

A Five Per Cent Racist? Rejoinder to Professor Hutchison

Michael V. White*

The comparison of races is no doubt an invidious task, which might sometimes lead to trouble, but I do not see that in statistical inquiries you can suppress plain facts. I think that in legislation relating to different parts of the United Kingdom it is always well to be reminded that there may be distinctly different races to be dealt with, and the more mixture of races can be promoted the better ...

W. Stanley Jevons.¹

My discussion of "The 'Irish Factor' in Jevons' Statistics" (White 1993) was one of three recent papers which considered some aspects of the roles of the categories of race, class, gender and 'character' in Jevons' political economy. Unlike the other two papers (White 1992; 1994), the arguments and material concerning the 'Irish factor' were condensed into the short space of a Note. In retrospect, that was a mistake. I therefore welcome the opportunity to consider in some detail the content and the context of Jevons' arguments which will enable a clear comparison to be made with Professor Hutchison's claims about the same material.

The analysis is presented in five main sections. The first three consider Jevons' argument about the effects of Irish immigration on British mortality statistics. This was initially presented in an 1870 Presidential Address to Section F of the British Association (Jevons 1883, pp.194-216). After the statistics which Jevons used to support his claim are considered in section I, the next section discusses the contemporary critique of the Address by T. R. Wilkinson. Section III then analyses Jevons' discussion of the Irish in England in the wake of Wilkinson's critique. Finally, sections IV and V consider a number of other matters which have been raised by Hutchison.

I The Old Supposition

The context for Jevons' remarks in his Presidential Address regarding the Irish and mortality rates was a sometimes acrimonious debate in Manchester during 1870.² There had been increasing concern in the 1860s regarding the high mortality rates in 'towns' such as Liverpool, Manchester and Salford, with particular attention paid to the plight of children. In early 1870, the astronomer to the Manchester corporation, Joseph Baxendell, argued that the Mancunian child mortality rate was actually lower than in any other 'leading manufacturing town in England'. The high total mortality rate could thus not be due, as had been claimed, to women working outside the home and neglecting their children. Baxendell argued that, instead, it was the result of changes in climatic conditions and he effectively suggested that more resources should be directed towards the study of meteorology rather than to 'sanitary improvement'. Criticism of Baxendell then focused on his peculiar statistical procedures which had the effect of concealing the high infant mortality rate in Manchester. For the principal critics, while there was no single cause of the mortality rates, the problem was closely related to "the congregation of masses of the populace within contracted areas".³

Referring to this debate in his Presidential Address, Jevons observed that the "excessive mortality in great towns" now appeared to be 'perplexing'. While it could not be explained by women with young children working in factories,⁴ neither was it due to the 'situation' of the towns (i.e. their size and site). Jevons introduced his own contribution to the debate by expressing 'surprise' that "more attention has not been given to the probable influence of a poor Irish population in raising the death-rate". This was because "the great towns which are most unhealthy

agree in containing a large proportion of Irish, and agree on nothing else which I can discover" (Jevons 1883, p.208). The statistical evidence to support this claim was given in an Appendix (*ibid.* pp.213-16), where Jevons reported that he had "tested the suggestions made in the text in a variety of ways, and ... in almost every case, met with confirmatory evidence" (*ibid.* p.213). This evidence was of two types. The first consisted of data for a series of 'towns', recording the proportion of Irish in the population (PIP) and the mortality rate (MR) per 1,000 of the population. The second, which was far less detailed than the first, concerned the Irish MR. Each type of evidence will be examined so as to explain the form of Jevons' argument and the criticism which followed his Address.

Most of the data on the PIP and the MR was presented in three tables, referred to here as A, B and C. Table A listed nine "principal" English 'towns', showing the PIP from the 1861 Census and the average MR between 1851-60 (Jevons 1883, p.213).⁵ Jevons concluded that this showed that the high MR in Liverpool and Manchester was "in striking conformity with their large" PIP. The figures for Salford, however, were not as striking as Jevons would have liked because he suggested that "more recent returns" for the town "would also exhibit conformity". The "only serious exception" was Sheffield, although no consideration was given as to why that might be the case or what the significance of the exception might be (*ibid.* p.214).

