more adherents. They often differed greatly in background, experience and outlook and thus, they offered a wide variety of views on how the reform of British society should be accomplished. Some reformers advocated limited political and social change, a mere expansion of the ruling oligarchy; others called for the end of oligarchical government and greater democracy. Similarly, views on the role of the Anglican Church ranged from a desire for outright and immediate disestablishment to a variety of Broad Church compromise schemes. As well, both free trade and protection claimed support among these progressives.⁶ Moreover, they were divided philosophically on the very nature of progress itself. Metaphysical idealists emphasized the role of man's spiritual character in understanding and improving the world, and they tended to view progress as the result of the continual, conscious, free, and, at times, difficult exertion of man's natural power for self-improvement. This view was opposed by the positivists who stressed the importance of using scientific principles derived from observations and experiences outside of man to analyze

human society. For the proponents of this school, progress was an inevitable process - the march of mind - through which, regardless of individual human effort, society continually advanced. Most intellectuals stood somewhere between these two extremes, often combining elements of both in their various interpretations of change.⁷

Yet despite these fundamental differences in outlook, the advocates of reform were united in the belief that progress was a reality;⁸ that society was better off than it had been a hundred years earlier and that things would be better still a hundred years hence. Furthermore they were convinced that the key to this progressive development was the expansion of human knowledge, intellect, and character.⁹ This conviction directed them toward a common advocacy of (liberal) inquiry and of an expanded and improved educational system. (These ideas were not new but rather dated back to the Renaissance and "the Baconian argument from advancing knowledge, each age possessing and profiting from a constantly increasing body of positive truth."¹⁰) To this, the eighteenth century rationalists had added the contention that as man learned to control his environment, the quality of life would be improved and the British utilitarians had taken this one step further by claiming that education would provide unlimited possibilities for improving "the moral and intellectual condition of mankind."¹¹

In the turmoil of the Victorian age, however, these theories took on a new meaning and immediacy for (liberal) intellectuals. The institutions and assumptions of the old order were breaking down and had, in their view, to be replaced by new ones, more suited to the emerging industrial society. Creating a new society, however, was a

complex task which, according to these reformers, required open, intelligent research, debate, and discussion taking into account the various classes, groups, and interests in British society and all the latest philosophical, social, and scientific theories. As well, they believed that during this period of transition, enlightened leadership was essential in all spheres to guide and direct a confused nation forward in a calm and orderly fashion. At the same time, the nation's population would have to be educated to understand and to contribute to the emerging society in which they were destined to play an ever-increasing role.

(In the eyes of (liberal) intellectuals, Britain's leading educational institutions, particularly the universities at Oxford and Cambridge, seemed the obvious places to begin this process of research, discussion, and education.) In the 1830's and 1840's, however, Oxford and Cambridge were ill-equipped to fulfill these reformist goals, because during these years they were still "part of the church, and consequently had religious functions: the training of the clergy of the Church of England and the education of the nation's social elite in Christian discipline and morality."¹² The boards of both universities had successfully resisted all efforts by secular and utilitarian reformers to reduce the church's influence and to introduce new subjects and theories relating to modern industrial society.¹³ Thus, while economic, political and social change were dramatically altering the rest of British society, the two leading universities remained isolated and conservative, preoccupied with a narrow curriculum of theology, classics, and mathematics. Other important subjects received little or no attention at Oxford and Cambridge.

History as a subject for serious study was not recognized at either university until the last half of the century (the average attendance in 1850 at the modern history course at Oxford was eight). There was even less interest in the few courses that were offered in the natural and social sciences. The study of art was not introduced until 1870... and that of modern literature still later.¹⁴

The professoriate was at best considered "useless" and "the most vulnerable point in the university system."¹⁵ In many instances, professorships were considered "sinecures, venerable relics of mediaevalism"¹⁶ and the tutors within the colleges had largely taken over the functions of instruction and teaching.¹⁷ Moreover, the system of fellowships did little to promote talent or intellect since "few of the fellowships were open to genuine competition" being "restricted by their endowments to candidates from particular localities, preparatory schools, or kinship of the founders. Of the 542 fellowships at Oxford, only 22 were open to all candidates."¹⁸ As well, fellowships were subject to religious restrictions and requirements which further limited the range of applicants. More significant still was the fact that only Anglicans were permitted to take degrees at Oxford and Cambridge, while Oxford also excluded dissenters from even taking courses.¹⁹ Consequently, a large section of the population was denied access to the two leading universities, both of which were generously endowed by the national government.²⁰

(Liberal) intellectuals believed that these weaknesses rendered the universities incapable of directing and influencing the reform of British society, and therefore they concluded that Oxford and Cambridge would have to be changed. During the 1830's, however, the cause of university reform met with little success. In 1834, the Whig government

introduced a bill that was intended to open Oxford and Cambridge to dissenters. It passed the Commons but was thrown out by the Lords.²¹

Meanwhile at Oxford, an anti-reform movement was beginning to take shape around a group of High Church theologians and academics who were devoted to protecting traditional institutions and assumptions against the recent attacks of reforming politicians. (The Tractarian or Oxford Movement, as it came to be known, emerged in 1833 with John Keble's famous sermon on "National Apostasy," and one of its primary goals was to put an end to the "intolerable interference by a (liberal) secular" state in the proper concerns of the church."²²) In the intense and widespread reform agitation of the 1830's, the Tractarians came to be seen by conservatives and traditionalist elements in Britain as the "dedicated defenders of a persecuted church."²³ Their opposition to reform and to rationalistic interpretations of Church doctrine won them many allies among the country clergy²⁴ whose strength in convocation was sufficient to prevent not only major government intervention in (the universities but also the advancement of individual (liberal)) academics.

Yet even at the height of Tractarian influence, university reform was not without its advocates. At Oxford, a small but active group of academics led by Thomas Arnold²⁵ attempted to counteract the influence of the Tractarians and to promote critical inquiry, refusing to accept "authority as a judge in intellectual matters." In the social and intellectual turmoil of the time, however, their activities only served to reinforce High Church conservatism at Oxford. Recognizing this, they chose to pursue their ideals elsewhere,²⁶ and it was not until the 1840's that a new group of university reformers began to emerge to

present a viable alternative to Tractarianism. Several factors contributed to this resurgence of academic (liberalism.) By 1841, the Oxford Movement was in a state of crisis. In that year John Henry Newman, in Tract XC, "offered an interpretation of the Thirty-Nine Articles - already very flexible - that seemed to most readers to lower all the barriers between the Anglican and Roman Catholic Churches."²⁷ The response at Oxford and throughout the country was very negative and Newman was forced to leave the university. Four years later, W.G. Ward, another leading light of the movement, was deprived of his degree and suspended from teaching for declaring that "when he had subscribed the Articles he had not given up a single Roman doctrine."²⁸ Distressed Anglicans increasingly turned away from the Movement, rejecting the extreme course it appeared to be taking. (In 1845, three of Tractarianism's most prominent figures, Newman, Ward, and Frederick Oakley joined the Catholic Church.) These secessions marked the end of the Movement as such and greatly reduced High Church influence over university, ecclesiastical, and national affairs.²⁹

(As Tractarianism was declining, (liberalizing) influences both inside and outside the universities were producing a growing number of reform-minded young men who began to enter Oxford and Cambridge in the forties.³⁰) Many of them were products of Rugby where Thomas Arnold, Tractarianism's leading opponent, had implemented his (liberal) views on religion, culture and education. Imbued with his ideas and his earnestness, they were determined to make the universities serve the interests of the whole nation rather than just those of the Anglican Church.³¹ Arnold's presence at Oxford as Regius Professor of Modern History from 1840-42 served to reinforce this ideal among his disciples and his

moving lectures undoubtedly convinced other students to take the reform side in the debate over the role of the universities. Moreover, while the reformist Whig government of Lord John Russell was defeated in 1841 and replaced by a conservative ministry under Robert Peel, the cause of national reform was in no way abandoned. Indeed, Peel's own political record demonstrated a sympathy for change and a determination to restructure British society. As early as 1834-35, he had revealed his intention to develop "a new, more (liberal) conservatism,"³² and after gaining power in 1841 he made good this intention by presiding over reforms in the area of mines, factories, public health, education, banking, railways, and trade and commerce. It was Peel, in fact, who finally succeeded in having the protectionist Corn Laws repealed in 1846.³³ (Thus, despite the continued existence of substantial elements opposed to change, by 1841 reformism as a ideal and as policy found powerful support in the universities and in government.)

II

This rising tide of (liberalism) in Britain was a crucial factor in Goldwin Smith's intellectual development. He entered Oxford in 1841 when the whole university was caught up in the Tractarian controversy and virtually everyone took sides —either with Newman or Arnold. Those who did not were thought by some to care "for nothing but Greek verbs."³⁴ Smith was not one of these few disinterested individuals because, as a result of his family background and early experiences, he had developed an outlook similar, in many ways, to that of Dr. Arnold and his pupils.

Born in 1823 into a well-established and prosperous middle-class family in Reading, England, Goldwin Smith was the son of Dr. Richard Smith, a medical doctor, and his first wife Elizabeth. Dr. Smith not

only maintained a successful medical practice until 1848, but also found time to take part in the development of railways in Britain. He helped to promote the Great Western Railway and later became a director of both the Great Western and Metropolitan Railways.³⁵ Young Goldwin then, grew up in a home where the professional, industrial, and commercial middle-classes were seen as crucial contributors to Britain's national development, much as Arnold saw them.³⁶ More important, the religious influences in Smith's life were decidedly (liberal) and Broad Church.³⁷ His mother, Elizabeth Breton, was of Huguenot descent, and although she died when he was only ten his³⁸ knowledge of her family's background may well have contributed to his suspicion of High Church Anglicanism and its tendency to minimize the significance of the Reformation. Moreover, as a young boy, Smith had become familiar with the Latitudinarian religious views of Henry Milman who resided in the neighbouring parish of St. Mary's and who Smith later portrayed as a man who openly confronted orthodoxy from his pulpit. The Smith family clearly approved of Milman's sermons for they sometimes attended his services rather than the more orthodox ones offered by their own vicar.³⁹ As well, the religious influence of his family continued beyond childhood. In 1839, Smith's father remarried and although he and his stepmother, Katherine Dukinfield, were not close, he often stayed with her brother, the Reverend Henry Robert Dukinfield, when in London. Dukinfield, who was then vicar of St. Martin's-in-the-Fields,⁴⁰ was becoming a devoted reformer of the Anglican Church. He worked with Bishop Blomfield, of London, whom Smith characterized as "a statesman prelate who strove to adapt the Church to the times and to renew her hold upon the nation not by

reviving her claims to priestly authority but by placing her in the van of social improvement."⁴¹

These various experiences and influences seem to have convinced Smith at a relatively early age, that the struggle to achieve the ideal set by Christ's life was a social as well as a spiritual one; that men would be required to reshape society and to improve it as they improved themselves individually. Social change, therefore, was essential to human progress and to the evolution of a better society and, although it was not always progressive, change could not be resisted indefinitely. This outlook, unshaken by five years at unreformed, conservative Eton,⁴² naturally directed Smith towards the Arnoldians at Oxford who shared a similar view of society.⁴³ Smith's (liberal) beliefs evolved quickly in this extremely polarized intellectual environment because he came under the influence of a concentrated, unified, and determined (liberal) force.

Admittedly, Oxford in the early 1840's was still deeply conservative, and Magdalen, the college to which Smith transferred shortly after matriculating at Christ Church, was noted, even among the unreformed colleges, for its extreme "backwardness."⁴⁴ Yet Smith found strong (liberal) adherents among the tutors, the students, and even the professors at Oxford. Richard Congreve, whose "influence upon his students was said to have been singularly bracing, morally as well as intellectually,"⁴⁵ coached him in classics. Congreve later became a famous Comtean positivist but during his years at Oxford, he was noted simply as "a typical pupil of Arnold, high-minded, intensely earnest, and latitudinarian in his theological opinion."⁴⁶ To Smith, he was "a strong (liberal) and Evangelical of Arnold's school."⁴⁷ Another of Smith's progressive

coaches was "the excellent Montague Bernard," who later helped to establish The Guardian, a distinguished (liberal) newspaper.⁴⁸ One of his closest friends at Magdalen was John Conington who had, from the start, been singled out by the conservative elements at Oxford as a "dangerous innovator." A young man with a deeply religious nature and evangelical tendencies, he, too, had come up from Rugby and was imbued with Arnold's determination to reform the educational system.⁴⁹

As well, from 1840 to 1842 Dr. Arnold was himself present at Oxford as Regius Professor of Modern History, and according to Smith, his influence among the students was such that "his name was a horror and a terror to the dominant High Church party." Their dismay was no doubt intensified by the fact that his lectures were very well attended. Smith personally found them both interesting and entertaining.⁵⁰

The influence of individuals such as these contributed a great deal to the evolution of Smith's outlook which quickly became "pronouncedly liberal."⁵¹ Yet in his first four years at Oxford he was not really active politically. It was only after he graduated B.A. in 1845, with an impressive record of accomplishments behind him,⁵² that he became more directly involved in university politics.

III

Goldwin Smith's active commitment to (liberalism) began after 1845 with the movement for university reform. The collapse of the Tractarian Movement that year and the resulting decline in conservative influence at Oxford, renewed the confidence of the liberal group there and revived hopes for reform.⁵³ At the same time, a significant personal setback reaffirmed Smith's own conviction that the system had to be

changed. Following his graduation in 1845, Smith went on to pursue an M.A. and entered a competition for a fellowship at Queen's, but was, in his own words, "defeated...by a combination of Anti-reformers and Ritualists."⁵⁴ Though the accuracy of his version of the competition may be open to dispute, the fact that he interpreted it as an attack on his (liberal) views⁵⁵ confirms the argument that this setback "guaranteed that he would be a university reformer."⁵⁶ National events, as well, seemed to coincide to produce a favourable environment for action. In 1846, Peel's government repealed the Corn Laws, long considered a symbol of the power of the landed aristocracy and gentry. This was seen as a great victory for (liberalism) and although Peel's government fell just after repeal was accomplished,⁵⁷ it was replaced by a fairly capable Whig administration which promised to carry forward the previous government's reform initiatives.⁵⁸ * 26/9

Afraid that these events increased the threat of outside intervention in the university, the Hebdomadal Board at Oxford appointed a committee in March, 1848 to hear proposals for change. The limited recommendations of this body, however, satisfied neither High churchmen, who remained devoted to the old system, nor (liberals) who demanded more extensive reform.⁵⁹ Convinced that government intervention was the only realistic alternative, Smith, Benjamin Jowett, and William Charles Lake, wrote the Prime Minister Lord John Russell requesting that a royal commission of inquiry into the administration of the university be set up immediately. Smith personally applied additional pressure by publishing his views on the issue in a series of letters to The Times under the name Oxoniensis.⁶⁰ With the powerful support of nonconformists, the reformers finally prodded the government

Also in 1850, commissions

* 17/30

to hear proposals for university reform.

into action.⁶¹ ~~Commissions~~ were appointed at both Oxford and Cambridge in August 1850, with A.P. Stanley and Smith serving^{ed} as secretaries to the Oxford Commission.⁶² ^{one of the}

Both commissions were presented with a wide variety of views on the role of the university in society. At Oxford, the two extreme positions were represented by Henry Halford Vaughan and the Reverend E.B. Pusey. In 1839, Vaughan's career at Oxford had been blocked by the Tractarians who were suspicious of his religious views. The experience convinced him "that the university should be a secular institution dominated by its professors."⁶³ He argued that "the function of the professors should be intellectual, not moral; their task should be learning not teaching." They "should pursue knowledge for its own sake, and not for any political or moral object."⁶⁴ This view was opposed by Pusey who, as a leading figure in the Tractarian movement, was determined to maintain Oxford as an institution of the Anglican Church. He believed "the university was a guardian of the Church, and it had to defend the idea of dogmatic truth against the destructive claims of human reason."⁶⁵ Thus, he claimed, both enrolment and curriculum had to be restricted. Only Anglicans should be accepted into the university and, once there, they should receive instruction the primary object of which would be to strengthen their "moral and religious fibre."⁶⁶ Oxford, according to Pusey, had to remain a teaching rather than a research institution and for this purpose the college-based tutorial system was better suited than a professorial framework, though professors had a place in both.⁶⁷

In 1850, most university reformers^M embraced neither of these extremes. Men like Mark Pattison, Benjamin Jowett and Goldwin Smith

* 29

agreed that the professoriate had to be expanded and strengthened and the curriculum broadened to include new fields of study. As well, they accepted the need for research and the pursuit of new knowledge within the university context. Moreover, they opposed religious restrictions on entrance, fellowships and offices and they wanted Oxford opened to dissenters who made up a large proportion of the nation's population. Nevertheless, they agreed with Pusey's basic contention that teaching had to remain the primary function of the university. Unlike Vaughan, who wanted Oxford to become a national centre of secular research and learning, these reformers wanted to create a teaching institution which, while it encouraged and promoted research, would be concerned primarily with producing an enlightened group of graduates. Educated in the best traditional and modern ideas and theories, these men would not become researchers or scholars but would go out into the country as administrators, politicians, clergymen, teachers, and civil servants where they would use their knowledge to improve society and to educate the public to take their places in the emerging social order.⁶⁸

In 1852, the Oxford Commission issued its report which "approved the relaxation of religious tests, the abrogation of restrictive medieval statutes, the free opening of fellowships to merit, and the creation of a teaching professorate."⁶⁹ The government followed the advice of the commission and in 1854 and 1856 it passed laws to implement these recommended reforms.⁷⁰ In effect, these measures substantially reduced clerical control of higher education, but they were not as far-reaching as many reformers had hoped. Nonconformists, though admitted to lower degrees, were still prevented from obtaining higher degrees, college

headships and fellowships, and professorships. While the number of fellowships was greatly increased and most were "opened to merit,"

[t]wo-thirds of the fellowships...still stipulated that their holders must take holy orders, and all except one of the headships of the colleges, as well as most of the senior professional chairs, continued to be limited to clergymen. Celibacy remained a qualification for holding college fellowships.⁷¹

Nevertheless, Smith, for one, believed that the commission did "as much as was practicable at the time," the state of opinion and opposing forces being what they were," and that it "practically transferred the university from clerical to academic hands," insuring that further reform would be forthcoming.⁷²

Smith's patient and optimistic attitude towards reform was quite indicative of the general confidence of (liberal) academics and thinkers at the time. Their demands had in part been recognized and acted upon and they were beginning to establish a conspicuous presence and high academic profile within the university community despite the perpetuation of strong conservative elements there. Moreover, the mood of the country was favourable to liberal ideals.³⁰ The Chartist scare of 1848⁷³ proved to be the last major social protest of the era and the 1850's opened with all the prosperity and hope expressed by the Great Exhibition of 1851.⁷⁴ For Smith, too, the late 1840's and 1850's were full of promise. He was elected Stowell Fellow in Civil Law at University College in 1846 and in 1847 he won the Chancellor's prize for his English essay on "The Political and Social Benefits of the Reformation in England." That same year, he was called to the bar having had his name entered at Lincoln's Inn earlier in the 1840's.⁷⁵ He was already developing "a great reputation in Oxford as a prophet and a devotee of progress"⁷⁶

and by 1850 he was establishing himself as a respected journalist and thinker. He began writing for the Peelite Morning Chronicle in 1850 and five years later he joined the staff of the newly formed Saturday Review contributing regular articles generally on literary themes. In 1858 he was asked to serve on another commission, this one devoted to investigating the system of popular education. Smith was responsible for writing the section of the Commission's report relating to charitable endowments. Moreover, throughout this period his legal work, commission business, journalistic pursuits, and his personal friendships drew him to London where he became acquainted with many of the leading political and intellectual figures of nineteenth century Britain. Through Edward Coleridge, his Eton master, he was introduced to the leading Peelites and through various other contacts he met Thomas Carlyle, Lord Tennyson, Henry Hallam, T.H. Huxley, Lord Macaulay, John Tyndall, Louis Blanc and Giuseppe Mazzini, to mention only a few.⁷⁷

Perhaps the most important confirmation of Smith's confidence in the ultimate triumph of the (liberal) cause came in 1858 when he was appointed Regius Professor of Modern History at Oxford, by Lord Derby. Though "wholly unsolicited" the position "was the height of [his] desire"⁷⁸ not only because it provided him with a personal opportunity to contribute to the development of the strong professoriate he and many of his fellow reformers desired, but also because it marked an important step in the general transformation of higher education. Smith was one of a group of younger, more radical academics which was not satisfied with reform merely as a means of avoiding "drastic parliamentary intervention."⁷⁹ Although they did not in any way reject gradual

reform as a means to achieve their aims, their goals were part of a much wider vision of the role of universities in society. Following the principles of Dr. Arnold and other educational reformers, these academics were committed to restructuring the whole of society "through a secular (liberalism) deriving its leadership from the universities."⁸⁰ The emergence of appropriate leadership depended upon the advancement of progressive academics who would defend and promote social inquiry, thereby keeping the universities at the forefront of the nation's life and who would, through enlightened teaching and instruction, encourage the development of an intelligent class of young men imbued with this liberal outlook and dedicated to its practical implementation in all sectors of British society.

The study of history seemed particularly well-suited to the accomplishment of these goals. On a philosophical level, history could be used, as Macaulay, Arnold, and others had used it, to prove the validity of (liberal,) reformist principles, to demonstrate that these principles were responsible for Britain's evolution into a powerful and prosperous nation. At the same time, history could furnish practical examples and instances of progressive policies and leadership, and therefore, it was seen by reformers "as an appropriate vocational training for future politicians and administrators,"⁸¹ who would be called upon to undertake "the great work of government."⁸²

IV

Smith recognized the great significance of his appointment because he shared the reformist belief in the importance of historical studies in educating the future leaders of British society. Thus his Inaugural Lecture was a plea to maintain and to develop the new school of history

(then being attacked by Oxford conservatives as a utilitarian (liberal) plot to undermine the traditional forms and roles of higher education) and an attempt to win allies for the cause of (liberal) education in general.

He argued that the new schools created by the university were, to a certain extent, part of the plan to make education "a more direct training for life" and that the task of the new School of Law and Modern History, in particular, was to educate the sons of England's ruling class, the gentry.⁸² According to Smith, in England, unlike most of continental Europe, the landowning gentry retained both the large estates and the political ascendancy they had gained in feudal times. Because of their wealth and local influence they were able to insure the survival of local self-government and thus to prevent the prolonged triumph of either absolutism or the democratic despotism of parliaments dominated by one class of society. He held that in the Middle Ages the gentry held their power by virtue of their military might. However Smith argued, in order to retain their political ascendancy in modern times they would have to demonstrate "superiority of intelligence" and prove that "their government [was] a government of reason in the interest of the whole people."⁸⁴ The university's "mission," therefore, until such time as another dominant group or class emerged, was to develop "the political character and the intelligence of the English gentry." This would, he maintained, "for a long time to come, [be] a main object of our system and a principal test of its success."⁸⁵ Smith was convinced that the end result of training the gentry "to do their duty to the people" would be a "resident" and "well-educated" gentry that would "be able and willing to act as the

social and moral educators of those below them."⁸⁶

To fulfill this purpose Smith proposed a general course of studies in which the School of Law and Modern History was to play a crucial role. Although he acknowledged that the classics were "still the best instruments of education," and "a wonderful and precious manual of humanity," he felt that the complexities and problems of the modern world could only be "studied in modern writers" since the ancients could not possibly have been aware of them.⁸⁷ History, he asserted, could provide the required analysis of modern developments. Because it had not yet been "traversed by principles" and was therefore not a philosophy or a science, however, history drew much of its "educational value" from the related areas Jurisprudence and Political Economy.⁸⁸ In Smith's view, an understanding of the rules of utility and justice and production and distribution were essential to the future statesmen of a commercial and constitutionally-governed nation and history provided ample evidence of their functioning.⁸⁹

Moreover, simple narrative history offered students equally crucial examples of the ethical and moral side of men, thus helping to develop in them the affections and sympathies necessary to enlightened leadership.⁹⁰ Smith also regarded a knowledge of modern languages and natural sciences as a positive component of education and a helpful instrument in the study of history.⁹¹ Of necessity, however, British history had to be "the staple" of the students' historical reading. This, of course, did not pose a great problem since Britain's "greatness" and "the long unbroken continuity of its national life" made British history "the best of all possible historical studies,"⁹² and provided the professor with sufficient material to "teach the rich to do their

duty."⁹³

Smith conceded that the charge of utilitarianism could, with some justification, be leveled at his conception of education and of the study of history and he acknowledged that "Utilitarianism in education is a bad thing."⁹⁴ The alternative however, was considerably worse:

...the great places of national education may avoid Utilitarianism till government is in the hands of ambitious ignorance, till the Bench of Justice is filled with pettifoggers, till coarse cupidity and empiricism stand beside the sick bed, till all the great levers of opinion are in low, uneducated hands.⁹⁵

V

Despite its dire predictions, Smith's Inaugural Lecture was essentially optimistic in tone, reflecting his confident belief that the upper classes had accepted, or at least were learning to accept, (liberal) reform and the conception of education and society it implied. Events soon proved, however, that this optimism was largely unfounded. In 1859, Charles Darwin's Origin of Species was published. That same year A.R. Wallace's evolutionary study reached the reading public, and once again free inquiry faced religious orthodoxy in a battle which "demonstrated that the opponents of university reform would also oppose, and would use traditional privilege to suppress, scientific advance when its conclusions did not concur with dogma."⁹⁶ The famous debate between Bishop Samuel Wilberforce and T.H. Huxley symbolized the increasingly polarized struggle. A clerical alliance took shape and began actively to inhibit the progress of (liberal) academics, reform, and inquiry at Oxford.⁹⁷ In response, several (liberal) academics

published Essays and Reviews, "a deliberate provocation to the clerical party" which demanded "the (liberation) of scholarship from the dominion of High Church interpretations of the fathers, and the Evangelical insistence on the literal interpretation of scripture."⁹⁸

The renewed attack on (liberal) studies and the realization that further reform was by no means secured forced the younger and more radical academics like Smith to reconsider their acceptance of the limited reforms of 1854-56. Faced with the inherent contradictions of "the Broad Church compromise" which allowed nonconformists to enter the university but not to attain its highest honours, and determined that the clerical counter-attack should not succeed, the academic (liberals) began to campaign in earnest for far more radical reforms. They rejected the compromise of 1854-56 and demanded complete abolition of religious tests and all other clerical restrictions on university education. The battle which ensued "both necessitated an appeal to national politics, and reinforced an alignment with nonconformist radicalism: for nine years it linked the universities, (Liberal) politics, Nonconformity and the intellectual world of London."⁹⁹

The intensity and length of this controversy and the bonds which it solidified worked to radicalize the political beliefs of academics like Smith. The outbreak of the American civil war in 1861 and the British government's attitude toward the conflict insured that the process of radicalization would continue. When the war broke out, most university (liberals,) after some initial hesitation, supported what they considered the democratic North against the aristocratic and slaveholding South. The government, meanwhile, concerned about England's dependence on Southern cotton and the North's blockade of England,

sympathized with the South. The (liberals,) however, saw something more behind the government's policy. To them it was clearly an attempt to undermine a democratic experiment and reaffirm the validity of aristocratic government¹⁰⁰ and, in Smith's view, it was based on nothing more than "the balanced selfishness of the landowners and the commercial capitalists."¹⁰¹ He saw in it no underlying concern for the welfare of England or for general principles of justice and honour.¹⁰²

The academic (liberals) thus alienated themselves from the allies they had known when they were "only mildly left of centre." For Smith, "who was to become their leader," this meant discarding Whig and Peelite connections which too often supported government policy in favour of the radical politics of the Manchester School.¹⁰³ This new alliance brought him into contact with Richard Cobden and John Bright and his energy and dedication to the cause not only won him their personal friendship and respect but also "brought vividly to the public mind a new image of the university man."¹⁰⁴ The new alliance also involved connections with the working class, or at least certain sections of that class sympathetic to the Northern cause. After a warm reception at a public meeting in 1863 at the Manchester Union and Emancipation Society, where the audience was overwhelmingly working class, Smith came to see labour as morally upright and intelligent and better able to see the real issues at stake in the conflict - democracy and slavery - regardless of where their own economic interests lay. Like many other pro-federalist Englishmen, he probably overestimated the enthusiasm of workers for the Northern cause,¹⁰⁵ but in any event this favourable impression of labour revived his faith in progress and strengthened his belief that democracy, rather than aristocracy, could provide the means by which to insure

the continuation of that process. ^{Smith} His visit to America in 1864 only reinforced these democratic tendencies. Smith saw what he considered a remarkably healthy society, given the war effort, and one that was both economically prosperous and intellectually vibrant.¹⁰⁶

This process of radicalization was promoted and reinforced by other developments which Smith and his fellow (liberals) saw as further indications of a conservative revival in England. Throughout 1866, leading conservatives, including Thomas Carlyle, Lord Alfred Tennyson, and John Ruskin, rallied to the support of Governor Eyre of Jamaica who had been implicated in the brutal suppression of a native revolt in that colony in October 1865 and who, as a result, was being investigated by a government commission of inquiry.¹⁰⁷ Their defence of Eyre was persuasive and they found allies among those people who believed "that men of whatever breed should be kept in their places and ruled firmly - through natural deference where possible, by force if necessary."¹⁰⁸ Similar sentiments were clearly behind the resistance to political reform in Britain in the 1860's. Led by Robert Lowe, the opponents of greater democratization scored a major victory in June, 1866 when a moderate reform bill was rejected by Parliament despite widespread public support for further reform.¹⁰⁹ As well, the agitation for the abolition of religious tests at Oxford and Cambridge continued to meet with strong opposition¹¹⁰ and the conclusion of the American Civil War did not alter substantially, the generally negative attitude of the upper classes towards the new world democracy.¹¹¹

In response to this perceived resurgence of conservatism, Smith enthusiastically joined the reform campaign of 1866-7. He spoke at the Oxford Reform league in 1866 and in 1867 he contributed an essay

on "The Experience of the American Commonwealth" to Essays on Reform, a series of articles written by leading academic (liberals) in support of political reform in Britain.¹¹² As well, in July, 1866 the Jamaica Committee was formed to campaign for the prosecution of Governor Eyre for the murder of the Jamaica rebel leader George Gordon. Smith, along with J.S. Mill, T.H. Huxley, Herbert Spencer and others, played a large role in this organization, and in 1867, he delivered a series of historical lectures, later published as Three English Statesmen, to raise money to support it.¹¹³ Moreover, he kept up his involvement in the religious tests controversy by writing and speaking in favour of the cause of secular education. At the same time, he wrote many articles and letters in attempt to reduce the post-Civil War tension between Britain and America.¹¹⁴

Yet despite the amount of time and effort Smith devoted to championing these and other (liberal) causes during the 1860's, he did not neglect his duties as historian and professor. He wrote historical essays on a wide variety of topics during this period and produced some interesting historical criticism in addition to a lengthy sketch on Irish History and Irish Character published in 1861. Moreover he fulfilled his professional duties with distinction and he seemed to have a brilliant career ahead of him.¹¹⁵ Unfortunately, he was forced to resign his chair in 1866 to care for his sick father, who took his own life the following year. Though it greatly disrupted Smith's life and undoubtedly left permanent emotional scars, this tragedy left Smith free to pursue his other interests, particularly his historical ones.¹¹⁶ His commitment to the cause of reform in Britain remained firm but the intransigence of the upper classes in the face of change convinced him

that progress, though helped along by passage of the second Reform Act in 1867, would be a much slower process than he had hoped. Personally disillusioned but confident nevertheless that his friends and colleagues were more than capable of promoting the (liberal) cause, he decided to return to America to pursue his interest, originally aroused in 1864, in that republic's history. His decision coincided with a visit to England by Andrew White, president of the newly formed Cornell University in Ithaca, New York. White offered him an appointment at Cornell and Smith gratefully accepted. He left England in the fall of 1868 at the age of forty-five.¹¹⁷ Many observers must have felt that Smith, by moving to America, had rejected Britain and all it stood for. Yet Smith remained deeply and permanently attached to the traditions, ideals, and values he had learned in mid-nineteenth century Britain and they shaped and informed virtually everything he wrote and said for the rest of his long life.

He accepted the professorship of English & constitutional history at Cornell.

