

BUCKLE AND AMERICA

Henry Thomas Buckle (1821-62) became a mid-Victorian celebrity when in June 1857 he published the first volume of *The History of Civilization in England*.¹ Earlier he had published nothing. A few people may have recognized Buckle as a marvelous chess player with a knack for languages and a huge private library but only a very few, so it was a surprise, when this young, self-educated historian challenged readers with his *History of Civilization*.² He invented what he called scientific history, history modelled on the physical sciences with the help of statistics. Bernard Semmel, one of the best guides to Buckle, complimented him as “perhaps, the first practicing historian to grasp the usefulness of statistics to history and to apply this insight, albeit in rudimentary fashion.”³

In his idea of scientific history, Buckle was misguided, but not in his theme of intellectual progress. He said that it required wealth to provide leisure to think and to think with skepticism. He saw no place for God in human history. He was innovative too when he wrote books that focused on ordinary people, not kings or generals. Buckle was interested “in demography and geography, ... of subsistence and patterns of settlement, and also in medicine and the history of disease.”⁴ He emphasized the importance of climate in explaining why some parts of the world developed an advanced civilization and others remained backward. He rejected race as an explanation. In his chapters on France, Spain, and Scotland, he claimed to find in each a distinctive national character. In his comparative intellectual history, he found their national characters inferior to that of his beloved England.

Buckle acquired his skepticism from French Enlightenment. He especially admired Montesquieu and Voltaire. The latter inspired him to write sociological history. In his *Essai sur*

les mœurs et l'esprit des nations (1756), Voltaire said: “I wish to write a history, not of wars, but of society; and to ascertain how men lived in the interior of their families.” Among his English contemporaries, John Stuart Mill had the greatest influence on Buckle. Buckle wrote about Mill in *Fraser's Magazine* (May 1859). Mill's stepdaughter Helen Taylor edited *The Miscellaneous and Posthumous Works of Henry Thomas Buckle*, published in 1872.

Although Buckle's publisher—worried about sales—had made the author pay for the printing of the first edition, demand for copies grew and the book had to be reprinted. A second volume followed in 1861.⁵ Buckle died of typhoid fever in Syria May 29, 1862 when he was only forty, so the additional volumes that he had planned never were written. In England, he soon was forgotten. Darwin replaced Buckle as England's intellectual star.⁶ Many historians dismissed Buckle, an outsider who never had attended university, and those who were devout Christians saw Buckle's history as hostile to their beliefs.⁷ In England, Buckle survived mostly as a minor figure in histories of positivism.⁸

A biographer (Giles St. Aubyn) described Buckle's book as “but the fragment of a fragment, consisting of an unfinished introduction to a work he never even began.”⁹ The two volumes that he published quickly disappeared into the dusty back shelves of secondhand bookstores.

There are exceptions to this neglect of Buckle. As late as 1894, George Bernard Shaw told a correspondent that among the few books which had a lasting influence on him were those by Buckle and Marx.¹⁰ Even later, in 1909, Cecil Reddie, the founder and headmaster at Abbotsholme School, replaced Bible readings at chapel with excerpts from Buckle's *Civilization*.¹¹ Buckle no doubt would have liked students hearing bits of his work. He once said that “young men ... are the only readers of much value; it is they who shape the future.”¹²

The anecdote of the humble curate's egg, parts of it not good and parts of it not bad, helps direct this paper's attempt to salvage Buckle's reputation. Many say that as it is partly bad, Buckle's work should be discarded. This paper argues that much of what Buckle wrote deserves attention and respect. Describing Buckle only as a naive advocate of scientific history omits much else about him that is important. For example, how could Buckle attract readers who ranged from English workers to Polish students to Japanese reformers?

As part of the task of reclaiming Buckle, the historian Peter Mandler explained Buckle's confusing title. His book "was a history of civilization, not at all confined to England, but dedicated to explaining why civilization had been achieved first and best in England, why others had been left behind, and how they might catch up."¹³ Buckle's first six chapters explained and illustrated his vision of history as a science. To prepare the way for his eventual study of England, he then followed with chapters for Spain, France, and Scotland. In different ways, they contrasted with England and showed how England was distinctive. Buckle's proposed third volume, which he did not live to write, would have added comparative chapters on Germany and the United States.