It seems doubtful that Jevons' contemporaries would have been surprised by the news that Liverpool and Manchester had a relatively high MR and PIP. What Jevons required to 'confirm' his "supposition that English mortality is greatly influenced by Irish immigration" (Jevons 1883, p.216) was some evidence that the variations in the MR bore a clear relationship to the variations in the PIP for the towns he had listed. Examination of this point was not, however, facilitated by the way in which Jevons presented the information in the table. Since he ranked the towns from highest to lowest using the PIP, it was not possible to clearly identify the relation between changes in the MR (the dependent variable) and the PIP (the explanatory variable). To enable that comparison, Table 1 uses Jevons' data to rank the towns by their MR which can then be compared with the respective PIP. Here, as in Jevons' presentation, Liverpool and Manchester lead the other towns in terms of both the MR and PIP. It is evident, however, that in a number of cases the sign of the changes in the MR and PIP is inconsistent with Jevons' posited relationship. Moreover, the variability in the extent of the changes might caution against drawing any conclusion about a direct causal relationship.

In Table C, Jevons (1883, p.215) also used the PIP to rank eight Scottish towns, although the period for the MR was an average between 1855-63. The towns were then divided into two groups. The first (consisting of Dundee, Glasgow, Greenock and Paisley) had a 'large' PIP (21.7 on average) with a high MR (av. 28.7); the second (Edinburgh, Leith, Perth and Aberdeen) had a 'small' PIP (av. 5.5) and a low MR (av. 23.8). Since Jevons provided both the average figures and the particular MR and PIP for each town, it is again possible to compare the changes in the two variables by ranking the towns using the MR. The results are shown in Table 2. Not surprisingly, the towns with the highest MR have the greatest PIP. However, the first three towns suggest an inverse relationship for the changes in the two variables and there is marked variability in the table.

While Tables A and C ranked towns by the PIP, Jevons reversed that procedure in Table B. Here, eighteen English towns were considered, including those in Table A with the exception of Salford. The towns were ranked by MR and the data presented in three groups: Group 1 with an average MR of 28 or more; Group 2 with between 24-26; Group 3 with 24 or less. The statistical basis for the MR in this table relied on just one year (1861). This was quite different from the MR in tables A and C which recorded an average for a number of years. Since mortality rates could differ noticeably from one year to another, both in the aggregate and for particular towns,⁶ this average ranking by the MR should be treated with some caution. Indeed, variability in the annual MR could help explain a number of anomalies when Table B is compared with Table A. For example, while the MR in A suggests that Sheffield would appear in Group 1 in Table B, it is relegated to Group 2. Again, while Leeds has a higher MR than Newcastle in Table A, only Newcastle appears in Group 1 in Table B. A further oddity is that while Newcastle is listed in

Group 1, with an average PIP of 21.9, the actual PIP for Newcastle shown in Table A was 9.0. While these anomalies can be identified from Tables A and B, it is not possible to make any further comparisons because Jevons did not provide specific information on the MR and PIP for each town in Table B. Given the peculiarities which can be identified from the limited information, however, it is not clear how much reliance can be placed on the average measures.

Jevons' 'confirmatory evidence', as it appeared in the Appendix, of a clear relationship between the MR and the PIP thus appears questionable. Moreover, given the terms of the contemporary debate concerning 'excess mortality', it would not be surprising if a critic was to argue that, even if a firm statistical relationship could be established between the two variables, this would be a spurious correlation since other factors (such as overcrowding and poor sanitation) could explain the MR. Jevons' first type of statistical evidence was thus not specific enough to establish a causal role for the PIP given that there were competing explanations for the MR. The second type of evidence to which he referred could, however, provide the means to assess his analysis more directly. Jevons' argument required that the Irish MR was greater than that for the rest of the population. It could therefore be directly confirmed or rejected by clear MR statistics. If, however, the evidence was unclear, the argument had to rest on an unsubstantiated assumption.