Notes

Chapter I

- ✓ 1. Walter Houghton, The Victorian Frame of Mind, 1830-1870, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1957), pp. 1-4 and 8-11.
See also Richard Altick, Victorian People and Ideas, (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1973), pp. 73-74. Goldwin Smith often referred to his own times as an era of transition. (See Goldwin Smith, "The Origin of Morality," North American Review, 167 (October, 1898), p. 427) and Elisabeth Wallace, Goldwin Smith Victorian Liberal, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1957), p. 217, a quote from an 1888 letter from Smith to Mrs. Humphry Ward.
2. The social, economic, and political effects of these revolutions have been discussed by many historians but E.P. Thompson's The Making of the English Working Class, first published by Victor Gollancz in 1963, is by far the most comprehensive account of lower class life in late eighteenth and early nineteenth century Britain.
3. Houghton, p. 27; R.K. Webb, Modern England, (New York: Dodd, Head & Co., 1975), pp. 152-3 and 158-9.
4. Webb, pp. 186-9 and 193-201; Altick, pp. 81-89.
5. Houghton, pp. 27-32.
6. The ideological and political differences among various liberal thinkers and reformers are discussed in many works dealing with Victorian intellectual life. Three were particularly useful for this study: Christopher Harvie, The Lights of Liberalism, (London: Penguin Books Ltd., 1976); T.W. Heyck, The Transformation of Intellectual Life in Victorian England, (London: Croom Helm, 1982); Christopher Kent, Brains and Numbers, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1978).
7. Maurice Mandelbaum, History, Man, and Reason, (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1971), pp. . Houghton, p. 27.
8. Houghton, p. 14.
9. Heyck, pp. 155-6; Altick, pp. 246-7.
10. Houghton, p. 28.
11. Ibid., pp. 28-9.
12. Heyck, p. 65.
13. Ibid., p. 156-9.

14. Houghton, p. 142.
15. W.R. Ward, Victorian Oxford, (London: Frank Cass & Co. Ltd., 1965), p. 146.
16. Kent, p. 10.
17. Heyck, p. 73.
18. Ibid., p. 72.
19. Ibid., p. 69-70; Kent, p. 9; Webb, p. 225.
20. Kent, p. 9.
21. Webb, p. 226.
22. Ibid., p. 230.
23. Ward, p. 111.
24. Webb, p. 230.
25. Kent, p. 5.
26. Harvie, p. 29.
27. Webb, p. 231.
28. Ibid., p. 232.
See also Harvie, p. 31.
29. Harvie, pp. 30-31; Webb, p. 232.
30. Harvie, p. 34.
31. Kent, pp. 5-6.
32. Webb, p. 253.
33. Webb, pp. 258-272.
34. quoted in Kent, p. 5.
35. The Dictionary of National Biography, 2nd Supplement 1901-1911, vol. 1, 1920 ed., s.v. "Smith, Goldwin," by Sidney Lee, p. 328; Goldwin Smith, Reminiscences, ed., Arnold Haultain, (New York: The Macmillan Co. Ltd., 1910), p. 5; Wallace, p. 4.
36. Kent, p. 5.
- (1) 37. Harvie, p. 23.

- (2) 38. D.N.B., p. 328; Smith, Reminiscences, pp. 5-6; Wallace, p. 4.
39. Smith, Reminiscences, pp. 2 and 4.
- (3) 40. D.N.B., p. 328; Smith, Reminiscences, pp. 12 and 159; Wallace, p. 6.
41. Smith, Reminiscences, p. 159.
42. For an account of Smith's years at Eton see: D.N.B., p. 329; Smith, Reminiscences, pp. 35-49; Wallace, p. 4.
- (4) 43. Kent, p. 8.
- (5) 44. Harvie, p. 55.
45. The Dictionary of National Biography, 1st Supplement 1818-1899, vol. XXII, 1909 ed., s.v. "Congreve, Richard," by T. Hudson Beare, p. 476.
46. Ibid.
- (6) 47. Smith, Reminiscences, p. 51.
- (7) 48. Ibid., pp. 51-2.
49. The Dictionary of National Biography, v. IV, 1908 ed., s.v. "Conington, John," by Henry Nettleship, pp. 938-42.
50. Smith, Reminiscences, pp. 67-8.
- (8) 51. D.N.B., 2nd Supplement, vol. 1, s.v., "Smith, Goldwin," p. 329.
- (9) 52. His honours included winning the Hertford Scholarship in 1842, and the Ireland Scholarship, the Chancellor's prize for Latin verse, and a first class in Literae Humaniores in 1845. See D.N.B., "Smith, Goldwin," p. 329.
- (10) 53. Kent, p. 10; Harvie, pp. 31-2.
- (11) 54. Smith, Reminiscences, p. 74.
55. D.N.B., 2nd Supplement, vol. 1, s.v., "Smith, Goldwin," p. 329.
- (12) 56. Ward, p. 132.
57. Webb, pp. 271-2.
58. Ibid., p. 275.
59. Ward, pp. 144-7 and 151-2.
60. D.N.B., 2nd Supplement, vol. 1, s.v., "Smith, Goldwin," p. 330; Wallace, p. 7.
61. Kent, p. 9; Heyck, p. 157.
- (15) 62. D.N.B., 2nd Supplement, vol. 1, s.v., "Smith, Goldwin," p. 330; Heyck, p. 10.

63. Heyck, p. 162.
64. Ibid., p. 164.
65. Ibid., p. 165.
66. Ibid., p. 166.
67. Ibid.
68. Ibid., pp. 161 and 167; Kent, pp. 10-11 and 14; Harvie, p. 23.
69. D.N.B., 2nd Supplement, vol. 1, s.v. "Smith, Goldwin," p. 330.
70. Webb, pp. 290-1.
For a more detailed account of the acts of Parliament see Ward,
pp. 193-202.
71. Wallace, pp. 7-8.
72. Smith, Reminiscences, pp. 114-5.
73. The limits of liberal reformism were clearly delineated during
this episode when many reformers, including Goldwin Smith served
as special constables to help maintain peace.
74. Webb, pp. 278-9.
- (13) 75. D.N.B., 2nd Supplement, vol. 1, s.v. "Smith, Goldwin," p. 329;
Wallace, pp. 5-6.
- (14) 76. Ward, p. 132.
77. D.N.B., 2nd Supplement, vol. 1, s.v. "Smith, Goldwin," p. 330;
Wallace, pp. 10-16; Smith, Reminiscences, pp. 132-56.
For Smith's own complete account of these experiences see Smith,
Reminiscences, pp. 116-173.
78. Smith, Reminiscences, p. 272.
79. Harvie, p. 31.
80. Ibid., p. 47.
81. Ibid., p. 44.
82. Quoted in Kent, p. 7; See also p. 8.
83. Goldwin Smith, "Inaugural Lecture," in Lectures on Modern History,
(Oxford: J.H. and Jas. Parker, 1861), pp. 11-14.
84. Ibid., pp. 13-20.
85. Ibid., pp. 19-20.
86. Ibid., pp. 13-14.

87. Ibid., pp. 22-4.
88. Ibid., pp. 26-7.
89. Ibid., pp. 29-33.
90. Ibid., p. 33.
91. Ibid., p. 36.
92. Ibid., p. 36.
93. Ibid., p. 16.
94. Ibid., p. 12.
95. Ibid.
96. Harvie, pp. 45-7.
97. Ibid., p. 77.
98. Ibid., pp. 45-7.
99. Ibid., pp. 75-6.
100. Ibid., pp. 105-8; Kent, pp. 24-5; Wallace, pp. 28-30; Smith, Reminiscences, pp. 319-20.
Goldwin Smith's personal assessment of the events surrounding the Civil War can be found in Smith, Reminiscences, pp. 319-356.
101. Quoted in Harvie, p. 111.
102. Wallace, pp. 29-30.
103. Harvie, p. 108.
104. Ibid., p. 112.
105. Smith, Reminiscences, pp. 320-22; Harvie, pp. 112-15.
106. Harvie, p. 109; Wallace, p. 36; Kent, p. 38.
107. Webb, pp. 316-18; Wallace, pp. 23-4; Harvie, pp. 126-7; Kent, pp. 25-6; Smith, Reminiscences, pp. 357-9.
108. Webb, p. 318.
109. Harvie, pp. 121-5; Kent, pp. 35-6; Webb, pp. 323-4.
110. For a detailed account of the prolonged difficulties encountered by the advocates of abolition see Harvie, pp. 74-96.

111. Goldwin Smith Bibliography 1845-1913, ed. Patricia H. Gafney. Collection of Regional History and University Archives, John M. Olin Library, Ithaca: New York, 1972, pp. 10-11. A glance at these pages containing entries for 1865 and 1866 demonstrates Smith's continuing concern with the issues involved in the Civil War and Britain's response to it.
112. Goldwin Smith Bibliography, p. 11; Harvie, p. 263.
- (16) 113. Webb, pp. 316-18; Wallace, pp. 23-4; Harvie, pp. 126-7; Kent, pp. 25-6; Smith, Reminiscences, pp. 357-9.
- (17) 114. Goldwin Smith Bibliography, pp. 10-12; Harvie, pp. 88-9.
- (18) 115. Wallace, p. 18; Harvie, p. 128; Herman Ausubel, "Goldwin Smith," in Some Modern Historians of Britain, eds. Herman Ausubel, J. Bartlet Brebner, and Erling M. Hunt, (New York: The Dryden Press, 1951), p. 93.
- (19) 116. Smith, Reminiscences, p. 365; Wallace, p. 22; Harvie, p. 128; D.N.B., 2nd Supplement, vol. 1, s.v. "Smith, Goldwin," p.333; F.H. Underhill, In Search of Canadian Liberalism, (Toronto: The Macmillan Company of Canada Ltd., 1965), p. 89.
117. Smith, Reminiscences, pp. 365-6; Wallace, p. 40; D.N.B., 2nd Supplement, vol. 1, s.v. "Smith, Goldwin," p.333 -4.

CHAPTER II

The Greatness of England

Goldwin Smith's interest in the study of history and his views on the theory, purpose, and content of history were very much the product of the self-consciously historical age in which he lived. In the early years of the nineteenth century Whig thinkers were anxious to promote the major political reforms that they felt would reflect the social and economic changes brought about by the age of revolution. In search of arguments in favour of reform, some of them turned to the historical record to prove that the key to Britain's greatness rested in the continual development of her ancient constitution to accomodate modern changes. In order to promote this view certain Whig supporters began to write a version of English history that stressed the evolution of constitutional government over the ages. One of the first and by far the most famous contributor to this Whig interpretation of English history was Thomas Babington Macaulay. To a large extent, his works established the basic framework for much of the liberal, reformist, and radical history written during the nineteenth century.

Concerned with immediate political issues, Macaulay's work was largely political. His historical outlook was that of a modern Whig. As a member of parliament at the time of the first reform bill, he saw and supported the growth of political liberty and enlightened government and he looked into history to find both its origins and its justification.¹ He found both in England's ancient constitution which "took its rise in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, with Magna Carta and the summoning of the burgesses and knights of the shire to Parliament."

Though "imperfect" at the outset "its essential character was clear: monarchy was limited, the sovereign was below the law; kings could not tax, or legislate without Parliament."² According to Macaulay, arbitrary government under the Tudors was one of a few "aberrations which never became a settled, accepted part of the constitution." Therefore in the seventeenth century "there was a free constitution for Parliament to defend and by defending to add to and improve." It was from this constitution and the precedent of its ongoing development that England's modern liberties and reforms derived.³

Macaulay's great popularity as a writer and an historian soon made this view of England's past a very influential one⁴ and its influence was extended and entrenched by social, economic, and political events after 1848 which brought stability, prosperity, and optimism about the future to English society.⁵ Other Victorian historians accepted this general interpretation of England's past though they often disagreed with many of Macaulay's specific opinions of individuals and events. J.W. Burrow has recently argued that, apart from Macaulay, William Stubbs and E.A. Freeman both produced important works between 1848 and 1878 which could be seen as contributions to the Whig view of history. He also suggested that Samuel R. Gardiner, J.R. Green, and W.E.H. Lecky made similar contributions during the same period. The outlooks and works of these men varied greatly but, to a certain extent, they all shared the belief that England's greatness rested in her ancient free constitution and its progressive development through the ages.⁶

Yet despite its popularity and influence, the Whig view of history was not without its opponents and critics in Victorian England. Conservatives generally disagreed with its unfavourable portrayal of the

48

monarchy and the aristocracy in the constitutional battles of past centuries; more importantly, they tended to question and even to reject the whole notion of progress through change and reform. This latter criticism was echoed by another group of historians who did not dispute the assertion that progress had indeed taken place but whose conception of progress differed greatly from that of prominent Whig historians like Macaulay. Macaulay was influenced by the rationalist ideas of the eighteenth century⁷ and tended to view progress as the triumph of the human mind (especially the intellectual and scientific component of it) over the environment. He applauded the accomplishments of "applied science" which had contributed so much to the advanced state of English society in the nineteenth century and he looked forward confidently to its future achievements.⁸ His confidence in man's intellect was shared by the Positivists who believed that society passed through successive stages of intellectual development, each stage higher than the one which preceded it, on its way to the positive or scientific stage. For these thinkers, the process was intellectual and scientific, based on the continuous advancement of human knowledge. Later, such views were further reinforced by the theories of Charles Darwin, published in the second half of the century, which suggested that an inevitable process of natural, biological evolution was responsible both for man's existence and for the complex development of his brain.

An alternative to this intellectual, scientific view was formulated early in the nineteenth century by Thomas Arnold and the Liberal Anglican historians. These historians rejected the rationalism of Henry Hallam, James Mill, George Grote, and Macaulay for whom progress was an un-

questioned assumption, "an unbroken course of inevitable material improvement," and intellectual development.⁹ Wrote Julius Hare, "How baseless and delusive is the vulgar notion of the march of mind as necessarily exhibiting a steady regular advance within the same nation in all things."¹⁰ For the Liberal Anglicans inevitable progress was unacceptable because it did away with their "absolute presupposition," God's Providence.¹¹ As their title implied, the men of this school--Thomas Arnold, Connop Thirwall, Dean Milman, Julius Hare, and A.P. Stanley among others--were deeply religious and, although they like most other nineteenth century historians stressed the importance of the growth of the nation's "mental life" in interpreting the development of society, for them, all progress, mental or otherwise depended "entirely on Christianity."¹² They claimed that Christian teachings inspired "man's efforts for good" by providing him with "an understanding of God's purpose, so far as it is visible," a goal, in other words, to which he must strive, and the faith to endure the struggle towards it.¹³ The goal, as they saw it, "the culmination of the education of the human race," was the spiritual unity of mankind "with Christ as its head." Genuine progress for the Liberal Anglicans was "therefore synonymous with the development of true religion, that is to say, with Christianity."¹⁴

Such theoretical disputes did not, however, prevent many Whig and Liberal Anglican historians from agreeing on the purpose, as opposed to the theory, of history. Like their colleagues and contemporaries in other intellectual fields, many of them were preoccupied with educating the English population and shaping public opinion. Carlyle, Macaulay, Green, John Seeley, Lord Acton, J.A. Froude, Thorold

Rogers, and Leslie Stephen were all historians; they were also, according to the definition offered by T.W. Heyck, Victorian "men of letters" who believed that it was their function to provide moral leadership and guidance to a population displaced and troubled by political, social, economic, and mental change.¹⁵ They recognized that in the aftermath of the Industrial Revolution, the literate public was being confronted with an overwhelming and baffling array of conflicting views on the most fundamental issues. Political problems such as parliamentary reform, international trade, working class radicalism, and imperial policy added to the general confusion of a population faced with increasingly complex developments in industrial and scientific technology. At the same time in the intellectual sphere "new or rapidly developing subjects like geology, political economy, biblical criticism, anthropology and sociology" left most Englishmen puzzled while new philosophical and scientific theories and concepts such as positivism and evolution with their questioning of accepted Christian belief aroused grave uncertainties concerning the very nature of man and his place in the world.¹⁶

These "upheavals in their mental and material frames of reference generated in Englishmen a powerful need for guidance and support."¹⁷ This need had once been fulfilled by the church but during the Victorian era men began to depend, to a much greater extent, on "secular sources" for the direction and reassurance essential to their peace of mind in a volatile environment.¹⁸ Increasingly men of letters--novelists, social critics, poets, philosophers, scientists, economists, as well as historians--were expected to provide the necessary moral leadership, "to help the audience through the troubles of economic, social, and

religious change."¹⁹ In this context it was understandable, indeed even natural, that many historians should have come to see themselves "as preachers and sages, with an essentially didactic function," explaining and interpreting the material and mental changes of the day to an anxious public.²⁰

Determined to help shape national opinion, they not only wrote with great moral commitment--a belief that they were asserting "sacred and mighty principles" and striving to achieve "vast ends"²¹--but they also wrote in a manner that would be understood by an ever-widening audience which, though increasingly literate, was generally not highly educated. Many of these historians no doubt would have agreed with Walter Bagehot's assertion that writers should

speak to the many so that they will listen
- that they will like to listen - that they
will understand. It is of no use addressing
them with the forms of science, or the rigour
of accuracy, or the tedium of exhaustive dis-
cussion. The multitude are impatient of
system, desirous of brevity, puzzled by
formality.²²

Victorian writers, he argued, should not concern themselves with long, detailed, scholarly works which attempted to analyze "all difficulties" but rather should attempt to offer "the lessons of a wider experience."²³

As far as Matthew Arnold was concerned:

The great men of culture are those who have had a passion for diffusing, for making prevail...the best knowledge, the best ideas of their time; who have laboured to divest knowledge of all that was harsh, uncouth, difficult, abstract, professional, exclusive; to humanize it, to make it efficient outside the clique of the cultivated and learned, yet still remaining the best knowledge and thought of the time.²⁴

This desire to make knowledge more accessible to the many often produced writers who were generalists and popularizers, who were concerned more with the "assimilation and interpretation" of knowledge than with "research - the deliberate discovery of new knowledge."²⁵

The determination to reach and to instruct the public was apparent in the work of many Victorian historians. Macaulay popularized a version of English history which he believed would help to shape the future.²⁶ Seeley used history to teach the future rulers of society how to be statesmen,²⁷ while Leslie Stephen wrote all his work, including his history, with the intention of "making clear what others had thought or observed first."²⁸ Lord Acton maintained that historical study was "the basis of all real insights into the present" and "a school of virtue and a guide to life."²⁹ There were those who rejected this view of the purpose of history yet until the late nineteenth century it retained great influence and helped to shape the outlooks of many young intellectuals.

II

Goldwin Smith's views on the theory and purpose of history were clearly influenced by the examples set by both the Whigs and the Liberal Anglicans. Theoretically his work owed most to the latter.³⁰ Not only had Smith heard Milman's sermons as a boy and Arnold's lectures as a student at Oxford but he had also developed friendships with several of Arnold's pupils at university, one of whom was A.P. Stanley, who later served with Smith as secretary of the Oxford reform commission in the early 1850's.³¹ These experiences left a lasting impression on Smith's view of history and progress. Smith's approach to history was essentially that of a Christian idealist. He believed that God had

created man and had implanted in him an aspiring and moral nature which provided him with the ability, the knowledge, and the desire to improve himself and his world morally, intellectually, and materially. He was sustained in his aspirations by the promise of immortality, also the gift of God. Smith claimed further that God had given Christ to the world to stand as an ideal which all mankind would strive to achieve. His high moral character and his humanitarian teachings, especially benevolence and the brotherhood of man, inspired men with the knowledge of how to elevate human character which, for Smith, was the only conceivable purpose for man's existence.³²

The movement towards moral perfection, however, required great effort. Smith therefore concluded that "effort is the law, if law it is to be called, of History. History is a series of struggles to elevate the character of humanity in all its aspects, religious, intellectual, social, political..."³³ Human progress then was "a progress of effort," based on man's determination to expand his knowledge and understanding of God's purpose.³⁴ Because effort depended on human will and historical circumstances, both of which were complex and unpredictable, Smith maintained that the "awakening of moral life" was not always continuous or regular and that relapses could and did occur. Nevertheless he thought it obvious that "the history of the race" had exhibited "a course of moral, intellectual, and material progress" such that a general "doctrine" might be proposed.³⁵ Smith argued with some conviction that

the knowledge and wealth of our race increase and accumulate from age to age, and that their increase and accumulation re-act powerfully on the moral state of man. It is less obvious but it seems not less certain, that our views of morality itself expand, and that our moral code is improved, as, by the extension human intercourse, our moral

relations are multiplied, and as, by the advancement of science and jurisprudence, they become better understood.³⁶

The elevation of human character - individual and collective - which was the natural result of this historical process, would, in Smith's view, ultimately lead man to form a truly moral community of all mankind which, in the most fundamental sense, would be based on the recognition of the ideas "of a universal Father, a brotherhood of mankind, of humanity itself."³⁷ It would, he claimed, teach men

to believe in a society embracing all races, a common effort and a common hope, international relations modified by those beliefs, the infeasible sanctity of human life, mercy, humility, charity, the spiritual equality of the sexes, purity, the value of virtues other than military, the spiritual worth and dignity of the weak things of this world.³⁸

Moreover, this community would uphold and defend qualities crucial to true Christian character, but which the narrowly "austere, priestly or puritanic" versions of Christianity excluded.³⁹ Great intellectual achievements, both scientific and artistic, had and would continue to have their source in the "Christian virtue" of self-devotion while "Christianity, by first proclaiming the equality and brotherhood of men, became the parent of just and enduring liberty" and its most able and devoted guardian for all time.⁴⁰ As well, in its true form, Christianity had promoted and would continue to promote productivity and prosperity without encouraging wasteful luxury.⁴¹

Smith argued that man's movement toward this grand design could best be accomplished in an environment of long term stability and order in which the past as far as possible could "slide quietly into the future."⁴² He was convinced that, at its best, progress was "continuous and calm" and that from the careful and methodical testing of various

forms and principles for society "with the mental efforts and the sacrifices they involve, humanity gain(ed) what no sudden illumination could give it, large spiritual experience, and a deep sense of the value of truth."⁴³ For Smith this calm and stable, yet flexible and fluid, environment had to be a society which upheld the rule of law, fulfilled the material needs of its people, guaranteed "the utmost possible freedom of self-development" and encouraged the pursuit of knowledge and truth.⁴⁴

The moral education of society was the dominant theme in Smith's philosophy of history and, like many of his colleagues, he was anxious to contribute as much as he could to that education. Thus he shaped his historical writings to reach and to instruct the widest possible audience. Smith shared Macaulay's conviction that past events were not significant in and of themselves but rather because they might lead "us to form just calculations with respect to the future."⁴⁵ He believed that the purpose of history was to provide lessons that would instruct the public on both philosophical issues such as the nature of true morality and practical issues such as the need for political reform. He maintained, moreover, that in order to be useful historical studies had to be based on clearly drawn morals, simple lessons, and a popular style which appealed to ordinary people. An historian like Stubbs, though a master in his own right whose works were an invaluable source for other historians, had done little to make the lessons of history accessible to a curious public.⁴⁶ Smith, on the other hand, set out to be a generalizer of history.⁴⁷ Only one of his book-length works required more than one volume to complete while the others seldom exceeded more than 250 pages. Most of his work was published in the form of review essays in the major British and North

American periodicals of the day. His language was "clear, incisive, fresh, and vigorous" and his imaginative style brought "the figures of the past back to life in his pages."⁴⁸ As well he did not simply narrate the events of history but attempted to interpret them for his readers, to discuss their causes and their significance.⁴⁹

The content of Smith's historical works was also influenced by his desire to speak to the general public. Smith made no attempt to discover new documentary sources or to offer an innovative and original interpretation of history. Instead he based his work on a wide reading of secondary sources and he stayed well within the boundaries of traditional political history reflecting, to a large extent, the Whig view of history. Like most Victorian liberals Smith was imbued with a sense of the greatness of his nation. That greatness, he believed, derived from England's unique historical development which provided an unusually stable, enlightened environment in which moral character and moral community could steadily improve. Smith was certainly not alone in assuming that these peculiar circumstances had placed mid-Victorian England at the forefront of human progress and had given her the special mission of leading the rest of the world towards free and balanced government, social stability, material prosperity and moral intellectual, scientific, and religious enlightenment.⁵⁰ He believed that because of her unique position, England's political history was of special interest to all those who were concerned with promoting progress throughout the world.

III

Goldwin Smith's approach to English history changed little in the fifty or more years that he wrote on the subject and for this reason it is possible to examine the body of his work as a whole rather than in sections. The most complete expression of his approach is contained in his two volume work entitled The United Kingdom: A Political History and it will be the primary focus of this discussion, though several other of his essays, reviews, and articles will be used to supplement it. The United Kingdom was Smith's longest single work and, published in 1899 when he was nearly eighty, it can be seen as an attempt to keep alive the ideals, values, and traditions which he believed were the source not only of England's greatness but also of the movement for worldwide progress. In the 1890's, the growth of imperialism, especially in the English-speaking world, seemed to threaten everything in which he believed. Smith must have felt that the Christian notions of justice, brotherhood, and benevolence were becoming lost in the rhetoric of the white man's burden and the Darwinian struggle for existence in which only the strongest animal, man, or nation survived.

Smith, himself, attributed a "limited aim" to the book claiming that he only wanted "to give the ordinary reader...a clear, connected, and succinct view of the political history of the United Kingdom as it appears in the light of recent research and discussion."⁵¹ He stated that his friends had "urged" him to write it so, unlike one or two of his other works, it cannot be said to have been inspired by any particular event or issue.⁵² Nevertheless, one cannot help feeling that, once convinced to undertake the task, he produced a work that, at base, was an

eloquent attempt to reassure his readers that justice, benevolence, and brotherhood would prevail in the end despite historical setbacks like the one through which they were all living.

i The Constitution Emerges

In the opening chapter of The United Kingdom: A Political History, Smith argued that

England has taken the lead in solving the problem of constitutional government; of government, that is, with authority, but limited by law, controlled by opinion, and respecting personal right and freedom. This she has done for the world and herein lies the world's chief interest in her history.⁵³

He therefore made the political events which led to the emergence of constitutional government the primary theme in the work. He believed that the most important element in England's constitutional development was political progress towards the formation of a national government which understood and reflected the needs of the whole nation and acted in its best interests. He argued that the roots of this process could be found in the political consciousness engendered by the early governing institutions of the Germanic tribes that settled England in the fifth century. According to Smith they tended towards "self-government" based on "local institutions" and an inclination towards "freehold ownership of land."⁵⁴ The power of their kings was limited and subject to the consent of an assembly of civil and ecclesiastical leaders, while all "public land belonged to the nation not the king."⁵⁵ The character of this early community was substantially improved by the advent of Christianity in 597, which in Smith's opinion did much to counteract the "warlike" qualities so predominant in primitive times.⁵⁶ The English church, however, was national though it maintained an

offspring's allegiance to mother Rome. In fact, Smith argued, at this point the English church bore "nearly the same relation to the state which it bore after the Reformation."⁵⁷

Yet while Smith applauded the progressive tendencies of this early system, he also understood its weaknesses especially in an age of invasion and conquest. Despite the limits placed on the powers of the king the stability of the community was still dependent to large extent on his strength and ability. Alfred (871-901) and his line (to 979) were effective rulers and Harold (1066) might have been, had not the instability and weaknesses brought on by the Danish invasions and the subsequent rule of Edward the Confessor (1043-1066) "tempted a mighty robber" in the Norman prince William (1066-1087).⁵⁸ In considering William's place in English history, Smith stated that his "enterprise had a double character; it was a crusade as well as a conquest."⁵⁹ The Norman monarchy established itself as an autocracy in which the king owned all the public land and distributed it through a system of military tenure to the Norman aristocracy--"a class dedicated to arms."⁶⁰ Moreover, while the "national basis" of land tenure was being replaced by a territorial, military system, the national church was being assailed by the Hildebrandic papacy which, according to Smith, intended to set "the church free from secular influence" to make it more Roman, and eventually to place it well above the state in power and status.⁶¹ It was out of these developments that the basic forms of feudalism appeared to Smith to have arisen.

Smith rejected the view that the Norman conquest was "a blessing in disguise" claiming that political development, and national unity could have been promoted as much by Harold and his successors.⁶² Yet Smith had

to accept the conquest as an historical fact and although he criticized the Norman social order he admitted the monarchy, the aristocracy, and the church established by William were to play important, if not selfless, roles in the constitutional development of England. In the absence of thriving, independent towns and cities, and with peasants and labourers still "tied to the soil," it was these institutions "by their interaction and collision, at first almost blind," that formed "the rudimentary constitution" of England.⁶³ Of these, "the three pieces on the political board,"⁶⁴ during the middle ages Smith generally viewed the monarchy as having been the primary source of political progress. In the movement from feudal to national institutions and government it was, in Smith's view, often necessary to curtail the ambitious pretensions of the church and the nobility, whose foreign and personal allegiances posed a threat to national development.