In 2011, as a sign that this obscure Victorian historian might still be worth reading, Cambridge University Press reprinted the 1857 and 1861 volumes of *The History of Civilization in England*. In 1970, the University of Chicago Press already had reprinted Buckle's chapters on Scotland.¹⁴

Buckle deserves to be rescued from oblivion for at least two reasons; his popularity outside his homeland and his modelling of what can be called sociological history. In countries such as Russia, Japan, and Brazil, he was seen as a guide to nation-building. Few scholars who wrote so little were translated into so many languages including Yiddish, Armenian, Turkish, and

Urdu. Nation-builders drew encouragement from Buckle when he identified the distribution of wealth as the answer to the perplexing question of how backward countries might climb out of national poverty.¹⁵ It was not only the educated who read Buckle. Workers and radicals gained hope that they could reshape their societies. A British journalist recalled that when travelling in Russia in 1874 he encountered peasants who had copies of a Russian translation of Buckle's *History of Civilization*.¹⁶

One of England's leading Marxist historians, Raphael Samuel, pointed out the origin of Buckle's *History of Civilization in England*: "Descending from the Scottish historical school of the eighteenth century, it was much concerned with evolutionary stages of development and could be described as a kind of secular epic, one reason, perhaps, why it was so appealing to Victorian Freethinkers [such as John Mackinnon Robertson who in 1895 wrote a book, *Buckle and His Critics: A Study in Sociology*, or for a later period, G.A. Wells, "The Critics of Buckle," *Past & Present* 9 (1956)]. Its subject was civil society rather than the state."¹⁷

In 2012, Ian Hesketh modified what Samuel said to cast *The History of Civilization in England* as "a liberal epic." Hesketh pointed out: "Anyone who has read beyond the oft-cited [six-chapter] introduction to Buckle's work knows that what follows is not exactly the promised colorless statistical analysis of the progress of civilization but rather an intellectual history of great men." The wars that Buckle's intellectual heroes fought were "not of the battlefield but of the mind."¹⁸ What Hesketh said is most convincing for Buckle's chapters on eighteenth-century France and Scotland, less so for their earlier chapters, and not at all for the solitary Spanish chapter. Spain had no Voltaire, no Adam Smith.

Unlike his famous contemporaries Thomas Macaulay and Thomas Carlyle, Buckle was little interested in stories about great warriors and rulers and their wars.¹⁹ Dismissing generals

and political leaders, Buckle wrote about great men who were scholars or scientists or literary geniuses.²⁰ Carlyle might have Cromwell, but Buckle had Newton. Macaulay had the Glorious Revolution, but Buckle had the Enlightenment with its host of philosophes.

Buckle acknowledged that great men mattered. “The discoveries of great men never leave us; they are immortal.”²¹ He said: “the two mightiest intellects our country has produced are Shakespeare and Newton.” Adam Smith’s *Wealth of Nations* “looking at its ultimate results, is probably the most important book that has ever been written.”²² He added: “this solitary Scotchman has, by the publication of one single work, contributed more towards the happiness of man, than has been effected by the united abilities of all the statesmen and legislators”²³ Despite saying this, Buckle insisted great men were not what most mattered. Their success depended on the circumstances of the time. “The reformers of our time swam with the stream: they aided what it would have been impossible long to resist.”²⁴

In 2012, science historian Richard R. Donohue, offered another revisionist interpretation of Buckle posting “Henry Buckle and the Wealth and Poverty of Nations,” followed by supplementary posts in 2013 and 2014.²⁵ Donohue argued that Buckle was “significant when placed in the context of the history of ideas” as he “conjoined civilizational progress with the spread of rationalism and the decline of superstition and barbarism.” Moreover, “Buckle’s actual argument [concerned] the importance of the distribution of wealth to the development of the intellect and national character of a people.” Buckle based his analysis on David Ricardo’s theory of rents and wages. According to Buckle, “without wealth there can be no leisure, and without leisure there will be no knowledge.”²⁶ Wealth needed to be widespread for a country to be healthy. Donohue added that “perhaps as importantly, Buckle exemplifies the type of thinker

... who was interested in the dynamics governing the transition of one economic state into another.”

Buckle offended religious people, by his praise of skepticism, but for him, the advance of skepticism brought about progress. Skepticism meant the:

spirit of inquiry, which, during the last two centuries, has gradually encroached on every possible subject; has reformed every department of practical and speculative knowledge; has weakened the authority of the privileged classes, and thus placed liberty on a surer foundation; has chastized the despotism of princes; has restrained the arrogance of the nobles; and has even diminished the prejudices of the clergy.²⁷

Buckle was a non-believer in a devoutly Christian country. Until 1886, the House of Commons did not permit an atheist to take the seat to which he had been elected. Buckle might call himself a deist, an eighteenth-century term, or a freethinker, a term that became popular during his lifetime. The term agnostic was not coined until 1869. Buckle believed in an afterlife but denied that God had any role in establishing the laws of history that shaped human life. “His God, like Carlyle’s, never did anything.”²⁸ He despised all organized religions as superstitious and intolerant and was vehemently anti-clerical.

