

Hegel-Studien

Band 11

TEXTE UND DOKUMENTE

M. J. Petry. Hegel and the »Morning Chronicle« – Helmut Schneider. Dokumente zu Hegels politischem Denken 1830/31

ABHANDLUNGEN

Manfred Baum. Zur Vorgeschichte des Hegelschen Unendlichkeitsbegriffs – Wolfgang Marx. Die Logik des Freiheitsbegriffs – Thomas M. Seebohm. The Grammar of Hegel's Dialectic – Nathan Rotenstreich. On Cyclical Patterns and their Interpretation. The Interpretations of Judaism in the Wake of Vico and Hegel

MISZELLEN

Ludwig Hasler. Aus Hegels philosophischer Berner Zeit – Wim van Dooren. Eine frühe Hegel-Diskussion in Holland

DISKUSSION

Heinz Kimmerle. Hegels Naturrecht 1802–1805/06 – Johann Heinrich Trede. Die endgültige Lösung einer Diskussion?

LITERATURBERICHTE UND KRITIK

BIBLIOGRAPHIE

Abhandlungen zur Hegel-Forschung 1974. Mit Nachträgen aus früheren Berichtszeiträumen

HEGEL-STUDIEN

In Verbindung mit
der Hegel-Kommission der Rheinisch-Westfälischen
Akademie der Wissenschaften

herausgegeben von
FRIEDHELM NICOLIN und OTTO PÖGGELER

Band 11

FELIX MEINER VERLAG
HAMBURG

Inhaltlich unveränderter Print-On-Demand-Nachdruck der Originalausgabe von 1976, erschienen im Verlag H. Bouvier und Co., Bonn.

Bibliographische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliographie; detaillierte bibliographische Daten sind im Internet über <http://portal.dnb.de> abrufbar.

ISBN 978-3-7873-1475-1

ISBN eBook: 978-3-7873-2939-7

ISSN 0073-1578

© Felix Meiner Verlag GmbH, Hamburg 2016.

Alle Rechte vorbehalten. Dies gilt auch für Vervielfältigungen, Übertragungen, Mikroverfilmungen und die Einspeicherung und Verarbeitung in elektronischen Systemen, soweit es nicht §§ 53 und 54 URG ausdrücklich gestatten. Gesamtherstellung: BoD, Norderstedt. Gedruckt auf alterungsbeständigem Werkdruckpapier, hergestellt aus 100 % chlorfrei gebleichtem Zellstoff. Printed in Germany. www.meiner.de/hegel-studien

HEINZ HEIMSOETH

ist am 10. September 1975, im 90. Lebensjahr, gestorben.

Schüler von Cohen und Natorp, hat Heimsoeth die Verengungen der erkenntniskritisch-wissenschaftstheoretischen Fragestellung des Neukantianismus bald überwunden. Daß die metaphysischen Hintergründe und Endabsichten der Kantischen Philosophie neu ins Blickfeld gerückt wurden, ist wesentlich dem Mitwirken Heimsoeths zu danken. Neben dem Werk Kants, dem sein unablässiges Bemühen galt, waren die großen Themen der Metaphysik zentraler Gegenstand seines weitgespannten philosophiehistorischen Forschens. So beschäftigte ihn auch der Beitrag Hegels im geschichtlichen Zusammenhang des metaphysischen Fragens.

Als langjähriger Vorsitzender der Hegel-Kommission der Deutschen Forschungsgemeinschaft konnte Heinz Heimsoeth — noch im hohen Alter von bewundernswerter Aktivität — die Erfahrungen seines Forscherlebens dem großen Projekt der Hegel-Gesamtausgabe zugute kommen lassen. Maßgeblichen Anteil hatte er auch an der Begründung der *Hegel-Studien*. In seinem Geleitwort zum ersten Band, der vor fünfzehn Jahren erschien, gab er ihnen die Aufgabe mit, für die Hegel-Forschung „Organ der Sammlung und Anregung“ zu sein; ein Programm, dem sich die *Hegel-Studien* noch heute verpflichtet wissen.

INHALT

TEXTE UND DOKUMENTE

- M. J. PETRY, Rotterdam
Hegel and the „Morning Chronicle“ 11
- HELMUT SCHNEIDER, Bochum
Dokumente zu Hegels politischem Denken 1830/31 81

ABHANDLUNGEN

- MANFRED BAUM, Siegen
Zur Vorgeschichte des Hegelschen Unendlichkeitsbegriffs 89
- WOLFGANG MARX, Heidelberg
Die Logik des Freiheitsbegriffs 125
- THOMAS M. SEEBOHM, State College, Pa
The Grammar of Hegel's Dialectic 149
- NATHAN ROTENSTREICH, Jerusalem
On Cyclical Patterns and their Interpretation. The Interpretations of
Judaism in the Wake of Vico and Hegel 181

MISZELLEN

- LUDWIG HASLER, Bern
Aus Hegels philosophischer Berner Zeit 205
- WIM VAN DOOREN, Utrecht
Eine frühe Hegel-Diskussion in Holland 211

DISKUSSION

- Hegels Naturrecht 1802–1805/06 (HEINZ KIMMERLE, Bochum) 219
- Die endgültige Lösung einer Diskussion? (JOHANN HEINRICH TREDE, Essen) 228

LITERATURBERICHTE UND KRITIK

- W. C. Zimmerli: Die Frage nach der Philosophie (HELMUT GIRNDT, Duisburg) 235
- W. R. Beyer: Zwischen Phänomenologie und Logik (MANFRED BUHR, Berlin) 240
- A. Léonard: Commentaire littéral de la logique de Hegel (EUGÈNE FLEISCHMANN, Paris) 242
- B. Liebrucks: Sprache und Bewußtsein. Band 6, Teil 1–3 (PETER ROHS, Kiel) 244
- G. Maluschke: Kritik und absolute Methode in Hegels Dialektik (KLAUS DÜSING, Bochum) 249
- Zur Diskussion um Hegels Dialektik.* — Über Schriften von A. Sarlemijn, L. Erdei, R. Simon-Schaefer, W. Becker, B. Liebrucks, W. Schmied-Kowarzik, D. Böhler, R. Bubner, D. Henrich (ANNEMARIE GETHMANN-SIEFERT, Bochum) 253
- W. Röd: Dialektische Philosophie der Neuzeit (CARL FRIEDRICH GETHMANN, Essen) 269
- Veränderung und Entwicklung. Hrsg. von G. Stiehler (JOSEPH WACHTER, Bochum) 271
- G. W. F. Hegel: Vorlesungen über Rechtsphilosophie 1818–1831. Hrsg. von K.-H. Ilting. Band 2–4 (ROLF P. HORSTMANN, Bielefeld) 273
- R. K. Hočvar: Hegel und der preußische Staat (ROLF P. HORSTMANN, Bielefeld) 277

B. T. Wilkins: Hegel's Philosophy of History (MURRAY GREENE, New York)	279
K. Bal: Rozum i historia (RYSZARD PANASIUK, Lodz)	281
H. Scheit: Geist und Gemeinde (WALTER KERN, Innsbruck)	284
P. Szondi: Poetik und Geschichtsphilosophie I (PETER-CH. FENNER, Bochum)	290
Hegel and the History of Philosophy. Ed. by J. J. O'Malley, K. W. Algozin and F. G. Weiss (JERE PAUL SURBER, Denver)	292
Hegel et la Pensée Grecque. Publié sous la direction de J. D'Hondt (JEAN-LOUIS VIEILLARD-BARON, Tours)	295
Hegel et le Siècle des Lumières. Publié sous la direction de J. D'Hondt (MANFRED BAUM, Siegen)	298
J. D'Hondt: Verborgene Quellen des Hegelschen Denkens (HELMUT SCHNEIDER, Bochum)	301
P. Baumanns: Fichtes ursprüngliches System; A. Schurr: Philosophie als System bei Fichte, Schelling und Hegel (LUDWIG SIEP, Freiburg) . . .	303
K. Homann: F. H. Jacobis Philosophie der Freiheit (HELMUT SCHNEIDER, Bochum)	307
B. Lypp: Ästhetischer Absolutismus und politische Vernunft (REINHARD ROMBERG, Münster)	309
H. Ende: Der Konstruktionsbegriff im Umkreis des Deutschen Idealismus (AXEL PITT, Freiburg)	310
G. Planty-Bonjour: Hegel et la pensée philosophique en Russie 1830–1917 (THOMAS M. SEEBOHM, State College Pa)	313
M. Bakunin: Frühschriften (ULRICH DIERSE, Bochum)	316
L. D. Easton: Hegel's first American Followers; The American Hegelians. Ed. By W. H. Goetzmann (HANS-MARTIN SASS, Bochum)	319
H. T. Engelhardt, jr.: Mind-Body: A Categorical Relation (MURRAY GREENE, New York)	321
H. Schnädelbach: Geschichtsphilosophie nach Hegel (ULRICH DIERSE, Bochum)	324