The monarchy generally fulfilled this role. Henry II (1154-1189), Edward I (1272-1307), and Henry IV (1399-1413) made the most notable contributions to the nation according to Smith. Henry II was able to make "a national monarchy supreme over the baronage" and to restore order after the baronial "anarchy" of Stephen's reign.⁶⁵ He improved England's system of public justice making it "an oasis...in a Europe of dark and arbitrary tribunals," and under him "the spirit of the law" and "the science of jurisprudence" began to replace the rule of tribal and feudal custom.⁶⁶ In Smith's view, this was an integral part of Henry's attempt to remove control of government and administration from the whims of various feudal lords and to place it in the hands of an organized, coherent, and centralized body headed by the national monarch and his council. Smith saw this same movement from feudal to national "machinery"

in Henry's financial and commercial policies.⁶⁷

According to Smith, however, these progressive developments were hindered by the "irrepressible and internecine" conflict between the emerging nation-state and the church, the power of which had been "creeping onwards to the subversion of royal authority and national independence."⁶⁸ The cause of church supremacy and privilege found its English champion in Thomas Becket who Smith claimed was motivated not by a moral desire to raise the Christian character of English society but by a determination to promote papal power.⁶⁹ Smith maintained that "the government could deal with him only in one of two ways, by throwing itself at his feet or by taking him by the throat."⁷⁰ Henry chose the latter and though Smith did not support his extreme behaviour, he believed that he had during the conflict, put the interests of the nation first.⁷¹

Nearly a century later, during the reign of Edward I even greater steps were taken by the monarchy to secure national development. Edward made "parliamentary government national, constitutional, and permanent."⁷² Smith claimed that he was able to do this because he was a strong king but at the same time was "liberal enough to desire partnership with his people."⁷³ He was the true founder of parliamentary government and the parliament he called was "essentially perfect, the archetype of all parliaments to come, consisting of the three estates of the realm; the lords temporal and spiritual..., the commons represented by two knights elected by each county and two burghers elected by each borough; and the body of the clergy represented by their elected proctors."⁷⁴ The House of Commons, whose members were elected by local assemblies which formed the foundation of the whole system, "met to grant supplies, to

give advice to the king, to inform him about the state and wants of their districts."⁷⁵ The legislative power of parliament was limited. The king and his chosen advisors, who met in his council, directed policy and legislation but parliament had great influence through its powers of taxation.⁷⁶

Beyond the definitive establishment of parliamentary institutions, Edward I made other important contributions to the development of balanced constitutional and national government, according to Smith. He altered feudal land tenure and curbed the local power of the lords. He made the church "an estate of the realm, liable to national burdens," and "not a dominion apart," for although he was religious, Edward would not tolerate papal or ecclesiastical encroachments on the secular power.⁷⁷ As well, Edward I helped to move England to "a higher stage of civilization" by giving her "life under fixed law," by giving the foundations of common law "a lasting form," and by improving the judiciary and separating it more completely from the other branches of government.⁷⁸

In Smith's view, Henry IV's contribution to the development of constitutional government was not as significant as that of Edward I but it was still an important one. He, "the offspring of a popular house and a popular revolution, was of all the kings in the middle ages the most constitutional, and of the powers of the medieval parliament his reign is the high-water mark."⁷⁹ He accepted and respected the Commons, even tolerating its inquiries into his personal household, in recognition of the great strength of the elective principle. Moreover, in an age of foreign and internal hostilities, great divisions in the church, oligarchical faction and conspiracy, Henry, according to Smith, "certainly represented order, national unity, and civilization."⁸⁰

Despite the progressive character of these kings, however, there were times, in Smith's view, when weak or corrupt misrule on the part of the monarchy made the church and the nobility the "provisional champions and guardians of liberty."⁸¹ William II (1087-1100) for example was "a monster of tyranny and lust" who "filled his coffers with the fruit of his lawless exactions, and his dungeons with the victims of his injustice."⁸² Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury under William, attempted to curb the king's evil nature and to restore moral order to the decadent court and society that surrounded him. For his efforts, this virtuous and benevolent man was terrorized and persecuted by William.⁸³ The despotic rule of King John (1199-1216) was in Smith's view rooted in his intense conflict with Innocent III over the relative powers of church and state. At the conclusion of his war with Rome he made no peace with his subjects for having circumvented the traditional forms of government and finance. As a result, there developed "a great political movement in which the strength of the Angevin monarchy, with its army of mercenaries, and the decline of the feudal militia, compelled the nobility to enlist the people" in "defense of liberty and right," as guaranteed by "the laws of Edward the Confessor" and "the Charter of Henry I."⁸⁴ Civil war ensued and John was soon forced to treat with the barons at Runnymede where he accepted the Great Charter, the first great document of English liberty of which all the others, to Smith were, "complements or reassertions."⁸⁵ In his view the most significant aspects of the Charter were the enshrinement of the principle of redress of wrongs and the securing of personal liberty and "unbought justice."⁸⁶ Because the benefits of the Charter, moreover, filtered down to the freeman and the villain Smith concluded that it had a "broad national

character" and that in upholding it "the barons, once foreign conquerers and oppressors, could now act as leaders of the whole people" and could rightfully force the king's acceptance of the pact.⁸⁷

Smith believed that these efforts on the part of the church and the nobility were important and progressive but he maintained that they were exceptions to the general rule. When, at the end of the middle ages, the feudal system had deteriorated into anarchy, it was the monarchy, once again, that saved the nation. According to Smith, the Wars of the Roses which began during the reign of Henry VI (1422-61) and which carried on until 1485, were little more than an extreme and prolonged form of the aristocratic anarchy that had repeatedly erupted during the middle ages whenever strong leadership was lacking. Moreover he argued that these wars

with all their havoc--material, moral, social, and political--were the natural sequel of the hundred-years' war. The restless, turbulent, bloodthirsty, and rapacious temper formed in raiding over France showed itself, when there was no longer an outlet for it abroad, in civil broil at home, and from "spanning for French crowns" the nobles took to "spanning for each other's estates and heads."⁸⁸

The reigns of Henry VI (1422-1461), Edward IV (1461-1483), Edward V (1483), and Richard III (1483-1485) were dominated by the ugly episodes of this fractricidal feud in which no principle but that of factional self-interest was ever at stake.⁸⁹

ii Despotism Interlude

In Smith's view, Henry Tudor (1485-1509) the victor of Bosworth Field, did a great service to England simply by ending the civil war; but this was not his only accomplishment. He initiated policies which restricted church privilege at a time when the corruption and apathy

of the ecclesiastical hierarchy was becoming increasingly apparent. He also established a pacific foreign policy for England and encouraged trade and commerce. Moreover, Smith argued that by taking the trouble to pack the Commons, Henry recognized the importance of parliament in legitimizing his authority, and though he seldom met it, his absolutist tendencies were restricted by parliamentary control of taxation, supported by the very "spirit of the nation."⁹⁰ These achievements were added to by Henry VIII (1509-1547) who Smith thought very little of as a man but whose limitless ambition led to the assertion, once and for all, of the complete supremacy of state over church and to the unleashing of the forces of the Reformation in England. Henry's need for a male heir forced him to confront the pope who refused to free him from his first wife. In order to obtain his divorce and to avenge papal insolence he made himself head of the English church and granted himself a divorce, constantly using a subservient parliament to legitimize his usurpation.⁹¹

Smith maintained that Henry VIII was by no means a Protestant and that he opposed theological and doctrinal innovation. In fact, he did little more than transfer the pope's authority to himself; yet his actions were not without support in the nation as a whole. Many Englishmen had always viewed the papacy as a foreign power and the open corruption and worldliness of the Renaissance church only added to the unpopularity of the ecclesiastical hierarchy. As well, although they were not widespread, simpler views of the Christian religion were beginning to take shape and to gain adherents in England in opposition to Roman Catholicism. Ultimately, Smith argued, a great deal of good would come out of Henry's quarrel with Rome because by breaking with the papacy, "by destroying the monasteries, by wrecking shrines, by abolish-

ing pilgrimages," by providing an English translation of the Bible, and by "humbling" the clergy, he had opened "the flood-gate...through which the tide of protestantism was sure to pour."⁹²

After Henry's death the break with Rome was solidified by the development of a reformed religion. Under the thoughtful guidance of Cranmer, Latimer, and Ridley, protestantism was given "free course" and the last remnants of popery and Catholic ceremony were swept away during the reign of Edward VI (1547-1553).⁹³ With the advice of German theologians, Cranmer formulated an English and protestant liturgy which was imposed on the nation and, by the end of Edward's brief reign, the Reformation was firmly established in England. Even the Catholic revival under his half-sister Mary (1553-1558) did not disrupt the growth of protestant religion and, according to Smith, her persecution of reformers only served to make Catholicism more unpopular.⁹⁴ Yet the English nation was still not secure. Catholics inside and outside England did not recognize Elizabeth I (1558-1603) as the rightful heir and thus religious rebellion at home and invasion by a foreign Catholic power posed very real threats. According to Smith, it was this insecurity that permitted Elizabeth to maintain the personal and near dictatorial power established by her father and grandfather.⁹⁵

In Smith's view, it was fortunate for England that Elizabeth did not wield this great power alone since she was a "false," "perfidious" and "selfish" woman whose policies were marked by inconsistency, hesitation, and weakness.⁹⁶ It was, argued Smith, the actions of her councillors that provided the source of England's strength during these difficult years. They settled the religious question by incorporating certain crucial components of protestant doctrine into the transfer of

ecclesiastical power from pope to the English monarchy. Elizabeth's councillors also forced the queen to accept the leadership of the protestant cause in Europe and to support the Scottish, Dutch, and Huguenot insurgents against their rulers. As well, these men restored a badly damaged economy and gave English commerce "new life," and, as a result of their labours, by the seventeenth century, England had overcome the threats of civil unrest and foreign invasion and had established herself as an independent national entity.⁹⁷

iii The Rebirth of Liberty

For Smith, this was an important step in the political advancement of England but once it had been accomplished he believed that further progress required a broadening of the narrow base of government upon which Tudor despotism had rested, to reflect the new ideas and interests produced by the religious and proprietary revolutions of the sixteenth century. The dissolution of the monasteries had created a new landed gentry which held its lands independently of the crown and which had a strong sense of rural independence and a hearty dislike of aristocracy and hierarchy. At the same time the evolution of protestant theology had advanced as a result of the open Bible and the importation of radical protestant ideas from the continent and a group known as Puritans had formed its own direct and simple Christian faith on this basis. These groups had drawn greater moral force and enthusiasm from the struggle with Spain and Catholicism and when that conflict ended, they turned their enthusiasm towards domestic politics. Assembled in a House of Commons devoid of Catholics, the gentry and the Puritans were determined to assert the right of the lower house "in spite of rebukes from the throne, to deal with the highest questions of state."⁹⁸ They

demanding major changes in the church, attacked autocracy and privilege in general, and successfully asserted their "exclusive right of initiating money bills," depriving the conservative, court-oriented House of Lords of a potential source of strength to sustain its dwindling influence over government.⁹⁹

At the same time "the monarchy still regarded itself as of right autocratic," and the first two Stuart kings were determined to rule the country as their Tudor predecessors had without reference to the demands of the Commons.¹⁰⁰ Had they been more in tune with the needs and wishes of their changing society, their policy might have had a chance for success but they opposed any substantial changes that would have taken into account the views and ideals of the new classes represented in the Commons. As well, they attempted to prevent these groups from promoting change themselves by withholding political power from them. Smith argued that this stance made the monarchy an obstacle to further political progress and that the Commons by challenging the crown and advocating an expansion of the basis of government became the primary promoter of progress.¹⁰¹

Smith claimed that James I (1603-1625) was a "kind-hearted, good-tempered" and well-educated man but that he was also a strong believer in hereditary monarchy and a staunch supporter of the Anglican hierarchy.¹⁰² As such it was almost inevitable that he would collide with a House of Commons filled with independent gentry and Puritans, on any issues involving parliamentary rights or religion. When called by James to grant funds, the Commons demanded redress of grievances before discussing supplies. They attacked some of the crown's feudal rights, they challenged James' right to impose arbitrary taxation and his attempts to

govern without parliament, and they denounced his maintenance of corrupt monopolies and tainted courts and his attacks on the independence of the judiciary and the press. As well, the Commons bitterly opposed James' foreign policy which drew England closer to Catholic Spain and attempted to seal the alliance with a royal marriage while the protestant side in the Thirty Years War was desperately in need of support from England. James' reply to the members' criticisms was a reminder "that their liberties and privileges were the gifts of his ancestors and himself" and that they should stop meddling in the Crown's affairs. The Commons maintained that their liberties and privileges "were their birthright" since Lancastrian times and thus, according to Smith, the foundations were laid for an ongoing battle.¹⁰³

Smith believed that the "mortal duel" still might have been delayed, however, had James' successor been "a king like Edward I, so formed by nature that his heart would beat with that of his people and his aims and policies would be theirs."¹⁰⁴ Unfortunately, Charles I (1625-1649) was also out of touch with the political and religious views of the emerging English nation. According to Smith, he alienated Protestant sentiment by pursuing a foreign policy which oscillated "between the support of Protestant freedom, [against Spain and in favour of the Huguenots and the Elector Palatine] for which the nation yearned, and the support of Catholic absolutism to which his own heart yearned."¹⁰⁵ Later he came into direct conflict with the Puritans and other protestant groups by promoting "high church and absolutists divines" like Montague and Mainwaring and by attempting to enforce a strict, high church interpretation of the Thirty-Nine Articles. These ecclesiastics under the direction of Laud, the Archbishop of Canterbury, were determined not

only to establish "the complete ascendancy of the prerogative" in ecclesiastical affairs but also to suppress Puritanism throughout the country.¹⁰⁶

In the political sphere, Charles and the Commons collided from the outset. Charles' foreign policy errors forced him to seek funds from Parliament but he "quarrelled with parliament" and had to turn "to irregular ways of raising money."¹⁰⁷ Finding that more funds were required, however, he called parliament again and attempted to coerce a Commons already angered by Charles' perceived abuses of its rights and his tendencies toward arbitrary government. The members' response was a reassertion of the priority of redress of grievances over the granting of supplies. Their grievances were set down in the Petition of Right which, in Smith's view, was "second only to the Great Charter" among "the muniments of liberty and...the pledges for the supremacy of parliament."¹⁰⁸ In addition the Commons insisted upon its right to discuss and to protest Charles' religious policies. Charles retaliated by ordering an adjournment, arresting nine members, and embarking on a long-term course of government by prerogative, independent of parliament. Laud's attempts "to extend religious uniformity...to Scotland," however, ended in a disastrous rebellion in that country and Charles, unable to subdue the Scots alone, reluctantly recalled parliament.¹⁰⁹

Conscious of Charles' weak position and angered by eighteen years of government by prerogative the Commons, led by John Pym, Hampden, Vane, Falkland, and Cromwell, immediately swept away the instruments of arbitrary rule and began to extend its influence into the financial, legislative, and executive branches of government. Charles, however, continued to intrigue against parliament and rebellion broke out in

Ireland threatening to undermine these advances. In order to reaffirm them the Commons appealed directly to the people for support setting down in the Grand Remonstrance "all the abuses, misdeeds, and usurpations of Charles' government," stressing the good work of parliament and calling for "more complete safeguards" for the continuation of parliamentary government. It was during the debate on the Remonstrance that the decisive lines of conflict were drawn and Charles' attempt to arrest five members sparked the Commons' revolutionary demand for complete control of the executive power and command of the military. When Charles refused, civil war ensued.¹¹⁰

Smith maintained that the war divided England religiously, politically, socially, and economically. The aristocratic and half-feudal north and west supported Charles along with the nobility, the wealthy gentry, and the Anglican clergy. The areas of commerce and industry, the great cities and towns, and most of the south and east of England followed parliament.¹¹¹ The pressures and events of the conflict eventually placed Cromwell and his New Model Army at the head of the parliamentary cause and, after the defeat of the royalists, at the head of the nation. The king was executed and the monarchy and the House of Lords were done away with. Parliament became the supreme governor and defender of the nation making England the "first national republic," and pointing "the way for the exodus of European society from the hereditary system."¹¹² Smith claimed, however, that the people were still monarchists to a large extent, and were not prepared for a rapid leap into the future by experimenting with republican government, especially when that government was not a representative assembly "but the revolutionary organ of a dominant party," and was constantly plagued

by civil and sectarian unrest.¹¹³

Cromwell (1653-1658), on the other hand, though an enemy of royal tyranny, believed in constitutional monarchy and understood the necessity of restoring order and authority and of broadening the basis of national government. The remnant of the Long Parliament could not accomplish these tasks and so he dismissed it.¹¹⁴ In its place he offered himself and a series of assemblies and councils which would advise and assist him in governing the nation. According to Smith, however, these bodies proved uncooperative and therefore posed a threat to the security of the revolution. Consequently Cromwell was forced to rule without parliament but, in Smith's view his accomplishments were still of great significance. He implemented a religious policy which, though it established Puritanism as the national religion, extended a great measure of tolerance to all protestants who were obedient and patriotic citizens, and in this Cromwell showed himself a greater friend of religious freedom than his parliaments. He tried to reform England's legal system in favour of "the people," he strenuously "fostered" commerce, and undertook a "moral and grand" foreign policy which attempted "to unite Protestant Christendom" in order to protect Europe from the ambitious and intolerant Catholic powers.¹¹⁵

Smith argued that, despite its military base, "the Protector's government was taking root, as a government...was sure to do when it gave the people peace at home, grandeur abroad, free trade, an open course for industry and practical improvement." Unfortunately, Cromwell's attempts to create a truly national government were cut short by his sudden death in 1658.¹¹⁶ Deprived of forceful leadership the country quickly fell into chaos which eventually brought about the restoration

of the Stuarts. With their return, the institutions of the Protectorate faded away - the army dispersed peacefully and Puritanism as such disappeared.¹¹⁷ Yet, in Smith's view, the greatest achievement of the revolution was not lost. The limits of monarchial power had been clearly defined in the struggle and even the Stuarts, who attempted to eradicate all the gains of the revolution, found that they could not successfully challenge this principle.

iv Challenge, Survival and Expansion

For Smith the Restoration represented a great reverse in England's progressive development. Charles II (1660-1685) and his brother James (later James II) were both raised in the French court under the influence of rising absolutism. They despised everything the revolution represented and, with the sympathy of much of the country, still recoiling from the far-reaching changes of the 1640's and 1650's, they attempted to establish a new system of government. Aided by cooperative parliaments, Charles reclaimed certain crucial powers, extended treason laws, and curtailed liberty of opinion. The Anglican ecclesiastical establishment and its ritualistic religion were revived and the 1662 Act of Uniformity drew a line between state and free churches and paved the way for persecution of nonconformists.¹¹⁸

Persecution extended into the political realm as well. The political element of the Puritan opposition to Charles I had been re-shaped and carried on by a group which came to be known as Whigs. They favoured constitutional liberty, toleration, and parliamentary supremacy in opposition to the Tories who defended prerogative, church privilege and monarchical supremacy. Supported by a "hideously profaned" judiciary Charles persecuted influential Whigs, including Lords Russell and Essex

and Algernon Sidney, and he suspended the charters of various Whig cities like London, permitting their remodelling in his own interest.¹¹⁹ The nation, for the most part, did not resist these policies but it did object to the crown's sympathy with Roman Catholicism. In Charles' reign the common hatred and fear of papist religion had exploded into the "murderous panic" of the Popish Plot with its cruel and senseless persecution of Catholics who were largely loyal citizens of England.¹²⁰

James II (1685-1688) was also sympathetic to the religion in which he had been raised. Smith believed that had he limited his schemes to establishing absolute monarchy he might have succeeded but he also wanted to restore Catholicism which the nation despite its conservative mood could not accept. James used the guise of general toleration for all non-Anglicans to lay the groundwork for eventual Catholic supremacy. He waived laws restricting the participation of Catholics and nonconformists in government and administration. According to Smith, however, the nonconformists saw James for what he was—"a most bigoted son" of an "avowedly intolerant" church—and they joined the Anglicans in opposition to James. The Anglican clergy, led by the seven bishops, criticized and resisted James' Romanizing policies and found that the nation supported their actions.¹²¹ James, having lost most of his allies, attempted to rally support by assembling a subservient parliament through "corruption, fraud, and violence." His "open aggressions on electoral rights" did not produce the parliament he needed and further alienated the nation which was almost "unanimously hostile to his designs." When James' son was born it destroyed all hope that "his system would come to an end with his life," and drove the nation to desperate measures.¹²² A group of aristocrats invited William of Orange

to intervene on behalf of the English people and he accepted their invitation to oust James as part of his determined plan to prevent further French aggrandizement and to maintain the independence of Europe. His success was secured by lack of cooperation between James and Louis XIV and by the defection of Marlborough and Princess Anne from James' side.¹²³

The Glorious Revolution was, according to Smith, not a revolution at all but "a change of dynasty" required by James' attempts to alter the established forms of government, "to turn a limited monarchy into a despotism, and...to impose an alien religion on the nation."¹²⁴ Those who framed the revolutionary settlement spoke of the constitution, "the original contract between king and people," and the fundamental laws of the nation, which, they claimed, were above the crown and which James had attempted to subvert.¹²⁵ Under William and Mary (1689-1702) these principles were reaffirmed in the Declaration of Right which settled once and for all "the long struggle for supremacy between king and parliament." The enshrinement of parliamentary supremacy, however, was in Smith's view no guarantee of political progress. In order to exercise its powers, the House of Commons began, in William's reign, to organize itself on a party and cabinet basis. This system was useful when substantive divisions of principle existed such as between the supporters of the Stuarts and the men who drove James II out of England, but when such divisive issues faded away or were resolved party became nothing more than faction held together by corruption, and promoting the "public good" became secondary to party tactics.¹²⁶

According to Smith, under William the evils of this system were not completely apparent since a Whig ministry could be maintained and could

implement many Whig policies even when the Commons was dominated by conservative forces such as the country squires.¹²⁷ By 1711, however, the party system was becoming dominant. Having dismissed her Whig ministry in 1710 Anne (1702-14) called upon the Tories to govern. In order to pursue their policies they were forced to swamp the House of Lords which was still dominated by Whigs who rejected the shameful treaty of Utrecht which ended the war with France. Having overwhelmed the upper house, the Tories were free to implement reactionary policies in all fields and the supremacy of the majority party in the Commons was complete.¹²⁸ In 1714 power was returned to the Whigs who supported the revolutionary claimant to the throne, George I (1714-1727) against the descendants of James II. Because the Hanoverian claim was not completely secure, however, the Whigs were called upon to protect the new government and therefore they "became the party of authority and repression." They supported the standing army, initiated a stringent Riot Act, and extended the life of parliaments to seven years from three; and while the Tories courted democracy they began to perfect the system of party patronage, pocket boroughs, places, and pensions that insured their dominance in the Commons.¹²⁹

Throughout the eighteenth century, according to Smith, narrow and corrupt party interests ruled the House of Commons and consequently little was done to improve and reform the government in the national interest.¹³⁰ In this context the cause of ongoing political development depended upon the efforts of progressive ministries and prime ministers, who, in Smith's view, were the only people who showed any inclination to put the nation's interests before their own. Robert Walpole, "the first prime minister properly so-called," contributed a great deal to

the development of the party system under George I. According to Smith, "he grasped power unscrupulously and monopolized it jealously, but when it was in his hands he used it well." By shrewd manipulation of the Commons he was able to implement sound economic policies which gave the nation "the material elements of happiness."¹³¹ William Pitt the younger, who was raised to power in 1783 by "an unconstitutional intrigue," was also "a skillful manager of the House of Commons," and a shrewd politician. Yet even though he cherished political power, Smith believed that he always had a purpose above that of promoting himself or his party. He "set out a Liberal," a disciple of Adam Smith, and a supporter of parliamentary reform. Following Smith's free trade doctrine he revised the customs, duties, and excises and signed a commercial treaty with France. He also liberalized the libel law, a great triumph for freedom of opinion, and his sympathy for the anti-slave-trade cause set an important example. Unfortunately, in Goldwin Smith's opinion, his repeated attempts to reform the political system failed in the face of opposition from the vested interests he challenged in his proposals.¹³²

Yet Smith maintained that this system was far too dependent on individual ability, character, and will to reflect, consistently and fairly, the needs of all England. Ministers of high calibre were not always available and, as Smith never tired of reminding his readers in reference to Pitt, even the most able and devoted reformers could reject the cause of reform in the midst of their careers. In Pitt's case, the French Revolution had provided the occasion for a reversal of policy. In 1793 he went over to the side of reaction with a vengeance, suspending Habeas Corpus, and repressing freedom of action and opinion

with a series of far-reaching acts.¹³³ Because such betrayals were always a possibility, Smith maintained that the policies and goals of Prime Ministers and ministries had to be balanced and checked by a House of Commons that represented the whole nation rather than the one hundred and fifty-four persons who, prior to 1832, could control a Commons majority. Unfortunately, however, the excesses of the French Revolution had whipped the English hierarchy into such a reactionary frenzy that any efforts at reform, political or otherwise, met with powerful and united opposition within both parliament and society as a whole.¹³⁴

It was not until the late 1820's, according to Smith, that the government began to recognize that the face of English society had been irrevocably changed and that the laws and the system of government would have to begin to reflect those changes. Many influential people in the government and in parliament were genuinely dedicated to the cause of political reform but, in Smith's view, the impetus for change came largely from outside of parliament. It was the constant agitation of the new classes that had emerged as a result of the Industrial Revolution to gain political power that sealed the fate of the oligarchical system of government. Between them, these new classes of manufacturers and workers, had both economic and numerical strength yet they were excluded from political decision-making. Joined by these and other groups who had grievances against the government, the reformers in parliament were finally able in 1832 to pass the First Reform Bill.¹³⁵ According to Smith, this act, by reinforcing the supremacy of the House of Commons and by making the electoral process and the constituency system more reasonable and equitable, made the government more, though

not completely, representative of the new interests in society. This, he argued, laid the groundwork for further expansions of the representative base of the national government as the country grew and evolved and as new classes and groups emerged to take their place in the political system.¹³⁶

IV

Thus, the English nation had produced a balanced framework for government which combined order and liberty and which had a built-in mechanism for peaceful reform. This in itself was a momentous achievement but, according to Smith, it was not England's only contribution to the progress of society. She had also made great advances in the economic and intellectual spheres. Smith believed that the historical sources of England's economic development could be found in the expansion of trade and commerce and the growth of towns and cities during the middle ages. It was among the commercial classes who inhabited the towns that a vibrant, mobile, and innovative economy first began to evolve and to challenge the traditional, localized, agrarian feudal economy with its limited production and its fixed structures and regulations which, though they promised a certain amount of stability, offered little opportunity for change, improvement, and expansion. The first signs of this process could be seen in the late twelfth century and throughout the thirteenth,¹³⁷ but the most significant gains were made under Henry VII who brought order and prosperity to the land, who encouraged industry and trade, and who actively sought the support of the commercial classes.¹³⁸

The efforts of these classes were aided by the continuing decline of the feudal system after 1485 which not only promoted the general growth

of trade and commerce but also transferred substantial landed wealth to the new anti-hierarchical gentry who were in the forefront of economic and political change during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Their rise to power, particularly in the south, signalled the end of the feudal economy as well as the end of monarchical despotism.¹³⁹ The changes brought about by this "proprietary revolution" were extended and confirmed during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries by the development of international trade, a national system of finance and a rational and consistent administrative framework for customs and duties.¹⁴⁰ With this ongoing economic change, however, landed wealth, tied as it was to protective trade policies and to the discouragement of industrial growth, had become entrenched, complacent, and less than progressive.¹⁴¹ By the nineteenth century this complacency was being challenged by the emergence of a new economic power which took its place beside the agricultural and commercial interests. Smith maintained that the manufacturing class which had developed industries through the use of remarkable technological innovations and improvements, the productive powers of which were immense and which employed large numbers of workers, were the new leaders of economic progress. Their industries held new promise for prosperity not just for England but for the world and they strove to achieve that promise by advocating a policy of international free trade which they and Smith believed would sustain, expand, and someday perfect the industrial system of production. It was, in part, these economic concerns that led the middle class into the political arena where they helped to force the substantial reform of the system.¹⁴²

According to Smith, England had also made an important contribution to the recognition of what he considered man's fundamental rights, particularly the right to freedom of conscience and opinion.¹⁴³ He saw the origins of the gradual emancipation of conscience from authority in the medieval system of justice which afforded considerable legal protection to the individual,¹⁴⁴ but he claimed that the first major steps toward freedom came as a result of the decline of feudalism and the Catholic church. Both of these systems were based on authoritarian hierarchies which were at best paternalistic and at worst despotic and which required complete conformity to their political and religious conception of society.¹⁴⁵

Once tainted by corruption and misrule, however, these hierarchies began to deteriorate, losing their holds on the minds of men. People began to question traditional medieval ideals and the intellectual ferment that resulted from their criticisms developed into the Renaissance. By opening the door for new knowledge and new learning and by challenging feudal and Catholic authority, Smith argued that the Renaissance paved the way for the Reformation which insured that the Catholic hierarchy would no longer wield universal power over men and which, in the long run, also helped to limit the authoritarian powers of the state.¹⁴⁶ Yet while he noted that the protestant hierarchy, which replaced the Catholic one in England, tended towards greater toleration of dissent, he acknowledged that protestantism, like Catholicism demanded strict conformity to its view of religion, politics, and society. Moreover, the Reformation in England had united the coercive powers of church and state giving each a vested interest in the enforcement of conformity, both political and religious, and in the defense and

extension of their joint authority over the whole of English society. Smith argued that the persecution of dissent on this basis, though at times understandable, was always wrong and did nothing to enhance national unity or political stability.¹⁴⁷

In Smith's view, the 'fallacy' of church establishment did a great deal of damage to the nation generally and especially to the cause of freedom of opinion. The Anglican establishment not only encouraged the religious prejudices of the people and used them to terrorize and persecute a largely loyal Catholic population but it also used parliament to attack protestant nonconformity.¹⁴⁸ As well, it almost invariably threw its whole-hearted support behind the defence of established political authority, in all of its forms, against the aspirations of the general population for change. That some progress was slowly being made toward freedom of conscience was demonstrated by the attempts of Cromwell and William III to broaden the scope of the English church to include most protestants rather than to divide the protestant faith into the privileged, state-supported church and the barely tolerated nonconformists.¹⁴⁹ It was not until the late 1820's that the original promise of these policies and ideals was realized by the emancipation of the Catholics and the removal of some of the major disadvantages and restrictions placed on nonconformists.¹⁵⁰

These advances were reinforced by a general decline in the political authority of the state, the natural result of the emergence of a parliamentary system of government composed of groups holding conflicting views of society. Moreover, greater political freedom was further assured by the clearer definition both of the law - especially as it related to treason and libel - and of the individual's legal rights. While Smith

argued that the Anglican church still retained too much influence and authority, particularly in the sphere of higher education, he felt that the protection of individual rights was fairly well advanced in England and that the belief in freedom of conscience was firmly entrenched in the minds of most Englishmen.¹⁵¹

Each and every one of these accomplishments was important in and of itself and yet for Smith their significance went even further than this. He saw these developments as indicators of moral progress. He was convinced that constitutional government was not an end in itself, but "merely transitional," one important step in a much greater process - man's progress towards elevating human character and forming a moral community of mankind.¹⁵² He argued that while progress consisted of three elements - "the moral, the intellectual, the productive or virtue, science and industry" - the moral element was "the cardinal element of the three." Without it, knowledge and industry would be "aimless wandering forces working at random good and evil." Real progress therefore could only be measured by the formation of good moral character and this, he argued, was "the true key to history."¹⁵³

Because Smith's view of morality was fundamentally a Christian one, his historical view of the development of moral character was tied very closely to his conception of the evolution of Christian religion. He believed that the early Christian clergy and the Catholic church had been a power of moral progress in the war-like and uncivilized middle ages. They had first "transmitted" and taught basic Christian principles to the people and their hierarchical and ritualistic religion satisfied the need of an uneducated society for strong moral guidance and for mystical and superstitious explanations of the world.¹⁵⁴

Furthermore, while some maintained "medieval Christendom was a vast relapse of humanity, or at best a suspension of progress," Smith argued that the Christian character of the age had not only contributed to the social, economic, intellectual and political development of England but that it had restrained and moderated the fierce and war-like atmosphere and personalities of an era dominated by force.¹⁵⁵

Smith asserted, however, that by the end of the middle ages

Catholicism fell through the superstitions and impostures which had gathered round it, and which intellect, awakened by the Renaissance, spurned away; through papal tyranny and corruption; through general ossification, so to speak, of a system, which had once in all its organs ministered to spiritual life.¹⁵⁶

Having long ago "wandered far from the hillsides of Galilee," and lost touch with Christ's "simple words of life and love," the Catholic church could no longer function as a moral force in the elevation of human character.¹⁵⁷ While this religion and "the morality which it had sustained" declined, however, no new Christian force emerged to replace it and thus a moral interregnum ensued.¹⁵⁸ At the head of this age stood Alexander VI, "the moral monster of the Papacy," the Borgia tyrants, and the unscrupulous political creed of Machiavelli. England's contributions to this moral lapse were many, especially during the years of the Wars of the Roses, but in Smith's view the most disreputable characters of this era were Henry VIII, "with his uxoricides and judicial murders," Thomas Cromwell, "an English pupil of Machiavelli," who served Henry with "diabolical skill," and Elizabeth, "with her vicious court and her own wickedness."¹⁵⁹

Morality did not regain its hold on the lives of men until religious faith was revived by the Reformation. In England, the fruits of Henry

VIII's unbridled ambition began to ripen with the development of a religion based on the open Bible and "independent of church teaching."¹⁶⁰

A great number of the English people, according to Smith, had made substantial progress, politically, economically, intellectually, and morally and no longer felt the need for superstition, mysticism, and rigid clerical hierarchies. Puritanism, though "equivocal" and too taken with the Old Testament, was in Smith's view rational and tolerant compared to Catholicism "though its toleration at first might have been less a principle than the necessity of a struggling minority, or a consequence of its internal divisions."¹⁶¹ More important, Smith argued,

It brought man, without intervention of church or priest, into direct communion with his Maker. Its spirit was independent, high, and in the battle with the Evil One, heroic. Its morality, though narrow, austere, and somewhat sour, was pure and strong.¹⁶²

By turning men's minds back to the true teachings of Jesus as recorded in the Bible and rejecting the perverse and distorted versions offered by a corrupt ecclesiastical establishment, the Puritans contributed to the general elevation of human character. This was proven in part by the political and economic progress made under their leadership.

Even though this great moral uplifting was followed by a relapse and a descent into the "Stygian pool" of the Restoration where everything was "the reverse of great, lofty, or heroic," Smith maintained that Puritanism did not disappear "without working something of its character into the abiding fibre of humanity."¹⁶³ Moreover it was replaced by "political Nonconformity" which among "the middle and lower middle classes" maintained "the tradition of a sound morality" and struggled "from age to age by purely constitutional effort for the removal of its disabilities,

and as an oppressed body fighting always on the side of freedom."¹⁶⁴ When general moral improvement commenced again, one hundred years after the disappearance of Puritanism, it was due, in Smith's view, not to the leadership of George III or his court, but to the influence of Methodism and "of the evangelical movement within the establishment which Methodism set on foot; perhaps also to the alarm which the spread of scepticism had given the clergy, and to a recoil from the impiety and immorality of the Voltairean school."¹⁶⁵ The evangelicals and Methodists rejected the Anglican establishment's hollow and lifeless conception of religion and morality and offered a truer and more satisfying view of Christian principles. In doing so, they helped to strengthen the base upon which a genuinely universal Christianity would ultimately be founded. This, Smith argued, would make the example of Christ clear to all men and awaken in them the desire to improve their moral character. Even in his own day, he saw this as the next great step in man's long journey towards the formation of a moral community of all mankind.

1. John Kenyon, The History Men: The Historical Profession in England since the Renaissance, (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1983), pp. 69-71, 77, and 80; John Kenyon, "Holding the Whig Line," Times Literary Supplement, December 4, 1981, p. 1407; G.P. Gooch, History and Historians in the Nineteenth Century, 2nd ed., (London: Longman's, Green, and Co., 1913), pp. 294-8; see also Patricia M. Morton, "Life After Butterfield? John Burrow's A Liberal Descent and the Recent Historiography of Victorian Historians," Historical Reflections, 10(Summer, 1983), pp. 229-44.

Macaulay's political and historical outlook has been over-simplified and misunderstood by many historians and, unfortunately, this very brief assessment of his place in English historiography can do little to reverse that tendency. For a more sensitive and exhaustive analysis of Macaulay's particular brand of Whiggism, see Joseph Hamburger, Macaulay and the Whig Tradition, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1976).