Unlike many of his contemporaries, Buckle was not a racist. Prominent historians such as Stubbs, Freeman, and John Kemble argued that England’s greatness was the result of its Germanic or Anglo-Saxon inheritance.²⁹ To the contrary, Buckle rejected so-called scientific racism “as original distinctions of race are altogether hypothetical.” “It is ... not to any fanciful peculiarity of race, that we owe the sturdy and enterprising spirit for which the inhabitants of this island have long been remarkable.”³⁰ In 1863, some polygenists broke away from the Ethnological Society to form the Anthropological Society of London. Its head, Dr. James Hunt, was contemptuous toward Africans. “Hunt directed his racist diatribes against the late Henry Thomas Buckle and especially John Stuart Mill, both of whom had attempted to explain differing human conditions on the basis of social and physical influences.”³¹ The cultural historian Peter

Mandler said that “what distinguished Buckle [from others who wrote about the national character] was his uncompromising refusal to dabble in the new politics of race,” and he called attention to “Buckle’s dogmatic anti-racialism.”³²

Buckle anticipated the later Marxist interpretation of England’s seventeenth-century civil wars. Instead of a Puritan Revolution, he saw a class war of the yeomanry and the traders versus the nobility and the clergy and “an outbreak of the democratic spirit.”³³

When Buckle died, Marx was mostly concerned about a friend who had translated the first two volumes of the *History of Civilization* into German and who anticipated paying work as the translator of many additional volumes. Marx wrote Engels on June 18, 1862, that: “Buckle has played a trick on [his translator] Ruge by dying. In his imagination, Ruge had envisaged another library to be written by Buckle and ‘transposed’ into German by Ruge. Poor Ruge! And poor Buckle who, this very day, is traduced by a ‘friend’ in a *testimonium pietatis* in *The Times*.” [dispatch from Beirut by J.S. Stuart-Glennie, 1 June 1862]

Although not a socialist, Buckle was not a class snob. Sensitive to the contrast between wealth and poverty, he said: “It is not right that any man should have two thousand pounds a year and his housemaid only twenty.”³⁴ When friends brought him to a railway station, they were surprised that he purchased a second-class ticket. Buckle explained: “I always talk and often find very intelligent people in those carriages; the first-class travellers are so dull; directly you broach a subject they are frightened.”³⁵ He later rode third-class to accompany his dog named Skye.³⁶

He wanted to know his country’s common people. “Whenever [Buckle] travelled about he always got in conversation with the police and school-teachers.” “In a large town, such as Birmingham, he used to talk through all the worst parts, to observe manners for himself.”³⁷

Not an elitist, Buckle advised his friend Emily Shirreff,

I want my book to get among the Mechanics' Institutes and the *people*; and to tell you the honest truth, I would rather be praised in popular and, as you rightly call them, *vulgar* papers, than in *scholarly* publications. ... [They] are no judges of the critical value of what I have done, but they are admirable judges of its *social* consequences among their own class of readers. And these are they whom I am now beginning to touch, and whom I wish to move."³⁸

Buckle told an American acquaintance that he was pleased with "the numerous letters he had received from working-men." He added that "these letters often surprised him by the acuteness and capacity displayed by their writers."³⁹ For working-class readers, Buckle wanted an inexpensive version of *The History of Civilization in England*, printed on cheap paper without footnotes or references, but his publisher rejected the idea because it might reduce the sales of the more costly edition.⁴⁰

Soon after Buckle died, he was virtually forgotten in his homeland, but what about elsewhere? In many parts of the world, from Brazil to Japan, middle-class readers and a few working-class ones continued to find Buckle relevant. After Buckle had become a distant memory, scholars explored the story of his reception in their countries.⁴¹

In contrast, a study of Buckle's influence in the United States has yet to happen. This article begins the task of finding whether Buckle mattered for some Americans. His neglect is puzzling. Other than Buckle's distaste for organized religion, his ideas fit well with American values.

No translation was needed for Americans, and Appleton quickly published copies of Buckle's two volumes. In the days before international copyright, Appleton paid Buckle nothing for the first volume and a token £50 for the second. The educated middle class did not need to struggle through Buckle's fat volumes, crowded with footnotes, to learn about his ideas. The serious periodical press published long articles, favorable and unfavorable, about *The History of*

Civilization in England. For instance, in October 1858, the *North American Review*, the oldest literary magazine in the country, reported the publication of the first volume in a thirty-five-page review. As a result of the publication of his *History of Civilization*, Buckle became acquainted with American intellectuals such as the Unitarian clergyman Theodore Parker who reviewed Buckle's first volume in a religious periodical. Buckle intended to visit the United States which was to be one of the subjects that he planned to address in his intended third volume, but ill health and then the outbreak of the Civil War prevented the visit.

Buckle's obituary in the *New York Times*, 20 June 1862, is worth quoting in full.

The death of Mr. BUCKLE will perhaps come home with more personal grief to his readers on this side the Atlantic than to his British fellow-countrymen. The whole form of his genius was essentially democratic, and here was something in his bold, aggressive nature, his contempt of tradition and routine and his catholic sympathies, that won strangely on our transatlantic temper. The next volume (the third) of his *History of Civilization*, was moreover to have been occupied with the United States, and if he had been spared, it was his intention this Summer, to have paid a visit to our country, as he thought to find here the best illustrations of the laws of the distribution of knowledge. It is perhaps allowable, therefore, to indulge a feeling of grief that cold obstruction should have fallen on this bright genius who has imported science into History, and from whom we had reason to expect so much.