O. Marquard: Schwierigkeiten mit der Geschichtsphilosophie (OTTO PÖG- GELER, Bochum)	326
G. Renggli: Die Philosophie des objektiven Geistes bei Nicolai Hartmann mit Berücksichtigung Hegels (KURT MEIST, Bochum)	327
H. Kieseewetter: Von Hegel zu Hitler (ROLF K. HOČEVAR, München) . . .	329
W. Euchner: Egoismus und Gemeinwohl; J. Streisand: Kritische Studien zum Erbe der deutschen Klassik; M. Buhr: Zur Geschichte der klassi- schen bürgerlichen Philosophie (GERHARD GÖHLER, Berlin)	332
J. Zelený: Die Wissenschaftslogik und „Das Kapital“ (JOSEPH WACHTER, Bochum)	336
R. Gumpfenberg: Freiheit und Wissenschaftsgeschichte (WALTER CH. ZIM- MERLI, Zürich)	338
H. Nakano: Was der Philosophie Hegels zugrundeliegt (TAKAKO SHIKAYA, Bochum)	341
Stuttgarter Hegel-Tage 1970. Hrsg. von H.-G. Gadamer (WALTER JAESCH- KE, Bochum)	344
Beyond Epistemology. Ed. by F. G. Weiss (MICHAEL J. PETRY, Rotterdam)	348
<i>Hinweis auf einige jüngere italienische Studien über Hegel und seine Re- zeption. — Über F. Papa, L. Lugarini, C. Cesa, G. Galabro ed altri (REMO BODEI, Pisa)</i>	350
J. D'Hondt: Hegel in seiner Zeit (HELMUT SCHNEIDER, Bochum)	352
<i>Briefeditionen aus dem Umkreis Hegels von H. Fuhrmans und J. L. Döder- lein (FRIEDHELM NICOLIN, Bonn)</i>	355
Kurzreferate und Selbstanzeigen über G. Thaulow, A. Hager, A. Pitt, H. P. Kainz, M. I. Lewina (Trad.), R. Lauth (Hg.), W.-D. Marsch, E. de Negri, F. W. Kantzenbach, H. Deuser, S. Crites, J. F. Sandberger, H. Hengst, O. Negt, R. Duna- yevskaja, H. Lange, G. Lichtheim	359

BIBLIOGRAPHIE

Abhandlungen zur Hegel-Forschung 1974. Mit Nachträgen aus früheren Berichtszeiträumen	375
--	-----

M. J. PETRY (ROTTERDAM)

HEGEL AND 'THE MORNING CHRONICLE'.

Like the rest of Hegel's political writings, the article on the Reform Bill is not an explicitly philosophical work, but an essay in political journalism, — an attempt to analyze the problems posed by a concrete political situation and to suggest means for overcoming them. The hub of its argument is that the English monarchy, unlike many of its continental counterparts, had failed to function as the promoter of the general welfare and justice of society, and that the country was therefore being administered and governed not in the interest of all, but in the interests of the social and economic groupings controlling Parliament: "The reason why England is so remarkably far behind the other civilized states of Europe in institutions derived from true rights is simply that there the governing power lies in the hands of those possessed of so many privileges which contradict constitutional law and true legislation."¹ Since the main theme of this paper is the influence of the Utilitarians upon Hegel's political thinking, it is perhaps worth noting here at the outset that JAMES MILL, from the time when he was converted to BENTHAMISM, also rejected the constitutional theory of the balance of powers, and that he finally reached conclusions concerning the potential reforming role of the monarchy which closely resemble Hegel's. From about 1820 until his death in 1836, he too was a firm advocate of the view that effective reform could only be pushed through with the help of a monarchy which had freed itself from its aristocratic entourage and identified itself with the interest of the people: "A first magistrate is necessary; that is a fixed and undisputed point. The necessity of unity in matters of administration, the use of concentrated responsibility, and many other considerations, seem to place the balance of advantage on the side of the individuality of the first magistrate. He should be one, not two, or more."²

Hegel develops this central conception in his analysis of the contents of the Bill, pointing out that there was evidence of its having been drawn up by men serving a sectarian and even a personal interest³, and that the proposals it

¹ *Berliner Schriften*. Hrsg. v. J. Hoffmeister. Hamburg 1956. 469—470; *Hegel's Political Writings*. Ed. by T. M. Knox and Z. A. Pelczynski. Oxford 1964. 300; extracts 33, 49.

² *London Review*. January, 1836. No 4. 302—305; cf. E. Halévy: *The Growth of Philosophic Radicalism* (tr. Morris, London 1972). 418—421; extract 14.

³ Extract 45.

contained were not a coherent and consistent body of constitutional reforms, but an incongruous hotchpotch of abstract principle and positive rights⁴. He was by no means the only contemporary observer to put forward such criticism, and by and large subsequent historical research and later parliamentary reform have borne him out on these matters. It is generally agreed that the leading promoters of the Bill saw it as a means of preventing the necessity for a revolution which would have threatened the interests of the landed and propertied classes.⁵ The resulting Act, although it certainly introduced a new principle into the English constitution by amending the representation of the *people* and not that of communities and interests⁶, also perpetuated many features of the old electoral system which had been severely criticized even by the more moderate reformers of the 1820's. In fact it initiated as much as it accomplished, and its subsequent revision has involved a protracted and complex process of constitutional development, — the secret ballot was not introduced until 1872, basic reforms such as the enfranchisement of women and the abolition of arbitrary property qualifications for voting were only carried through after the First World War, and comprehensive proportional representation has still to be achieved.

A large part of Hegel's article is devoted to an analysis of the sociological and institutional background to the political manoeuvring involved in getting the Bill through Parliament, — the bribery rampant at elections, the taxation and poor-rate burden, church tithes, the state of Ireland, the game laws, the inconsistency and inefficiency of the legal system, the lack of a professionally trained administrative class etc.⁷ He then goes on to suggest that it was Parliament's failure to deal with these problems in a disinterested, rational and constructive way that had given rise to the English version of the irresponsible, abstract and potentially destructive theorizing which had already run riot in France⁸, and that to pass a Bill enabling this radicalism to find a voice in a partially reformed Parliament could give rise to a confrontation which might lead to the overthrow of the whole constitution, the disruption of all administration. "The people would be a power of a different kind; and an opposition which, erected on a basis hitherto at variance with the stability of Parliament, could be led to look for its strength to the people, and then introduce not reform

⁴ Hoff. 487—488; K. and P., 315.

⁵ *Morn. Chron.* March 30th 1831, p. 3 col. 3, *Leader* quoting Grey: "The people, disappointed of their just expectations . . . , would be inflamed with resentment, and would eventually demand, with a voice of thunder, that which it would be found impossible longer to deny." Cf. *Michael Brock: The Great Reform Act*. London 1973. 336.

⁶ Extracts 38, 41.

⁷ Hoff. 465—483; K. and P. 296—311.