2. J.W. Burrow, A Liberal Descent: Victorian Historians and the English Past, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), p. 33.
3. Ibid., pp. 33-5.
4. Kenyon, The History Men, pages 68, 71-73, and 83-4; Kenyon, "Holding the Whig Line," p. 1407; Gooch, pp. 294-9; Morton, p. 231-2.
5. Walter Houghton, The Victorian Frame of Mind, 1830-1870, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1957), pp. 38-45; R.K. Webb, Modern England, (New York: Dodd, Head & Co., 1975), pp. 278-96; Richard Altick, Victorian People and Ideas, (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1973), pp. 106-8.
6. Burrow, pp. 2-3.
7. Kenyon, The History Men, p. 68; Kenyon, "Holding the Whig Line," p. 1407.
8. Houghton, pp. 39-40.
9. Duncan Forbes, The Liberal Anglican Idea of History, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1952), pp. viii, 6, and 7.
10. Ibid., p. 7.
11. Ibid., pp. 7-8.
12. Ibid., p. 100.
13. Ibid., pp. 87-8.
14. Ibid., pp. 82 and 85.
15. T.W. Heyck, "From Men of Letters to Intellectuals: The Transformation of Intellectual Life in Nineteenth Century England," Journal of British Studies, 20(Fall, 1980), pp. 158-61.

16. Walter Houghton, "Victorian Periodical Literature and the Articulate Classes," Victorian Studies, 22(Summer, 1979), p. 391.
17. Heyck, p. 161.
18. Ibid.; Houghton, "Victorian Periodical Literature," p. 396.
19. Heyck, p. 160.
20. Ibid., p. 161.
21. Quoted in Houghton, The Victorian Frame of Mind, p. 221.
22. Quoted in Houghton, "Victorian Periodical Literature," p. 392.
23. Ibid.
24. Quoted in Houghton, "Victorian Periodical Literature," p. 397.
25. Heyck, p. 161.
26. Ibid.; Hamburger, p. xi.
27. J.W. Burrow, "To School the Statesmen," Times Literary Supplement, August 1, 1980, p. 877; Kenyon, The History Men, pp. 171-172.
28. Sidney A. Burrell, "Leslie Stephen," in Some Modern Historians of Britain, eds. Herman Ausubel, J. Bartlet Brebner, and Erling M. Hunt, (New York: The Dryden Press, 1951), p. 112.
29. Gooch, p. 391; See also Kenyon, The History Men, pp. 132-5.
30. See Forbes, pp. 107 and 182-3.
31. Goldwin Smith, Reminiscences, ed. Arnold Haultain, (New York: The Macmillan Co. Ltd., 1910), pp. 2, 4, and 67-8; The Dictionary of National Biography, 1st Supplement 1818-1899, vol. XXII, 1909 ed., s.v. "Congreve, Richard," by T. Hudson Beare, p. 476; The Dictionary of National Biography, v. IV, 1908 ed., s.v. "Conington, John," by Henry Nettleship, pp. 938-42; The Dictionary of National Biography, 2nd Supplement, 1901-1911, vol. I, 1920 ed., s.v. "Smith, Goldwin," by Sidney Lee, pp. 67-8.
32. Goldwin, Smith, "On the Study of History," in Lectures on the Study of History, (Oxford: James Parker and Co., 1865), pp. 73-81; Goldwin Smith, "On the Study of History - II," in Lectures on the Study of History, pp. 91-95; Goldwin Smith, "On some supposed Consequences of the Doctrine of Historical Progress," in Lectures on the Study of History, pp. 133-35 and 164-5.

For further discussion of Smith's theory of history see also: Goldwin Smith, Guesses at the Riddle of Existence and Other Essays on Kindred Subjects, (New York: Macmillan, 1897);

- Goldwin Smith, "The Treatment of History," American Historical Review, 10(, 1905), pp. 67-78; Goldwin Smith, "The Study of History," Atlantic Monthly 25(January, 1870), pp. 44-56; Goldwin Smith, "The Origin of Morality," North American Review 167(October, 1898), pp. 418-427; Goldwin Smith, "The Moral Freedom of Man," in Lectures on the Study of History, pp. 171-90; Goldwin Smith, "The Ascent of Man," in Lectures and Essays, (Toronto: Hunter, Rose & Co., 1881), pp. 89-104; Goldwin Smith, "The Prospect of a Moral Interregnum," Canadian Monthly 16(December, 1879), pp. 651-63.
33. Smith, "On the Study of History - II," p. 95.
 34. Smith, "On the Study of History," p. 73.
 35. Ibid.
 36. Smith, "On some supposed Consequences of the Doctrine of Historical Progress," p. 119.
 37. Smith, "Moral Interregnum," p. 654.
 38. Ibid.
 39. Smith, "On some supposed Consequences of the Doctrine of Historical Progress," p. 146.
 40. Ibid., pp. 152-6.
 41. Smith, "On some supposed Consequences of the Doctrine of Historical Progress," pp. 161-3.
 42. Goldwin Smith, The United Kingdom: A Political History, 2 vols. (Toronto: Copp, Clark Co., Ltd., 1899) vol. I, p. 314; Herman Ausubel, "Goldwin Smith," in Some Modern Historians of Britain, p. 89.
 43. Goldwin Smith, "Pym," in Three English Statesmen: A Course of Lectures on the Political History of England, (London: Macmillan & Co., 1867), p. 3; Smith, "On the Study of History - II," p. 98.
 44. Goldwin Smith, The Political and Social Benefits of the Reformation in England, (Oxford: Francis Macpherson, 1847), p. 21.
 45. Heyck, p. 161; See also Elisabeth Wallace, Goldwin Smith: Victorian Liberal, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1957), pp. 68-9.
 46. Ausubel, "Goldwin Smith," p. 95.
 47. Raphael Samuel, "People's History," in People's History and Socialist Theory, ed. Raphael Samuel, (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1981), pp. xxiv-xxv.

48. Ausubel, "Goldwin Smith," pp. 94 and 98.
49. Ibid., p. 96.
50. Burrow, A Liberal Descent, p. 32; Kenyon, The History Men, p. 81.
51. Goldwin Smith, The United Kingdom, vol. I, p. v.
52. Ibid., p. vii.
Smith wrote and published Three English Statesmen in an effort to raise funds for the Jamaica Committee while Canada and the Canadian Question, (London: Macmillan Co., 1891) was intended to influence the outcome of the Canadian federal election in 1891, though in the end it appeared after the fact.
53. Smith, The United Kingdom, vol. I, p. 1.
54. Ibid., pp. 3-4.
55. Ibid., p. 8.
56. Ibid., pp. 6-7; See also: Smith, The Social and Political Benefits of the Reformation in England, pp. 10-11.
57. Smith, The United Kingdom, vol. I, p. 10.
58. Ibid., pp. 12-15.
59. Ibid., p. 17.
60. Ibid., p. 28.
61. Ibid., pp. 18 and 24-37; See also: Smith, The Political and Social Benefits of the Reformation in England, pp. 11-12.
62. Smith, The United Kingdom, vol. I, p. 21.
Stubbs, for one, viewed the Conquest as an event that benefitted England. See Kenyon, "Holding the Whig Line," p. 1407.
63. Smith, The United Kingdom, vol. I, pp. 38-9.
64. Ibid., p. 38.
65. Ibid., pp. 76-8.
66. Ibid., p. 83.
67. Ibid., pp. 79-84.
68. Ibid., p. 85.
69. Ibid., p. 97.

70. Ibid., p. 94.
71. Ibid., pp. 85-99.
72. Ibid., p. 165.
73. Ibid.
74. Ibid., p. 70.
75. Ibid., pp. 175-6.
76. Ibid., pp. 171 and 175-6.
77. Ibid., pp. 177-78 and 181.
78. Ibid., pp. 181-84.
79. Ibid., p. 249.
80. Ibid., pp. 249-50 and 254.
81. Ibid., p. 38.
82. Ibid., p. 44.
83. Ibid., pp. 48-57.
84. Ibid., pp. 128-30.
85. Ibid., p. 133.
86. Ibid., pp. 134-7.
87. Ibid., pp. 138-9.
88. Goldwin Smith, "Ramsay's Lancaster and York," The Nation, July 28, 1892, p. 71.
89. Smith, The United Kingdom, vol. I, pp. 268-9; See also: Goldwin Smith, "Gairdiner's Richard III: part I," The Nation, July 3, 1879, pp. 11-12 and "Gairdiner's Richard III: part II," The Nation, July 10, 1879, pp. 28-9.
90. Smith, The United Kingdom, vol. I, pp. 286-8, 293, and 296-7.
91. Ibid., pp. 318-23 and 326-31; Goldwin Smith, "An English Pupil of Machiavelli," The Independent, Sept. 4, 1902, pp. 2121-2122; Goldwin Smith, "Froude's Divorce of Catherine of Aragon," The Nation, December 31, 1891, p. 511; Goldwin Smith, "A Gallery of Portraits," North American Review, 176(April, 1903), p. 538.

92. Smith, The United Kingdom, vol. I, pp. 314-18, 327-30 and 339-41; Smith, "Divorce of Catherine of Aragon," p. 511; Goldwin Smith, "Child's Church and State under the Tudors," The Nation, September 25, 1890, p. 251.
93. Smith, The United Kingdom, vol. I, p. 344; Smith, "Child's Church and State," p. 251.
94. Smith, The United Kingdom, vol. I, pp. 344-8 and 360-66; Goldwin Smith, "Froude's History of England: From the Fall of Wolsey to the Death of Elizabeth," Edinburgh Review, 119(January, 1864), pp. 250-1.
95. Smith, The United Kingdom, vol. I, pp. 370-1, 376-8, 380-1 and 385-92.
96. Ibid., p. 367.
97. Ibid., pp. 368-70, 371-9, 379-81, and 385-92; Goldwin Smith, "Hopkin's Puritans and Queen Elizabeth," The Nation, November, 16, 1876, p. 302; Smith, "Froude's History of England: From the Fall of Wolsey to the Death of Elizabeth," pp. 262 and 264; Goldwin Smith, "Hume's Courtships of Queen Elizabeth," The Nation, May 28, 1896, p. 418.
98. Smith, The United Kingdom, vol. I, pp. 392, 394, 397-8, 401, and 403.
99. Ibid.
100. Ibid., p. 403.
101. Ibid., pp. 430-1; Smith, The Political and Social Benefits of the Reformation in England, p. 28.
102. Smith, The United Kingdom, vol. I, pp. 433 and 438-9.
103. Ibid., pp. 442-4, 445-50, 456-8 and 460-7.
104. Ibid., p. 455.
105. Ibid., pp. 470-1; Smith, "Pym," p. 4.
106. Smith, The United Kingdom, vol. I, pp. 480 and 488; Smith, "Pym," pp. 9-12; Goldwin Smith, "Simpkinson's Laud," The Nation, May 2, 1895, pp. 346-7.
107. Smith, The United Kingdom, vol. I, p. 452.
108. Ibid., pp. 479-80.
109. Ibid., pp. 494 and 504-8; Smith, "Pym," pp. 8-9 and 12-13.
110. Smith, The United Kingdom, vol. I, pp. 514-5, 524-5, and 526-9;

- Smith, "Pym," pp. 28-9, 30-1, and 34-5; See also Goldwin Smith, "Falkland and the Puritans," Contemporary Review 29(April, 1877) pp. 925-43 and Goldwin Smith, "The Grand Remonstrance," Edinburgh Review 112(October, 1860), pp. 460-88.
111. Smith, The United Kingdom, vol. I, pp. 535-7; Smith, "Pym," pp. 39-40.
 112. Smith, The United Kingdom, vol. I, pp. 547-54, 572, 573, and 574; see also Goldwin Smith, "The Life of Fairfax," The Nation, May 12, 1870, pp. 305-7; Goldwin Smith, "The Great Puritan," Atlantic Monthly 94(September, 1904), pp. 308-20.
 113. Smith, The United Kingdom, vol. I, pp. 573 and 575-6; Goldwin Smith, "Cromwell," in Three English Statesmen, pp. 68-71; Goldwin Smith, review of Cromwell's Place in History by Samuel Rawson Gardiner, in American Historical Review 3(October, 1898), p. 136.
 114. Smith, The United Kingdom, vol. I, pp. 594-7 and 598-9; Smith, "Cromwell," pp. 72-3; Goldwin Smith, "Carlyle's Cromwell and Guizot's English Republic and Cromwell," The Times, January 4, 1855, p. 5; Goldwin Smith, review of History of the Commonwealth and Protectorate, by Samuel Rawson Gardiner, in American Historical Review 4(April, 1899), p. 533.
 115. Smith, The United Kingdom, vol. I, pp. 600-4, 605-11, 622-4, 630, and 632-4; Smith, "Cromwell," pp. 74, 77-78, 82-3, and 98-100; Smith, review of Cromwell's Place in History, p. 137; Smith review of Commonwealth and Protectorate, p. 534.
 116. Smith, The United Kingdom, vol. I, pp. 640-1; Smith, "Carlyle and Guizot," p. 5; See also Smith, "Cromwell," p. 112.
 117. Smith, The United Kingdom, vol. I, pp. 644-9; Smith, "Cromwell," p. 114.
 118. Smith, The United Kingdom, vol. II, pp. 1, 405, 9-12, and 14-21.
 119. Ibid., pp. 45-9; Smith, "Falkland," p. 941.
 120. Smith, The United Kingdom, vol. II, pp. 40-2, and 51.
 121. Ibid., pp. 25, 56, and 62-8.
 122. Ibid., pp. 69-10.
 123. Ibid., p. 71; See also Goldwin Smith, "Lord Wolseley's Marlborough," The Nation, June 7, 1894, pp. 430-2.
 124. Smith, The United Kingdom, vol. II, p. 53.
 125. Ibid., pp. 78-82.
 126. Ibid., pp. 85 and 105-8; Goldwin Smith, "Pitt-I," in Three English Statesmen, pp. 124-5.

127. Smith, The United Kingdom, vol. II, pp. 111-2, and 115-8.
128. Ibid., pp. 147-150-1.
129. Ibid., pp. 165-7 and 176-7.
130. Ibid., pp. 158-60.
131. Ibid., pp. 170, 173, and 178-9.
132. Ibid., pp. 235-6, 238-43, and 246-7; Goldwin Smith, "Lord Rosebery's Pitt," The Nation, March 24, 1892, p. 233; Goldwin Smith, "The Two Mr. Pitts," Macmillan's Magazine 62(August, 1890), p. 245; Goldwin Smith, review of Pitt: Some Chapters of his Life and Times, by Edward Gibson, in America Historical Review 4(April, 1899), p. 527; Smith, "Pitt-I," pp. 118-20, 122, 139-40, 148-9, and 154-5.
133. Smith, The United Kingdom, vol. II, pp. 272-8; Goldwin Smith, "Pitt-II," in Three English Statesmen, pp. 189 and 209-13; Smith, "Rosebery's Pitt," pp. 233-4.
134. Smith, The United Kingdom, vol. II, pp. 157, 281, 320-1 and 327-8.
135. Ibid., pp. 320-2 and 341-8.
136. Ibid., pp. 349-53 and 359-60.
137. Smith, The United Kingdom, vol. I, pp. 115-7 and 146-7.
138. Ibid., pp. 280-3 and 290-5.
139. Ibid., pp. 350-1, 392, 430-1 and 535-6.
140. Ibid., pp. 630-1 and 641; Smith, The United Kingdom, vol. II, pp. 174-5, 178-9 and 239-42.
141. Smith, The United Kingdom, vol. II, pp. 154-6 and 158-9.
142. Ibid., pp. 322 and 371-2.
143. Goldwin Smith, "On the Foundation of the American Colonies," in Lectures on Modern History, (Oxford: J.H. and Jas. Parker, 1861), p. 22.
144. Smith, The United Kingdom, vol. I, pp. 83, 181-4 and 133-7.
145. Ibid., pp. 279-81, and 312-17; Smith, The Political and Social Benefits of the Reformation, pp. 23-4.
146. Smith, "Moral Interregnum," p. 655; Smith, The Political and Social Benefits of the Reformation, p. 1; Smith, "On some supposed Consequences of the Doctrine of Historical Progress," pp. 166-7.

147. Smith, The United Kingdom, vol. I, pp. 337-41, 348, 377-9, 393, 395, 427-30, and 500-504; Smith, "Simpkinson's Laud," p. 346.
148. Smith, The United Kingdom, vol. I, pp. 151, and 162; vol. II, pp. 440-42, 500-504.
149. Ibid., vol. I, pp. 582-4, 604, and 607; vol. II, pp. 86-89.
150. Smith, The United Kingdom, vol. II, pp. 322, 336-7, and 364-5.
151. Ibid., pp. 82-3, 114-5, 201-202, 228-9, 246, and 276-7.
152. Goldwin Smith, "Inaugural Lecture," in Lectures on the Study of History, p. 40; Goldwin Smith, "England and America," in Atlantic Monthly 14(December, 1864), pp. 751 and 755; Smith, "On the Study of History I," p. 79.
153. Smith, "On some supposed Consequences of the Doctrine of Historical Progress," p. 128; Smith, "On the Study of History I," p. 79.
154. Smith, The United Kingdom, vol. I, p. 6; Smith, "Moral Interregnum," p. 654.
155. Smith, "Moral Interregnum," p. 654; Smith, The Political and Social Benefits of the Reformation, pp. 10-11.
156. Smith, "Moral Interregnum," p. 655.
157. Smith, The United Kingdom, vol. I, pp. 35 and 230-33.
158. Smith, "Moral Interregnum," p. 655.
159. Ibid., Goldwin Smith, The United States: An Outline of Political History, (New York: Macmillan & Co., 1893), p. 2.
160. Smith, The United Kingdom, vol. I, pp. 392-3.
161. Ibid.
162. Ibid., p. 393.
163. Smith, The United Kingdom, vol. II, pp. 1 and 17.
164. Ibid., p. 17; See also Smith, "Falkland and the Puritans," p. 943.
165. Smith, The United Kingdom, vol. II, pp. 195-6.

CHAPTER III

England's Glory: America

For Goldwin Smith, England's greatness did not rest solely in her achievement of ongoing national progress. He believed that his nation's real greatness consisted in its ability to transplant and to nurture English ideals, values, traditions, and institutions throughout the world and to create new and progressive nations. In Smith's view the United States of America was the best example of the evolution of a new nation based on the English example and as such he was anxious to watch its development believing that it too would make an important contribution to the movement for world progress.

I

Smith clearly believed that England had contributed more than any other nation to the overall progress of humanity by establishing the basic principles of constitutional government which had, over the ages, facilitated the continuous and calm accumulation of experience and knowledge by men and the development of greater human understanding through the gradual recognition and implementation of basic Christian truths. Smith called this process, by which man's accumulated achievements were passed on from generation to generation, the "succession of the ages," and he upheld it as one of the "two grand facts with which the philosophy of history deals."¹ In this process, he argued, certain nations and groups within nations take the lead and guide other nations toward the realization of the Christian ideal. England, he maintained, had played such a role as a result of a unique historical development which set her apart from and gradually ahead of other nations. As long as England or, more precisely, her rulers kept moving towards this goal

and remained aware of the needs and desires of society, their leadership of the nation and of the cause of humanity would remain fairly secure. When and if that sense of direction and understanding became blurred, whether by the self-interest or the ignorance of the rulers, their leadership would become corrupt, reactionary, or simply ineffective. That leadership would then either be replaced within the nation by a new group of rulers or the nation as a whole would lose its leading position to another, whose governors were better equipped to carry it towards its fundamental goals.

Thus Smith argued, "the division of nations" was an essential factor in man's historical development and the second of the "two grand facts" of historical theory.² These divisions, he maintained, were secured by geographic, religious, climatic, and linguistic barriers and were "as deeply rooted as they could be without destroying the unity of mankind." They had, from the earliest times, caused problems and incited hatred and hostilities but without them mankind would be "one state with one set of customs, one literature, one code of laws," and if it "became corrupted" nothing "but a convulsion that would rend the frame of society and deeply injure the moral life which society is designed to guard" would save man. Moreover, we would risk losing "the very idea of political improvement." Smith maintained that "nations redeem each other. They preserve for each other principles, truths, hopes, aspirations, which, committed to the keeping of one nation only, might, as frailty and error are conditions of man's being, become extinct forever."³

These were abstract, theoretical principles which Smith formulated and expressed in a lecture at Oxford in 1861 dealing with the philosophical foundations and structures of historical study. Yet, for Smith,

they were not without valuable practical applications. As proof of this he offered in the same lecture the examples of Rome's corrupt domination of European civilization first under the Empire and then under the Roman Catholic Church, arguing that the Germanic tribes and the Reformation ultimately saved society, though at a great cost in bloodshed and bitterness.⁴ Contained in the same series of lectures (though not in the same lecture), published in 1861 as Lectures on Modern History, was another more immediate example of the same principles, though its significance was not yet apparent, perhaps even to Smith himself. In his Inaugural Lecture Smith argued that England, because of the "long unbroken continuity of its national life," unequalled among nations, was the best possible subject for historical study. He claimed that throughout her history England had been preoccupied with the continuous development of "a political constitution, combining Roman order with Northern liberty, and harmonizing the freest possible development of the individual mind and character with intense national unity and un-failing reverence for the law." This task had required moral and intellectual effort of the highest magnitude and had placed England in the forefront of human progress.⁵

Smith continued with this argument in the final lecture of the series, entitled "On the Foundation of the American Colonies," in which he maintained that it was England's advanced stage of development and her understanding of freedom that prepared her to become "the mother of a great nation."⁶ For Smith the establishment of the American Colonies and their subsequent development into an independent, progressive and prosperous nation, was a momentous achievement and one for which English liberty, law, literature, religion, blood and language was largely

responsible. Even while they were breaking their ties with England and the old world, the American people were speaking in the same "voice" as "those who framed the Petition of Right and the Great Charter" defending their rights as Englishmen. Moreover, when they set out to construct their new nation after gaining their independence, they built upon the ideals of freedom and the fundamental equality of men which their English ancestors of the seventeenth century had first, if feebly, upheld. Their democratic republic, though not without serious flaws, was an unparalleled accomplishment and one in which all English-speaking people could take pride.⁷

Despite Smith's obvious enthusiasm for America, it was clear that, at the time of these lectures, the relationship between England and America had not yet occurred to him as a potential example of how the divisions and differences among nations insured that the ideal of progress would be maintained when one or more nations became corrupted. He certainly acknowledged America's remarkable achievements and future potential, but at the same time he remained convinced of England's role as a great power of progress in the world. It was more than a little ironic that the same year in which these lectures were published the American Civil War broke out and brought the relationship between England and America to the forefront of political discussion in England, substantially altering Smith's views on the two nations.

II

Goldwin Smith's interest in American history and politics obviously predated the outbreak of hostilities between the North and South, but these subjects derived their immediate and enduring significance for Smith directly from the war and its political repercussions in England.

From the outset the war affected England simply because the Northern blockade cut off cotton supplies to English mills. As a result, mills began to close down and mill owners, with a few notable exceptions, took up the cause of the South. They were supported by many staunch free-traders, for whom the North meant protectionism, and conservatives who were anxious "to belabour the American democracy" the principles of which conflicted with their aristocratic world-view. The views of the pro-South side were forcefully expressed by The Times, which consistently implied that the roots of the conflict were to be found in the nature of America's democratic experiment as embodied in Northern political attitudes and not in the struggle to abolish slavery.⁸

In fact, during the early stages of the struggle "many Englishmen thought it a war to preserve the union rather than destroy slavery, a pardonable error, since during the first year and a half this was the position adopted by Lincoln who did not proclaim the freedom of the slaves until October, 1862."⁹ The British government maintained a policy of official neutrality and many liberal academics, Smith included, had ambivalent feelings towards the conflict.¹⁰ While they hated slavery and sympathized with the democratic ideals of the North, they did not support its protectionist policies and resented "its reluctance to proscribe slavery." As well, they retained "a traditional enthusiasm for minority rights," the defence of which was tied to the southern cause.¹¹ Smith, personally, was reluctant "to fan the flame of civil war in another nation," and he was not at all convinced that reuniting the slave and free states was a practical or morally sound policy. He later explained, however, that his "first ground for hesitation was removed by the efforts of the South to draw us [England] into the quarrel. The

second was swept away by the progress of the war, which left us practically to choose between the victory of freedom and that of slavery."¹²

Once Smith had made the choice, however, there was no longer any sign of hesitation on his part as he threw his complete support behind the pro-North cause and allied himself with a distinguished group of English liberals who had done the same. Among this group were men such as Richard Cobden, John Bright, Leslie Stephen, James Bryce, John Stuart Mill, and T.H. Green, all of whom were dedicated, like Smith, to sustained and intelligent criticism of the South and its defenders, especially The Times, and to the presentation of an accurate and fair picture of the Northern cause for the benefit of the English people.¹³ Of all of these men, with the possible exception of T.H. Green who has been described as "a convinced and almost reckless pro-Federal," Goldwin Smith was perhaps the most bitter and vocal opponent of the Southern side. This was due, in no small measure, to his profound loss of faith in the English ruling class and propertied society generally. Before the outbreak of the war, Smith's political connections had been Peelite and Whig and his political outlook, as demonstrated by his Inaugural Lecture, had been fairly moderate, retaining a generous and optimistic attitude toward the role of the wealthier classes in the development of English society. Their reaction to the Civil War, which was expressed in a national policy based on "the balanced selfishness of the landowners and the commercial capitalists,"¹⁴ disgusted him so deeply that he identified himself "with the resolute opponents of the South, whom he styled 'the Manchester School.'"¹⁵

For these men the conflict was between democracy and slave-holding aristocracy and Smith, who shared their interpretation of the war, gladly

joined in their pro-North agitation, writing and speaking publicly in support of the cause. His connections with Manchester men, especially the few manufacturers from the north of England who were sympathetic to the Federalist side, and his complete rejection of the wealthier classes with their Southern, aristocratic sympathies, substantially altered his view of the working class. Smith, along with other liberal academics perceived organized labour's support of the North as evidence of strong moral character and healthy political intelligence which deserved to be reflected in the government of the nation. Although their interpretation of the workers' attitudes toward them and the war was inaccurate, it nevertheless resulted in the emergence among liberal thinkers of a more immediate and enduring commitment to democratic reform in England. Goldwin Smith certainly shared this commitment, arguing that democracy, of all political systems, could best secure the progressive development of society at least for the foreseeable future.¹⁶

This conviction was deepened by Smith's visit to the United States in 1864. He went to America to, as he called it, "report on the real state of affairs" and to satisfy his own curiosity about American politics and the conduct of the war.¹⁷ Smith was not the only liberal academic to visit the United States during the war—Edward Dicey, Leslie Stephen, Lord Houghton, and Henry Yates Thompson also made the journey—but he went with the intention of returning there for a more extended visit once the war was over. Moreover, he was received more warmly and enthusiastically than most foreigners and was "everywhere acclaimed" for his articulate and staunch defence of the North.¹⁸ He met some of the most important and influential people in America, intellectuals, political, and military leaders. When he first arrived he stayed in

Boston with Charles Eliot Norton, who became his good friend. Later he met Emerson, Thoreau, Longfellow, and the poet William Cullen Bryant. Among his political and military acquaintances were Senator Sumner, Theodore Roosevelt, General Butler, Secretary of State Seward, General Grant and President Lincoln. For three months Smith toured America, lecturing on various themes related to the Civil War and relations between America and England and travelling as far west as Iowa and north to Canada. He noted favourably the pervasive belief in equality, not "of intellect, wealth, or influence, but of status in the community and the negation of privilege," which for him was equality in its truest form and the very foundation of democracy. America, with its religious freedom and popular educational system, could boast of a remarkably intelligent population whose industriousness made for an impressive level of general prosperity in the North.¹⁹

By the time his tour of America was drawing to a close, Goldwin Smith had developed a new conception of America's role in the world and of its relationship to England. The speech he delivered to the Boston Fraternity in December 1864 was a vivid indication of how his views on America had solidified as a result of the war and of how he had come to see America as an appropriate example of his theory of the division of nations. In this lecture, entitled "England and America," Smith argued that the "real hour" of America's birth, whether its official histories acknowledged it or not, was "the English Revolution of the seventeenth century," which, while it failed in England, "at least, as an attempt to establish social equality and liberty of conscience," had succeeded in America where there was no hereditary aristocracy, ecclesiastical hierarchy or feudal tradition to undermine it. In the new world "a free community was founded,

though in a humble and unsuspected form, which depended on the life of no single chief, and lived on when Cromwell died." Here the Puritan emigrants carried on the true English traditions of freedom, self-government, and Christian morality, "beyond the reach of the Restoration."²⁰

In fact, argued Smith, it was the very success of this "free community" that explained the reaction of England's ruling class for whom America's democratic experiment, since it enshrined the principle of freedom and equality, posed a very real threat. Thus in the Civil War which, for Smith was but one "vast episode in the...irrepressible conflict between Aristocracy and Democracy," England's wealthy classes, "the heirs of the Cavaliers," supported the aristocratic, semi-feudal and slaveholding South against the free, democratic states of the North, defended by "the heirs of the Puritans."²¹ Smith felt that, given this situation, it was clear that the progress of society, England's included, was tied to the fortunes of American democracy. Smith told Americans that their "regeneration, when...achieved, will set forward the regeneration of the European nations. It is the function which all nations, which all men, in their wavering progress towards perfection, perform in turn for each other."²² It was, it seemed, America's opportunity to lead men forward in their fitful though steady course of advancement and Smith was thoroughly convinced that the nation was able and willing. At the same time, he was hopeful that the "brightness" of its shining example would "one day reillumine the feudal darkness of the Old World."²³

In this way Smith returned to England at the end of 1864 "confirmed in his previous theoretical belief in the vitality and general excellence of American political institutions." He spoke frequently to English

audiences about the character of the American nation attempting to mend the rift between the two countries, and, when the Civil War finally ended, he did everything in his power to encourage the establishment of friendly relations between them.²⁴ The end of the war in no way diminished his interest in the United States; rather, his personal and political experiences over the next two years only served to rekindle and encourage it. As early as December 1865 he expressed to Eliot Norton a desire to return to America to study and write "some portion of American history" should he outlive his father for whom he was caring full-time.²⁵ Moreover, his involvement in the agitation for the second Reform Act and in the Jamaica controversy had reaffirmed his disillusionment and disgust with England's rulers, though the qualified success of these activities had, to a certain extent, allayed his fears for England's future which would soon be in the hands of a new reformed parliament. These experiences, coupled with the death of his father in 1867, convinced him to return to America to study this nation which had so recently succeeded England as the leader of progressive society. A meeting with Andrew White, who invited Smith to become an honorary, non-resident professor at Cornell, the newly-formed university near Ithaca, New York, formalized Smith's plans to leave England for an unspecified period of time. Though his concern and love for England never dwindled, the break turned out to be a lasting one.²⁶

Goldwin Smith was forty-five when he left England and while the impact of a new land and, to a certain degree, strange environment did not substantially alter his view of society, it certainly added to his general background of knowledge and experience. The three years he spent in America were largely taken up with the development of

Cornell University. When he arrived there, he had been impressed by the captivating countryside and, although the university was at that time little more than "a single block of buildings, much the reverse of beautiful," he found the local academic community both friendly and stimulating.²⁷ Among his colleagues were Louis Agassiz, James Russell Lowell, George Curtis, and Bayard Taylor, all of whom were non-resident like himself. From the outset, Smith assisted in both the intellectual and physical development of the young university, bringing over his large personal library and a collection of English fossils and later providing English stonecutters and Oxford ivy for the ornamentation of some new buildings. Apart from his regular lectures, which were always very popular, he also wrote and spoke on the function of a university in society, emphasizing its dual role as a teaching institution and as an organ for the general advancement of learning and science through research.²⁸

His obvious devotion to the university was, at least in part, due to his pledge to abstain from commenting on American politics, which, as a foreigner, he thought he had no right to do. Only once in three years did he think it justified to break that pledge and that was when, in 1869, as a well-informed Englishman living in America, he felt compelled to answer Charles Sumner's attacks on England over the Alabama claims "which he considered an incitement to war."²⁹ Smith found some support for his defence of England but his stand was generally unpopular due to the great tension in Anglo-American relations at this time, and this undoubtedly contributed to his growing feeling of being a foreigner in a hostile country. Moreover, he disliked being cut off from political journalism and he was disheartened by Ezra Cornell's schemes for the

university, particularly the admission of women. As well, the prospect of a home with his relatives in Canada was a strong inducement to a man who after two years at Cornell, "yearned for a rather more domestic life."³⁰

Thus in 1871 Smith left Cornell and settled in Toronto. He never gave up his connection with Cornell, however, returning there from time to time and giving the university generous financial support (which included his \$700,000 estate when he died).³¹ His interest in American politics and history did not fade either, despite his inability to live comfortably in the United States. During his years in Canada he wrote a good deal of American history, publishing his major work The United States in 1893. In this book, and in the articles, essays and sketches that supplement it, Smith maintained his perception, developed at the time of the Civil War, of America as the great hope for human progress. He also attempted to explain how and why it, of all nations, was suited for this critical task.