Like MACAULAY [who died in 1859], BUCKLE leaves behind him only a splendid fragment -- a glorious torso, not a completed and rounded work of art. Indeed, such was the vast scope of his scheme -- from so cosmic a range did he find it necessary to draw his inductions -- that the two volumes of the *History of Civilization in England* which Mr. BUCKLE has left behind, were but a portion of the introduction -- but the propylaeum of a temple which the building brain had planned, and which there are no hands now in all the world fit to execute. This superficial similitude apart, however, there is no resemblance between the two modern historians, each respectively the type of a school of historical composition: MACAULAY, the brilliant annalist and unrivaled painter of historical composition; BUCKLE, the severe analyst, to whom events were only interesting as food for philosophic generalizations, and social phenomena but subjects for scientific induction.

We have no mind here to touch on what are considered the faults and failings of Mr. BUCKLE. Undoubtedly he had his own. He offended fearfully both the Scotch and the Scotch Kirk: just as he offended the High Church tories, aristocrats, bureaucrats, professors and pedants. A rough and terrible iconoclast, no doubt; but let that pass. He has inaugurated a new method in History; and it is not too much to say that no historical composition henceforth can escape the influence of his genius. We can well

apply to BUCKLE's History of Civilization the proud title which THUCYDIDES claimed for his History of the Peloponnesian War -- "a possession forever."

The *New York Times* obituary is worth reading. It argued that Buckle's "essentially democratic" spirit appealed to Americans. It speculated that Buckle meant more for Americans than he did for the British. The concluding paragraph compared Buckle's *History of Civilization* with the history of the Peloponnesian war by Thucydides. Presumably this was an endorsement of scientific history, but this is not said explicitly.

Answering the question who in America read Buckle is not easy. Names of readers are scarce, but here are a few. John William Draper published two major books, the *History of the Intellectual Development of Europe* (1862) and *History of the Conflict between Science and Religion* (1876), that parallel Buckle's *Civilization*. Although Draper never acknowledged any debt, he obviously had read Buckle. When the sharp-tongued botanist J.D. Hooker heard Draper speak at Oxford, echoing what Buckle had written, he complained: "a paper of a yankee donkey called Draper ... did not mend my temper; ... it was all pie of Herbert Spencer and [Henry Thomas] Buckle without the seasoning of either."⁴²

William Francis Allen, a University of Wisconsin history professor, was the rare historian who was enthusiastic. Allen's lecture notes described Buckle explaining his books about civilization.⁴³ Many other writers at least mentioned Buckle. Andrew D. White, president of Cornell University, cited Buckle several times in *A History of the Warfare of Science with Theology in Christendom* (1896). Louisa May Alcott, in her short story "Anna's Whim" (1873), mentioned Buckle's theories about female equality.⁴⁴ John Dewey, philosopher and educational reformer, read Buckle's *History of Civilization* in the late 1870s while an undergraduate at the University of Vermont.⁴⁵ In his book *Progress and Poverty* (1879), the advocate of the single

tax, Henry George, quoted Buckle frequently, sometimes favorably and sometimes not. The famous agnostic Robert G. Ingersoll called Buckle's *History of Civilization* "one of the greatest books in the world."⁴⁶ The feminist Elizabeth Cady Stanton welcomed Buckle's laws of progress and his recognition of the intellectual contribution to society that women made.⁴⁷ In his autobiography, Henry Adams said that "no one except Buckle had tried to link [history] with ideas."⁴⁸ Adams meant no one before Buckle. A "single tax" politician from Manitoba, F.J. Dixon, apparently read Buckle.⁴⁹ Writing in 1922, Arthur Meier Schlesinger said Buckle "did much to open the eyes of historians all over the world to the vital relationship between natural conditions and human development."⁵⁰

African American intellectuals read Buckle. In 1899 Booker T. Washington thanked T. Thomas Fortune for sending him an extract from Buckle and asked where he could obtain Buckle's book.⁵¹ Another black intellectual, Hubert Harrison admired Buckle's scientific approach to history but later moved on from Buckle to socialism.⁵²

By the 1900s few historians had any use for Buckle. Sociologists and other social scientists responded more favorably. For instance, when Thomas Nixon Carver, a Harvard professor edited for his students an anthology, *Sociology and Progress* (1905), it included three chapters excerpted from Buckle.⁵³ Carver praised "Buckle's vast learning and irresistible logic ... especially [the second chapter in Buckle's first volume, "Influence Exercised by Physical Laws over the Organization of Society and over the Character of Individuals"], a monument to his genius which time is not likely to mar. Certainly in this age, ignorance of Buckle argues an incomplete education as truly as does an ignorance of Adam Smith or of Darwin."⁵⁴

Some of Buckle's readers were interested in his Royal Institution address of 1858, "The Influence of Women on the Progress of Knowledge," and not his *History of Civilization*. The

lecture appeared in print many times. It argued that women had ways of learning that men lacked. Buckle's lecture about the intellectual contributions of women was often cited, for instance, in a book, *Women and the Alphabet*, by a Unitarian minister Thomas Wentworth Higginson, published in 1881, and another book, *Women in Science*, by a Catholic priest, J.A. Zahn, published in 1913.