⁸ Hoff. 492—493; K. and P. 319—320: "Only in the French democratic constitution of the year III under Robespierre — a constitution adopted by the whole people but of course all the less carried into effect — was it prescribed that *laws* on public affairs were to be brought before individual citizens for confirmation."

but revolution.”⁹ Although he was almost certainly influenced by contemporary continental events such as the French and Belgian revolutions in reaching this conclusion, Hegel’s basic premiss here is quite evidently an informed, reasoned and comprehensive survey of the state of Great Britain, and one has only to remember the rick-burning, cattle-laming and machine-smashing which spread throughout the agricultural districts of southern England in the autumn of 1830, the Derby, Nottingham and Bristol riots which followed the Lords’ rejection of the Bill in the October of 1831, to realize how close to revolution England was while he was writing.¹⁰

The precise nature of Hegel’s mature attitude to revolution and reform, the basic reasons for his dislike of crude and disruptive radicalism, have not always been fully appreciated by those who have professed to be interpreting him. The traditional Marxist point of view has led many continental scholars to regard the Berlin political writings as simply “reactionary”, and English scholars have tended to fall in with the drift of this interpretation by reading into them a dyed in the wool Toryism of the Eldon kind.¹¹ This investigation should show, that at least in his interpretation of the background to the Reform Bill, Hegel had his closest English counterparts in the BENTHAMITES, ROMILLY, MACKINTOSH, BROUGHAM, MACAULAY, — in intellectuals who, for all their differences, were agreed as to the general desirability of bringing about peaceful reform within the existing framework of the law and the constitution.¹² In his broad assessment of the Bill he tends to differ from them not on the fundamental issue of long-term objectives, nor even on that of tactics, but on that of political *timing*. The basic difference between them is that whereas *he* thought it necessary, in the interest of orderly social and constitutional development, that those in control of government should respond to the pressing need for economic, social and legal reform *before* making any change in the electoral system which might open Parliament to the radicals, they tended to see the Bill as the most readily available *means* for the achievement of their general social, legal and political objectives. Looking at this difference in the light of subsequent developments, it seems not unreasonable to conclude that it is easy to overrate its signi-

⁹ Hoff. 506, K. and P. 330. Cf. the Catholic Association (extract 17), and O’Connell’s election as M. P. for County Clare in 1828.

¹⁰ April 1831. Hegel refers to events in Parliament which took place at the end of March, and even, apparently, as late as April 21st (extracts 44–50). Cf. Hoff. 785–786; extracts 33, 40, 41; W. R. Beyer in: *Deutsche Zeitschrift für Philosophie* 19 (1971), 628–643.

¹¹ W. R. Beyer: *Zwischen Phänomenologie und Logik*. Frankfurt 1955. 188: „Die Philosophie des Universitätsprofessors Dr. Hegel, des ‚Hegels im Glück‘, erstarre. Nach der Logik gelang ihm im Grossen kein revolutionärer Wurf mehr.“ Cf. J. H. Muirhead in *Enc. Brit.* (11th ed. 1911) vol. 13. 203: ‘The revolution of 1830 was a great blow to him, and the prospect of democratic advances almost made him ill.’

¹² Extracts 1, 33, 34, 54 etc.

ficance¹³, and that there is much to be said for the wisdom of both assessments.

PELCZYŃSKI is undoubtedly right to call attention to the importance of distinguishing between Hegel's positive ideas on concrete political issues and the principles of his more general philosophy.¹⁴ Although most of the topics touched upon in the political articles are also dealt with in the *Philosophy of Right*, these topical writings are certainly not attempts to solve practical problems by the application of general philosophical principles. As has already been observed, they are in fact political journalism, and they are effective as such precisely because they are so firmly based upon the informed commonsense of those actually involved in the situations about which Hegel is writing. In the *Philosophy of Right* however, as throughout the whole of the *Encyclopaedia*, the overriding consideration is the *philosophical* procedure involved in eliciting from the given subject-matter the structure and interrelationships of a comprehensively dialectical exposition. This is not to say that there are no connections between Hegel's political journalism and his political philosophy, but that what connections there are are rooted principally in the *subject-matter* common to both, not in his philosophy. Most of the topics dealt with in the analytical part of the article on the Reform Bill are also to be found in the *Philosophy of Right*, — the codification of the law (§ 216), the support of the poor (§ 241), the function of the monarchy (§ 275), the selection and training of civil servants (§ 289), taxation (§ 299), elections (§ 308) etc. It is, however, only in the latter work that the treatment is systematic and philosophical.

Hegel's journalism is therefore important to the study of his political philosophy not because it shows him putting his general philosophical principles to the test in practical political situations, but because it indicates far more readily than the *Philosophy of Right* his *actual* interests, preoccupations and prejudices, the ultimate sources of his empirical knowledge. His idiosyncrasies are also apparent in his philosophical work of course, but criticism of them there has to take into consideration the principles of his overall system, whereas in the political writings the fundamental topic of enquiry is simply his handling of his sources.

Although Hegel was evidently following English affairs as early as the 1790's¹⁵, there is no direct evidence as to what his sources were at this time, and it is not even certain that he could read English. He seems already to have been in the habit of reading newspapers regularly while he was teaching at Jena however,

¹³ George Heiman: *The Political Thought of Hegel and J. S. Mill* (Thesis, University of Toronto, 1966).

¹⁴ Op. cit. 5–137. In Hegel's *early* political writings there is as yet no clear distinction of this kind, — hence the main thesis of Raymond Plant: *Hegel*. London 1973.

¹⁵ See his *Vertrauliche Briefe* (Frankfurt 1798. 71, 81, 82), an annotated translation of a French work (1793) by J. J. Cart (1748–1813), and his reference (1798) to Fox's speech of May 26th 1797 in support of "Mr. Grey's motion for a reform in Parliament": H. S. Harris: *Hegel's Development*. Oxford 1972. 430.

and the researches of D'HONDT and BEYER provide us with good reasons for assuming that even during his early years most of his information about England was probably gathered from periodical literature.¹⁶ Fortunately there is no need for us to speculate as to the nature of his sources during the period immediately preceding the publication of the article on the Reform Bill, since many of the jottings and notes he then made have been preserved among the papers now held by the *Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz* in Berlin and *Houghton Library* at Harvard.¹⁷ These collections confirm what might have been suspected long ago from a reference contained in the *Aesthetics*, and what is clearly apparent from the selections published by HOFFMEISTER¹⁸, namely that throughout the greater part of the 1820's Hegel was a regular and assiduous reader of the *Morning Chronicle*. — It is a choice of paper which says much for his taste and perceptiveness, and on which one can only congratulate him. The modern reader is still struck by the intelligence, informativeness, liveliness and readability which made the Chronicle the most popular and influential English paper of its day: "This paper we have been long used to think the best, both for amusement and instruction, that issued from the daily press. It is full, but not crowded; and we have breathing-spaces and openings left to pause upon each subject. We have plenty and variety. The reader of a morning paper ought not to be crammed to satiety. He ought to arise from the perusal light and refreshed. Attention is paid to every topic, but none is overdone. There is liberality and decorum. Every class of readers is accommodated with its favourite articles, served up with taste, and without sparing for the sharpest sauces. A copy of verses is supplied by one of the popular poets of the day; a prose essay appears in another page, which, had it been written two hundred years ago, might still have been read with admiration; a correction of a disputed reading, in a classical author, is contributed by a learned correspondent. The politician may look profound over a grave dissertation on a point of constitutional history; a lady may smile at a rebus or a charade. Here, PITT and FOX, BURKE and SHERIDAN, maintained their nightly combats over again; here PORSON criticized and JEKYLL punned. An appearance of conscious dignity is kept up, even in the Advertisements, where a principle of proportion and separate grouping is

¹⁶ *Jacques d'Hondt: Hegel Secret*. Paris 1968; *W.R. Beyer*: op. cit. Cf. Hegel's well-known Jena aphorism: "Reading the morning newspaper is a kind of realistic morning-prayer. One orientates one's attitude to the world towards God, or towards what the world is. In that one then knows where one stands, both provide the same reassurance." (*Hoffmeister: Dokumente*, 360).

¹⁷ I should like to acknowledge my indebtedness to both these institutions for permission to publish the original manuscript material contained in this article, and to Dr. K.-R. Meist of the Hegel Archive, Bochum, for having first suggested to me that it ought to be investigated.