III

In discussing the relationship between England and America and formulating his interpretation of American history, Goldwin Smith reaffirmed his conviction, first set down in 1859-61 in his Lectures on Modern History, that human progress consisted in society's movement toward the development of "a real community" based on the general acceptance and entrenchment of the fundamental Christian principles of brotherhood and benevolence. He maintained that the political manifestation of such a moral foundation would be a society "in which each member shall contribute his gifts and faculties to the common store, and the common government shall be the work of all."³² The movement toward this

society had, he argued, been led by England where the principles and institutions of constitutional government had first been established and successfully entrenched. Over a period of some eight hundred years, the English nation had developed the "great foundations of constitutional government, legislative assemblies, parliamentary representation, personal liberty, self-taxation, the freedom of the press, and allegiance to the law as a power above individual will." These were, according to Smith, the basic forms which enabled men to improve themselves and their society, steadily and calmly, towards the achievement of a moral community.³³

In England, these principles had found their greatest advocates and most determined promoters in the Puritan revolutionaries of the seventeenth century. Their simple, though narrow, Christian theology was the closest existing approximation of the ideal morality embodied in Christ's teachings and their defence of it led them to challenge the power of the monarchy, the aristocracy, and the Anglican Church, and eventually to crush them, establishing in their place the precedents for constitutional monarchy and representative government. Yet while their achievements set an enduring example for future generations of Englishmen, the immediate results of their great moral effort were, in large measure, swept away by the Restoration with its revival of hierarchy and privilege which, even in the nineteenth century, continued to thwart the development of truly representative and democratic institutions in England.³⁴

Though progress in England was caught up by the powerful influence of the feudal past, however, progress generally was saved by the transmission of the ideals of the English Revolution to the New World, through the Puritan colonists who founded the New England colonies in America.

These colonists, like the counterparts they left in England, were, in Smith's view, the most complete embodiment of English principles and ideals, much truer, in fact, to English tradition than the restoration monarchs, most English aristocrats and many of the political leaders of the eighteenth century England, who did so much to prevent the reform essential to gradual, orderly progress. As a result, America, uninhibited by the power of privilege and a feudal past which did not reach across the Atlantic had surpassed England in the development of a progressive society based on English principles.³⁵

America's leading role in advancing civilization did not, however, entitle it to presume to be the sole guardian and promoter of progress since it, like any other nation, was imperfect and therefore susceptible to corruption. "Americanize the planet," Smith argued, "and you will retard not quicken the march of civilization which, to propel it, requires diversity and emulation."³⁶ Moreover, he maintained that America could not afford to ignore England's contribution to progress, simply because they had surpassed it. He admitted that the powers of reaction were ascendant in the English government, such that English liberals turned to America for hope, but suggested that all nations, including America, had suffered setbacks in their development and that this was no reason to dismiss the English nation as unimportant. The American achievement, he stated, flowed directly from England's system of constitutional government and while the governments of the day might have been untrue to those principles, "the heart of English nation" was still dedicated to their advancement, and therefore deserved the respect of the American people as a crucial ally in the struggle to promote the development of a progressive society through "the advancement

of their common civilization."³⁷

In this context, all of Smith's historical work on the United States can be seen as an attempt to forge a workable alliance between America and England by moderating the bitter and strained relations that had prevailed between the two nations since the American Revolution. He believed that the first step in reconciling the two major branches of the Anglo-Saxon race was the development in each nation of an accurate and fair understanding of the other nation's history. It was this conviction that led him to produce two books and several lengthy articles during the late 1880's and the early 1890's. Together, they offered English audiences a generally positive interpretation of American history, based on the view that the two nations were natural allies which could profit from one another's examples.

i The Foundations of American Democracy

The crucial theme in Smith's perception of American history was, therefore, the essential "Englishness" or "Anglo-Saxoness" of the American nation and he set out to demonstrate that its remarkable progress was firmly rooted in that tradition as embodied in the Puritan colonists of New England and their descendants. At the same time he attempted to prove that the quarrel between England and America, far from being the source of American development, had not only been unnecessary but had also, in fact, been detrimental to the advancement of American society. This view necessarily led Smith to stress the substantial positive achievements of pre-revolutionary New England, an emphasis which accurately reflected his preoccupation with the Puritan revolution in England and his insistence on the importance of morality and moral character in history. Following the example set by nineteenth

century American historians like John G. Palfrey, who believed that the hard work and sound character of the Puritans were the sources of America's modern greatness,³⁸ he argued that the positive influence of the Puritan colonists was largely the result of their moral outlook. They had left England not to search for gold or commercial wealth or to fill a military outpost but to preserve their religion from the persecutions of the Stuarts. It was this sustaining Christian motive which had enabled them to succeed where other colonists had failed in establishing a permanent colony in the face of great hardship and suffering.³⁹

The first colonists were followed by others from among the persecuted of England and soon a group of five communities had evolved all of which shared a similar moral character, based on a fundamental and simple Christian vision. Smith maintained that even where theocracy existed, as in Massachusetts, religion was derived from "the Bible interpreted by reason" and it owed "paramount allegiance not to authority but to truth." Religious leaders were well-educated men whose "ascendancy was moral and intellectual...not that of caste or thaumaturgy."⁴⁰ As well, a generally high level of intelligence in the communities reinforced by the establishment of common schools insured the maintenance of this enlightened and progressive leadership. This rational, independent, and advanced moral view of society went "hand in hand" with the political tendencies of English Puritanism towards republicanism, political liberty, and self-government. Unlike their counterparts who remained in England the New England colonists were able to leave the monarchical and hereditary system behind them and although, as Smith maintained, democracy had not yet established itself, it "was not long in raising its head

and foreshadowing its destined empire."⁴¹ Local self-government was firmly established in Massachusetts at the county and township levels and the entire colony was governed by representative institutions elected by democratic ballot. Connecticut was even more committed to democracy than Massachusetts and boasted a written constitution based on the belief that the authority of government rested on the consent of the people. Throughout New England the principle of self-taxation, "the political lever of democracy," was deeply ingrained and the "democratic spirit" of the colonists demanded written codes of laws which, while upholding "the great underlying principles of English justice," were both more rational and more humane than those of the mother country. These political tendencies developed steadily in the free environment of the New World and the New England colonies led by Massachusetts fast became "independent and almost sovereign communities," that promised to contribute a great deal to the advancement of society.⁴²

The only major flaw Smith identified in describing these colonies was the existence of Puritan theocracy. As in the case of Cromwell's Puritan Commonwealth, Smith found the establishment of theocracy, with its unification of church and state and its narrow interpretation of morality, abhorrent and destructive of freedom of opinion and the ideal of Christian tolerance upon which that freedom was based. He acknowledged that belief in theocracy was an ideological flaw common to the age but he refused to defend the persecution of the Quakers or the general tendency of theocratic governments "to deal with sins as crimes."⁴³ The flaw, however, was not a deeply rooted one, in Smith's view, because the political tendencies of the colonies were always towards freedom while the moral and religious tendencies of a simple,

intelligent theology were, in a stable and prosperous environment where its adherents had no fear of attacks from authority, towards toleration and the search for truth. Moreover, these general theoretical trends were reinforced by the practical example of Rhode Island where "the perfect doctrine of liberty of conscience, the sole guarantee for real religion, the sole trustworthy guardian of the truth," was both proclaimed and practised. In this context theocracy could not but gradually fade away and its disappearance did much to promote the general development of a progressive society in America.⁴⁴

The emergence of the Middle States - Pennsylvania, New York, New Jersey - certainly contributed to this rapid development by adding additional English influences to the colonial system. Though originally colonized by Dutch and German settlers, these communities came under the powerful influence of English protestant emigrants and evolved into English-speaking colonies whose governments followed the English model, with a governor and representative assembly, and whose religious outlook was a simple one which allowed for "practical toleration" of all good citizens who believed in God. While the Middle States differed from the New England colonies in many ways, Smith claimed that they shared the same basic vision of society. As English Puritans and Protestants of various types, their ideals had been shaped by the historical experiences of England which had taught them, as it had taught Cromwell, the necessity of self-government and liberty as means by which to advance towards the formation of a moral community of man.⁴⁵

Smith's preoccupation with the significance of the English Revolution of the seventeenth century entered very largely into his favourable depiction of the northern colonies which, for him, represented the success

of the Cromwellian ideal that had, so tragically, failed in England. This preoccupation also explained his extremely one-sided and negative view of the Southern colonies. For Smith, these communities as a whole represented everything opposed to the principles of the English Revolution. They had, he admitted, been settled by Englishmen, but these colonists had lacked the strong moral character of the Puritans, and their society reflected that fact. Government tended to be oligarchical, controlled by a powerful group of men who, like English aristocrats, owned large tracts of land worked by poor whites and slaves over whom they reigned. The lack of towns, local politics, and a middle class prevented the emergence of nobler political tendencies and insured the supremacy of the idle planter class.⁴⁶ Smith was critical of any class which was not self-sufficient since those who lived completely off the labour of others seldom contributed anything to the moral, political or economic development of society. He believed that such men, whether capitalists or aristocrats, deserved the condemnation of all progressive men. The Southern planters, he argued, deserved even greater condemnation because, by basing a whole society on the unrewarded labour and complete degradation and oppression of a section of the human race, they not only undermined political progress but, more important, they subverted the most basic of Christian principles, the brotherhood of man.⁴⁷

ii A Disastrous Schism

Smith viewed the leaders of Southern society in much the same way as he viewed the greater part of the English aristocracy. They were, on the whole, a reactionary force seeking to perpetuate and to extend a hierarchical and privileged social structure that belonged to a past age. In doing so, they exerted a profoundly negative influence within

Anglo-Saxon civilization. Fortunately, however, their combined influence was modified by the strength of the progressive elements in the English race. In England, as in the Northern colonies of America, there were many men who, following the example set by Cromwell, challenged the dominance of privilege in church and state and called for political and social reforms which would establish genuinely representative self-government and guarantee basic rights and liberties. Predictably, men such as these looked favourably upon the American experiment and saw the leaders of New England as important allies in their struggle with reaction. Indeed, Smith argued, the English nation had, with American help, soundly defeated the forces of French despotism in the New World and freed the North American continent so that the work of building an advanced society there could be completed and extended. Together, Smith claimed, the English and American promoters of progress promised to do great things for mankind.⁴⁸

This view of American society and its historical relationship to England explained Smith's critical interpretation of the American Revolution. Smith abhorred all forms of violence and extremism, though he admitted that circumstances, such as those which existed in England at the time of the Puritan Revolution, sometimes precluded moderation and calmness, and that the victories won in the end were in certain cases worth the sacrifices inflicted on society by revolution and war. He maintained, however, that the American Revolution was neither a justifiable nor an ultimately rewarding example of the use of violent political methods. He claimed that it was a civil war between two branches of the same race whose interests were, at base, the same.⁴⁹

It was not the result, he argued, of a tyrannical English plot to subvert

and to destroy the liberties of the American people, as George Bancroft and the nationalist historians of America claimed. It was, instead, the consequence of the misguided and ill-informed policies of a distant government which based its actions on the strength of the fallacious feudal link between a mother country and its colonies.⁵⁰

Like Charles M. Andrews and George L. Beer, Smith viewed the American colonies as having become self-governing and virtually independent while England's rulers remained attached to the idea of Empire, thereby laying the groundwork for the conflict.⁵¹ The leaders of colonial resistance were not, like Hampden, "combatting an attempt to found on arbitrary taxation a reactionary government" which would have destroyed civil liberties and "quenched the spiritual life of the nation." The English government only sought a colonial contribution to Imperial defence and apart from its ill-considered attempts to tax the colonies and its "unjust" and "foolish" interference in colonial trade and manufactures, the colonies enjoyed a degree of independence, security and freedom unknown in the colonies of other nations.⁵² In Smith's view, colonial grievances against the Imperial government, though legitimate, were hardly sufficient cause for a civil war, and he maintained that although the colonists protested the policies of the government they were generally attached to England and had little desire to break their link with her. Moreover, in England there were, among the progressive elements of government and society, devoted advocates of colonial rights, who denounced government policies and defended the rights of the colonies to develop as independent self-governing communities attached to England more by shared principles and ideals than by a need for tutelage and guidance. Their influence was clearly visible in the rapid repeal of

most of the aggravating taxes and economic intrusions of the Imperial government.⁵³

According to Smith, these circumstances favoured some form of peaceful settlement of the dispute between England and America. Unfortunately, the chances of reconciliation were destroyed when "a paltry quarrel" was turned into a violent conflict by the inflamed rhetoric and passionate extremism of colonial agitators bent of inspiring a revolution that would lead to the complete and total independence of America from England. Men like Samuel Adams and Patrick Henry were dead set against reconciliation and used every conceivable tactic, from hypocritical professions of loyalty to "stageplay" theatrics to incite the population to violence.⁵⁴ The outrages and acts of violence committed against England as a result of their activities were answered with measures of repression which "were passionate, indiscriminate, and insulting; bolts of blind wrath launched across the Atlantic" by "trans-oceanic rulers" who by their very nature were ill-informed and ignorant of the situation in America. These measures signalled the triumph of the extreme parties on both sides and struck a blow at the progressive forces in England whose calls for moderation were lost in the war cries of the Tory parsons, bishops and squires and the other supporters of prerogative.⁵⁵

Such a triumph of passion over reason was, Smith claimed, invariably detrimental to progress. The war effort itself was far from admirable, particularly for the Americans, since their victory was due to the military intervention of reactionary France,⁵⁶ and the consequences of the conflict did little to promote the overall advancement of American society. In fact, Smith went so far as to argue that America's greatest

achievements had come before the "quarrel with George III" and that the triumph of England would have been preferable to the political developments which ultimately resulted from the war.⁵⁷ The major positive effects of war consisted in the freeing of American commerce and manufacturing from English interference and the achievement of complete political independence, under a constitution based, ironically, on the English model. That these reforms could have been accomplished without a bitter and destructive conflict between fellow Englishmen seemed obvious to Smith and he lamented the fact that the failure of the statesmen of the time to recognize this had made the two most progressive powers in the world enemies. The American nation became Anglophobic and the political vision of their leaders often became clouded by a paranoic suspicion of all things English. The new nation repudiated its heroic past by rejecting its connection with English history, which according to Smith belonged as much to America as it did to England.⁵⁸ The revolution was upheld and glorified as the source of American liberty and self-government, and as such was used to perpetuate the schism in the Anglo-Saxon race. This resentment and mistrust of England eventually led to the renewal of military conflict between the two powers in the "repulsive" and completely profitless War of 1812.⁵⁹ Such antagonism could hardly contribute to the positive development of either nation and consequently could do little to promote the cause of world progress so closely linked to the efforts of the Anglo-Saxon race. Moreover, the American Revolution not only did little to promote the general advancement of humanity but also, by ruining the finances of the French monarchy, contributed to the French Revolution thereby setting the course of European development back some fifty years by reviving the

influence of the anachronistic feudal monarchies which prior to 1789 had been facing almost certain dissolution.⁶⁰

iii Slavery and Democracy

The international consequences of the war were serious in so far as they divided and weakened the combined forces of progress in the world. In a strictly American context, the after-effects of the war were equally serious and did little to counteract the international setbacks. Smith argued that the violent rupture with England had created a political system in America which was ill-equipped to lead society toward the formation of a moral community. That political system, though based on the English model, incorporated features which undermined its essentially progressive character. The political structure of the American nation was rooted in the union of the northern and southern colonies which began as a military necessity and was at the outset "little more than a league." It quickly gained a significance far beyond the practical purposes for its creation. To Americans and to their nationalist historians, it became "an object of general worship" as an indisposable component of the great struggle with English tyranny and the very basis of the American nation.⁶¹ For Smith, however, the union was an incongruous one between the slave-owning Southern states and "the industrial, democratic, and progressive North." There were two separate societies differing both in spirit and structure and it was obvious to Smith that the moral, social, political structures of the South were not only alien to the Northern system but also profoundly inferior to it.⁶² Any society based on slavery was a thoroughly backward and retrogressive one, in Smith's view, and the existence of slavery in the midst of a modern advanced nation could not but have a serious

negative effect on its development. The slave economy was not only cruel and repressive in the extreme, particularly after the invention of the cotton gin and the Louisiana purchase, but it was aggressive and militant, proclaiming "itself the best and most beneficent birth of time."⁶³

Its statesmen, the leaders of the Slave Power, pursued a policy which sought to secure slavery's place in American society and to extend its influence by directing "the foreign policy of the republic to Southern aggrandisement." Smith claimed that the North acquiesced to Southern supremacy, because important political, economic, social and religious interests there were tied to the maintenance of Southern society. Slavery elected presidents and all candidates were forced to court the Southern vote. It "cowed the House of Representatives and the nation generally by threats of breaking up the union, the idol of the American heart." Economically, the North was tied to slavery by its share in the gains made by it and by the debt owed to its businessmen by the South, while general prosperity convinced the population to keep peace at all costs. The churches, also, "preached submission to the law" and kept the slavery issue out of their churches not wishing to lose their Southern supporters.⁶⁴

According to Smith, the only force working openly to abolish slavery was the moral movement led by William Lloyd Garrison. He and his colleagues ran various anti-slavery journals and formed abolitionist societies in an attempt to awaken Northern morality from its "drugged" state. In doing so these men endured constant harassment, violent attacks and general persecution including restrictions on their freedom of expression, from all quarters. Eventually, however, their cause began

to find "its way to the hearts of simple people who did not hold Southern securities and were not politicians." Their actions also prompted the increasingly arrogant and illegal interference of the Slave Power in the constitutional rights of the nation, and revealed, once and for all, the grave moral threat slavery represented for America.⁶⁵

Smith argued that the moral awakening of the American nation had been slow because the union of the slave with the free states had produced a political system which, for many years, functioned as a defence against abolition and emancipation. Smith claimed that the great differences between North and South prompted the emergence of two political parties to defend the special interests of each and that soon after the union, the radical democratic bias of the system which was rooted in the revolutionary struggle emerged and led to the supremacy of the party that identified itself with that bias. The Anti-Federalists and their successors, the Democrats, stood for radical democracy which upheld individual and state rights against the emergence of a strong national government.⁶⁶ In doing so, they were able not only to represent the interests of the uneducated urban masses of the North but also to protect the social and political institutions of the South including, of course, slavery, from what they believed would be the inevitable intrusions of the national government in their society.⁶⁷ This defence of narrow and particular interests was, in itself, abhorrent to Smith who thought that a good government had to promote the general welfare of the whole nation; but the central presence of the slavery issue intensified his condemnation of the Democrats and their political ideals. He was by no means uncritical of the other major political force which

originated in the Federalist and Whig parties and later became the Republican party, since it too had often ignored the moral issue of slavery in order to preserve the union.

Yet Smith believed, along with the majority of nineteenth century American historians, that this group of men were more enlightened, represented a wider constituency of the American people and more accurately reflected the national interest by attempting to strengthen the federal government and place it above narrow state and individual interests. Moreover, Smith's view of this party was influenced by the fact that their dedication to the national government and the constitution ultimately led them to confront the Slave Power and its partisans in battle.⁶⁸ For Smith, the battle was between the "iron despotism" and of the autocratic South and "the unforced efforts and sacrifices" and "the spontaneous zeal" of the democratic and free North. Though the war was bloody and destructive, there was no doubt in Smith's mind which side represented the force of progress. He viewed the defeat of the Slave Power as a substantial achievement in the revitalization of the moral foundations of America.⁶⁹

iv Party and the Presidency

At the same time, however, he was concerned that with the removal of the slavery issue from the centre of the American political scene, the parties would deteriorate into factions based on the defense of their own peculiar interests and ambitions rather than the defense of political principles. Their collisions and conflicts would, he claimed, inhibit the process of national government by placing individual interest above that of the nation.⁷⁰ The negative effects of party could only be counteracted by strong national leadership and Smith was

pessimistic, at best, about the ability of American society and the revolutionary political system to produce such leadership.

For Smith, who had been deeply influenced by the educational ideas of Thomas Arnold and other Victorian reformers and liberals, leadership played an absolutely crucial role in the development of moral society. He believed in democracy and looked forward to the time when all men would participate actively in the governing of society but like many of his contemporaries - men such as James Bryce and John Stuart Mill - he was convinced that general participation had to be achieved gradually and that it had to be dependent on the education of all participants. This education was in Smith's view a long-term historical process which required the guidance and tutelage of the masses by the intellectual, political, and moral leaders of society — in the words of Coleridge and Arnold, the clerisy. Smith argued that these leaders had to be men of sound moral character who possessed a clear and progressive vision of where society ought to be going and who had the courage and ability to lead it there in an orderly but steady fashion, without giving in to the temptations of immediate power, prestige, and popularity. This, of course, presupposed a determination to remain above party and particular interests and to understand and promote the interests of all groups and classes in society.⁷¹

Smith's ideal type set exacting standards of character and behavior that few American leaders satisfied. In the non-political sphere, Smith presented William Lloyd Garrison as an example of strong moral character and vision combined with the determination and ability to educate men and alter society. He was, Smith claimed, "a pure moral force," who endured great hardship, harassment, and persecution in order to awaken

the conscience of the nation to the evil of slavery. Although he lacked moderation, this was a quality which would have been of little use against the militant Slave Power.⁷² His only equal in the political sphere had been George Washington, whose solid Christian character had helped him to save the nation from military and political destruction during and after the war with England. Though a politician, he had remained above party and had attempted to keep Jefferson and Hamilton in the same cabinet while also setting the foundations for a strong national government. He had placed policy above popularity and had steered the nation clear of revolutionary France and toward reconciliation with England. His belief in democracy was limited; but his dedication to national development was steadfast and genuine.⁷³

Only one other president made a comparable contribution to the nation and he, too, derived his powerful influence from a national crisis. Abraham Lincoln, though more of a party man and more committed to democracy and popular opinion, had possessed a strong moral character. His moderate but determined political leadership carried the American nation through its most difficult hour.⁷⁴

Smith also thought highly of Alexander Hamilton, although he regretted his essentially ambitious character. He claimed that he held "the foremost place among American statesmen" for his dedicated advocacy of "nationality with order and strong government." He was above state interests and willingly "braved unpopularity in defence of righteousness," in an attempt to moderate the excesses of the Revolution, including unbridled, uneducated democracy and rampant Anglophobia.⁷⁵ Smith considered himself a democrat and a Manchester liberal, but he maintained that a strong national government made up of the moral and intellectual

leaders of society would be imperative until the general moral character of the nation reached a higher level.

The efforts of Hamilton and the other strong leaders did much to raise the character of the nation and their influence proved enduring but the revolutionary system of government, embodied an extreme democratic bias in the form of an elective presidency which had tended for the most part to work against the emergence of strong, decisive, and enlightened government. Smith argued that the presidency had generally been occupied by weak men who possessed no firm vision of society and thus were little more than pawns of special interests and parties, most often those of the Slave Power. Madison was elected to fight a war with England, Monroe contributed to the revitalization of slavery by accepting the Missouri Compromise and Polk, "the arch-obscurity," had pushed the nation into the Mexican war for the benefit of the South.⁷⁶

Such men were common products of the elective presidency, yet in Smith's view they were by no means its most dangerous. Much of the damage done by these men was erased by the defeat of the Slave Power in the Civil War. According to Smith, more serious damage was done to the cause of American progress by the entrenchment and glorification of radical democratic tendencies by influential and powerful men, whose actions ultimately turned the presidential elections into popularity contests. These tendencies were first embodied in the political doctrine of Thomas Jefferson. Jefferson "had unabounded faith in the people and never doubted the success of the American experiment in democracy." He was acutely aware of where society and the people were moving and was shrewd enough to place himself in the forefront of that movement. He listened carefully to popular opinion and his faith in its righteousness

was so strong that he protested all attempts to guide the people believing that popular anarchy and chaos was preferable to strong government.⁷⁷ Jefferson's influence on the American people was profound and his ideas about the nation, its political structure, and its role in the world became deeply ingrained in American society. While he was in power, the practical expression of these radical principles was modified by his good sense and intelligence and the national government retained an important, though more closely surveyed, role in the state.⁷⁸

When, however, the democratic notions implanted in the people by Jefferson became fully developed, suspicion of government was translated into a general mistrust of intelligence and distinction. The eventual consequence of this development was the election of Andrew Jackson, who was one of the people rather than just their friend as Jefferson had been, and whose jealous hatred of all powers above that of the people, embodied in himself, was tempered by neither intelligence nor common sense.⁷⁹ Jackson was "a barbarian to the core" and his "furious passions" had no base in moral principle but were merely the violent expressions of his outraged egotism. Believing himself "the only direct and genuine representative of the people," he attacked all authorities that challenged his will including Congress and the Supreme Court. He turned the Civil Service into a party machine and sent the country into economic chaos by destroying the national bank. He placed himself and his conscience above the constitution and used his power to incite the poor against the rich. Smith viewed his legacy as one of political corruption, lawlessness, and class hatred.⁸⁰ Moreover, his example lived long after his rule and placed the available,

popular presidential hopeful above the able and intelligent one. This quest for "the Unholy Grail," reduced good, thoughtful, and even brilliant men such as Webster and Clay to crude vote-seeking hypocrisy.⁸¹

Thus Smith made it clear to his readers that the American system, like all others, was flawed and that despite what Fourth of July polemicists might claim, American institutions were "not a miraculous leap into a political millennium." They were, however, certainly "a great step in advance of the Old World" and their moral foundations were sufficiently firm in Smith's view to suggest that progress would continue even though parties and the elective presidency did not disappear.⁸² It was as important as ever, according to Smith, that Englishmen understand the American example and that they view the American people as partners in the long-term struggle to achieve a moral community of man.

1. Goldwin Smith, "On the Study of History - I," in Lectures on the Study of History, (Oxford: James Parker & Co., 1865), p. 70.
2. Ibid.
3. Ibid., p. 71.
4. Ibid., pp. 72-3.
5. Goldwin Smith, "Inaugural Lecture," in Lectures on the Study of History, pp. 39-41.
6. Goldwin Smith, "On the Foundation of the American Colonies," in Lectures on Modern History, (Oxford: J.H. and Jas. Parker, 1861), p. 32.
7. Ibid., pp. 30 and 32.
8. Christopher Harvie, The Lights of Liberalism, (London: Penguin Books Ltd., 1976), pp. 106-7; Goldwin Smith, Reminiscences, ed. Arnold Haultain, (New York: The Macmillan Co. Ltd., 1910), pp. 319-21; see also Elisabeth Wallace, Goldwin Smith: Victorian Liberal, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1957), pp. 28-9.
9. Wallace, p. 28.
10. Smith, Reminiscences, p. 334.
11. Harvie, p. 105.
12. Smith, Reminiscences, pp. 321-2.
13. The Dictionary of National Biography, 2nd Supplement 1901-1911, vol. 1, 1920 ed., s.v. "Smith, Goldwin," by Sidney Lee, p. 332.
14. Quoted in Harvie, p. 111.
15. Harvie, pp. 111 and 113; DNB, p. 332.
16. Harvie, p. 113; DNB, p. 332; Elisabeth Wallace, "Goldwin Smith: Victorian Liberal," University of Toronto Quarterly, 23(January, 1954), p. 166; Goldwin Smith, "England and America," Atlantic Monthly 14(December, 1864), p. 12.
17. Smith, Reminiscences, pp. 327-8.
18. Harvie, p. 108; DNB, p. 332; Wallace, Goldwin Smith, pp. 32 and 34-5; Morris Bishop, A History of Cornell, (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1962), p. 84; Philip Dorf, The Builder: A Biography of Ezra Cornell, (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1952), p. 344.

19. Wallace, Goldwin Smith, pp. 35-6; DNB, p. 332; Smith, Reminiscences, pp. 328-33, 339, 341, 345 and 353-5.
20. Smith, "England and America," pp. 752-3.
21. Ibid., pp. 754-5.
22. Ibid., p. 763.
23. Ibid., p. 753.
24. Wallace, Goldwin Smith, p. 38; DNB, p. 333; Frank H. Underhill, In Search of Canadian Liberalism, (Toronto: The Macmillan Co. of Canada Ltd., 1965), pp. 88-9.
25. DNB, p. 333; Wallace, Goldwin Smith, p. 38; Smith, Reminiscences, p. 365.
26. DNB, p. 333; Smith, Reminiscences, pp. 365-6; Bishop p. 84; Dorf, p. 344.
27. Smith, Reminiscences, pp. 371-5; Bishop notes on p. 104 that in July 1870, Smith wrote to Charles Eliot Norton stating: "My high opinion of our staff of Professors is confirmed...I do not think that I have ever had to do with a set of men whose character and ability I esteemed more highly."
28. DNB, p. 334; Bishop, pp. 104-5; Dorf, p. 392; Wallace, Goldwin Smith, p. 45.
29. Wallace, Goldwin Smith, p. 45; DNB, pp. 334-5; Smith, Reminiscences, p. 409.
30. DNB, pp. 334-5; Wallace, Goldwin Smith, pp. 48-50; Smith, Reminiscences, p. 450.
31. Smith, Reminiscences, p. 464; Wallace, Goldwin Smith, p. 51; DNB, pp. 335 and 339.
32. Smith, "England and America," pp. 755 and 762.
33. Ibid., pp. 751 and 755.
34. Ibid., pp. 752-3.
35. Ibid.
36. Goldwin Smith, The Schism in the Anglo-Saxon Race, (New York: The American News Co., 1887), p. 35.
37. Smith, "England and America," p. 763; Goldwin Smith, The United States: An Outline of Political History, 1492-1871, (New York: Macmillan & Co., 1892), p. 73.

38. Gerald N. Grob and George Athan Billias, Interpretations of American History: Patterns and Perspectives, vol. 1, (New York: The Free Press, 1967), pp. 24-5.
39. Smith, The United States, pp. 4-6.
40. Ibid., pp. 7-11.
41. Ibid., pp. 11 and 15-18.
42. Ibid., pp. 18, 21-2 and 28-9.
43. Ibid., pp. 9-10, 12-15 and 21.
44. Ibid., pp. 10, 15, 31 and 35-7; Smith, "On the Foundation of the American Colonies," pp. 23-4 and 28.
45. Smith, The United States, pp. 53-7; Smith, "On the Foundation of the American Colonies," pp. 26-8.
46. Smith, The United States, pp. 39-43, 45-7 and 48-52; Smith, "On the Foundation of the American Colonies," pp. 23-4 and 28.
47. Smith, The United States, pp. 43-4.
48. Ibid., pp. 64-6 and 73; see also Smith, "England and America."
49. Smith, The United States, p. 68; Smith, "On the Foundation of the American Colonies," p. 31; Smith, The Schism in the Anglo-Saxon Race, pp. 11 and 20-1; Smith, "England and America," p. 756.
50. Smith, The United States, pp. 64, 68-71, 73-4 and 80-1; Grob and Billias, pp. 86-7; Smith, The Schism in the Anglo-Saxon Race, p. 7.
51. Grob and Billias, pp. 128-30; Smith, The United States, pp. 69-71.
52. Goldwin Smith, "American Statesmen," The Nineteenth Century 23(January, 1888), p. 99; Smith, The United States, pp. 71 and 80-1; Smith, The Schism in the Anglo-Saxon Race, p. 13; This view was shared by American historians like George L. Beer and Charles M. Andrews; see Grob and Billias, pp. 88-90 and 129-30.
53. Smith, The United States, pp. 71-2, 81 and 84; Smith, "American Statesmen," p. 99; Smith, The Schism in the Anglo-Saxon Race, pp. 20-1.
54. Smith, "American Statesmen," pp. 97-8, 100 and 102; Smith, The United States, pp. 75-7.
55. Smith, The United States, pp. 74 and 83.
56. Ibid., pp. 106-7 and 110.