Sociologists knew more about Buckle than other Americans did. In 1866 William Graham Sumner studied theology at Oxford where Buckle was much discussed. Reading him made students ask: could there be a science of society? After Buckle "planted the seed," Sumner shifted his allegiance to Buckle's rival Herbert Spencer, often considered the founder of sociology in the English-speaking world.⁵⁵ Another sociologist, Emory S. Bogardus, in *The Development of Social Thought* (1922), devoted a chapter to "Buckle and Geographic Social Thought," placed between chapters for Marx and for Spencer. Among anthropologists, Franz Boas stood out as reading Buckle in 1882.⁵⁶ A leading twentieth-century geographer Isaiah Bowman (later president of Johns Hopkins University) acknowledged Buckle's influence.⁵⁷

A much belated sign that Buckle was read in the United States (or that a publisher thought he should be read) came in 1947 with the publication of *The Wisdom of Thomas Buckle*, a booklet (labelled B-639), consisting of 26 pages of quotations selected by Elmer C. Helm and Emanuel Haldeman-Julius. Oddly, it called Henry Buckle by his middle name, Thomas. Bound and paginated with the booklet are five pages of contemporary political and religious news and comment. It was reprinted in 2010 and 2013. It was one of the cheap Little Blue Books, of which an estimated 300 to 500 million were sold between 1919 to 1978. The socialist publishing company Haldeman-Julius had its headquarters in non-socialist Kansas. Haldeman-Julius directed its Little Blue Books and its more expensive Big Blue Books at the working class, both

overtly radical booklets and others that sought with books out of copyright to bring culture to the masses. Little Blue Books also included a few original titles.

The Buckle booklet consisted of short quotations from *The History of Civilization in England*. Here is the first quotation: “Political economy has been raised to a science, and by it much light had been thrown on the causes of the unequal distribution of wealth which is the most fertile source of social disturbance.” The existence of *The Wisdom of Thomas Buckle* shows that an American publisher and those who reprinted it thought there was a market for it.

Searching in working-class and radical newspapers might reveal American interest in Buckle. German and other immigrants often published newspapers in their own languages and could read translations of *The History of Civilization in England*. The language of Jewish immigrants from Eastern Europe was Yiddish. Yiddish articles about Buckle were published during the early 1900s in New York City. For instance, Iser Ginzburg, who had emigrated to the United States in 1893, wrote a booklet about Buckle’s philosophy of history.⁵⁸

James J. Oneil, one of the founders of the Socialist Party of America, was a prolific writer on socialist and working-class topics. He quoted Buckle a couple of times in his pioneering book, *The Workers in American History*.⁵⁹ He was one of the editors of the *New Leader*, when in April 1927, the *American Mercury* published his article, “The Socialists in the War.” It lamented that an ill-informed public opinion helped the government suppress anti-war protests. Within a year of American entry into the war, twenty socialist newspapers were “thrown out of the mails.” In September 1917 Federal police (Oneil called them the Cheka after the Soviet secret police) raided the headquarters of the Socialist Party. The article began with a quotation from Buckle’s review of John Stuart Mill’s *On Liberty*. Buckle acknowledged the importance of political despotism but argued that there was a worse kind of despotism. “This is

the despotism of custom to which ordinary minds entirely succumb, and before which even strong minds quail.”⁶⁰

There is much room for more research. The *New York Times* obituary made me hope to find more Buckle readers. Although wrong about laws of history, analogous to those of physics or astronomy, Henry Thomas Buckle was a great and pioneering sociological historian. Finally, it should be mentioned that Buckle was the inspiration for the enormously popular eleven-volume *Story of Civilization* written by Will Durant (eventually in collaboration with his wife Ariel Durant). The idea for this sprawling history came to Will Durant in 1912 when he was ill with dysentery in Damascus, the Syrian city where Buckle had died of typhoid fever in 1862 after having published only two volumes of his *History of Civilization*.⁶¹

ENDNOTES

¹ Thomas William Heyck’s entry for Buckle in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* supersedes the entry by Sir Leslie Stephen in the old *Dictionary of National Biography*. The standard book-length study of Buckle is Giles St. Aubyn, *A Victorian Eminence: The Life and Work of Henry Thomas Buckle* (Barrie, 1958). Still valuable is the old biography by Alfred Henry Huth, *Life and Writings of Henry Thomas Buckle* (Sampson Low and others, 1880) which includes many letters. At the age of twelve, Huth had accompanied Buckle to Egypt and Syria. Recently valuable book chapters have appeared by Ian Hesketh in *The Science of History in Victorian England* (Pickering & Chatto, 2011), and Lawrence Goldman in *Victorians and Numbers: Statistics and Society* (Oxford University Press, 2012). An earlier important article is Bernard Semmel, “H.T. Buckle: The Liberal Faith and the Science of History,” *British Journal of Sociology* 27 no. 3 (Sept. 1976).