¹⁸ Extract 11: Hoff. 677—739.

observed; the announcement of a new work is kept distinct from the hiring of a servant of all-work, or the sailing of a steam-yacht." ¹⁹

By the time Hegel was reading it regularly, the general character of the *Chronicle* was already well established and widely recognized. It had been founded some fifty years before (1769) by WILLIAM WOODFALL (1746–1803), to whose personal interests and abilities it owed much of its initial success. WOODFALL had strong Whig sympathies, a great interest in Parliamentary affairs, and a remarkable memory, which enabled him to write out as much as six or seven columns of Parliamentary debate without the aid of notes. It was natural enough therefore that his paper should soon have become famous for the fulness and accuracy of its Parliamentary reporting, especially of speeches made by members of the opposition. In 1789 he was bought out by JAMES PERRY (1756–1821), who further improved the excellence of the paper's Parliamentary reporting by organizing a team of reporters, and identified it even more closely with the opposition party through his personal contacts. PERRY had a way with him, "a dash, no slight one either, of the courtier". ²⁰ During the Peninsular War he vexed and puzzled WELLINGTON by the promptness with which he managed to publish articles based on highly confidential despatches. ²¹ He grumbled about the "disgusting, though necessary, reports of parliamentary chattering", but continued to spend £ 2,000 — £ 3,000 a year on them. ²² Though in no respects a creative writer himself, he had an eye for literary talent, and got on well with poets and men of letters. In September 1793 the young COLERIDGE sent him a poem soliciting the loan of a guinea for a distressed author: "PERRY, who was generous with his money, sent it, and COLERIDGE often mentioned this, when the *Morning Chronicle* was alluded to, with expressions of a deep gratitude proportioned to the severe distress that small sum at the moment relieved." ²³ COLERIDGE, LAMB, THOMAS MOORE, HAZLITT and J. P. COLLIER contributed to the literary reputation of PERRY's paper, and with articles and letters from BROUGHAM, SIR JAMES MACKINTOSH, SHERIDAN and RICARDO also appearing regularly in its columns, it was equally distinguished in the political sphere. Despite PERRY's

¹⁹ W. Hazlitt: *The Periodical Press*. (In: *Edinburgh Review*. Vol. 38, May 1823); *Works*. Vol. 16. 222–223. Hegel knew of the *Edinburgh*, see note 35, and copied out the greater part of its review of Bentham's *Papers relative to Codification* (Nov. 1817, 217–237), see *Berl.* V, 2, 4.

²⁰ Charles Lamb: *Newspapers Thirty-five years ago*. In: *The Last Essays of Elia*. F. K. Hunt: *The Fourth Estate* (2 vols. London 1850) characterizes Perry as follows: "Though not profound, he was quick, versatile and showy. He wrote like a man of the world, and took plain, common-sense views of the subjects on which he treated; and his style was easy and familiar. He was fond of epigrams, and very successful with them." (106)

²¹ Wellington's staff officer Willoughby Gordon sent copies to the opposition leader Lord Grey, who forwarded them to Perry: A. Aspinal: *'Politics and the Press 1780–1850.'* London 1949. 282.

²² Thomas Moore: *Memoirs*. London 1853–6. vol. 8. 127.

²³ *The Gentleman's Magazine*. Vol. 10. 124 (Aug. 1838).

outspoken criticism of the establishment and of government policy, he was too well-known and influential to be easily prosecuted for libel, so that his paper gained an enviable reputation for candour and independence of judgement.²⁴ Although it always remained broadly Whig in its sympathies, it was financially independent of the party organization, and did not hesitate to take a line of its own if it disagreed with current party policies. It annoyed BROUGHAM when it did not criticize CANNING'S acceptance of the office of Foreign Secretary in September 1817 for example, and there was some talk at this time of the Whigs' setting up a paper of their own.²⁵ On occasions it took a line which was not only independent but also unpopular. It did not take as uncompromising an attitude to PETERLOO as was expected for example, and it failed to give its wholehearted support to BROUGHAM on the QUEEN CAROLINE issue.²⁶

When PERRY'S health began to decline in 1817, the editorship passed to another Scotsman, JOHN BLACK (1783—1855), who had begun to edit its foreign correspondence about six years before, and who had already made his mark as a translator and interpreter of serious Italian and German works. It was under BLACK, and during the period that Hegel read it regularly, that the paper reached the height of its influence, reputation and prosperity.²⁷ BLACK was a close friend of JAMES MILL, and as the younger MILL points out in his autobiography, during the first years of his editorship the paper bid fair to become the main organ of the utilitarians: "During the whole of this year, 1823, a considerable number of my contributions were printed in the Chronicle and Traveller: sometimes notices of books, but oftener letters, commenting on some nonsense talked in Parliament, or some defect of the law, or misdoings of the magistracy or the courts of justice. In this last department the Chronicle was now rendering signal service. After the death of Mr. PERRY, the editorship and management of the paper had devolved on Mr. JOHN BLACK, long a reporter on its establishment; a man of most extensive reading and information, great honesty and simplicity of mind; a particular friend of my father, imbued with many of his and BENTHAM'S ideas, which he reproduced in his articles, among other valuable thoughts, with great facility and skill. From this time the Chronicle ceased to be

²⁴ He was not immune however. He was prosecuted and acquitted in 1792 and 1810, and in 1798 fined and imprisoned for publishing material detrimental to the reputation of the House of Lords: *Parliamentary History*. Vol. 33; *H. R. Fox Bourne: English Newspapers*. London 1887. Vol. 1.

²⁵ *Patricia Hollis: The Pauper Press*. Oxford, 1970; *Aspinall: op. cit.*; *E. Halévy: The Liberal Awakening*. London 1961. 24—25.

²⁶ *C. W. New: The Life of Henry Brougham to 1830*. Oxford 1961. 94—96; *A. Aspinall: Lord Brougham and the Whig Party*. Manchester 1927. 46—47; *Morn. Chron. leaders* 19th—23rd August 1819, and June 6th—Nov. 11th 1820.

²⁷ It was purchased from Woodfall in 1789 for £ 1,500. In 1821, when it was bought by W. I. Clement (d. 1852) for £ 42,000, it cost 7d (4d duty), had a circulation of about 6,000, and was showing an annual profit of £ 12,000: see *Fox Bourne, op. cit.* Vol. 1. 363; *English Historical Review*. 1950. 223; *James Grant: The Newspaper Press*. London 1871. Vol 1. 256—313.

the merely Whig organ it was before, and during the next ten years became to a considerable extent a vehicle of the opinions of the Utilitarian radicals. This was mainly by what BLACK himself wrote, with some assistance from FONBLANQUE²⁸, who first shewed his eminent qualities as a writer by articles and *jeux d'esprit* in the *Chronicle*. The defects of the law, and of the administration of justice, were the subject on which that paper rendered most service to improvement. Up to that time hardly a word had been said, except by BENTHAM and my father, against that most peccant part of English institutions and of their administration. It was the almost universal creed of Englishmen, that the law of England, the judicature of England, the unpaid magistracy of England, were models of excellence. I do not go beyond the mark in saying, that after BENTHAM, who supplied the principal materials, the greatest share of the merit of breaking down this wretched superstition belongs to BLACK, as editor of the *Morning Chronicle*. He kept up an incessant fire against it, exposing the absurdities and vices of the law and the courts of justice, paid and unpaid, until he forced some sense of them into people's minds. On many other questions he became the organ of opinions much in advance of any which had ever before found regular advocacy in the newspaper press. BLACK was a frequent visitor of my father, and Mr. GROTE²⁹ used to say that he always knew by the Monday morning's article, whether BLACK had been with my father on the Sunday."³⁰

By continuing and developing PERRY'S independent and critical attitude, BLACK raised the paper above party conflict and eventually identified it with the most powerful English philosophical movement of the time. It therefore says much for his general abilities as a journalist that he was able to maintain its popularity for as long as he did: "Its philosophical consistency made it seem inconsistent, and was irritating to shallow and fickle people . . . BLACK offended the Radicals by demolishing COBBETT'S rhetoric and questioning his honesty, and shocked the Whigs by recognising virtue in CANNING and declaring that WELLINGTON was sometimes in the right."³¹ BLACK'S European interests and connections might have caused him trouble had he not been a man of such complete and transparent integrity. He reported the policies of the Holy Alliance and of the anti-liberal government in France as accurately and objectively as he did the liberal sentiments of CANNING'S famous speech at Plymouth, and this breadth of interest

²⁸ A. B. Fonblanque (1793–1872) contributed regularly to the *Chronicle* during the 1820's. He attracted notice by the terseness and superiority of his style as well as the boldness and liberality of his opinions: see *E. B. Fonblanque: Life and Labours of Albany Fonblanque*. London 1874.

²⁹ George Grote (1794–1871), the historian of Greece.

³⁰ *J. S. Mill: Autobiography* (1873), ch. IV. The early contributions Mill refers to began to appear in the *Chronicle* in October 1822 and were usually signed "Wickliffe".