Although Jevons made no mention of any MR statistics for the Irish population in Britain, he did acknowledge that it appeared necessary to "ascertain whether the mortality in Ireland at all bears out the apparent effect of Irish immigration into England" (Jevons 1883, p.216). The only evidence Jevons cited in that regard was for Dublin and he reported that "the average for a few years" showed the MR and the birth-rate (BR) to be roughly equal at 26.1 per 1000 of the population. Both of these were "low" when compared with the British figures, although there was "one return" (presumably for one year - this was not made clear) which showed an MR of 33.6 and a BR of 24.7 (ibid. pp.209, 216). Since the BR was greater than the MR "in England and other progressive countries", Jevons concluded that either the Irish population was in "an abnormal state" or the Irish statistical returns were "wholly unworthy of confidence". After noting that other complaints had been made about the "apparent untrustworthiness" of the returns, Jevons argued that until "we know to what extent the returns are defective, they are simply misleading and mischievous; but if they are at all approximate to the truth, they lend strong support to the supposition that English mortality is greatly influenced by Irish immigrants" (ibid. p.216). This was a peculiar argument. If the Dublin returns were 'wholly unworthy of confidence', Jevons had no information on which to base his crucial assumption about the Irish MR. Alternatively, the Dublin returns could 'lend strong support' to his case only if he relied upon the one return where the MR exceeded the BR.⁷ This would require the arbitrary dismissal of the average MR which was lower than those recorded in Table A for Sheffield, Leeds, Newcastle and Birmingham, all of which had a low PIP. Jevons' key assumption was therefore either completely unsubstantiated or depended on one return.

Professor Hutchison has drawn attention to the possible importance of Jevons' 'teenage' years in Liverpool, where he was born in 1835 (Hutchison 1994, section II).⁸ During the 1830s and 1840s large numbers of Irish immigrants arrived in Liverpool and Manchester. (In five months during 1847, there were 300,000 immigrants to Liverpool, when the native population was 250,000 (Swift 1990, p.21). It was often claimed at the time that the immigrants increased the total MR so that "the Irish became an easy target and the *poor* Irish, who were the only *visible* Irish, became convenient scapegoats for environmental degradation" (ibid. p.21 OE).⁹ While one historian has argued that "there (now) appears to be no substantial proof of the supposition" that the Irish increased the MR (Jackson 1963, p.55), it had been subjected to a careful examination in the 1845 report of the Commissioners' inquiry into the 'state of large towns and populous districts'. A supplement to the report, prepared by Commissioner Playfair, analysed the case of Liverpool, drawing on a wide range of evidence to show that the MR of Irish immigrants was actually lower than that for the population overall (Playfair 1845). While that study showed the importance of carefully examining potential sources of evidence regarding the Irish MR in Lancashire, there is no indication that, twenty five years later, Jevons was interested in such a

detailed investigation. Although the rate of increase in the population attributable to Irish immigrants had peaked by 1851 and the PIP by 1861 (Davis 1989, pp.105-7; Swift 1990, p.12), Jevons appears to have drawn on a 'popular memory' in giving new voice to the 1840s supposition. He was, however, alone in resurrecting it during the 1870 statistical debate on 'excess mortality'.

How does Hutchison evaluate the arguments in Jevons' Address? Without providing any analysis of the statistical tables, he simply offers the opinion that they "purport and seem to indicate, very broadly, that the towns with the highest mortality rates have the larger proportion of Irish residents" (Hutchison 1994, s. III). Apparently unable to grasp what type of evidence was required to substantiate Jevons' supposition, Hutchison then claims that Jevons presented his argument as a "tentative generalisation". The statistical tables were only designed to reveal a "probable influence" - (i.e. obviously not the only influence) - on mortality rates" and Jevons referred to his argument as merely a "suggestion" which required "further investigation". It is misleading for Hutchison to imply here that it is necessary to defend Jevons against the suggestion that he had argued that the 'only' influence on mortality rates was the presence of Irish immigrants. That move distracts attention from the context of the contemporary debate where, as Jevons noted, it was necessary to explain the 'excessive mortality' in a number of towns when compared with others. While indicating that "further investigation" was required before his "suggestion" could provide a basis for policy measures, Jevons was quite clear about the properties of his own statistical 'tests'. After presenting the tables for English towns, he concluded that "these facts appeared to me to be almost of a conclusive character by themselves"; then, with the addition of the Scottish towns in Table C, "we meet with the strongest possible corroboration" (Jevons 1883, pp.209, 215). In making no mention of these statements, Hutchison confuses two components of the rhetorical style of Jevons' argument. On the one hand, if a general policy was to be implemented taking account of the Irish factor, it would require "further investigation" to support it, if only because the information in Jevons' statistical exercise was not detailed enough to "point out exactly where most attention is needed" (Jevons 1883, p.209). On the other hand, the more detailed work could proceed because Jevons had provided 'almost conclusive evidence', indeed the 'strongest possible corroboration' for the role of the Irish factor. This was far from being the 'tentative generalisation' which Hutchison has constructed.