² A lengthy review of the Huth biography in the *Academy* (7 Feb. 1880) by William Minto offered an eccentric view of a Buckle who never took himself or his speculations seriously. Minto said that Buckle did not develop his idea of scientific history and was content to make others think. This seems not like the arrogant Buckle who irritated many of his contemporaries. Minto also told a story of a youthful Buckle who, visiting an old nurse, threw her daughter’s cat out a window and then sauntered down the street swiping fruit from shop displays. Minto saw a similar impishness in Buckle when he was a man in his thirties, although without throwing cats out of windows. This is not convincing. Buckle was a vain man who never bothered to own a chess board when he was a champion player. He could practice all his moves in his mind.

Buckle rarely met anyone that he considered his equal other than John Stuart Mill and perhaps Darwin.

³ Semmel, p. 379.

⁴ Brian W. Young, *The Victorian Enlightenment: An Intellectual History* (Oxford University Press, 2009), p. 159. Young emphasized how the Scottish Enlightenment influenced Buckle.

⁵ Of the 3000 copies printed, 2956 were sold immediately. The remaining copies belonged to the author. Mark Francis, *Herbert Spencer and the Invention of Modern Life* (Taylor & Francis, 2014), p. 145. Francis cited the Longmans archives which had acquired the records of Buckle's publisher.

⁶ Darwin published his *Origin of the Species* in 1859.

⁷ E.A. Freeman boasted: "I said from the beginning that Buckle was an ignorant windbag, and now everybody says so." Freeman to James Bryce, 11 July 1875. Quoted in James Kirby, *Historians and the Church of England: Religion and Historical Scholarship, 1870-1920* (Oxford University Press, 2016), p. 191.

⁸ Christopher Parker, "English Historians and the Opposition to Positivism," *History and Theory*, 22 no. 2 (May 1983).

⁹ St. Aubyn, p. 184. St. Aubyn speculated that, if Buckle had lived another twenty years, he would have finished the work that he had projected. This seems unlikely, as in St. Aubyn's own book (pp. 60-62), Buckle was described as near collapse after he had struggled to complete the second volume.

¹⁰ Semmel, p. 370.

¹¹ *Miscellaneous and Posthumous Works* 1: 16-17. Quoted in Baldwin, p. 5.

¹² Hale, p. 490.

¹³ Mandler, *The English National Character* (Yale University Press, 2006), p. 82.

¹⁴ Unless I borrow a passage from a book in which it had been quoted, I cite the pagination in the Cambridge University Press reprint for the first volume. I use the D. Appleton reprint for Spain. For the Scottish chapters, I cite H.J. Hanham's edition of Buckle's *On Scotland and the Scottish Intellect* (University of Chicago Press, 1970). His "Editor's Introduction" is an excellent introduction to Buckle. Mostly a historian of England, Hanham published a book called *Scottish Nationalism* in 1969.

¹⁵ In 2012 a historian of science, Christopher R. Donohue, posted on an obscure Internet site his important essay, "Henry Buckle and the Wealth and Poverty of Nations." The Internet site was the History and Historiography of Science (part of a larger site for Ether Wave Propaganda).

¹⁶ St. Aubyn, p. 31. This journalist reported that in towns, he "rarely had a serious conversation without hearing Buckle's name mentioned." Huth 2: 87 n. 8

¹⁷ Raphael Samuel, "Grand Narratives," *History Workshop* 29 (Spring 1990): 130.

¹⁸ Ian Hesketh, book review of Edward Adams, *Liberal Epic*, in *Journal of British Studies* 51 no. 3 (July 2012): 251. Adams included a chapter "Utilitarianism and the Intellectual Critique of War: Mill, Creasy, and Buckle."

¹⁹ See Yaacov Shavit. “Thomas Carlyle versus Henry Thomas Buckle: ‘Great Man’ versus ‘Historical Laws’,” in ChaeRan Y. Freeze and others, eds., *The Individual in History: Essays in Honor of Jehuda Reinharz* (Brandeis University Press, 2015). Regretting the absence of Carlyle from the discussion of Victorian historians, Ciaran Brady calls Carlyle “perhaps the most important British thinker on the nature and purpose of history--writing in the early nineteenth century.” Review of *The Science of History in Victorian Britain*, by Ian Hesketh, and Samuel Rawson Gardiner and the *Idea of History*, by Mark Nixon, in *English Historical Review* 127 (Dec. 2012): 1551. Ciaran Brady wrote *James Anthony Froude: An Intellectual Biography of a Victorian Prophet* (Oxford University Press, 2013).

²⁰ Edward Adams, *Liberal Epic: The Victorian Practice and History from Gibbon to Churchill* (University of Virginia Press, 2011), p. 251.

²¹ *Civilization* 1: 206.