³¹ *Fox Bourne*: op. cit. Vol. 2. 13–14. In 1834 Clement sold the paper to the politician and journalist Sir John Easthope (1784–1865) for only £ 16,000. Black resigned the editorship in 1843. It continued to decline and was sold again in 1849 and 1854. In 1860 it amalgamated with the *Daily Telegraph*.

and scrupulous fairness were not always fully appreciated. Early in 1822 for example, METTERNICH was actually encouraged to insert an article in the Chronicle, and LORD GRANVILLE (1773–1846), the British ambassador to France, wrote as follows to Canning soon after his arrival in Paris in October 1824: "I think I can assure, you, on authority not to be disputed, that the private correspondence in the *Courier* and the *Morning Chronicle* is written under the direction of the agents of the French Government."³² Like both BROUGHAM and JAMES MILL, BLACK was convinced that any close identification with socialist radicalism was not only undesirable in itself, but would have made it practically impossible to get the desired reforms through Parliament. His sub-editor THOMAS HODGSKIN (1787–1869) sometimes managed to insert socialist propaganda into the paper surreptitiously however, — a move which led to severe criticism from MILL, who wrote as follows to BROUGHAM about the Chronicle's reporting of one of ATTWOOD's³³ speeches during the reform crisis: "The nonsense to which your Lordship alludes, about the rights of the labourer to the whole produce of the country, wages, profits, and rent, all included, is the mad nonsense of our friend HODGKIN [sic], which he has published as a system and propagates with the zeal of perfect fanaticism . . . These opinions, if they were to spread, would be the subversion of civilized society; worse than the overwhelming deluge of Huns and Tartars."³⁴

Admirable though BLACK's paper was as a popularizing medium and as a means for bringing the principles of BENTHAMISM to bear upon current problems, it was clearly unable to accommodate the lengthy and elaborate articles and reviews that then constituted the stock in trade of any serious political or philosophical movement. MILL saw the need for a periodical comparable to the Whig *Edinburgh* and the Tory *Quarterly*³⁵, and it was for this reason that he launched the *Westminster* in January 1824³⁶. In the decade or so during which Hegel was reading the Chronicle, the paper was therefore important to the BENTHAMITES not as a vehicle for the direct presentation of their philosophical views but as a means of general propaganda, and they were well aware that it was effective as such only in so far as it maintained its attitude of critical independence.

³² H. Temperley: *The Foreign Policy of Canning*. London 1966. 300. Canning's speech was delivered on October 28th 1823; Metternich wrote to Esterházy about the article on January 31st 1822.

³³ Thomas Attwood (1783–1856), the Birmingham political reformer and monetary theorist.

³⁴ Mill's letter of Sept. 3rd 1832: see Alexander Bain: *James Mill*. London 1882. 363–367. Hodgskin was at that time a naval officer on half pay. In 1825 he published an anonymous work which influenced Marx — see extract 10. Mill may be referring to his *Popular Political Economy* (London 1827). Cf. the *Chronicle* January 28th 1830.

³⁵ The *Edinburgh Review* was started in 1802, the *Quarterly Review* in 1809. Hegel made extracts from both: *Quart.* Jan. 1817 p. 523, April 1818 p. 30, Sept. 1818 p. 116; *Edin.* Nov. 1817 pp. 217–237, March 1819 pp. 368, 415.

³⁶ See G. L. Nesbitt: *Benthamite Reviewing*. The Westminster Review 1824–1836. New York 1934.

Consequently, Hegel was almost certainly unaware that there was any close connection between BENTHAM's philosophy and the sort of information he was gathering from the Chronicle. The paper adopted a reforming motto³⁷, and it pulled no punches in its leaders, but it concentrated upon making its points by implication, by straightforward reporting of particular items of news, and it was quite evidently on account of its news value that Hegel continued to read it regularly. Since he drew most of the conclusions it was hoped he would draw, not only all the factual material but also the greater part of the argumentation to be found in the Reform Bill article may also be found in the Chronicle. This subject needs to be more fully investigated than is possible here, but it may be of value to give a broad survey of the paper's policies and attitudes with regard to certain central issues, to point out which of Hegel's extracts relate to these issues, and to indicate the possible reasons for his reacting as he did.

In the crucial field of the *law*, as MILL noted, the Chronicle looked beyond the official machinery, and attempted to mobilize public opinion, not only against undesirable conduct, but also against the judges' view that this appeal to the people was mere scandalmongering, and that those who had the cause of justice at heart might obtain their end equally well by providing evidence in the courts.³⁸ It devoted a lot of space to publicizing the proceedings of the police courts, since this was the only effective check on the wanton exercise of the power of commitment entrusted by law to the magistrates.³⁹ It provided detailed accounts of proceedings at the central courts and county assizes, especially if the issues raised, the handling of the evidence or the decisions reached could be used to illustrate the anomalies of the system.⁴⁰ In reporting *Parliamentary* affairs it gave full publicity to what actually went on at elections⁴¹ and to speeches advocating reform⁴², and rarely missed a chance of reviewing constitutional issues in the light of the general economic, social and religious state of the country⁴³. On the central matter of the reform of the electoral system it had a consistent if somewhat devious policy, determined partly by the changes that took place in the Parliamentary scene and partly by JAMES MILL's political tactics. Throughout the whole of LORD GREY's parliamentary career it never failed to take an opportunity to call attention to the underrepresentation of the industrial areas, to advocate the redistribution of seats, and to emphasize the

³⁷ September 3rd 1822: "Misgovernment must destroy the Press, or the Press will destroy misgovernment." See W. H. Wickwar: *The Struggle for the Freedom of the Press 1819—1832*. London 1928.

³⁸ It also indulged in simple sensationalism however, in reporting scandalous cases in detail primarily on account of their news value: extracts 2, 13.

³⁹ Extracts 31, 58, 59.

⁴⁰ Extracts 21, 24, 28, 59, 65 (issues); 12, 36, 37, 58, 60, 64 (evidence); 26, 27, 40, 42, 62 (decisions).

⁴¹ Extracts, 19, 23, 35, 41, 44, 45, 50, 63.

⁴² Extracts 1, 34, 38, 40, 46.

⁴³ Extracts 5, 7, 9, 29, 52, 57 (economic); 3, 32, 42, 46, 70 (social); 8, 13, 16, 17, 18, 22, 27, 29, 42, 51 (religious).

social implications of such a move. Shortly after PETERLOO for example, it suggested that bestowing representation on the great industrial towns of the north would be far more effective than any Coercion Act in restoring tranquillity to the disturbed areas.⁴⁴ During WELLINGTON's administration however, it was more impressed by his breaking with the ultra Tories, his furthering the cause of Catholic emancipation and the pacifism of his foreign policy, than it was by his opposition to Parliamentary reform, and it tended to blame the lack of progress in this sphere upon the radicals.⁴⁵ Although MILL himself had no sympathy with the radicals, and thought it essential that reform should be brought about by constitutional means, he saw the value of creating the appearance of impending *revolution* in order to extract concessions from Parliament, so that when the Chronicle attacked HUNT and COBBETT and emphasized the dangers of the potential effectiveness of their methods, it was simply pursuing an orthodox BENTHAMITE policy: "It is of immense consequence that the army of the people should now be such as to dispel the illusion which some Peers may entertain, that this is a question with regard to which the people may be safely opposed . . . Let it never be forgotten that power is with the people, and that the people have merely to resolve, and their purpose is effected. This every sensible Peer must know."⁴⁶

The main features of Hegel's political thinking had developed long before the 1820's, and by 1821 had already been given their detailed philosophic form. As has already been observed, the philosophical structure of the *Philosophy of Right* is simply part of the overall structure of the *Encyclopaedia*, and in itself is essentially irrelevant to practical politics. It is however within this framework that Hegel expounds his positive opinions on particular topics. To analyze the interaction in his thinking between philosophic structure and positive opinion would take us beyond the scope of this paper, but in assessing the use he made of the Chronicle in selecting the material for his article on the Reform Bill, it is essential that we should refer back to the positive political ideas expressed in his philosophical work.

His views on codification (§ 216) naturally led him to make a close study of the Edinburgh's review of BENTHAM's papers relative to the subject⁴⁷, and to

⁴⁴ October 20th 1819.