II A Class Act

The basic problems with Jevons' analysis were soon identified by the banker, Thomas Wilkinson. In a short paper read to the Manchester Statistical Society, Wilkinson diplomatically suggested that, "(w)ith all respect for so eminent an authority as Professor Jevons, I think ... (that his) statistics ... do not satisfactorily explain the high rate of mortality in our towns" (Wilkinson 1871, p.51). In part, the problem was due to the extent of variations in the MR and PIP for the towns in Tables A and C. Wilkinson noted, for example, that Newcastle, Leeds, Birmingham and Sheffield had an average PIP of 7.25 and an average MR of 27.5. This was higher than the MR in Paisley (26.5) where the PIP was 18.1. Again, Salford, Newcastle, Bradford, Leeds, Birmingham, Sheffield and London had the same (av.) MR as that for Paisley but an av. PIP of only 8. Moreover, while Dundee and Paisley had an av. PIP of 20.9 and an av. MR of 26.9, this was only slightly above the av. MR of 26 for Sheffield and London, where the av. PIP was 5.4. Wilkinson concluded that "the question is decidedly more complicated than appears at first sight" from Jevons' tables (*ibid.* pp.51,52).

Wilkinson then argued that Jevons' statistics were more consistent with a different explanation for the mortality rates. Referring to the four Scottish towns with the high average MR, he noted that they contained "a large proportion of the population working at a high pressure for mere sustenance ... The group in which we should expect to find the death rate high is that in which the population is more densely packed, and where the competition for the struggle for life is very keen." Because the "large, life-producing centres are also the places where the destroying forces

are also most active", Wilkinson was not "surprised" to see them having the highest MR in Jevons' Table C (Wilkinson 1871, pp.52-3).

Wilkinson's analysis was not restricted to a critique of and an alternative explanation for Jevons' aggregate statistics with regard to the Scottish towns. Following in Playfair's footsteps, he provided further support for his explanation by reporting results from a survey, conducted in 1868, of the Gaythorn and Knott Mill districts in Manchester which contained 592 families. The survey also provided direct evidence controverting Jevons' assumption on the MR. For the one third of the families who were Irish had a lower child MR (39 per cent) than the English families (44 per cent) (Wilkinson 1871, p.51). Wilkinson then discussed the conditions in two groups of houses in Knott Mill. The first, with an Irish population of 32 per cent, contained 80 families; the second, with an Irish population of approximately 50 per cent, had 92 families. In both cases, the child MR was lower for the Irish as compared with the English families (ibid. p.53). Nevertheless, the total child MR was alarmingly high. It was due, Wilkinson argued, to overcrowding and the inadequate sewerage and sanitation system. He illustrated this with an example of two Knott Mill courts where there were 27 houses with "only two privies for general use at the end of each court", describing some of the terrible results (ibid. p.54; see also White 1993, p.83). Jevons had noted that the problem of the high Mancunian MR might appear 'perplexing' in part because the city was often "considered the best paved, best watered, and in some other respects, the best managed town in the country" (Jevons 1883, p.207). Wilkinson presented a different perspective: "The responsibility for so dreadful a state of things existing at this day in any quarter of the city is all the greater from the fact, that so long ago as 1832 public attention was most urgently directed to the extensive existence of similar evils by Dr. Kay, now Sir J. Kay Shuttleworth, and has since been pressed upon public attention by sanitary reformers" (Wilkinson 1871, p.54). In summary, Wilkinson identified problems with Jevons' aggregate data, provided an alternative explanation and used more fine-grained evidence to support it which showed the lack of a positive relation between the PIP and the MR. For these reasons, it does not seem outrageous to conclude that his analysis provided a "refutation" which was "devastating" for Jevons' argument (White 1993, p.81).