57. Smith, "England and America," p. 752; Smith, "American Statesmen," p. 103.
58. Smith, The United States, pp. 114-5, 117, 122-8 and 143-6; Smith, "England and America," pp. 751-3; Smith, "American Statesmen," pp. 94-5; Smith, The Schism in the Anglo-Saxon Race, pp. 7 and 32-7.
59. Smith, The United States, pp. 166-7 and 170; Goldwin Smith, "American Statesmen - II," The Nineteenth Century 23(June, 1888), pp. 882-4; Smith, The Schism in the Anglo-Saxon Race, pp. 26-7.
60. Smith, The United States, pp. 115-6; Smith, The Schism in the Anglo-Saxon Race, pp. 25-6.
61. Smith, The United States, pp. 86-7 and 178; Grob and Billias, pp. 202-4.
62. Smith, "American Statesmen," p. 96; Smith, "American Statesmen - II," p. 888.
63. Goldwin Smith, "William Lloyd Garrison," Macmillan's Magazine 52(March, 1886), p. 321; Goldwin Smith, "American Statesmen - III," The Nineteenth Century 24(August, 1888), p. 266; Smith, The United States, pp. 221-7.
64. Smith, "William Lloyd Garrison," pp. 321-3; Smith, The United States, pp. 227-8.
65. Smith, "William Lloyd Garrison," pp. 329-32; Smith, The United States, pp. 177 and 231.
66. Smith, The United States, pp. 115, 117, 118-9, 135, 150, 206-7 and 237; Goldwin Smith, "The American Commonwealth," Macmillan's Magazine 59(February, 1889), p. 252; Smith, "American Statesmen," p. 96; Smith, The Schism in the Anglo-Saxon Race, pp. 24-5.
67. Smith, The United States, pp. 206-7 and 210.
68. Ibid., pp. 131-5, 192-3, 203-5, 206-7, 210, 214-5 and 233-37; Smith, "American Statesmen," p. 96; Smith, "American Statesmen - II," pp. 884 and 890; Grob and Billias, pp. 245-8.
69. Smith, The United States, pp. 255, 261 and 285; Goldwin Smith, "A Moral Crusader," Macmillan's Magazine 62(May, 1890), pp. 24-6.
70. Smith, The United States, pp. 299-301; Smith, "The American Commonwealth," pp. 243-4.
71. Smith, "The American Commonwealth," p. 245; Smith, "American Statesmen," p. 112.

72. Smith, The United States, pp. 230-3; Smith, "William Lloyd Garrison," pp. 323 and 329; Smith, "A Moral Crusader," pp. 21 and 25; see also Goldwin Smith, The Moral Crusader, William Lloyd Garrison: A Biographical Essay, (Toronto: Williamson & Co., 1892).
73. Smith, The United States, pp. 131, 139-40 and 143-9; Smith, "American Statesmen," p. 103.
74. Smith, The United States, pp. 239-41; Goldwin Smith, "Abraham Lincoln," New York Sun, February 12, 1909, p.
75. Smith, The United States, pp. 132-5; Smith, "American Statesmen," pp. 104-7. Smith's views on Hamilton and Jefferson were similar to those held by the American historian Richard Hildreth; see Grob and Billias, pp. 245-8.
76. Smith, "American Statesmen - II," pp. 882 and 890; Smith, "American Statesmen," pp. 177-8 and 211-12.
77. Smith, The United States, pp. 135-9 and 155-65; Smith, "American Statesmen," pp. 107-11.
78. Smith, The United States, pp. 155-65.
79. Ibid., pp. 156, 193-6 and 198-201; Smith, "American Statesmen - III," pp. 269-73.
80. Smith, "American Statesmen - III," p. 269; Smith, The United States, p. 196.
81. Smith, The United States, pp. 179, 208 and 210-11; Smith, "The American Commonwealth," pp. 242-3; Smith, "American Statesmen - II," p. 890; Smith, "American Statesmen - III," p. 264; Smith, "A Moral Crusader," p. 18.
82. Smith, "England and America," p. 751.

CHAPTER FOUR

The Canadian Question

Goldwin Smith's interest in Canada, its history and its destiny derived from the same Christian idealist principles that inspired his interest in England and the United States, but these principles are much less obvious in his Canadian works. This is due, in part, to the fact that he wrote little Canadian history¹ and that his only major historical work on Canada, Canada and the Canadian Question, was written with the specific and limited intention of influencing the outcome of the Canadian election of 1891 in favour of the Liberal Party and reciprocity, thereby promoting eventual commercial and political union with the United States. Certain of Smith's arguments in this work were deterministic and offered a pessimistic view of the ability of Canadians to shape their nation's destiny. Taken alone or in the limited context of his writings on continental union, Canada and the Canadian Question does create an image of Smith as an economic and geographic determinist and a self-confident and aggressive disciple of laissez-faire Manchester liberalism. Placed in the wider context of Smith's fundamental concern for society's progress towards moral community, however, the book and the idea of continental union can be seen as merely a means to this greater end.

I

Canada has been kept in the cradle till thought has awakened in her, and fear with thought. She has learned to scan her future without learning to face it. Yet, after all, she must face it. She, too, will have to play her due part in the progress of humanity, as we have played ours before her.²

Smith's preoccupation with "the progress of humanity" formed the basis of virtually everything he wrote on Canada. He believed that Canada, like England and the United States, was part of the long-term historical process by which modern civilization had been produced and which, ultimately, would shape the world of the future. The English had "by long and hard effort...made the will of kings subject to the law," and it was the task of the new world to build "strong, stable, enlightened and impartial" governments based on the "national will."³

The founding of the American colonies had signalled the beginning of this creative process because the "migrations of the Puritans to New England were the final exodus of humanity from feudalism in the state and "authority" in the Church." This determined that democracy would be "the necessary lot" of the new world.⁴ In Smith's view, democracy was unlikely to be the last stage of human development but it was the latest and highest phase of man's progress towards moral community because it implied the essential brotherhood and equality of all mankind. It provided the most favourable environment for further advancement towards this basic Christian ideal and its ongoing improvement was, therefore, crucial to the evolution of modern society.

Smith was convinced that Canada was part of this new order and that as "an American democracy" her task, like that of her neighbour, was "to make the will of the people subject to reason," to help build a form of government which required the intelligent participation of all members of society and which concerned itself with the promotion of the interests of the whole community.⁵ It was this conviction that inspired and sustained Smith's interest in Canada and the many books, essays, articles, letters and speeches he wrote about Canadian issues

over some forty-eight years, can be seen as attempts to facilitate Canada's fulfilment of the momentous role he had assigned her.

Throughout his career, Smith believed that Canada's ability to contribute to the development of democratic society was limited by the influence of certain anti-progressive, anti-democratic forces and his writings were intended to remove these obstacles. In the early 1860s, when Smith first wrote about Canada, he believed that the most immediate and obvious obstacle to Canada's fulfilment of her role as a progressive nation was the influence of the imperial link with England. In his view, a political connection between an old world, feudal, and aristocratic nation and a new world democracy could not help but limit the advance of the democratic community. He advocated colonial emancipation as a means by which to remove this negative connection.

In 1861, the Trent Affair threatened to erupt into a war between Britain and the United States in defence of British North America and, in the subsequent debate over provision for colonial defence, the whole relationship between the mother country and her colonies was brought into question.⁶ For Smith, this provided an excellent opportunity to win the British public over to the idea of colonial emancipation moving Canada, thereby, one step closer to the goals he had assigned her. During 1862-3 he wrote a series of letters to the leading liberal paper in London, the Daily News. Published later in 1863 as The Empire, these letters offered convincing arguments in favour of emancipation which took into account not only the interests of Britain but also those of Canada.⁷

Smith argued that from Britain's point of view, the value of the imperial framework was constantly diminishing. The benefits to be gained

from colonial trade and emigration were far outweighed by the cost of governing (even in a limited way) and defending a wide variety of far-flung dependencies. Moreover, the costs were inevitably thrust upon the helpless British taxpayers whose hard-earned wages could have been better spent on badly needed domestic reforms and improvements. As well, the maintenance of the paternal relationship between the imperial nation and its colonies helped to reinforce the traditional paternalistic, hierarchical view of British society which in Smith's opinion was decidedly anti-progressive.⁸

Furthermore, Smith claimed that the Empire was not only damaging British society but was also undermining the colonies themselves by restricting their development into responsible nations. He argued that the imperial framework was "keeping the colonies in a perpetual state of infancy, and preventing the gristle of their frames from being hardened into bone."⁹ While British tutelage and guidance had once been essential to the establishment and early development of the basic institutions of constitutional government in the colonies, the current influence of the Colonial Office, far from being essential, was largely detrimental to their continuing evolution. Quoting a colonist who claimed that the Colonial Office had always striven to keep as much power as possible for the crown and to yield as little as was acceptable to the people, Smith asked whether any act of that office could "be shown to have been beneficial to the political character of the colonies." Even when the intentions of the office were good, the great distances and differences between Britain and her colonies resulted in a general lack of knowledge and understanding. As well, the influence of British party politics on colonial administration was never a stabilizing one.¹⁰

Even in the field of colonial defence, where the benefits to the colonies seemed more obvious, Smith maintained that the colonies would be better off on their own. Rather than learning to defend themselves and to take full responsibility for their own actions in international affairs, the colonists depended upon Britain and were, therefore, likely to be less cautious and reasonable in their relations with other countries. This lack of self-restraint, rooted in a strong sense of responsibility, was a dangerous weakness particularly for Canada when, as a dependency of Britain, she was an obvious target for American hostility and she was not easily defended. According to Smith, the political education of any nation depended, to a large extent, "on self-exertion, on self-control, on self-applied experience, on the instinctive adaptation of institutions to circumstances."¹¹ English settlers, more than any others, were particularly well-equipped to advance quickly in this course of political education since their "shrewd intelligence and sturdy self-reliance" inspired them to govern themselves as much as possible.¹²

As far as Smith was concerned the British North American colonies, particularly Canada, were clearly ready and able to govern themselves. They already enjoyed a large measure of independence and self-government such that they had not hesitated to challenge the authority of the mother country in the areas of defence and trade, and it would not, he argued, be a drastic step to complete their independence. Together, these colonies were "naturally destined to make one nation," and the sooner their union was secured, the sooner they could begin their progressive task. Smith rejected as "humiliating" the claim that Canada could not be independent and retorted that even if she could not make her due contribution to progress on her own, it would be made

as part of the democratic new world, rather than the aristocratic British empire.¹³ He argued that England and Canada differed "radically...from each other in social structure. England is an aristocracy, while the whole frame of society, to which political institutions must conform, is in Canada democratic." Their institutions, Smith claimed, were "directly opposed...in religion, in politics, and in trade." England has "a high electoral qualification and an aristocratic Parliament," while Canada had "manhood suffrage and democratic assemblies." The Mother country had embraced a policy of free trade while Canada constructed its commercial system on the basis of protection.¹⁴ Moreover, the Canadians had "renounced" the Established Church that Pitt had attempted to build and had "turned its endowments to the purposes of the State." They had also firmly rejected the idea of creating an hereditary aristocracy in Canada, opting to maintain the essential equality of their community of independent freeholders.¹⁵

Britain, therefore, was not in a position to guide or to direct Canada and her other North American colonies towards the fulfilment of their democratic purpose. The United States, as the first great democratic power, was certainly better equipped to lead her northern neighbour; yet she too was plagued by the influence of internal anti-progressive forces in the early 1860s which diverted her from playing her part in democratic development. Moreover, Smith claimed that democracy was "a great experiment, which might be more safely carried on by two nations than by one." Two nations could, he argued, by "emulation, mutual warning and correction, mutual supplementation of defects," help and improve one another and steady "each other's steps."¹⁶ The division of nations was important to the progress of society as Smith

saw it and although he saw signs of ultimate continental union, he remained convinced that an independent Canadian nation was crucial to the advancement and evolution of democratic society in North America:

That the Canadians should be a separate nation from the Americans seems a thing manifestly to be desired; not only, for their own sake but for that of the Americans themselves, who have shewn only too plainly that they stand in need of the lessons which nations, like men, derive from the society of their equals.¹⁷

This great potential could not be realized, however, until the political connection with England was ended and Canada was able to take her proper place in the new world.

II

The impact of Smith's emancipationist arguments in England and British North America was impossible to judge. Yet it was clear that his views were characteristic of a "prevalent attitude" in England and the colonists were forced to consider how they would survive in the absence of a strong imperial framework.¹⁸ As a result of these and other considerations, four of Britain's North American colonies joined together in 1867 to form the dominion of Canada. In doing so they seemed to move one step closer to total independence and the ultimate fulfilment of their role in perfecting democratic society. Encouraged by this development and more disillusioned than ever with America and its hostility to all things English, Smith arrived in Toronto in 1871 convinced that Canada's overall contribution to progress could best be made by the development of an independent, democratic Canadian nation.

The need for mutual defence and intercolonial trade had drawn the colonies into confederation and they looked to the new federal government to devise policies that would insure Canada's independence and

security and promote the development of a prosperous national economy. Under the leadership of John A. Macdonald, the government set out to accomplish these goals by bringing the vast area of the Northwest and British Columbia into confederation, by connecting the various regions with a network of railways which would facilitate both inter-provincial trade and national security, and by attempting to gain better trading terms with the United States.¹⁹

These policies, however, met with limited success. Soon after confederation, Nova Scotians, believing that they had been coerced into joining the union, began to agitate for repeal and their discontent was only quieted when their leader, Joseph Howe, accepted the union with the promise of a cabinet post and better terms for the province. In 1869, the Canadian government had acquired Rupert's land, but in their zeal to incorporate it into the dominion, they neglected to consider the needs and wishes of the local inhabitants who rose in rebellion against the government's plans for their home. In the insurrection that ensued, serious religious, racial, and regional differences became evident, giving rise to conflict and debate throughout the country. Moreover, the bargain struck between the federal government and British Columbia and the plan for building a transcontinental, national economy were based on an ambitious railway-building scheme the cost of which was overwhelming and which had forged unhealthy alliances between big business and the government. As well, the Treaty of Washington, though it soothed Anglo-American relations, did not bring the reciprocity most Canadians had hoped for and it demonstrated the weakness of Canada's negotiating position in relation to the United States.²⁰

Always a critical observer of Canadian affairs, Smith was well-aware of the difficulties facing the young country when he arrived there in 1871. Soon after his arrival he became involved in the nationalist movement which had begun to take shape the year after confederation.²¹ In 1868 a group of like-minded, idealistic young men inspired by the achievement of confederation established the Canada First movement in an attempt to promote the development of a unique Canadian nationality. The members of this movement—men such as George Denison, Charles Mair, William Foster, Robert Haliburton, and Henry Morgan—though they differed on many issues, were united in their desire to make Canada a strong nation neither inferior to nor dependent upon England or the United States. In their determination to promote national unity, they criticized all those factors which divided and weakened Canada. They called upon Canadians to place their country above race, creed, and personal, party and regional interests and they attacked political corruption and partisan journalism as detrimental to the character of the new nation.²²

The idealistic outlook of Canada First appealed to Smith for he, too, was anxious to elevate the character of Canadian national life. Although he never actually joined the movement "he warmly sympathized with it, gave it financial assistance, and spoke and wrote much on its behalf."²³ He also contributed a great deal of time and money to the Canadian Monthly and National Review, a journal which attempted to give "a literary expression to the spirit of nationalism signalized by Confederation," and "to stem the process of Canada's intellectual annexation to the United States."²⁴ Independent in politics and devoted to freedom of speech, this journal represented an important departure

from the party-dominated press of the day and Smith supported it wholeheartedly until 1874, when he became deeply involved in the production of the Nation, the new journalistic organ of Canada First. Intended to look at all public issues from "the national point of view," the Nation "devoted primary attention to the degeneration of political life," but it was also concerned with "the growing political influence of the Catholic church" in national politics. Smith contributed regular editorials, articles, and reviews to this journal in which "he dealt faithfully with the various sins of the two old parties," and for which he was "violently attacked" by George Brown and the other leaders of the party press.²⁵

Smith's writings in the nationalist journals of the day were intended to promote the development of an independent, democratic, and progressive Canadian nation. In the 1870s, he saw many serious obstacles standing in the way of this development and he attempted to remove them by mobilizing public opinion against them. In his earliest writings on Canada, the Empire letters of 1862-3, he had been preoccupied with the negative influence of the imperial connection. In the 1870s he was still disturbed by the reproduction in the British North America Act of the whole British system of government even though many of the institutions were simply not appropriate for an essentially democratic nation.²⁶ Confederation, however, seemed to Smith an immediate precursor to total independence from Britain and he therefore concerned himself increasingly with issues that seemed to pose a more immediate and serious threat to Canada's democratic mission. In 1862, he had complained that the imperial connection "artificially" preserved French Canada from being assimilated into "modern civilization." While claiming respect for the French Canadian

people, he argued that their institutions were backward and harmful to the evolution of progressive society.²⁷ By the 1870s he was convinced that the anti-progressive forces in Quebec were growing. Quebec had always been a conservative element in North America because it was "ecclesiastically as well as socially and politically, a section of the Catholic and Monarchical France which existed before the Revolution."²⁸ The growth of Ultramontanism in Quebec and throughout the Catholic world, however, had made matters worse. Determined to crush all forms of liberalism in church and state, the Ultramontanes, according to Smith, intended to reunite the temporal and spiritual powers under papal rule, and to reclaim all those rights and privileges that had been lost to the state. Smith believed that they had "all the influences of the hour in their favour" and that they would exert powerful influence over French Canadian society. That influence, moreover would be felt in the rest of Canada because French Canadians were a "united mass" of voters "welded together by a separate nationality,...greatly under ecclesiastical control, and steady in their allegiance to their leaders, who have the confidence of their clergy." Their cohesiveness made them a great power in confederation since their votes could elect or defeat the government of the day.²⁹

The reactionary influence of Quebec was not the only obstacle which threatened to prevent Canada from making a useful contribution to the evolution of democratic society. Canadian society was also plagued by a wide variety of differences and divisions:

Geography is all against us, and we abound with sectional interests, local and commercial. Not only so but our Confederation embraces two distinct nationalities, sharply contrasted in social

and religious character, as well as differing
in blood and languages....³⁰

Such disunity was not insurmountable but it required a strong national government to unite the different regions, races, and interest groups, to control the reactionary influence of Ultramontaniam and to direct Canadians towards their common goal of creating a better democratic society.

Unfortunately, producing a truly national government was difficult in a party system. Smith maintained that the Canadian party system had taken shape in the days before the achievement of responsible government when the political contest was between Tories and reformers. He argued, however, that "since the establishment of Responsible Government and religious equality, party had had no intelligible basis; it has been faction and nothing else."³¹ Even during an election "it was impossible to discover any principle which could form a permanent line of demarcation" between the parties; and "without a dividing principle," party became faction.

The aim of faction is place, its bond is selfishness, the means which it universally and inevitably employs to hold together its forces and attain its ends are intrigue, jobbery, and corruption; its deliberations are conspiracies; its patriotism is the sacrifice of country to cabal; its eloquence is slander of opponents.³²

According to Smith, the primary object of a government based on party was not "the welfare of the country" but simply "the retention of office," and the tendency of such a government was "always downward" because more intelligent and honourable men were "repelled from politics" and "each generation of rulers" would inevitably become "smaller and viler than the last." Corruption would become "more necessary and more familiar" dragging public morality down to the lowest possible level."³³

For Smith, party was rarely a positive influence in any country, but in Canada it was particularly damaging. Canadians could ill-afford yet another divisive element in their confederation. The Canadian union was "not yet properly cemented" and a party government was "an instrument of disruption" rather than an "instrument of consolidation." It was a weak government rather than the strong national government required to unite the country and to keep it on its progressive course.³⁴

Yet Smith remained confident that Canadians had the ability and the desire to overcome these obstacles. Even while he was predicting the triumph of Ultramontanist in Quebec, he was noting the existence of small but determined liberal elements there and suggesting that "young Canada" could perhaps produce a man or men willing to challenge the establishment in Quebec. Moreover, Ontarians had, in 1871, elected a Liberal government of which Oliver Mowat became leader in 1872. As well, there were signs after the conclusion of the Treaty of Washington negotiations that Canadians were finally beginning to recognize that their interests often differed from those of Great Britain and that they could best be defended by Canadians.³⁵

Moreover, Canadian intellectual life and the cause of independent journalism had been advanced by the Canadian Monthly, the Nation, and the Liberal, a daily newspaper founded in 1875. Although none of these publishing enterprises attained popular success, they exerted a "considerable" influence in English Canada as long as they lasted.³⁶ Smith derived some confidence from these developments and attempted to pass that confidence on to Canadians by reminding them that even though the tasks before them were difficult, with a determined effort, they could build a great democratic nation.

But in her competition with the vast and compact empire to the south of her, Canada must rely to a considerable degree on the soundness of her institutions. The elective principle must now be recognized as having become the only possible basis for government, at all events upon this continent. But if we can so apply it as to guard against the special maladies to which, like the hereditary principle, it is subject, and which have been terribly developed in the United States; if we can hold at bay faction and faction's universal concomitant, corruption; if we can keep down trading politicians and city thieves; if we can save our tariff and our public works from rings; if we can preserve the independence of our judiciary, and the security which an independent judiciary affords for prosperity and trade; if we can maintain on a decent level the morality of public life and the character of public men, Canada will have advantages and attractions of which she will soon feel the benefit in a material as well as in a moral point of view.³⁷

III

This optimistic view of the Canadian system, its ability to overcome the obstacles before it, and the contribution it could make to the improvement of democratic society carried Smith through the 1870s. Circumstances, however, could not sustain his hopeful attitude. Canada First came to an abrupt end in 1875 when one of its leading figures, Edward Blake, returned to conventional party politics as a minister in Alexander Mackenzie's government.³⁸ The demise of what Smith considered a thoroughly progressive force was a serious blow in itself but in conjunction with economic depression, aggressive Ultramontanism, and another weak party government, it was too much for him. By 1877 he was convinced that the forces working against the emergence of a unified, progressive nation had overwhelmed the elements working in its favour.

Ten years after confederation, Canada was still attached to

England and the sentiment in favour of retaining the link was constantly maintained by groups such as the United Empire Loyalists, British immigrants, British military personnel, the Anglican church hierarchy and the English aristocracy at "the little courts of Ottawa."³⁹ New and aggressive life had been breathed into this sentiment by the emergence of the Imperial Federationists who sought to link all British possessions regardless of character or place under an imperial parliament. This pro-British sentiment was in most cases based upon a hatred of all things American and democratic and undoubtedly contributed to the uncertainty with which Canada approached her democratic role in the world.⁴⁰

While French-Canadians retained "their exclusive national character" and although they showed no desire to contribute to a united Canadian nationality, they nevertheless wielded great power in confederation as both parties competed for their votes and that power was exerted on the anti-progressive side. The reactionary, priestly influence had grown to such a point that Smith believed "it impossible for a Liberal Catholic party or a liberal party of any kind" to make advances against it. Confederation, in Smith's view, should have contained and reduced these influences but at the very least it should have united the provinces, regions, and sections of the country and secured some degree of economic prosperity for the people. Despite the achievement of inter-provincial free trade, it had done neither.⁴¹ As a result, Smith came gradually to believe that Canada could contribute little to the advancement and improvement of democratic society on her own. The anti-progressive forces at work in confederation were too numerous and too powerful to be overcome by a weak and tenuous national, democratic

ideal.⁴² As he watched events in Canada unfold in the 1880s, this conviction was sustained and even strengthened.

With the re-election of the Conservatives in 1878 and a slight upturn in the depressed world economy, the situation seemed to be improving in Canada. Macdonald's policies of higher tariffs, rapid completion of the railway and increased western settlement, promised to revitalize the national economy. Economic revitalization, however, did not come without high costs. The deal struck between the federal government and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company was a costly one indeed. The company was given enormous grants in land, cash, tax and duty exemptions, and a twenty year monopoly on western traffic. When these benefits proved insufficient to the task time and time again, Macdonald saw that the company received additional aid. For a young country which, after a few brief years of respite, had been plunged back into deep economic depression the economic price of these policies was high enough, but the political costs were even higher. The ambitious nation-building schemes of the government and the centralization of power upon which they were based did not win the support of the whole country and in fact inspired great discontent in certain sectors.⁴²

In the west, Indian, Métis and white inhabitants alike had reason to criticize federal policies. Their lives, land, and livelihoods were being threatened by the disappearance of the buffalo, the extension of the square survey, the CPR monopoly and high tariffs. Believing that self-government was the solution to their problems, they petitioned the federal government but their demands were ignored until they erupted into rebellion in 1885. That rebellion not only illustrated the

government's ignorance of the effects of its policies particularly in the unrepresented Northwest, but it also brought racial and regional conflict to the forefront of Canadian political life once more.

Quebec considered the execution of Riel, the rebel leader, an attack on French, Catholic influence in confederation and responded by electing a French-Canadian nationalist, Honoré Mercier, as provincial premier. He was determined to challenge the centralized anti-provincial and now apparently anti-French and anti-Catholic view of confederation and he was not alone in his crusade for provincial rights. The Liberal government of Ontario was struggling with Ottawa over the rights to liquor licencing while the maritimes, suffering badly from the depression and the negative effects of the tariff which they felt profitted only central Canada, actively and aggressively sought more favourable economic policies. In 1887, these provincial and regional grievances were brought together at an inter-provincial conference hosted by Mercier and over the next few years, the federal government was forced to make concessions which gave the provinces greater control over their own affairs and greater input into confederation.⁴⁴

From Smith's point of view, these developments clearly demonstrated the fundamental weakness of the progressive forces in Canada and they reaffirmed his conviction that the only way to strengthen these forces, and to insure the triumph and continued evolution of democracy was to unite with the purposeful, confident, democratic nation to the south. Political union, however, was a long-term ideal which Smith realized would probably not even be achieved in his lifetime. Thus while this ideal was at the base of much of what he wrote about Canada after 1877, he gave greater prominence in his writings to ideas and opinions which

he felt might bring about some immediate improvement in the state of Canadian society.⁴⁵

Smith questioned, and called upon his readers to question, the government's costly determination to build the transcontinental railway which, he believed, had already proved to be of limited use. He granted "that commercial sacrifices, and great commercial sacrifices, may often be rightly made for a political object," and that "the political object in the present case—the foundation of an anti-democratic Empire on the democratic Continent" was believed by many "able and worthy men" to be "both good and feasible." Yet Smith claimed that, in this instance, the political goal was likely to bring financial ruin to the nation.⁴⁶ It had already produced wide-ranging corruption which reached to the highest levels of government and its goals had yet to be achieved. British Columbia had "been annexed" but she had not, in Smith's view, "been incorporated, nor made morally a part of the Confederation," and she cared little "for the federal interest." The Northwest still contained "less than fifteen thousand inhabitants" and in Manitoba, where settlement had reached a higher level, the government and the population were protesting angrily against the commercial sacrifices they were being forced to make in accordance with the concessions granted in the C.P.R. contract.⁴⁷

Moreover the railway was not the only cause for concern. Provincial and regional discontent had reached new heights and Smith noted "revivals of Anti-Confederation sentiment" throughout the country. In New Brunswick and Nova Scotia tendencies towards separation from the dominion were clearly visible as the economic picture dimmed and large numbers of maritimers moved to the United States. In Manitoba, also effected by the

exodus to the States, the struggle against the rail line restrictions imposed by the federal government on behalf of the CPR continued.⁴⁸

At the same time Ontario was battling with Ottawa over liquor licencing rights and British Columbia, still only tenuously connected to the rest of Canada, remained at the centre of the financial controversy over the transcontinental railway. Sources of discontent in the Northwest were many, including the uncontrolled activities of land-sharks, high prices caused by the tariff, lack of transportation for western goods, and the slow pace of general development. Quebec, meanwhile remained a province apart, jealously guarding her position in confederation against any extension of English-Canadian influence.⁴⁹

Smith suggested that difficulties such as these could be lessened or perhaps even avoided by the establishment of a determined, enlightened, national government. The emergence of such an administration was hindered, however, by the confused loyalties of Canada's political leaders which were too often divided between the empire and the nation and between the party machine and the people.⁵⁰ Smith deplored this situation but he knew that the system would not change overnight. Consequently, while he continued to expose the inadequacies and injustices of the party system and the imperialist tendencies of its leaders, he also offered more pragmatic solutions to the problems facing Canada. Constitutional reform was a recurrent theme in his writings. He called for Senate reform, for the inclusion of some mechanism to decide inter-provincial disputes, for greater definition of federal and provincial jurisdictions, for fixing the duration of parliaments, for the establishment of some "regular mode of trial for political corruption and other political offences," and for the development

of an agreeable formula for constitutional amendment independent of the Imperial parliament.⁵¹

Equally important as political reform in Smith's view, was economic, financial, and commercial reform. Smith had supported Macdonald in the 1878 election in the hope of obtaining good government⁵² but he was skeptical from the outset about the wisdom of the protectionist policies of the Conservatives. Smith was not a free trade purist but he believed that the test of any policy was whether it would "bring wealth to the nation as a whole." Protection, he argued, deserved to "be fairly tried," by this standard, and, if it failed, free trade with the United States or, as Smith preferred to call it, commercial union, deserved equal consideration.⁵³ Confident in the belief that there existed strong natural economic ties between Canada and the States, and that a protected Canadian economy would never provide the "full measure of prosperity" that would come with an open continental system,⁵⁴ Smith was quick to announce the failure of the tariff policy. After two years it had not equalized revenue and expenditure; nor had it revived reciprocity discussions. Moreover, when the policy was five years old, Smith expressed grave doubts about whether it had actually fostered Canadian industry or merely produced privileged interests, protected and enriched at the expense of the nation. In the maritimes and the west the heavy burden of the tariff of keenly felt and discontent was growing. With the onset of the depression, the situation throughout the country became acute. While the government, elected in 1882, openly embraced protection and abandoned all talk of "Adjustment," Smith called for the immediate reduction of the tariff.⁵⁵

Admittedly, Smith's concerns went beyond the immediate economic

welfare of the nation. His opposition to the National Policy was also philosophical. He believed that, as a policy, its general aim was "to create a power antagonistic to democracy," on the North American continent. In his opinion, it viewed "Canada not as a community of the New World with interests and a future of her own, but as an "auxiliary kingdom" governed by a quasi-aristocracy of knights."⁵⁶ The continental commercial policy, on the other hand, accepted Canada as a New World community and refused "to sacrifice the interests of her people in any way to that of European Reaction." To this school of thought, the American Republic was not "an object of everlasting hostility," but "a friend and neighbour," whose commercial partnership should be welcomed by Canadians. For Smith, commercial union was not merely a pragmatic solution to economic hardship. If achieved, it would demonstrate once and for all that Canada had taken her place as a part of "the democratic Continent" to which she was already bound geographically.⁵⁷

IV

Much has been made of Smith's advocacy of commercial and political union with the United States, and rightly so. It was a favourite topic of his and he did devote a great deal of time, money, and effort to promoting it. Yet Smith's continentalist schemes never completely dominated his writings or his life. In fact, it was only in 1887 and 1888 that the subjects of commercial union, free trade, and Canadian-American co-operation were given greater attention than most other issues.⁵⁸ Throughout his career in Canada, Smith never stopped writing on English and American politics, international and imperial relations, the Irish question, history, philosophy, religion, education, and the

state of society in general. In addition to contributing hundreds of letters, articles, and reviews to leading journals all over the English-speaking world, he also wrote numerous histories, biographies, verse translations, and pamphlets and became directly involved in the creation or revival of several important Canadian newspapers and journals. The Canadian Monthly, the Nation, and the Liberal were his first ventures. In 1880, he began publication of The Bystander which he wrote completely on his own. It was "a miscellany notable for its variety of topic and lucidity of expression," and, less than a year after its creation, "it had attained a far larger circulation than any previous Canadian periodical," despite the unpopularity of many of Smith's opinions.⁵⁹ In 1883, Smith went on to found the Week, "an independent journal of politics, society, and literature," to which he contributed a weekly section and numerous articles and which provided an important forum for young Canadian writers. Thirteen years later he took over the Weekly Sun, an agrarian journal that he "rescued from extinction" and turned into a respected source of information and comment.⁶⁰

Journalistic endeavours were singularly important to Smith, who was devoted to freedom of thought and expression and to the education of society. But he always combined them with other activities. From the time he arrived in Canada until his death in 1910, he took an interest in "matters of education, social reform, and public benevolence."⁶¹ He represented Ontario teachers on the Council of Public Instruction in 1874 and later became president of the Provincial Teachers' Association. He was appointed to the Senate of the University of Toronto in 1873 and he continually promoted higher education and did what he could to improve the system and the quality of instruction. As well, he campaigned

relentlessly for the purification of corrupt municipal politics and administration and for the establishment of a public system for relief of distress. He spent great time and effort convincing the government of the inadequacy of private charity in the face of industrialization and, when a city welfare officer was finally appointed in 1893, Smith personally paid his salary for the first two years. He was equally "liberal in private charity" contributing thousands of dollars every year to various causes. Among other things, his money sent an unknown boy to St. Andrew's College, helped to build a new synagogue and a new wing at the Catholic House of Providence, and supported countless other groups, of all types and denominations, working among the poor, the sick, and the aged.⁶²

Continental union, then, was never Smith's sole concern during his life in Canada. For a few years, between 1887 and 1891, however, it did preoccupy his attention and that of many other Canadians who were worried about the difficult economic situation and the divisiveness it generated. Smith and a few other individuals, including J.W. Longley and J.V. Ellis, openly supported complete political and economic union with the United States as a solution to these problems. Others, like Sir Richard Cartwright, suggested a strictly commercial arrangement which was ultimately labelled "unrestricted reciprocity" and incorporated in the Liberal party platform in 1887. Introduced into the Commons soon after, the policy did not fare well. Many people believed that commercial union would inevitably lead to political union and certain American politicians with their talk of "peaceful annexation" did little to dispel this fear. The extension of American protectionist policy came to be seen by many Canadians as an attempt "to starve Canada into annexation."⁶³

Nevertheless, advocates of commercial cooperation worked hard to keep the issue alive and to carry it into the election of 1891. Smith's Canada and the Canadian Question was intended as a contribution to this effort (though it did not reach the public until after election day and the defeat of the Liberals).⁶⁴ As with his other works, this book had a philosophical purpose in addition to its immediate pragmatic goal. Smith wanted to insure that Canada would fulfil her role in improving and perfecting democratic society by convincing Canadians that continental union would be beneficial to them and their society and that, in the long run, it was probably inevitable.