⁴⁵ E. Halévy: *The Liberal Awakening*. London 1961. 302; Elizabeth Longford: *Wellington*. London 1972. 179; see *Morn. Chron.* September 26th 1829: "The cause of reform never was at a lower ebb than at this moment; and it is more indebted to Cobbett and Hunt than anybody else for its fallen condition."

⁴⁶ *Morn. Chron.* September 19th 1831. Cf. extracts 6, 25; J. Hamburger: *James Mill and the Art of Revolution*. New Haven and London 1963.

⁴⁷ *Papers relative to Codification* (Edin. Rev. Nov. 1817, 216—237), see Berl. V. 2, 4 and note 19. Hegel copied out *the greater part* of this review from page 222 onwards: "In spite of the panegyrics which have so often been pronounced upon our laws, and upon the administration of them, no person who is practically acquainted with our English system of jurisprudence, and who will speak of it ingenuously, can deny

draw the conclusions MILL and BLACK expected him to draw from the legal reports published in the Chronicle.⁴⁸ His preconceptions concerning society's obligations in respect of poverty (§ 241) clearly influenced his selection of material concerning the social responsibilities of the law, the landowners and the church in Ireland, and led to his calling attention to this aspect of the Irish question in his article.⁴⁹ His attempt to characterize the monarchy as uniting within itself the three moments of the constitution, counsel and decision (§ 275), provided him with the philosophical background for the opinion that it was the weakness of this institution in Great Britain which was holding up the improvement of the country's constitution.⁵⁰ As MILL reached the same conclusion at much the same time, tracing the idea in the Chronicle would be a worthwhile undertaking, since there is only one clear reference to it in Hegel's surviving notes.⁵¹ His thorough treatment of the civil service (§§ 287–297) has its natural corollary in his picturesque condemnation of the "crass ignorance" of Britain's "fox-hunters and landed gentry". The incidental similarities between Hegel and the BENTHAMITES might be illustrated by many judgements of this kind. The very phrasing here, indicative though it is of Hegel's deep and long-standing enthusiasm for the ways of German civil servants, is evidently taken straight from the Chronicle, and it is indeed difficult to imagine either Hegel or JAMES MILL responding very readily to the joys of the chase.⁵² Since Hegel finds the philosophic significance of taxation in the state's exaction of services from individuals in order to provide for their "well-being and happiness" (§ 299), one readily appreciates the process of direct suggestion by means of which the Chronicle's constant complaints about the tax burden gave rise to the treatment of this subject in Hegel's article.⁵³ On the other hand, it is difficult to imagine a sharper contrast than that between the conscientious analysis of the principles of electoral representation in the *Philosophy of Right* (§§ 308–311), and the hair-raising accounts given by the Chronicle of what went on at election time in Britain. Taking into consideration the extracts Hegel made on this topic, one is struck mainly by the mildness of his remarks in the article.⁵⁴

It has already been observed that although the Chronicle soon changed its opinion of WELLINGTON'S political abilities once he had taken office, it never

that it is attended with great and numerous mischiefs, which are every day becoming more intolerable." etc. etc.

⁴⁸ Hoff. 469; K. and P. 300.

⁴⁹ Extracts 3, 16, 17, 29, 32, 46, 70; Hoff. 477–478; K. and P. 306–307.

⁵⁰ Hoff. 469–70, 501; K. and P. 300, 327.

⁵¹ Extract 33; cf. 14, 38, 49; Hoff. 783.

⁵² Extract 33 (February 5th 1828); Hoff. 482; K. and P. 310–11. Curiously enough, and for reasons of his own of course, Marx comes out here on the side of the fox-hunters: see *Kritik der Hegelschen Staatsphilosophie* (1843). Tr. J. O'Malley Cambridge 1970. 44–54. Cf. the Chronicle's championing of London University, July 19th 1825.

⁵³ Hoff. 471; K. and P. 301–302.

⁵⁴ See note 41. Hoff. 465, 488; K. and P. 296, 297, 316.

abandoned MILL's policy of attempting to create the appearance of impending revolution. Hegel had evidently worked out his basic opinion as to the possibility of a revolution in Britain as early as February 1828, when he expressed himself on the subject as a result of the Chronicle's negative reaction to WELLINGTON's acceptance of the premiership.⁵⁵ It is quite evident therefore, that when he praises WELLINGTON's political insight and concludes his article with the suggestion that the Bill might "introduce not reform but revolution", he is not indulging in his own peculiar brand of Toryism, but simply retailing the views he had acquired from the Chronicle.⁵⁶

As is well known, Hegel had no very high opinion of the philosophical capabilities of the English, and several of these extracts illustrate the sort of factual material on which he based his judgement.⁵⁷ Although he was almost certainly unaware of the Chronicle's philosophical background however, he had acquired some knowledge of BENTHAM's philosophy of law, and it is therefore possible that the "greatest happiness" principle had some influence upon his treatment of the sphere of "Practical Spirit" (§§ 469–480) in the *Encyclopaedia*. Feeling, impulses and happiness are treated here as the immediate presuppositions of abstract right, which would certainly seem to imply that he was in basic agreement with BENTHAM in regarding this level of psychology as constituting an important factor in the formulation of rational legislation.⁵⁸

Hegel did not only use the material he had gathered from the Chronicle for his article on the Reform Bill. In editing these extracts some attempt has therefore been made to indicate other contexts in which this material appears, and in tracing these contexts some reference has been made to unpublished lecture material.⁵⁹ As might have been expected, there is much evidence that at this stage in his career he was reading in order to confirm, not in order to develop his ideas. References in the Reform Bill article for which there are no corresponding manuscript notes have been included among the extracts⁶⁰, although it is of course not absolutely certain that Hegel relied upon the Chronicle in all these cases, and there is indeed direct evidence that he also consulted

⁵⁵ Extract 33.

⁵⁶ Hoff. 497, 506; K. and P. 323, 330. Since the section of the article containing these observations (Hoff. 495–506; K. and P. 321–330) was censored as being "unsuitable for the State paper" (Hoff. 786), it did not appear with the rest in the *Allgemeine Preussische Staatszeitung* nos. 115, 116, 118 (April 26th–29th, 1831).

⁵⁷ *Enc.* §§ 394, 408; extracts 2, 5, 7, 10, 13, 30.

⁵⁸ Cf. *Philosophy of Right*. §§ 20–21. In the 1827 edition of the *Encyclopaedia*, the sphere of "Free Spirit" (§§ 481–482) constitutes the initial level of "Objective Spirit". The existing notes relating to Hegel's lectures on these paragraphs have now been prepared for publication. He evidently mentioned "the system of eudemonism", but he made no direct reference to Bentham.

⁵⁹ Extracts 2, 25.

⁶⁰ Extracts 13, 19, 23, 34, 41, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50.

other sources⁶¹. Many of his notes have undoubtedly been lost. It is apparent from the published text of the *Aesthetics* for example, that only part of extract eleven has been preserved, and several extracts have disappeared even since HOFFMEISTER had access to them.⁶²

It is to be hoped that this paper will encourage those interested in Hegel's political thinking during the Berlin period to take the Chronicle into consideration when assessing the nature of his positive views (and perhaps to trace those extracts that are still unidentified). In its broadest context such a field of research is important in that it illustrates how much ground Utilitarianism shares with Marxist socialism once one views these movements from an Hegelian standpoint.⁶³ And it is, perhaps, encouraging to find that most of the anomalies, inconsistencies, corruptions and idiocies pointed out by the Chronicle and noted by Hegel were in fact eliminated long ago by the democratic Parliamentary procedures brought into being by the Great Reform Act.⁶⁴

Editorial procedure

Forty five of these extracts are published by permission of the *Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz* (Nachlaß Hegel, K. 15. V 1, 1 ff; V 3, 2 ff and V 4, 7), five of them by permission of the *Harvard College Library*. This manuscript material, which consists of nothing more than rough notes, constitutes a small part of an extensive and largely unsorted body of miscellaneous papers containing jottings made by Hegel during his reading. The manuscript originals of a further seven extracts seem to have disappeared since they were first published by HOFFMEISTER in 1956, and it has therefore been necessary to reprint them from his text. One extract has been taken from the manuscript lecture-notes included in a new two-language edition of the *Philosophy of Subjective Spirit* soon to be published by Reidel's of Dordrecht, and the remaining twelve have been drawn from the English translation of the article on the *Reform Bill*. The references in square brackets indicate the source of each extract, and suggest passages in Hegel's published works on which it may have a bearing. The following abbreviations have been used:

⁶¹ In extract 1 for example, he quotes a Parliamentary speech more accurately than the Chronicle reported it, and in extract 30 he seems to have checked the Chronicle's account of the court case against another source.