²² *Civilization* 1: 194. See also Roger Baldwin, “Henry Thomas Buckle: A Re-Evaluation” (Ph.D. dissertation, NYU, 1967), pp. 236, 238. Baldwin spent his life teaching at a small liberal arts college and apparently published nothing about Buckle. A leading intellectual historian credited Buckle with making a new interpretation of Adam Smith. Simon J. Cook, *The Intellectual Foundations of Alfred Marshall’s Economic Science: A Rounded Globe of Knowledge* (Cambridge University Press, 2009), pp 25-26.

²³ *Civilization* 1: 197.

²⁴ *Civilization* 1: 252.

²⁵ For Donohue, see his Internet post, 30 May 2012, “Henry Buckle and the Wealth and Poverty of Nations.” in Ether Wave Propaganda: History and Historiography of Science. Donohue’s extended his new look at Buckle on 18 October 2013 in a comparative internet article, “John William Draper and Henry Buckle on Law Causality,” and further extended it in an Internet post, 30 Nov. 2014, very briefly in “The Intellectual Worlds of Henry C. Cary,” at the Ether Wave Propaganda site for the History of Economic Thought.

²⁶ *Civilization* 1: 31.

²⁷ *Civilization* 1: 308.

²⁸ Benn, p. 177.

²⁹ Benn.

³⁰ *Civilization 1*: 36-37, 447. Ian Hesketh, *The Science of History in Victorian England: Making the Past Speak* (Pickering & Chatto, 2011), p. 51. Hesketh's book includes a chapter, "The Enlarging Horizon: Henry Thomas Buckle's Science of History." See also Peter Mandler, "'Race' and 'Nation' in Mid-Victorian Thought," in Stefan Collini and others, eds., *History, Religion, and Culture: British Intellectual History, 1750-1950* (Cambridge University Press, 2009), and his *English National Character*; Jonathan Conlin, "An Illiberal Descent: Natural and National History in the Work of Charles Kingsley," *History* 96 (2011). There is a large and growing literature about E.A. Freeman. See Theodore Koditschek, "A Liberal Descent? E.A. Freeman's Invention of Racial Traditions," in G.A. Bremner and Jonathan Conlin, eds., *Making History: Edward Augustus Freeman and Victorian Cultural Politics* (British Academy, 2015); Simon John Cook, "The Making of the English: British Identity, Aryan Villages, 1870-1914," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 75 no. 4 (October 2014); and for a defense of Freeman, Vicky L. Morrisroe, "'Sanguinary Amusement': E.A. Freeman, the Comparative Method and Victorian Theories of Race," *Modern Intellectual History* 10 no. 1 (2013), who correctly pointed out that Freeman rejected a biological interpretation of race. Most recently, there is Vicky Randall, *History, Empire, and Islam: E. A. Freeman and Victorian Public Morality* (Manchester University Press, 2020). Freeman was vehemently anti-Semitic. For Froude, see Thomas W. Thompson, *James Anthony Froude on Nation and Empire: A Study in Victorian Racialism* (Garland, 1987). A Lowlands Scot, Thomas Carlyle supported Anglo-Saxon racism. Lord Acton quoted the racist Gobineau sympathetically.

³¹ Ronald Rainger, "Race, Politics, and Science: The Anthropological Society of London in the 1860s," *Victorian Studies* 22 no. 1 (Autumn 1978): 63. A more extreme group of racists formed the Cannibal Club, an exclusive dining club led by Richard Burton.

³² Mandler, *The English National Character*, pp. 82, 85. Stocking claimed that Buckle "toyed" with racial interpretations in the early 1850s but does not cite evidence. George W. Stocking, Jr., *Victorian Anthropology* (Free Press, 1987), p. 139. Buckle published nothing until 1857.

³³ Buckle, *Civilization 1*: 469, 473. See the mostly favorable entry about Buckle in the *Great Soviet Encyclopedia* (1979).

³⁴ Stephen, *The English Utilitarians* (Putnam's 1900), pp. 344-75.

Huth 2: 57.

³⁵ Huth 2: 58.

³⁶ Huth 2: 89.

³⁷ Octavia Huth, quoted in Huth 2: 103, 104.

³⁸ Huth 1: 142. It is not surprising that in his *Genealogy of Morals*, Nietzsche savaged Buckle. It was in Buckle's writings supposedly that the "plebeianism of the modern spirit, which is of English origin, broke out once again from its malignant soil."

³⁹ Charles Hale, "Personal Reminiscences of the Late Henry Thomas Buckle," *Atlantic*, April 1863, p. 489.

⁴⁰ Hale, pp. 495-96. In November 1860 at Brighton, Buckle for the first time met the Radical editor, George Holyoake. Huth 2: 36. Holyoake "wishes me to publish an edition of my History on common paper for six shillings, leaving out the notes." Buckle's diary, 18 November [1860] Quoted in Huth 2: 180 footnote 26 (which seems to misplace the meeting as in Egypt).