In order to meet this aim, Smith used Canadian history to demonstrate that Canada was a new world democracy that was being prevented from playing its part in the progress of democracy by the constant influence of conservative forces. In describing Canadian history, therefore, Smith wanted to reveal the essentially progressive character of the country and its inherent tendency towards freedom and democratic self-government while at the same time outlining the growth of strong anti-progressive currents in the community.

i New France and French Canada

Smith's historical analysis in Canada and the Canadian Question began with "French Canada Before the Conquest," in which he attempted to demonstrate that anti-progressive elements had ruled French Canada from the outset. In the early days of New France, there had been some potential for progressive development due to "the energy, the industry, the intelligence, and the love of freedom" which the early Huguenot emigrants had brought with them to the new world. Unfortunately, Catholic reaction struck in New France as it had in the mother country, and from

that point forward French Canada was consistently under the influence of the Catholic church which, despite the occasional emergence of reformist and liberal tendencies in the colony, maintained a great and largely reactionary influence down through the centuries.⁶⁵

While the Jesuits and the other missionary orders attempted, with little success, to civilize the natives and to educate the colonists, the colony "as an agricultural or commercial settlement...remained a failure, its only trade being the fur trade." Frontenac and Talon did what they could to turn New France into a prosperous commercial colony but the restrictions of monopoly and protectionism made improvements difficult. The feudal land system was imported along with various other old world conventions, undoubtedly setting back whatever positive development had taken place. With the imposition of political absolutism, moreover, there was little chance for local self-government to take root.⁶⁶

According to Smith, none of this activity did much to breath life into the colony and "such life as the colony had apart from the activity of the clergy" was in the fur trade. It was this aspect of colonial life that drew "all those who preferred the freedom of the forest to the paternal despotism of the Intendant and the priest." But this wild and semi-nomadic life was no training for the unexciting but demanding work of a colonist. When Louis XIV died, corruption and abuse replaced the well-intended but ill-conceived colonial despotism of his government and the state of the colony deteriorated further still. Thus, despite the military prowess of its colonists, preserved by the "absence of industrial and commercial pursuits." New France fell to the English.⁶⁷

For Smith, the conquest of New France was an important accomplishment, not only because it rescued New England from the threat of French

aggression but also because it delivered New France "from the realm of despotism to that of freedom," providing yet another new world community where English institutions could be planted and cultivated. From the outset the French settlers enjoyed the benefits of the English constitution—reduced military service, trial by jury, relief from Bourbon despotism and corruption, respect for their religion, and government by a Council which included Catholics. Even Papineau recognized that the security of life and property increased greatly as a result of English rule.⁶⁸

Unfortunately, this generous and conciliatory attitude, forced upon the government by the American Revolution, insured that Quebec would remain French and Catholic and that the reactionary hierarchy of clergy and seigneurs would remain intact and as powerful as ever. This led to racial conflict between the French Canadian communities and the English settlements growing up around them. In 1791 the British government divided Canada into two provinces hoping that this would put an end to the conflict. Both Upper and Lower Canada were given a governor, representing the crown, and an Executive Council to advise him, an appointed Legislative Council similar to the Lords, and an elected Assembly representing the Commons. Though modelled after the British system, the governor actually governed, unlike the British monarch who only reigned, and the elected Assembly had little control over the upper house and the governor.⁶⁹

Lower Canada was confirmed as a French province but there remained a vocal English minority within the province and it soon monopolized the highest appointed offices. According to Smith, French power rested in the Assembly, for although they did not understand and were not really

"fit" for free institutions, French Canadians "grasped the votes which Imperial legislation had put into their hands as weapons to be used for the protection of their nationality and for the overthrow of the oligarchy of Conquest."⁷⁰ They struggled with the English upper house over

the control of the revenue and the Civil List, the composition of the Legislative Council (which the patriots desired to make elective that they might fill it with men of their own party), and the tenure of judges whom they wished to make irremovable...in order to diminish the power of the crown.⁷¹

These issues, along with conflicts such as that between the largely French agricultural interests and the predominantly English commercial elements, caused "constant strife" between the upper and lower chambers. With the exception of the years 1812-14, when both French and English united to repel the American aggressors, this struggle carried on until 1837 when the patriots, frustrated by the government's rejection of their plan to transfer greater power to the Assembly, rebelled. The insurrection was easily put down but in its brief hour, it demonstrated the great divisive power of race and the determination of the French to preserve their nationality.⁷²

When Upper and Lower Canada were united after the dual rebellions of 1837, the position of the French Canadians was left unchallenged despite Lord Durham's warnings that they should be assimilated. United in their determination to preserve their culture, they soon became dominant over the English-speaking factions and passed the Rebellion Losses Bill and made the legislature bilingual again. The premiership was shared between English and French leaders and cabinet positions were divided evenly. Separate Catholic schools received support in both provinces "in contravention of the principle of religious equality and severance of

the Church from the State."⁷³ According to Smith, the "French nationality was more securely entrenched than ever" and gradually they and

their clergy became, as they have ever since been, the basis of what styles itself a Conservative party, playing for French support by defending clerical privilege, by protecting French nationality and, not least, by allowing the French province to dip her hand deep in the common treasury.⁷⁴

Plagued by "faction, intrigue, cabal, and selfish ambition," however, the system of double majorities soon deteriorated into deadlock and Lower Canada, at the bidding of her conservative leaders, accepted union with the other British colonies with the promise that she would retain the power to preserve her nationality. In Smith's view, she sacrificed little since the great electoral power of her united mass of voters forced all political parties to compete for her support. Thus, she was allowed to remain "a theocracy" ruled by the clergy of a powerful, rich, and determined church and, in the years after confederation, far from showing any "tendency to merge her nationality in that of the dominion," she was more determined than ever to entrench and expand it.⁷⁵

ii Upper Canada and the English Provinces

While the course of Quebec's history had, in Smith's view, produced an essentially reactionary society, the history of English Canada was primarily devoted to the development of the principles and institutions of democratic self-government. Upper Canada had originally been settled by United Empire Loyalists fleeing from the American Revolution. They were given the same institutions as the Lower Canadians which provided representative but not responsible government. In the closing years of the eighteenth century the settlers were preoccupied with the difficult

tasks of clearing and working the land and building homes and communities. Smith extolled the virtues of these hard working people whose work and "home affections must have been their religion, the solemn and silent forest their temple." They eventually established common schools as the New England settlers had done before them.⁷⁶

With the achievement of the first essential tasks of settlement and with the immigration of new and different settlers, political life began to take shape. Pre-empted by the War of 1812 in which British Canadians distinguished themselves, political activity revived in 1814. Government was largely controlled by the Family Compact, a group of United Empire Loyalists who "formed a social aristocracy as well as a political ring." Their politics were Tory and through direct and indirect influence they controlled the Executive and Legislative Councils, many seats in the elected Assembly, the Bench, and the higher places in the Episcopal church.⁷⁷

The policies and attitudes of the Compact alienated many of the newer and more liberal settlers and out of their ranks grew a Reform party which advocated and campaigned for the same responsible government Englishmen enjoyed. An intense political contest ensued in which, Smith believed, passion played too great a role. With the appointment of Sir Francis Bond Head and his ultimate championing of the Tory cause, the Reformers were driven to rebellion to acquire what they considered their rights as Englishmen.⁷⁸ Their rebellion and Lord Durham's subsequent report secured responsible government for Canada in principle and Lord Elgin's approval of the Rebellion Losses Bill brought it into practise. The accomplishment of responsible government, however, removed the dividing principle between the parties and, with the union of Upper

and Lower Canada, new and more difficult problems emerged. Party was reduced to faction and, eventually, the faction fight ended in political deadlock.⁷⁹

It was out of this deadlock in Canada that the idea of confederation arose but the maritime colonies, which shared the same basic political character and institutions also seemed "ready for Confederation." They, too, had achieved responsible government in a series of struggles with entrenched oligarchy over issues like control over the Civil List, and, by the 1800s, some of the political leaders of the maritimes had come to see certain benefits in a wider union of the British North American colonies. According to Smith, there were at least two other important inducements to confederation: the belief that it would increase "military strength" and "security against invasion," and the hope that it would call "into existence an intercolonial trade to make up for partial exclusion from that American market which Canada had been enjoying to her great advantage during the last twelve years." A series of difficult and controversial negotiations between the leaders of the various colonies ensued and eventually, by an act of the Imperial Parliament, without the direct approval of the colonial populations, the dominion of Canada was created in 1867.⁸⁰

Smith maintained that despite "the false front" of British monarchical and aristocratic forms, like the Governor-General and his provincial Lieutenants and the appointed Senate, Canada was essentially "a federal republic after the American model."⁸¹ In the Canadian system the federal government was stronger in theory, though not necessarily in practise, judges were appointed, the civil service was permanent and relatively free from "the Spoils System" which

plagued the United States, and election petitions were tried by judges not by a party vote. Apart from these notable exceptions, the Canadian system was no better (and sometimes it was worse) than the American. Both were constantly challenged by the special problems of democracy and by the evil consequences of party politics, patronage, and corruption.⁸²

The Canadian confederation, however, was deficient in other important areas which had little to do with its democratic structure. Its success in increasing military security was, according to Smith, very doubtful and its acquisition and incorporation of the Northwest and British Columbia had been difficult, costly, and, in the end, incomplete since much of this vast region was still only sparsely populated and poorly developed. The twin policies of building political railroads and maintaining a protective tariff had been costly for all those who were not railway magnates or manufacturers and had added to regional and provincial divisions, making both economic prosperity and national unity elusive dreams.⁸³ As well, French Canada, inspired by Ultramontanist and revived Jesuit ambitions was becoming increasingly aggressive in its determination in Smith's view to create a French and Papal nation in North America. Smith argued that the Jesuit Estates Act and the various schools questions demonstrated the great strength of these ultra-conservative forces and the weakness of the so-called national government in refusing to challenge these pretensions in the name of national unity. For Smith and many other disillusioned observers, the steady exodus of people from Canada to the United States was a telling symbol of the limited success of the Canadian experiment.⁸⁴

V

Smith believed that the solution to Canada's problems, the answer to the Canadian question as he called it was to be found in some form of continental union. Continued dependence on England was, as it had been at the time of the Trent incident, beneficial to neither country and was unlikely to last much longer.⁸⁵ All hope of independence as envisioned by the nationalist Canada First movement of the 1870s had been destroyed by the strength of the old parties and by racial and regional disunity.⁸⁶ The movement for imperial federation, which had emerged in the 1880s to challenge continentalism and other schemes that threatened to subvert the British Empire, Smith dismissed as vague and unrealistic. Imperial Federationists refused to reveal their plan for uniting vastly different communities scattered throughout the world and for insuring the fair representation of all their various interests in some distant assembly. Without a concrete framework it would be difficult to imagine self-governing colonies like Canada surrendering any of their independence to an outside power regardless of their strong sentimental ties to the Empire.⁸⁷

Political union with the United States was Smith's own personal preference for a solution to Canada's difficulties because he believed that it would combine all the benefits of commercial cooperation with other important advantages. It would, he argued, unite the progressive forces on the continent. The reactionary influences of French Canadian nationalism and English imperialism would be diminished by the determined spirit of North America democracy while the Anglophobia of many Americans and the growing "foreign element untrained to self-government" would be displaced or at least challenged by the English traditions and

ideals proudly and openly upheld by Canadians. Canada, he went on, did not have to "give up any of the distinctive character or historical associations which she had preserved through the continuance of her connection with the mother country." After all, Scotland had retained her identity upon entering into union with England.⁸⁸

Smith thought it apparent "that the political fortunes of the Continent are embarked in the great Republic," that Canada was not "in reality" a separate or distinct experiment in democracy, and that she would "best promote her own ultimate interests," and those of democracy in general "by contributing without unnecessary delay all that she has in the way of political character and force towards the saving of the main chance and the fulfilment of the common hope."⁸⁹ Moreover, he was convinced that, since the secondary forces working in favour of a separate Canadian nation—imperial sentiment, political and commercial vested interests, dislike of the uglier side of American politics, and the lack of diplomatic power to negotiate a union—were comparatively weak, the primary forces—"geography, commerce, identity of race, language, and institutions," and the intermingling of the two peoples—would eventually prevail.⁹⁰

Although Smith believed that political union was "the bidding of Destiny," he was sensible enough to realize that most Canadians were not ready for such a drastic change. Commercial union, on the other hand, was a policy that could conceivably gain practical acceptance by the people and their government. He therefore addressed the two policies separately in his writings and attempted to demonstrate that even without political integration, commercial union promised a substantial increase in economic and commercial opportunities in

Canada and in the overall prosperity enjoyed by the Canadian people.⁹¹

The majority of Canadians, however, did not agree with Smith's assessment of the issues. Unrestricted reciprocity went down to defeat with the Liberal party in 1891 and it faded from Canadian politics until 1911 when it received another decisive defeat. Smith nevertheless continued to advocate continental integration (particularly in the economic sphere), though much less actively until the late 1890s when American imperial pretensions led him to reconsider the scheme. To the end Smith was never part of the mainstream of political thought in Canada; yet, while his continentalist ideas set him apart from Canadian nationalists, his fundamental outlook was, in many ways, similar to theirs.⁹²

Like Smith, Canadian imperialist thinkers were convinced of the importance of history as a "repository of enduring and valuable principles" which would inform and shape the development of the Canadian nation in the present and the future. Following the same Whig example that influenced Smith, they stressed "the steady advance of liberty and self-government," and the growth of material well-being. They believed in progress and they associated that progress with the special genius of the Anglo-Saxon race which had been passed on to Canada.⁹³ For some, this belief in Anglo-Saxon superiority precluded any deep sympathy or understanding of the aspirations of French-Canadians. Foreign in race, language, and, to a certain extent, religion, their ideals and their actions did not always fit English definitions of progress—separation of church and state was one example—and thus, as a group, they were often viewed as an obstacle to ongoing political and social development.⁹⁴

Smith and the Canadian imperialists also shared a determination to improve society through social criticism, reform, and intelligent, enlightened leadership in all spheres of society, especially in the political arena. As well, they all tended to be Christian moralists and idealists who viewed the progress of society as the realization of what they believed were true Christian principles and who assigned Canada and Anglo-Saxon civilization in general, an integral role in that process.⁹⁵

The irreconcilable difference between Smith and the imperialists was in the application of these shared ideals. The latter group believed that Canada, within an imperial federation, would be best equipped to achieve these goals.⁹⁶ Smith, who had long since given up any hope for an independent, progressive Canadian nation, thought that Canada's contribution to world progress would be better made as part of the United States. In the final analysis, both visions were unworkable, but the nationalist sentiments expressed by the imperialists, which Smith either misjudged or chose to ignore, proved to be an enduring, if somewhat fragile, aspect of Canadian life in the twentieth century.

Chapter IV

1. Smith's historical works on Canada included: "The Political History of Canada," The Nineteenth Century 20(July, 1886). pp. 14-32; "Canadian History and Home Rule," The Times, August 19, 1892, p. 5; "Canadian History and Home Rule," The Times, September 29, 1892, p. 8; "The Political History of Canada," New York Tribune, September 9, 1885, p. 1; "Lord Elgin," Canadian Monthly and National Review, 2(October, 1872), pp. 211-23 and 347-60.
2. Goldwin Smith, The Empire, (Oxford: J.H. and Jas. Parker, 1863). p. 136.
3. Ibid.; Goldwin Smith, The Political Destiny of Canada, (Toronto: Belford Bros., 1878). p. 15.
4. Smith, The Empire, pp. 54-5 and 112; see also pp. 143-4.
5. Ibid., pp. 104 and 136.
6. Peter Waite, The Life and Times of Confederation, 1864-1867, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1962). pp. 18-31; W.L. Morton, The Critical Years: The Union of British North America 1857-1873, (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Ltd., 1964). pp. 97, 99-106; F.H. Underhill, In Search of Canadian Liberalism, (Toronto: The Macmillan Company of Canada, 1960). pp. 90-1.
7. Underhill, pp. 90-1; Elisabeth Wallace, Goldwin Smith, Victorian Liberal, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1957). pp. 19-21 and 254-5; The Dictionary of National Biography, 2nd supplement, 1901-1911, vol. I, 1920 ed. s.v. "Smith, Goldwin." by Sidney Lee, pp. 331-2.
8. Smith, The Empire, pp. 2-3, 26-7, 31-4, 37, 41-4, 60, 62-3, 73-81, 88-94, and 104-8.
9. Ibid., p. 3.
10. Ibid., pp. 3-6, 36-7, 48-9, 97, 111-12, 123-4, and 137-8.
11. Ibid., pp. 49, 81-3, 99, 101, 108-9, 111, and 135.
12. Ibid., p. 50.
13. Ibid., pp. 42-6, 50, and 134-5.
14. Ibid., pp. 45, and 138; see also p. 104.
15. Ibid., pp. 139-41.
16. Ibid., pp. 100-2, 136-7; Smith, Political Destiny, p. 18.

17. Smith, The Empire, p. 102.
18. Waite, pp. 18-31; Morton, p. 102.
19. For a detailed discussion of the causes and goals of confederation see Waite, The Life and Times of Confederation and Morton, The Critical Years, especially chapters 1-11.
20. For a detailed discussion of the costs and early setbacks of union see Morton, The Critical Years, chapters 11-14.
21. DNB, p. 336; Wallace, p. 261; Underhill, pp. 93-4; Carl Berger, Introduction to Canada and the Canadian Question by Goldwin Smith. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1971). p. xi.
22. Carl Berger, The Sense of Power, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1970). pp. 49-77; Morton, pp. 235-7; Peter Waite, Canada 1874-1896: Arduous Destiny, (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1971). pp. 9-10 and 33-7; Joseph Schull, Edward Blake, vol. 1 (Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, 1975). pp. 121-4; Norman Shrive, Charles Mair: Literary Nationalist, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1965). pp. 24-34.
23. Wallace, p. 261; Underhill, pp. 93-4; see also Goldwin Smith, Introduction to Canada First: A Memorial to the Late William A. Foster, Q.C., (Toronto: Hunter, Rose & Co., 1890). pp. 1-12.
24. Wallace, p. 72; see also Karl F. Klinck, ed., The Literary History of Canada, 3 vols. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1965). vol. 1, pp. 174-6, and Marilyn G. Flitton, ed., An Index to the Canadian Monthly and National Review and to Rose-Belford's Canadian Monthly and National Review, 1872-1882, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1976), pp. vii-xxi.
25. Berger, The Sense of Power, pp. 71-3; Wallace, p. 76; see also Klinck, pp. 209-11 and 221.
26. Goldwin Smith, "Political Corruption," Canadian Monthly and National Review, 2(October, 1872). pp. 375-6.
27. Smith, The Empire, pp. 5-6 and footnote.
28. Goldwin Smith, "Current Events," Canadian Monthly and National Review, 2(December, 1872). pp. 544.
29. Goldwin Smith, "Great Britain Canada and the United States," Canadian Monthly and National Review, 1(May, 1872). pp. 454-8; Goldwin Smith, "The Dominion Parliament," Canadian Monthly and National Review, 2(July, 1872). p. 59.
30. Smith, "Political Corruption," p. 374.
31. Ibid., p. 371.

32. Smith, "The Dominion Parliament," pp. 57-9.
33. Ibid., p. 57; Smith, "Political Corruption," p. 367.
34. Smith, "Political Corruption," p. 374.
35. Goldwin Smith, "Current Events," Canadian Monthly and National Review, 7(March, 1875). pp. 344-50; Smith, "Current Events," 2(December, 1872). pp. 550 and 552-4.
36. Waite, Arduous Destiny, p. 34; see also Klinck, pp. 174-6, 209-11 and 221.
37. Goldwin Smith, "Col. Gray on Confederation," Canadian Monthly and National Review, 2(August, 1872). p. 174.
38. Underhill, pp. 94-5; Wallace, pp. 78-80; Waite, Arduous Destiny, p. 37; Berger, The Sense of Power, pp. 74-7; Shrive, pp. 122-36; Schull, p. 150.
39. Smith, The Political Destiny of Canada, pp. 4 and 9-10.
40. Ibid., pp. 10-13.
41. Ibid., pp. 5-6 and 14.
42. Ibid., pp. 19-21.
43. Waite, Arduous Destiny, pp. 54-123; Berger, Sense of Power, pp. 3-4; Berger, Introduction to Canada and the Canadian Question, pp. vi-vii; Wallace, pp. 265-8.
44. Waite, Arduous Destiny, pp. 124-199.
45. Goldwin Smith, The Bystander, 3(January, 1883). p. 1.
46. Goldwin Smith, The Bystander, 1(April, 1880). pp. 165-7;
Goldwin Smith, The Bystander, 1(June, 1880). p. 283;
Goldwin Smith, The Bystander, 2(January, 1881). pp. 1-2 and 4-5.
47. Smith, The Bystander, 1(June, 1880). pp. 283-4; Smith, The Bystander, 2(January, 1881). pp. 1-6; Smith, The Bystander, 3(January, 1883). pp. 7-8 and 10-12.
48. Smith, The Bystander, 1(July, 1880). pp. 344-5; Smith, The Bystander, 1(August, 1880). pp. 420-2; Smith, The Bystander, 2(January, 1881). pp. 5-6; Smith, The Bystander, 2(February, 1881). pp. 64-5; Smith, The Bystander, 3(January, 1883). pp. 7-8 and 11-12; Smith, The Bystander, 3(July, 1883). pp. 192-3.
49. Smith, The Bystander, 2(April, 1881). pp. 189-91; Smith, The Bystander, 3(January, 1883). pp. 11-14; Smith, The Bystander, 3(April, 1883). pp. 87-8; Smith, The Bystander, 3(October, 1883). pp. 255-6.

50. Smith, The Bystander, 1(January, 1880). pp. 10-11; Smith, The Bystander, 1(June, 1880). pp. 287-8; Smith, The Bystander, 1(July, 1880). p. 349; Smith, The Bystander, 2(May, 1881). pp. 238-9; Smith, The Bystander, 3(July, 1883). pp. 193-6.
51. Smith, The Bystander, 1(February, 1880). pp. 59-65; Smith, The Bystander, 2(April, 1881). pp. 179-81; Smith, The Bystander, 2(May, 1881). pp. 241-2; Smith, The Bystander, 3(January, 1883). pp. 23-4; Smith, The Bystander, 3(July, 1883). pp. 188-92; Smith, The Bystander, 3(October, 1883). pp. 255-65.
52. Wallace, p. 84.
53. Smith, The Bystander, 1(January, 1880). pp. 6-7, and 10; Smith, The Bystander, 3(January, 1883). p. 3.
54. Smith, The Bystander, 1(January, 1880). p. 9.
55. Smith, The Bystander, 1(April, 1880). pp. 162-6; Smith, The Bystander, 1(July, 1880). pp. 345-6; Smith, The Bystander, 3(January, 1883). pp. 3-6, 8-9, and 11-12; Smith, The Bystander, 3(October, 1883). pp. 287-9.
56. Smith, The Bystander, 1(June, 1880). pp. 278-9; Smith, The Bystander, 3(October, 1883). p. 289.
57. Smith, The Bystander, 1(June, 1880). pp. 280; Smith, The Bystander, 3(October, 1883). p. 280.
58. See Goldwin Smith Bibliography 1845-1913, ed. Patricia H. Gaffney. Collection of Regional History and University Archives, John M. Olin Library, (Ithaca: New York, 1972). pp. 17-30.
59. DNB, p. 335; Wallace, p. 88.
60. DNB, p. 335; Wallace, p. 90.
61. DNB, p. 338.
62. DNB, p. 338; Wallace, pp. 55-9, 99-108, 117-9, and 121-2.
63. Waite, Arduous Destiny, pp. 200-202, 205-9, and 221.
64. Berger, Introduction to Canada and the Canadian Question, p. vi. To a large extent this book is a summary and reaffirmation of much of what Smith said and wrote about Canadian-American relations between 1877 and 1900 and consequently similar views and opinions can be found in many different articles, essays, and letters written during these years and published under titles such as Commercial Union; Free Trade vs. Protection; Britain, Canada, and the United States; Imperial Federation; Continental Union; Continental Free Trade; and The Canadian Question.

65. Goldwin Smith, Canada and the Canadian Question, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1971). p. 54. Original publication, Toronto: Harper, Rose & Co., 1891.
66. Ibid., pp. 55-62.
67. Ibid., pp. 62-64.
68. Ibid., pp. 66-7, and 73.
69. Ibid., pp. 69-71.
70. Ibid., pp. 69-71.
71. Ibid., p. 72.
72. Ibid., pp. 72-78.
73. Ibid., p. 106.
74. Ibid., p. 107.
75. Ibid., pp. 108-10, 9, 12-16, and 168-72.
76. Ibid., pp. 80-84.
77. Ibid., pp. 85-9.
78. Ibid., pp. 89-96.
79. Ibid., pp. 98-110.
80. Ibid., pp. 110-16.
81. Ibid., pp. 118-25, and 129-35.
82. Ibid., pp. 125, 127, 145-6, and 135-42.
83. Ibid., pp. 152-5, and 155-68.
84. Ibid., pp. 168-72, and 183-4.
85. Ibid., pp. 191-202.
86. Ibid., pp. 202-4; see also Goldwin Smith, Introduction to Canada First: A Memorial of the Late William A. Foster, Q.C.
87. Berger, The Sense of Power, pp. 3-4.
88. Smith, Canada and the Canadian Question, pp. 212-17.
89. Ibid., p. 217.

90. Ibid., pp. 220-1.
91. Ibid., pp. 221-36.
92. Wayne Roberts, "Goldwin's Myth," Canadian Literature, 83(Winter, 1979). pp. 61-2.
93. Berger, The Sense of Power, pp. 107-19, and 226-7.
94. Ibid., pp. 58-9, 134-7, 206, and 214.
95. Ibid., pp. 175, 199, and 217-20.
96. Ibid., pp. 230-2.

CONCLUSION

Goldwin Smith was not a great historian. As both his contemporary and his modern critics have noted his approach and his methods were, in many ways, unprofessional, his facts were often wrong, and his judgments often prejudiced. His primary purpose in writing history was not to contribute to or to expand the common store of historical knowledge but rather to use the examples and lessons he found in the past to influence developments in the present and the future. Because of these very flaws, however, Smith's historical works are an excellent source of his ideas. An examination of several of them clearly adds to our knowledge of the man and his thought.

Smith has generally been viewed by historians as a Victorian(liberal) whose outlook was defined primarily by his political and economic beliefs—democracy, anti-imperialism, free trade, and limited state intervention in society. These certainly were important elements of his thought but, as this analysis of some of his major historical works demonstrates, these beliefs were part of a much broader world-view which cannot be defined strictly in political and economic terms. In order to understand Smith's brand of(liberalism)fully, we must view him as a Christian idealist whose most fundamental concern was the moral progress of society along Christian lines and for whom politics and economics were the vehicles through which that progress was achieved. This religious outlook had its roots in Smith's family background and in his education. At home and later, at Oxford, he came under the influence of Broad Church and (Liberal)Anglicanism, Evangelicalism, and Nonconformity. His earliest activities—university reform, the Jamaica Committee, support of the

North in the Civil War, and democratic reform of the political system—were all inspired in some way by his determination to improve society according to the Christian principles of justice, benevolence, and human brotherhood.

His philosophy of history derived from the same Christian worldview. Following Arnold and the (Liberal) Anglicans, he believed that the elevation of human character, the advancement of morality through effort along Christian lines, and the movement towards the creation of a moral community of mankind were the keys to progress and the purpose for man's existence. History was the record of the process by which man struggled to achieve these goals and the proof that, despite certain historical setbacks, society had, over the ages, advanced towards them. The political and economic aspects of Smith's thought derived from these basic principles. He believed that the progress of society towards the formation of a moral community of mankind could best be accomplished in an environment of long-term stability, peace, and prosperity. Therefore, he, like the Whig historians, stressed the growth of constitutional government, the emergence of democracy and the movement to improve and perfect democratic society in his major historical works.

England, he argued, had led the world in the development of constitutional government which combined freedom with order, individual right with the common good; he therefore concentrated his attention upon this aspect of English history. He traced the growth of the constitution from its origins in early Saxon institutions, through the era of the Great Charter and Edward I's parliament, the despotic Tudor interlude and the revival of parliamentary power in the seventeenth century down to modern times when the system of constitutional monarchy

and rule by the majority in the Commons was firmly and finally established. These accomplishments had been carried even further by the Americans who had built a nation based on the English principles of freedom and self-government transplanted in the new world by the Puritan colonists of the seventeenth century. The nation they built, however, was more egalitarian and democratic than the English model upon which it was based because feudalistic notions of privilege in church, state, and society were not maintained in many of the colonies. In the new world, progress had fewer enemies and consequently moved more quickly and decisively. After full independence from England was achieved, the republic had survived a bloody civil war and had defeated the reactionary forces of slavery establishing once and for all the strength and the supremacy of democratic society in the new world.

Smith maintained that Canada's history had prepared her for a similar and complimentary role to that of the United States. She shared the same English traditions of freedom and self-government developed first by the United Empire Loyalists and later by the other English-speaking immigrants who settled in Canada. Canadians, however, had been spared the upheaval of revolution, the plague of slavery, and the tragedy of a civil war and therefore, as a group, had the potential to exert a positive influence on the evolution of North American democratic society. Having failed to fulfill this role as an independent nation, Canada could best contribute to the improvement and ultimate perfection of the democratic system, Smith believed, by joining the United States in political union.

This emphasis on the growth of constitutional government and democracy combining freedom and stability and reconciling individual

and community interests led Smith, like other Whig and (liberal) historians, to uphold the English model of development as the key to progress. He idealized Anglo-Saxon civilization as the most progressive of all civilizations and it blinded him to the achievements and the contributions of the non-English-speaking peoples and countries of the world. As a result he was very unsympathetic to the nationalistic sentiments and aspirations of French and English Canada and Ireland. As well, his moral outlook was narrowly Christian and protestant and he possessed a deeply-rooted and frequently expressed prejudice against both Catholics and Jews, and a hearty dislike and paranoiac suspicion of the Catholic church, particularly the Jesuit order.

Moreover, despite his dedication to democratic reform, Smith was an elitist who believed that, for the present, society needed to be guided by a special group of leaders who, due to superior intellect, education, and vision, were able to understand the present needs and the future destiny of the people and the nation better than the people themselves. Leaders such as these and the institutions they controlled could, in Smith's view, insure orderly progress whereas an ill-informed or misled section of the masses could, by their activities, do great damage to society. Consequently, Smith often supported strong government and the powers of order against the people's demands for greater freedom. He generally viewed strong kings as progressive factors in the middle ages and he sympathized with Cromwell's actions in putting down the Levellers and the Irish. In American history he preferred the unprogressive British connection to the anarchic destruction of the War of Independence and he applauded Hamilton the centralizer while denouncing Jefferson, the democrat. Jackson who was one of "the people," he

thought the most destructive of all American presidents. During his years in Canada, he called repeatedly for strong national government, including the use of the federal veto on provincial legislation, to counteract regional and racial divisions. When that failed and he believed Canada was being pulled apart by the strength of its various factions, he advocated continental union as a means of bringing order and progress to the Canadian nation. As well, throughout the controversy over the Irish question he devoted his energies and his historical writings to maintaining and strengthening the Anglo-Irish union which he saw as a source of stability challenging the unrest and rebellion fostered by the Irish leaders of the Home Rule movement.