⁶² Extracts 1, 16, 51, 53, 55, 64, 65. The texts of the extracts Hoffmeister published are very imperfect.

⁶³ *Eric Stokes: The English Utilitarians in India*. Oxford 1959; cf. extract 54; *Graeme Duncan: Marx and Mill*. Two views of social conflict and social harmony. Cambridge 1973.

⁶⁴ Extracts 18, 21, 22, 24, 26, 34, 37; cf. 1, 12, 17, 36, 38, 62.

- Berl. Nachlaß Hegel. Staatsbibliothek Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Berlin.
- Harv. The Houghton Library. Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Hoff. *Berliner Schriften 1818—1831*. Ed. J. Hoffmeister. Hamburg 1956.
- K. and P. *Hegel's Political Writings*. Tr. T. M. Knox, intr. Z. A. Pelczynski. Oxford 1964.
- Ph. R. *Hegel's Philosophy of Right*. Tr. T. M. Knox. Oxford 1962.
- Enc. *Enzyklopädie (1830)*. Ed. F. Nicolin and O. Pöggeler. Hamburg 1959.
- Jub. *Jubiläumsausgabe*. Ed. H. Glockner. 20 vols. Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt 1965.

Fifty of the extracts have been collated with the text of the newspaper, and numbered in a chronological sequence. Despite a painstaking but admittedly not exhaustive search, it has not been possible to identify the original contexts of the remaining twenty with very much certainty. There are various reasons for this, — in some cases Hegel is not copying but summarizing, and in others he has either misdated or misassigned what he has noted, or simply failed to give any indication of its origin.

Editorial additions have been placed between square brackets, and every effort has been made to present the extracts precisely as they were noted down. In order to facilitate the comparing of what Hegel wrote with what appeared in the newspaper, any instance of inaccurate or fragmentary notetaking has been numbered, and the original version or the supplementary material has been supplied in a footnote. If the meaning of Hegel's German is not made explicit by these notes, a translation has been supplied.

During this period, the contents of the *Chronicle* invariably fell into a number of clearly defined categories, — advertisements, leaders, Parliamentary news and law reports being the most important. The category from which an extract is drawn has been indicated, and whenever possible some attempt has been made to assess its general significance and sketch in its historical background.

1.

Der von Sir James Mackintosh eingebrachte[n] Bill wegen Verminderung der Strafe für das Verbrechen der Verfälschung von Handschriften u. s. w. (die am 4. Juni 1821 durchgefallen ist) widersetzte sich der Generalprokurator und meinte, daß, wenn das Hängen abgeschafft würde, ein neues Gefängnis erbaut werden müßte, das eine Bastille genannt und in ganz England verwünscht werden würde; überhaupt sei die Bill eine Maßregel, um die Bestrafung von zehnjähriger Einsperrung zu harter Arbeit einzuführen, die man in England bis jetzt noch gar nicht kannte.

[*Transl.*:] Sir James Mackintosh's Bill for reducing the penalty for the offence of forging handwriting etc. (which was rejected on June 4th 1821), was opposed by the attorney-general, who was of the opinion that if hanging were to be abolished, a new prison would have to be built, which would be denominated a Bastille and execrated throughout England; that the Bill was simply a means for introducing the sentence of ten years' hard labour, which has hitherto been quite unknown in England.

[Hoff. p. 720.]

'The Morning Chronicle' June 5th 1821 p. 2 col. 4, *Parliament*: the Attorney-General (Sir Robert Gifford 1779—1826), "With respect to the punishment attached to the uttering of forged notes ... If imprisonment and hard labour were to be that punishment, prisons must be built, which would become the objects of detestation in every county in England."

Cf. 'Hansard's Parliamentary Debates' new series vol. V col. 1107, "What would be the consequence? They would be obliged to build a prison, which would be denominated a bastille, and which would be execrated in every part of England, for the security of those individuals ... Moreover, this measure went to introduce a punishment unknown to the law of this country — imprisonment and hard labour for ten years."

Sir James Mackintosh (1765—1832), unlike most British philosophers of his day, had some knowledge of the writings of Kant and Fichte. His theoretical interest in legal matters seems, however, to have been influenced more by Bentham than by German idealism, and as an active reformer he regarded himself as carrying on the work of Sir Samuel Romilly (d. 1818).

On March 2nd 1819 he carried a motion against the government for the setting up of a committee to consider 'so much of the criminal laws as relates to Capital Punishment in Felonies.' When its report was published in 1820, he attempted to give effect to its recommendations by introducing six Bills into the Commons, three of which were finally accepted by the Lords (1 George IV c. 115, 116, 117). He was not so successful in 1821, for the three Bills thrown out in 1820 were again rejected, but 1 William IV. c. 66 (1830) reduced considerably the number of cases in which forgery was a capital offence. On July 4th 1831 Mackintosh supported the second reading of the Reform Bill 'in a speech which was respectfully received, in spite of its philosophical generalities.'

2.

Es ist nicht leicht zu erkennen ob Menschen verrückt sind oder nicht, weil sich die fixe Idee oft sehr versteckt, häufig sind kluge Leute darüber getäuscht. In England ist der Zustand der Verrücktheit sehr häufig und es giebt da eigene Ärzte die sich nur auf seine Behandlung legen und doch kommt oft der Fall vor daß sie verschiedener Meinung sind. Über den Zustand des Lord *Portsmouth* waren z. B. die Ärzte sehr im Widerspruch, daß er nicht klug war, ist wohl zugegeben, die Behandlung die er sich von seiner Frau gefallen ließ, seine Liebhaberei Glocken zu läuten, besonders bei Leichenbegängnissen, wofür er sogar die Pence annahm, sprachen dafür, aber die Narrheit war schwer zu bestimmen.

[*Transl.:*] It is not easy to decide whether people are deranged or not, for the fixed idea is often by no means evident, and even experts are frequently deceived. The state of derangement is very common in England, but although there are special doctors there, concerned exclusively with the treatment of it, they will often deliver differing judgements. The doctors expressed very conflicting opinions on the condition of Lord Portsmouth for example. It was admitted that he was somewhat odd, this was evident from what he put up with from his wife and his fondness for ringing bells, particularly at funerals, for which he even accepted the pence he had earned, but it was difficult to prove him a fool

[Lecture on Anthropology, 5–6 p. m. Mon. July 18th 1825; ms. notes K. G. von Griesheim p. 225; cf. Kehler ms. pp. 162/3, Jub. 10 p. 224, 24 (Enc. § 408 Add.)]

‘The Morning Chronicle’ February 14th 1823 p. 4 col. 1, *Law Report*: “Lord Portsmouth’s Case. Proceedings of the Commission (De Lunatico Inquirendo) — Yesterday. Jos. Head — (Examination reassumed by Mr. *Wetherell*.) — Returned with Lord Portsmouth, when he went into Hampshire after his second marriage frequently, while there he told witness that Lady Portsmouth ill-treated him, by horsewhipping and threatening him; said the late Lady Portsmouth had behaved very kindly to him; in the late Lady Portsmouth’s lifetime witness often went out with Lord P. in his phaeton, both in town and country; they frequently passed a funeral, when his Lordship would sometimes hit at the coachmen driving the mourning-coaches or hearse, and would call them Anthony and Joe; he often ordered his phaeton to follow in the procession, and when it arrived at the burial ground he generally accompanied the corpse into the church and to the ground; witness was frequently at the church at Hurstbourne when the bells were being rung, and his Lordship always rung one; sometimes his Lordship would flog the ringers with the rope; witness once divided a sum of money amongst the ringers, which the clerk brought him, his Lordship’s share was fifteen pence, which he took; don’t recollect his Lordship’s *paying*, but he often *received* his share; when people were ill Lord Portsmouth would frequently inquire how they were, and orders always were given to the clerk to let him know when they died, that his Lordship might toll the church bell; knows that his Lordship frequently left the house, when so informed, for the purpose of ringing the bell.”