⁴¹ Such as Fiona McIntosh-Varjabédian, "Henry Thomas Buckle's *The History of Civilization in England* in France (1865–1918): A Transnational Reception Case," *Reception: Texts, Readers, Audiences, History* (2019) 11 no. 1; Andrzej Feliks Grabski, "Polish Enthusiasts and Critics of Henry T. Buckle," *Organon* 7 (1970); A. Várkonyi, "Buckle and Hungarian Bourgeois

-
- Historiography,” *Acta Historica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 10 no. 1/2 (1963); Alejandro Gomes Romero, “No país dos ventos alísios: leituras sobre Henry Thomas Buckle no Brasil republicano (1880-1900),” in *Revista Vernáculo* (2016), with an English language abstract; Danny S.L. (Shiu-lam) Paa, “Visions of Culture from Victorian England to Meiji Japan: The Case of Henry Thomas Buckle (1821-1862),” *Asian Culture Quarterly* (Winter 1987).
- ⁴² Quoted in James C. Ungureanu, “Yankee at Oxford: John William Draper at the British Association for the Advancement of Science at Oxford, 30 June 1860,” *Notes and Records, the Royal Society Journal of the History of Science* 70 no. 2 (June 2016), unpaginated online.
- ⁴³ Wilbur R. Jacobs, *On Turner’s Trail* (University Press of Kansas, 1994), p. 44. After being Frederick Jackson Turner’s history professor, Allen remained a lifelong friend.
- ⁴⁴ Julia Nitz, “Love and Gender Relations, and Women’s Education in Louisa May Alcott’s ‘Anna’s Whim’—A Close Reading of Intertextual Allusions,” *European Journal of American Studies* 17 no.3 (2022). Nitz cited Buckle’s relevant lecture which he published in the same year, “The Influence of Women on the Progress of Knowledge: A Discourse Delivered at the Royal Institution, on Friday, the 19th of March, 1858.” It was published in *Fraser’s Magazine*, April 1858, and reprinted in the first volume of *The Miscellaneous and Posthumous Works of Henry Thomas Buckle*.
- ⁴⁵ Lewis S. Feuer, “John Dewey’s Reading at College,” *Journal of the History of Ideas* 19 no. 3 (June 1958): 421.
- ⁴⁶ *The Works of Robert G. Ingersoll* (Dresden, 1900) 1: 107.
- ⁴⁷ Elizabeth Cady Stanton, *Feminist as Thinker: A Reader in Documents and Essays*, ed. Ellen Carol Dubois and Richard Cándida Smith (NYU Press, 2007), pp. 202, 243.
- ⁴⁸ *The Education of Henry Adams: An Autobiography* (Riverside Press, 1918), p. 221.
- ⁴⁹ Allen Mills, “Single Tax, Socialism and the Independent Labour Party of Manitoba: The Political Ideas of F.J. Dixon and S.J. Farmer,” *Labour* 5 (1980): 40.
- ⁵⁰ Schlesinger, *New Viewpoints in American History* (Macmillan, 1922), pp. 44-45.
- ⁵¹ Washington to Fortune, 1 March 1899. Quoted in *The Booker T. Washington Papers* (University of Illinois Press, 1972-89) 5: 46.
- ⁵² *A Hubert Harrison Reader*, ed., Jeffrey B. Perry (Wesleyan University Press, 2001), p. 33.
- ⁵³ Roger Baldwin, “Henry Thomas Buckle: A Re-Evaluation” (Ph.D. dissertation, NYU, 1967), p. 24. Another American doctoral dissertation looked at Buckle comparatively, Harold A. Petersen, “The Concept of Freedom: A Study in Liberal Values of Buckle, Acton, and Lecky” (Ph.D. dissertation, Northern Illinois University, 1973).
- ⁵⁴ Carver was both an economist and a sociologist.
- ⁵⁵ Harris E. Starr, *William Graham Sumner* (Holt, 1925), p. 72; Robert Bierstedt, *American Sociological Theory* (Elsevier, 2014), p. 2 (for the quotation).
- ⁵⁶ Marvin Harris, *The Rise of Anthropological Theory* (1968; revised edition, AtlaMira, 2001), p. 265.
- ⁵⁷ T.W. Freeman and others, eds., *Geographers: Biographical Studies* (Bloomsbury Academic, 2016) 1: 1936.
- ⁵⁸ *Jewish Language Review* 4 (1984): 175. See also the 66-page abridgement of Buckle, translated into Yiddish by Alter Bresler and Isaac Notovich, *Geshikhṭe der tsiyilizatsyon in England*. Buckle’s name was given as H.T. Bachl.
- ⁵⁹ I have not found the year when Oneil’s book was first published, but National Rip-Saw Press published a second edition in 1910. By 1921 there was a fourth edition.
- ⁶⁰ Reprinted in *The Miscellaneous and Posthumous Works of Henry Thomas Buckle*, p. 46.

⁶¹ Obituary in *New York Times*, 9 Nov. 1981.