Yet beneath all these Whiggish attributes and preoccupations, Smith's Christian idealism is apparent. His moral outlook was the source of his deep admiration for the Puritans in spite of their narrow, theocratic world-view and, more generally, it inspired his constant concern with the moral character of historical figures and the ages in which they lived. Moreover, in his historical works he almost invariably gave religious and moral developments a prominent place even though he often claimed to be discussing a nation's political history only. For Smith, religion could never really be separated from politics or economics or any other aspect of social development because Christianity was the course of the very idea of improvement, of advancement, of progress in all fields of human endeavour. Without the inspiration of an ideal moral community of all mankind, society would have achieved little, if anything, of enduring value.

It is only by understanding Smith's essentially religious view of history and of society that we can begin to develop a more complete image

of the man and his ideas. This, in turn, will help us to place Smith in the wider Victorian context and to understand the true and often confusing and conflicting character of Victorian liberalism which clearly no longer fits neatly into simple political, economic, and philosophical categories. Hopefully this study has contributed to that process by revealing some of the complexities and subtleties of one Victorian liberal mind.

APPENDIX

Irish History and the Union

Smith wrote a great deal about Ireland especially during the 1880s when the Home Rule issue dominated British politics and imperial affairs. His interest in Ireland, however, dated from the early 1860s when he was still in England and it was inspired both by practical concerns and philosophical principles. As an active Victorian writer concerned with the major issues of the age, Smith could not avoid discussing Irish affairs. At the same time, the direction Irish events were taking in his day presented an obvious and powerful challenge to Smith's belief in the progressive character of Anglo-Saxon civilization.¹ Despite union with Britain in 1801, social, agrarian, and political unrest and agitation had continued and even intensified in Ireland in the nineteenth century. Consequently, to many the benefits of union appeared limited. Poverty and destitution were as prevalent as ever and the policies of the British government had done little to alleviate the difficulties. Thus, from the 1860s forward more and more people—primarily Irish but also an increasing number of English—began to doubt the usefulness of the union and the form of government it had established in Ireland.²

Smith's staunch belief in the English model of constitutional government combining order and liberty would not permit him to share these doubts, to view the union as a failure, and to give up its defence. On the contrary, he maintained that it had been "for the last half-century the sole power of enlightenment and progress" in Ireland and he set out to convince England, Ireland, and the world of this by publicizing his interpretation of Irish history. His earliest work,

Irish History and Irish Character, was published in 1861 and of all his many writings on Ireland it was the most sympathetic, no doubt because it was written before the disestablishment of the Irish church and the implementation of land reform.³ In general, however, his view of Irish history varied little from 1861 to 1905, when Irish History and the Irish Question was published.

Smith's interpretation of Ireland's past was based on the argument that unfortunate historical circumstances and "the misdeeds of bygone times," were the causes of Ireland's misfortunes.⁴ Like England, Ireland had been invaded in the age of conquest, but unlike England that conquest had been partial, due to geographic barriers and the instability and inconsistency of medieval governments. According to Smith, the Anglo-Norman Pale established after the conquest was nothing more than a small colony surrounded by and constantly at war with the native tribes. The English monarchy expended its military energies in France instead of extending and confirming the conquest in Ireland and assimilating the natives into Anglo-Norman society, as had been done in England.⁵ Yet England's feudal claim to Ireland was maintained through Poyning's Law and with the advent of a stronger and more determined national government under the Tudors and attempt was made to complete the conquest of Ireland. With the Reformation, however, religious animosities were added to the racial conflict and the struggle became even more intense. Through "a war of extermination" the Tudors were able to place Englishmen and English law in control of the land but already the English people and the Protestant religion had come to be seen as oppressors and destroyers to be resisted at all costs. The Protestant colony planted at Ulster whose members were to become "trainers in

industry and civilization," became instead "a second Pale" cut off by religious and racial animosity from the people they were supposed to train.⁶

In the seventeenth century, under the Stuarts, a few significant reforms were attempted according to Smith. James I called "a Parliament of all Ireland, including the Catholics, the last national legislature that Ireland was ever to see." and Strafford attacked the abuses of corrupt wealth, tried to reform the impurities of the State church, and worked to encourage trade. The Irish people, however, remained determined to reclaim their land and to keep their own Catholic religion and their determination was fortified by the presence of a class of English adventurers for whom "Ireland had become the chosen field" of corrupt profit and selfish advancement. Thus when civil war erupted in England, the Irish people took the opportunity to attempt to drive out the Ulster settlers, beginning "a war of devils, each side massacring without mercy." Only Cromwell's "terrible blow" put an end to the conflict.⁷

Victorious in the war, the English were given back the land and the Irish leaders and soldiers were punished for taking arms against England. Smith argued that such measures, though cruel, were inevitable after a war and that, in general, Cromwell's policies were enlightened. He united Ireland and Scotland to England, giving the Irish the benefits of strong, progressive government, legal reform, free trade and toleration of Catholic conscience though not Catholic practice. Had he and his policies survived, Smith claimed, "this would probably have been the end of Irish suffering." Unfortunately, the Restoration rulers reversed Cromwell's achievements, reducing Ireland to an economic

and political dependency again and depriving her of "the indispensable means of civilization."⁸

It was not long before the plots and schemes of James II provided a chance for the Irish people to rise again to regain their land. After a brief and bloody reign they were defeated by William III and the armies of England and harsh punishment was inflicted upon them.

The Penal Code

reduced them to absolute helotage, proscribing their religion, excluding them...from the franchise..., from freehold ownership, from professions, from the higher education, from the guardianship of their own children, from the possession of arms, or of any horse but the merest jades, outraging natural affection by enabling the son of a Catholic on turning Protestant to reduce his father to a life interest in the estate.⁹

In conjunction with protectionism, these measures left the vast majority of the population disinherited, poor, and socially degraded; and their lot was made worse still by the "hierarchy of extortion" established to collect rents for absentee landlords and tithes for the Anglican church.¹⁰

In all this oppression and degradation, only the work of the Catholic priests served to raise the peasantry above the "condition of brutes," but even their efforts achieved little in the face of the foulness of eighteenth century Irish government.¹¹ The system of dependency also angered the Protestant oligarchy that dominated Irish society. While England was at war with her American colonies, the Protestant patriots formed an army and "extorted from England the independence of the Irish Parliament." Grattan's new nation, however, still excluded Catholics, five-sixths of the population, some of whom

were allowed to sit in Parliament, and its accomplishments were limited.¹² The land war raged with increasing intensity throughout the country and when the French Revolution broke out, the Irish people, encouraged by the revolutionary conspiracies of a few disgruntled, radical Protestants, prepared to fight again for their lost land. Locked in a deadly struggle with the Protestants, the Irish asked for French assistance. When it failed, they were left to fight alone for their race and their religion and, in the end, they were completely defeated.¹³

According to Smith, since "government by the Protestant oligarchy had ended in murderous anarchy," re-union became an "over-powering necessity." Pitt accomplished it not by corruption but by using peerages, promotions and payments to compensate all the Irish members for the loss of their boroughs and their political power in the Irish Parliament. He did not call an election to seek Ireland's approval because, as five-sixths of the population were not voters, the result could hardly have reflected the will of the people.¹⁴ Despite its controversial beginnings, however, the union brought progress to Ireland. Catholic emancipation was achieved in 1829 when the movement for religious toleration coincided with O'Connell's election to Parliament and throughout the 1830s Ireland enjoyed the benefits of the reform movement in England. With one hundred representatives in a reformed House of Commons her concerns and desires were well-known. In 1846, after the tragic Potato Famine which England protectionism had helped to cause, free trade was achieved and, according to Smith, "Parliament gave Ireland, long before it gave England, a national system of education, which, if the union were repealed, the priesthood would overturn." As well, she had, in 1869, been "given her religious equality, while England still had a State Church." In 1870

"a special and most drastic Land Act" had been implemented on her behalf while the occasional distress caused "by the growth of her population beyond the means of subsistence" was also relieved by Parliament "while English distress had been left to shift for itself."¹⁵

All this had been achieved by the united Parliament while Irish extremists were busy stirring up the land-hungry peasantry with anti-English propaganda blaming the union government for all of Ireland's problems and suggesting that an independent Irish government would grant them more control over their land. They promoted social war because they knew that peace would bring prosperity and stability and that it demonstrated the progressive character of the union, endangering their selfish political ambitions.¹⁶ Their activities, though countered by a series of Coercion Acts, continued throughout the 1870s and 1880s and eventually convinced a number of English politicians including, of course, Gladstone, to embrace Home Rule as the solution to Irish problems. Under this scheme Ireland would have its own parliament to deal with strictly Irish affairs and representatives in the British parliament to deal with wider concerns which effected all of Britain.¹⁷

The Liberal party and liberals in general were deeply divided over this issue.¹⁸ For Smith, Home Rule was not a realistic alternative to union because Irish nationalists would never be satisfied with partial independence and would surely have continued agitating until total independence was achieved. Home Rule was not, he argued, comparable to Canadian self-government within the Empire or to provincial government within the federation. Britain was not, nor could be made, a federal state and Ireland was not a progressive prosperous, peaceful,

contented, and distant colonial dominion. She was a part of Britain, geographically, economically, and historically and she was consumed by a burning hatred of the English and her people were constantly plotting unrest and rebellion against England. As an independent nation she would "be a thorn in the side of Great Britain," while as a member of a fair legislative union in time she could become a stable, prosperous, and progressive community, if only her leaders would stop cultivating "a barren feud."¹⁹

By the early years of the twentieth century, however, Smith began to doubt whether the feud would ever end. In 1903 he admitted that during "the course of this long struggle a spirit of antagonistic nationality has been developed in Ireland," which now would be "difficult to allay."²⁰ As he saw it, the choice had to be between union and independence and he hoped that he would not be charged with inconsistency or betrayal of his faith in a "free and hearty" union for contemplating the possibility of independence. Moreover, independence had a progressive side as well in so far as it might disarm the aggressive imperialism and jingoistic attitudes which had taken hold of the British government since the latter years of the nineteenth century.²¹ Yet he remained convinced that union, if approached properly, was better for Ireland and England, just as continental union between Canada and the United States was the best hope for North American democratic society.

1. In 1867 Smith wrote: "Unhappy Ireland, and still more unhappy England if Ireland is always to be our weakness and our shame, the standing confutation alike of our boasted statesmanship and of our boasted love of justice!" in "Pitt-II" in Three English Statesmen: A Course of Lectures on the Political History of England, (London: Macmillan & Co., 1867). p. 218.
2. For a detailed discussion Irish affairs in the nineteenth century see: L.P. Curtis, Anglo-Saxons and Celts, (Bridgeport: Bridgeport University Press, 1968) and Lawrence J. McCaffrey, The Irish Question, 1800-1922, (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1968).
3. Goldwin Smith, "The Fallacy of Irish History," Fortnightly Review, 35(, 1884). p. 49; Wallace, p. 92.
4. Smith, "The Fallacy of Irish History," p. 38; Goldwin Smith, Irish History and Irish Character, (Oxford: J.H. & Jas. Parker, 1861), p. 21.
5. Goldwin Smith, "The Unhappy History of Ireland," New York Evening Post, July 11, 1903, p. 1; Smith, "The Fallacy of Irish History," p. 38; Smith, Irish History and Irish Character, pp. 44-70; Goldwin Smith, Irish History and the Irish Question, (Toronto: Morang & Co., 1905). pp. 1-27.
6. Smith, "The Unhappy History of Ireland," p. 1; Smith, "The Fallacy of Irish History," pp. 39-41; Smith, Irish History and Irish Character, pp. 71-87; Smith, Irish History and the Irish Question, pp. 27-55.
7. Smith, "The Unhappy History of Ireland," p. 1; Smith, "The Fallacy of Irish History," pp. 40-1; Smith, Irish History and Irish Character, pp. 93-112; Smith, Irish History and the Irish Question, pp. 56-72.
8. Smith, "The Unhappy History of Ireland," p. 1; Smith, "The Fallacy of Irish History," p. 40; Smith, Irish History and Irish Character, pp. 112-19; Smith, Irish History and the Irish Question, pp. 72-85.
9. Smith, "The Unhappy History of Ireland," p. 1; see also Smith, "The Fallacy of Irish History," p. 40.
10. Smith, "The Unhappy History of Ireland," p. 1; Smith, Irish History and Irish Character, pp. 119-147; Smith, Irish History and the Irish Question, pp. 89-100.
11. Goldwin Smith, "The History of Ireland," New York Evening Post, July 18, 1903, p. 2; Smith, Irish History and Irish Character, pp. 119-147; Smith, Irish History and the Irish Question, pp. 101-106.

12. Smith, "The History of Ireland," p. 2; Smith, "The Fallacy of Irish History," p. 41; Smith, Irish History and Irish Character, pp. 155-63; Smith, Irish History and the Irish Question, pp. 107-131.
13. Smith, "The History of Ireland," p. 2; Smith, "The Fallacy of Irish History," p. 41; Smith, Irish History and Irish Character, pp. 165-170; Smith, Irish History and the Irish Question, pp. 132-47; Smith, "Pitt-II," in Three English Statesmen, pp. 218-33.
14. Smith, "The History of Ireland," p. 2; Smith, "The Fallacy of Irish History," p. 41; Smith, Irish History and Irish Character, pp. 170-78; Smith, Irish History and the Irish Question, pp. 149-58.
15. Smith, "The History of Ireland," p. 2; Smith, "The Fallacy of Irish History," p. 42; Smith, Irish History and Irish Character, pp. 178-92; Smith, Irish History and the Irish Question, pp. 160-88.
16. Smith, "The History of Ireland," p. 2; Smith, "The Fallacy of Irish History," pp. 42-3; Smith, Irish History and Irish Character, pp. 178-92; Smith, Irish History and the Irish Question, pp. 211-222.
17. Smith, "The Fallacy of Irish History," pp. 27-8 and 48-9; Smith, "The History of Ireland," p. 2; Smith, "Canadian History and Home Rule," September 29, 1892, p. 8; Smith, Irish History and Irish Character, pp. 178-92; Smith, Irish History and the Irish Question, pp. 188-200.
18. Christopher Harvie, The Lights of Liberalism, (London: Penguin Books Ltd., 1976). pp. 218-32; R.K. Webb, Modern England, (New York: Dodd, Head & Co., 1975). pp. 359 and 364-5; see also Curtis.
19. Smith, "The History of Ireland," p. 2; Smith, "The Fallacy of Irish History," p. 49; Smith, "The Political History of Canada," pp. 24-5; Smith, Canada and the Canadian Question, pp. 148-9; Smith, "Canadian History and Home Rule," August 19, 1892, p. 5; Smith, "Canadian History and Home Rule," September 29, 1892, p. 8.
20. Smith, "The History of Ireland," p. 2; Wallace, p. 93.
21. Ibid.

Secondary Sources: Selected Bibliography

Books:

Altick, Richard. Victorian People and Ideas. New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1973.

Ausubel, Herman. Historians and their Craft. New York: Columbia University Press, 1951.

_____; Brebner, J. Bartlet; and Hunt, Erling M. (eds.). Some Modern Historians of Britain. New York: The Dryden Press, 1951.

Berger, Carl. Introduction to Canada and the Canadian Question by Goldwin Smith. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1971.

Berger, Carl. The Sense of Power: Studies in the Ideas of Canadian Imperialism 1867-1914. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1970.

_____. The Writing of Canadian History. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1976.

Bishop, Morris. A History of Cornell. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1962.

Butterfield, Herbert. The Whig Interpretation of History. New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1965.

Burrow, J.W. A Liberal Descent: Victorian Historians and the English Post. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.

Creighton, Donald G. Canada's First Century. Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, 1970.

Dalberg-Acton, John. Essays on Church and State. ed., Douglas Woodruff. London: Hollis and Carter, 1952.

Dorf, Philip. The Builder: A Biography of Ezra Cornell. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1952.

Forbes, Duncan. The Liberal Anglican Idea of History. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1952.

Gooch, G.P. History and Historians in the Nineteenth Century. 2nd ed. New York: Peter Smith, 1949.

Grob, Gerald N., and Billias, George Athan. Interpretations of American History: Patterns and Perspectives. vol. 1. New York: The Free Press, 1967.

- Hamburger, Joseph. Macaulay and the Whig Tradition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1976.
- Harvie, Christopher. The Lights of Liberalism. London: Penguin Books Limited, 1976.
- Heyck, T.W. The Transformation of Intellectual Life in Victorian England. London: Croom Helm, 1982.
- Houghton, Walter. The Victorian Frame of Mind, 1830-1870. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1957.
- Kent, Christopher. Brains and Numbers. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1978.
- Kenyon, John. The History Men: The Historical Profession in England since the Renaissance. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1983.
- Klinck, Karl F., (ed.). The Literary History of Canada. 3 vols. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1965.
- McKillop, A.B. A Disciplined Intelligence: Critical Inquiry and Canadian Thought in the Victorian Era. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1979.
- Mandelbaum, Maurice. History, Man, and Reason. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1971.
- Morton, William L. The Critical Years: The Union of British North America, 1857-1873. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Ltd., 1964.
- Schull, Joseph. Edward Blake. 2 vols. Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, 1975-6.
- Shrive, Norman. Charles Mair: Literary Nationalist. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1965.
- Underhill, Frank H. In Search of Canadian Liberalism. Toronto: The Macmillan Co., of Canada Ltd., 1960.
- Waite, Peter B. Canada 1874-1896: Arduous Destiny. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Ltd., 1971.
- Waite, Peter B. The Life and Times of Confederation 1864-1867. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1962.
- Wallace, Elisabeth. Goldwin Smith: Victorian Liberal. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1957.

Ward, W.R. Victorian Oxford. London: Frank Cass & Co., Ltd., 1965.

Warner, Donald F. The Idea of Continental Union.
University of Kentucky Press, 1960.

Webb, R.K. Modern England. New York: Dodd, Head & Co., 1975.

Articles, Reviews, and Unpublished Materials:

Ausubel, Herman. "Goldwin Smith." in Some Modern Historians of Britain, eds. Herman Ausubel, J. Bartlet Brebner and Erling M. Hunt. New York: The Dryden Press, 1951. pp. 85-98.

Bumsted, J.M. "Historical Writing in English." in The Oxford Companion to Canadian Literature. forthcoming.

Burrell, Sidney A. "Leslie Stephen." in Some Modern Historians of Britain, eds. Herman Ausubel, J. Bartlet Brebner and Erling M. Hunt. New York: The Dryden Press, 1951. pp. 111-127.

Burrow, J.W. "To School the Statesmen." Times Literary Supplement, August 1, 1980. p. 877.

Carr, Graham. "Imperialism and Nationalism in Revisionalist Historiography: A Critique of Some Recent Trends." Journal of Canadian Studies. 17(Summer, 1982). pp. 91-99.

The Dictionary of National Biography, vol. IV, 1908 ed. s.v. "Conington, John." by Henry Nettleship.

The Dictionary of National Biography, 1st Supplement, 1818-1899, vol. XXII, 1909 ed. s.v. "Congreve, Richard." by T. Hudson Beare.

The Dictionary of National Biography, 2nd Supplement, 1901-1911, vol. I, 1920 ed. s.v. "Smith, Goldwin." by Sidney Lee.

Heyck, T.W. "From Men of Letters to Intellectuals: The Transformation of Intellectual Life in Nineteenth Century England." Journal of British Studies 20(Fall, 1980), pp. 158-83.

Houghton, Walter. "Victorian Periodical Literature and the Articulate Classes." Victorian Studies 22(Summer, 1979), pp. 389-412.

Kenyon, John. "Holding the Whig Line." Times Literary Supplement, December 4, 1981. p. 1407.

- McEachern, Ronald A. "Goldwin Smith." Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, University of Toronto, 1934.
- Morton, Patricia M. "Life After Butterfield? John Burrow's A Liberal Descent and the Recent Historiography of Victorian Historians." Historical Reflections 10(Summer, 1983). pp. 229-44.
- ✓ Roberts, Wayne. "Goldwin's Myth." Canadian Literature 83(Winter, 1979). pp. 50-71.
- ✓ Ross, Malcolm. "Goldwin Smith." in Our Living Tradition. ed. Claude T. Bissell. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1957. pp. 29-47.
- Samuel, Raphael. "People's History." in People's History and Socialist Theory, ed. Raphael Samuel. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1981. pp. xv-
- ✓ Wallace, Elisabeth. "Goldwin Smith, Liberal." University of Toronto Quarterly 23(January, 1954). pp. 155-172.

Works by Goldwin Smith

This bibliography of Smith's work is in two sections, 'Books and Pamphlets' and 'Articles, Essays, Lectures, and Letters.' Within each section the works are arranged chronologically by date of publication and alphabetically where there is more than one per year. In the second section there are some months and page numbers missing from certain articles received through the inter-library loan service. The information sent with the photocopies was not always complete and sometimes page numbers were not visible on copies of microfilmed newspapers. Also in the second section the entries for The Bystander refer to a journal written completely by Smith in which many different topics were discussed but not in standard article or review form. Therefore I have not included the titles of each brief discussion but rather have referred to the volume and page numbers only. In general, the pages referred to deal with Canadian affairs though some other topics are cited as well.

Books or Pamphlets:

- Smith, Goldwin. The Political and Social Benefits of the Reformation in England. Oxford: Francis Macpherson, 1847.
- _____. Irish History and Irish Character. Oxford: J.H. & Jas. Parker, 1861.
- _____. Lectures on Modern History. Oxford: J.H. & Jas. Parker, 1861.
- _____. The Empire. Oxford: J.H. & Jas. Parker, 1863.
- _____. Lectures on the Study of History. Oxford: James Parker & Co., 1865.
- _____. Three English Statesmen: A Course of Lectures on the Political History of England. London: Macmillan & Co., 1867.
- _____. The Political Destiny of Canada. Toronto: Belford Bros., 1877.
- _____. Lectures and Essays. Toronto: Hunter Rose & Co., 1881.
- _____. The Schism in the Anglo-Saxon Race. New York: The Trade supplied by the American News Company, Publishers Agents, 1887.
- _____. Canada and the Canadian Question. Toronto: Hunter, Rose & Co., 1891.
- _____. Loyalty, An Address Delivered before the Young Men's Liberal Club, Toronto on February 2, 1891. Toronto: Hunter, Rose & Co., 1891.
- _____. The Moral Crusader, William Lloyd Garrison. Toronto: Williamson & Co., 1892.
- _____. Essays on Questions of the Day, Political and Social. London: Macmillan & Co., 1893.
- _____. The United States: An Outline of Political History, 1492-1871. New York: Macmillan & Co., 1893.
- _____. Guesses at the Riddle of Existence and Other Essays on Kindred Subjects. New York: Macmillan & Co., 1897.
- _____. The United Kingdom: A Political History, 2 vols. Toronto: Copp, Clark Co., Ltd., 1899.

- _____. Commonwealth or Empire. Toronto: Wm. Tyrrell & Co., 1900.
- _____. Irish History and the Irish Question. Toronto: Morang & Co., 1905.
- _____. No Refuge but in Truth. Toronto: Wm. Tyrrell & Co., 1908.
- _____. Reminiscences. ed. Arnold Haultain. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1910.

Articles, Essays, Lectures, and Letters:

- Smith, Goldwin. "Carlyle's Cromwell and Guizot's English Republic and Cromwell." The Times, January 4, 1855. p. 5.
- _____. "Inaugural Lectures." in Lectures on the Study of History. Oxford: James Parker & Co., 1865. pp. 3-44. Delivered 1859. Originally published 1861.
- _____. "The Grand Remonstrance." Edinburgh Review 112(October, 1860). pp. 460-88.
- _____. "The Moral Freedom of Man." in Lectures on the Study of History. Oxford: James Parker & Co., 1865. pp. 171-90. Originally published 1861.
- _____. "On some supposed Consequences of the Doctrine of Historical Progress." in Lectures on the Study of History. Oxford: James Parker & Co., 1865. pp. 119-69. Originally published 1861.
- _____. "On the Foundation of the American Colonies." in Lectures on Modern History. Oxford: J.H. & James Parker, 1861. pp. 3-32.
- _____. "On the Study of History." in Lectures on the Study of History. Oxford: James Parker & Co., 1865. pp. 45-81. Originally published in 1861.
- _____. "On the Study of History - II." in Lectures on the Study of History. Oxford: James Parker & Co., 1865. pp. 82-118. Originally published 1861.
- _____. "England and America." Atlantic Monthly 14(December, 1864). pp. 749-69.
- _____. "Froude's History of England: From the Fall of Wolsey to the Death of Elizabeth." Edinburgh Review 119(January, 1864). pp. 243-79.

- _____. "Cromwell." in Three English Statesmen: A Course of Lectures on the Political History of England. London: Macmillan & Co., 1867. pp. 55-114.
- _____. "Pitt-I." in Three English Statesmen: A Course of Lectures on the Political History of England. London: Macmillan & Co., 1867. pp. 117-179.
- _____. "Pitt-II." in Three English Statesmen: A Course of Lectures on the Political History of England. London: Macmillan & Co., 1867. pp. 113-250.
- _____. "Pym." in Three English Statesmen: A Course of Lectures on the Political History of England. London: Macmillan & Co., 1867. pp. 3-51.
- _____. "The Life of Fairfax." The Nation, May 12, 1870. pp. 305-7.
- _____. "The Study of History." Atlantic Monthly 25(January, 1870). pp. 44-56.
- _____. "Col. Gray on Confederation." Canadian Monthly and National Review 2(August, 1872). pp. 173-83.
- _____. "Current Events." Canadian Monthly and National Review 2(December, 1872). pp. 544-56.
- _____. "The Dominion Parliament." Canadian Monthly and National Review 2(July, 1872). pp. 56-67.
- _____. "Great Britain, Canada, and the United States." Canadian Monthly and National Review 1(May, 1872). pp. 453-66.
- _____. "Political Corruption." Canadian Monthly and National Review 2(October, 1872). pp. 366-78.
- _____. "The Irish Question." Canadian Monthly and National Review 3(August, 1873). pp. 116-35.
- _____. "Current Events." Canadian Monthly and National Review 7(March, 1875). pp. 344-59.
- _____. "Hopkins' Puritans and Queen Elizabeth." The Nation, November 16, 1876. pp. 301-2.
- _____. "The Immortality of the Soul." Canadian Monthly and National Review 9(May, 1876). pp. 408-16.
- _____. "The Ascent of Man." in Lectures and Essays. Toronto: Harper, Rose & Co., 1881. pp. 89-104. Originally published 1877.

- _____. "Falkland and the Puritans." Contemporary Review 29(April, 1877). pp. 925-43.
- _____. "The Ninety Years' Agony of France." Contemporary Review 31(_____, 1877). pp. 103-22.
- _____. "The Greatness of England." in Lectures and Essays. Toronto: Harper, Rose & Co., 1881. pp. 21-41. Originally published 1878.
- _____. "Gairdiner's Richard III: part I." The Nation, July 3, 1879. pp. 11-12.
- _____. "Gairdiner's Richard III: part II." The Nation, July 10, 1879. pp. 28-9.
- _____. The Bystander 1(January, 1880). pp. 1-26.
- _____. The Bystander 1(February, 1880). pp. 57-88.
- _____. The Bystander 1(March, 1880). pp. 115-40.
- _____. The Bystander 1(April, 1880). pp. 161-84.
- _____. The Bystander 1(May, 1880). pp. 225-39.
- _____. The Bystander 1(June, 1880). pp. 277-90.
- _____. The Bystander 1(July, 1880). pp. 341-62.
- _____. The Bystander 1(August, 1880). pp. 403-422.
- _____. The Bystander 1(September, 1880). pp. 459-487.
- _____. The Bystander 1(October, 1880). pp. 521-539 and 558-62.
- _____. The Bystander 1(November, 1880). pp. 573-93.
- _____. The Bystander 1(December, 1880). pp. 621-36.
- _____. The Bystander 2(January, 1881). pp. 1-15.
- _____. The Bystander 2(February, 1881). pp. 57-69.
- _____. The Bystander 2(March, 1881). pp. 113-34.
- _____. The Bystander 2(April, 1881). pp. 169-91.
- _____. The Bystander 2(May, 1881). pp. 233-50.
- _____. The Bystander 2(June, 1881). pp. 297-312.

- _____. The Bystander 3(January, 1883). pp. 2-28.
- _____. The Bystander 3(April, 1883). pp. 79-106.
- _____. The Bystander 3(July, 1883). pp. 159-212.
- _____. The Bystander 3(October, 1883). pp. 255-93.
- _____. "The Fallacy of Irish History." Fortnightly Review 35(_____, 1884). pp. 37-49.
- _____. "The Political History of Canada." New York Tribune, September 9, 1885. p. 1.
- _____. "The Political History of Canada." The Nineteenth Century 20(July, 1886). pp. 14-32.
- _____. "William Lloyd Garrison." Macmillan's Magazine 53(March, 1886). pp. 321-31.
- _____. "American Statesmen." The Nineteenth Century 23(January, 1888). pp. 93-114.
- _____. "American Statesmen - II." The Nineteenth Century 23(June, 1888). pp. 881-92.
- _____. "American Statesmen - III." The Nineteenth Century 24(August, 1888). pp. 262-75.
- _____. "The American Commonwealth." Macmillan's Magazine 59(February, 1889). pp. 241-53.
- _____. The Bystander 4(October, 1889). pp. 1-21.
- _____. The Bystander 4(November, 1889). pp. 41-60.
- _____. The Bystander 4(April, 1890). pp. 210-26.
- _____. The Bystander 4(May, 1890). pp. 241-60.
- _____. The Bystander 4(September, 1890). pp. 377-90 and 402-3.
- _____. Introduction to Canada First: A Memorial of the Late William A. Foster, Q.C. Toronto: Hunter, Rose & Co., 1890. pp. 1-12.
- _____. "Child's Church and State Under the Tudors." The Nation, September 25, 1890. pp. 250-1.
- _____. "A Moral Crusader." Macmillan's Magazine 62(May, 1890). pp. 18-26.

- _____. "The Two Mr. Pitts." Macmillan's Magazine 62(August, 1890). pp. 241-5.
- _____. "Froude's Divorce of Catherine of Aragon." The Nation, December 31, 1891. pp. 509-11.
- _____. "Mr. Lecky on Pitt." Macmillan's Magazine 63(February, 1891). pp. 241-8.
- _____. "Canadian History and Home Rule." The Times, August 19, 1892. p. 5.
- _____. "Canadian History and Home Rule." The Times, September 29, 1892. p. 8.
- _____. "Lord Rosebery's Pitt." The Nation, March 24, 1892. pp. 233-4.
- _____. "Ramsay's Lancaster and York." The Nation, July 28, 1892. pp. 71-2.
- _____. "Canada's Intellectual Strength and Weakness." Illustrated London News, June 23, 1894. p.
- _____. "Froude." North American Review 159(_____, 1894). pp. 677-88.
- _____. "Lord Wolseley's Marlborough." The Nation, June 7, 1894. pp. 430-2.
- _____. "An Imperial Federationist on Canada." Illustrated London News, May 18, 1895. p.
- _____. "Simpkinson's Laud." The Nation, May 2, 1895. pp. 346-7.
- _____. "Burke." Cornhill Magazine 1 n.s.(_____, 1896). pp. 17-29.
- _____. "George III." Cornhill Magazine 1 n.s.(_____, 1896). pp. 752-62.
- _____. "Hume's Courtship of Queen Elizabeth." The Nation, May 28, 1896. pp. 418-19.
- _____. review of Cromwell's Place in History by Samuel Rawson Gardiner, in American Historical Review 3(October, 1898). pp. 135-9.
- _____. "The Origin of Morality." North American Review 167(October, 1898). pp. 418-27.

- _____. review of A History of the Commonwealth and Protectorate by Samuel Rawson Gardiner, in American Historical Review 4(April, 1899). pp. 529-34.
- _____. review of Pitt: Some Chapters of his Life and Times by Edward Gibson, in American Historical Review 4(April, 1899). pp. 527-31.
- _____. "An English Pupil of Machiavelli." The Independent, September 4, 1902. pp. 2121-2122.
- _____. "A Gallery of Portraits." North American Review 176(April, 1903). pp. 530-45.
- _____. "The History of Ireland." New York Evening Post, July 18, 1903. p. 2.
- _____. "Bradshaw's Self-Government in Canada." The Nation, August 27, 1903. p. 177.
- _____. "The Unhappy History of Ireland." New York Evening Post, July 11, 1903. p. 1.
- _____. "Bourinot's Lord Elgin." The Nation, January 7, 1904. pp. 15-16.
- _____. "The Great Puritan." Atlantic Monthly 94(September, 1904). pp. 308-20.
- _____. "Paul's Modern England." The Nation, May 26, 1904. pp. 413-15.
- _____. "The Treatment of History." American Historical Review 10(April, 1905). pp. 511-20.
- _____. "Abraham Lincoln." New York Sun, February 12, 1909. p.