The ‘Chronicle’ reported this case at length between February 13th and March 1st 1823. John Charles Walpole, third Earl of Portsmouth (1767–1853), after the death of

his first wife in 1813, married Mary Anne Hanson, the daughter of his solicitor. It soon became well-known that Lady Portsmouth was the mistress of the earl's physician, and that both lovers were in the habit of bullying him. Since his estates were worth over £ 17,000 p. a., the question of his sanity and so of the validity of the bond was raised.

Five commissioners appointed by the Lord Chancellor under a commission *de lunatico inquirendo* and a jury of twenty four met at the Freemasons' Tavern, Great Queen Street on Monday February 10th 1823, to enquire whether the earl was not of sound mind and capable of conducting his own affairs. The enquiry lasted about a fortnight, and the mass of evidence was greater than in any case which had come before the court in living memory. On February 28th Mr. Commissioner Traver summed up at great length: "He particularly commented on the evidence of the medical men who had declared Lord Portsmouth to be of unsound mind, and put it to the jury whether they had seen anything in their examination of his Lordship to lead them to a different conclusion." ('The Gentleman's Magazine' vol. 93 pt. i p. 270, Jan.—June 1823). The verdict was unanimous, "That John Charles, Earl of Portsmouth, is a man of unsound mind and condition and incapable of managing himself and his affairs; and that he has been so from the 1st Jan. 1809." In May 1828 the marriage was declared null and void on account of the earl's having entered into it when of an unsound mind: 'The Annual Register . . . of the year 1828', Chronicle pp. 59—63.

'A Genuine Report of the Proceedings on the Portsmouth Case' (79 pp. London, 1823; B. Mus. Cat. 6495 e. 20), see esp. pp. 12, 18; John Johnstone (1768—1836) 'Medical Jurisprudence: on madness' (Birmingham, 1800), the first English work on the medical and psychiatric aspects of crime; Anthony Highmore (1758—1829) 'A Treatise on the Law of Idiocy and Lunacy' (London, 1807).

3.

Mr. North, in English Parliam. 11/5 24. He confessed that he thought nothing more likely to do mischief than a perfect consciousness of purity of motive, accompanied with an imperfect knowledge of the subject.

[Berl. V, 3, 3, Hoff. p. 722; cf. Ph. R. § 137.]

'The Morning Chronicle' May 12th 1824 p. 3 col. 5, *Parliament*: "He was now about to give utterance to a sentiment, which, he was aware, would be considered by many gentlemen as savouring strongly of Irish prejudices, but which, he was sure, sprung from an ardent affection for his country; and that sentiment was, that if any of their institutions were to be modified or changed, or reformed, that modification and reform should come from the country Gentlemen of Ireland. From the observations he had made during the short time he had held a seat in that House, he felt disposed to deprecate any modification or change from any other quarter. The country Gentleman of Ireland were alone possessed of that practical knowledge of the country which was essentially necessary for the purpose of effecting any modification with security. The country Gentlemen could alone appreciate opinions, and even prejudices which it was necessary to respect. They would do nothing hastily or intemperately; they would avoid those errors into which others, though actuated by the best intentions, were

likely to fall. He respected the motives of those who came forward with propositions for the relief of Ireland, but he confessed that he thought nothing more likely to do mischief than a perfect consciousness of purity of motive, accompanied with an imperfect knowledge of the subject. It was from his own countrymen alone that he anticipated any thing like a safe and secure Reform in Ireland."

John Henry North (1789—1831), at this time M. P. for Plympton Earle in Devonshire, was a graduate of Trinity College Dublin, a king's counsel in Ireland, and an ardent and eloquent supporter of Canning. He was appointed Judge of the Irish Admiralty Court by Wellington, but it was not until the end of the Wellington administration, when he was M. P. for Drogheda, that there was any resurgence of the earlier brilliance of his speeches in the Commons. See 'Gentleman's Magazine' vol. CI pt. 2 p. 466; G. P. Judd *Members of Parliament* (London 1955) p. 290.

This debate on the state of Ireland is to be found in T. C. Hansard 'The Parliamentary Debates' vol. XI cols. 654—724 (Hegel's extract col. 702). Lord Althorp's motion, "That a select Committee be appointed to inquire into the State of Ireland" was defeated by 184 votes to 136.

4.

The Maxim of a wellknown French Statesman, that *language* was given to man to *conceal* his thoughts — seems to be ever present to the framer of the King's speeches to Parliament; — for in order to obviate all difficulty on the part of the opposition in echoing them, they are generally of a purely *negative* character.

[Berl. V, 3, 5; cf. Jub. 10 p. 252.]

'The Morning Chronicle' February 3rd 1825 p. 2 col. 2, *Leader*: "The maxim of a well-known French Statesman, that language was given to man to conceal his thoughts, seems to be ever present to the framers of the *King's Speeches* to Parliament; for, in order to obviate all difficulty on the part of the Opposition in echoing them, they are generally of a purely negative character. Yet one should think the ingenuity of Ministers would be rather hard tasked to evade all allusion to the circumstances which render so large an addition of troops necessary to our security. Danger there must be, or we should not be augmenting our army by upwards of twenty thousand men; and, to say nothing of the danger to those who represent virtually, if not really, the People of England, would be to declare Parliaments a farce, as well as County Meetings."

"La parole a été donnée à l'homme pour déguiser sa pensée." The words were evidently spoken by Talleyrand in conversation with the Spanish ambassador Izquierdo in 1807: see B. Barère (1755—1841) 'Mémoires' vol. 4 p. 447 (Paris, 1842); 'Siècle' Aug. 24th 1846.

5.

Brougham the right of men to employ their capital in that way which their interests, their wishes, or even their caprices point out — Brougham — by

Address as Answer to the Speech from Throne 3/2 25 Those statesmanlike and *philosophical* principles of free trade — for philosophical they undoubtedly were — on the adoption of which his Majesty had that day congratulated his Parliament.

[Berl. V, 1, 2, Hoff. p. 701; cf. Enc. (1830) § 7, footnote.]

'The Morning Chronicle' February 4th 1825 p. 5 col. 2. *Parliament*: "That narrow shop-keeping and huckstering policy, . . . is at length universally reprobated, although the reverse had been a policy which had been established in the conviction of enlightened minds for two generations, and had been inculcated by Adam Smith, and supported by a succession of able writers from his time . . . This very doctrine of free trade and of the rights of men — the right I say to employ their capital in that way which their interests, their wishes, or even their caprices point out — that long depreciated and absurd right is now happily acknowledged as the rising code of our commercial policy . . . Thank God, they have even realized those most damnable heresies of free trade; and in place of those real heresies and that narrow pedlar-like policy which so long oppressed the national enterprize, adopted those statesmanlike and philosophical principles of free trade — for philosophical they undoubtedly (*type faulty*) were — on the adoption of which his Majesty had that day congratulated his Parliament."

C. W. New "The Life of Henry Brougham to 1830" (Oxford, 1961). Hegel himself makes mention of Adam Smith in his 'Lectures on the History of Philosophy.'

6.

Morn. Chron. 9/2 25 (in Journal: Scotsman) The *Spaniards*¹ are the *Moslems*¹ of Western Europe. They have lost their place in the scale of nations and sunk into semi-barbarism from the same causes — the paramount influence of superstition and despotism. Like the Turks, they exhibit in their Government a most ludicrous combination of magnificent pretension and deplorable imbecillity², and in their national character, the same pride, ignorance, intractableness, and fanaticism. Like the Turks, too, they inherited a splendid empire, which is in a state of utter dilapidation. The colonies of the one³ like the subject nations of the other, having made the discovery, that their governors are weak, stupid, and tyrannical, cannot by any human means⁴ kept in subjection to rulers they despise. We may add, to complete the parallel, that the two Courts are composed of very similar materials. The Monk and the Mufti, the white page and the blak⁵ eunuch, are consellers⁶ of the same order;⁷ Spain and Turkey seem, in fact, to have been placed at the two extremities of Europe, to serve as monuments to other nations, of the degrading and barbarishing⁸ effects of superstition and despotism.

[Berl. V, 1, 1, Hoff. pp. 716—717; cf. Jub. 10 p. 83 (Enc. § 394 Add.)]