For Hutchison, however, those conclusions are "wildly exaggerated, and simply exemplify White's own uncontrolled prejudices". Instead, the "obvious outcome" of the Jevons-Wilkinson exchange, "for anyone not excessively prejudiced, was that there was no conclusive empirical-statistical evidence" for "either" case (Hutchison 1994, s. IV. OE). Three points are adduced to support these claims. First, without explaining Wilkinson's discussion of Jevons' tables, Hutchison simply observes that the "criticism is well-reasoned as far as it goes". No information is given, however, on where it did 'go' and the reader is given no means of assessing its significance. Second, the relevance of the Gaythorn and Knott Mill survey is dismissed with the claim that "the figures are based on much too small a population of some 70-80 families, to be highly significant". As was noted above, however, the survey district included nearly 600 families. Hutchison's third tack is to suggest that Wilkinson's analysis was not really incompatible with that of Jevons': "Wilkinson pointed to a possible compromise between his own view and that of Jevons ... (by recognising) the probability of Jevons's assumption that the Irish immigrants were very much poorer and prone to drink excessively than the poorest of the native population". Although this crucial point escaped Jevons' notice, since he subsequently described Wilkinson's paper as "the opposite opinion" to his own (Jevons 1883, p.159n), I am then accused of omitting any mention of Wilkinson's 'compromise' from my Note because it was damaging to the analysis (Hutchison 1994, s. IV). The 'compromise' quotation used by Hutchison thus deserves careful consideration. In the section of the article to which Hutchison refers, Wilkinson described the conditions in Knott Mill and then continued with the following paragraph where Hutchison's quotation has been italicised:

If light and air and cleanliness, as well as wholesome food and drink, are necessary to human life, then under conditions such as I have described, we should, as a matter of course, expect to find humanity dwarfed, sickly, diseased, and dying. And although it may be true that the Irish element aggravates some of the conditions, because it is an influx of that class (the poor and

the ignorant,) which in all nationalities suffers, and is a constant and prolific source of anxiety and loss to the community, in which it exists: still I think we shall be nearer the truth if we say that the high rate of mortality in large towns is caused by an increasing proportion of the very poor to the whole population, rather than by a large proportion of poor Irish (Wilkinson 1871, pp.54-5. EA).

Two things are evident from this paragraph. First, there is no mention (nor was there in Jevons' Address for that matter) of 'excessive drinking'. Second, the section of the sentence omitted from Hutchison's quotation leaves no doubt that Wilkinson considered that the mortality rate was due to the increasing proportion of the very poor in the population and the conditions in which they lived. More specifically, as Wilkinson then argued, the mortality rate was due to the concentration of the "commonest labourers" in "the interior of the cities and towns" which had been vacated by the "rich and middle class" (*ibid.* p.55). Whereas Jevons had explained the existence of excessive mortality by "the effect of nationality" (*ibid.* p.49), for Wilkinson it was a matter of class.

III Race and Character

That Jevons realised his argument required some clear evidence on Irish mortality rates is indicated in a letter written to his brother in 1874. Reporting that he was "going again into the subject of mortality, and the effect of the Irish population on mortality in English towns", Jevons referred to data from the USA Census (supplied by his brother) as "quite countenancing my theory" because it showed, in part, that the States with "higher" mortality rates had a larger proportion of "Irish deaths" than States with lower mortality rates (Black 1973-81, IV, p.55). While this was hardly conclusive evidence, Jevons was never to publish any data on the Irish mortality rate in 'English towns'. He did continue to assert, however, that the key assumption required for his argument was valid. In 1875, for example, he was recorded as telling his students during a lecture at Owens College that "the way the Irish live, especially in some of our large towns and in some parts of their own country, makes it a priori probable that they die fast" (*ibid.*, VI, p.59). The grounds for that 'a priori probability' were indicated in a note which Jevons prepared for the lecture:

Chalmers concluded, that 'every enlargement of our resources only tends to land us in a larger, it is true, but a more straightened population', quoted by Scrope, p.290.

No doubt this is true where there is no foresight, no providence, nothing but blind obedience to the impulse of nature.

Case of the Irish as (?) living on potatoes. If we live like animals we become subject to their laws. But we have many alternatives.

- 1 Prudence & deference of marriage.
- 2 Careful provision for children & energy in getting wealth.
- 3 Emigration.¹⁰

This seems consistent with Jevons' earlier observation, made to J.L. Shadwell in late 1872, that "(s)urely there is always over-population when people are improvident, and unable, or careless, to provide for the inevitable vicissitudes of the seasons. Ireland has furnished the clearest possible case of over-population ..." (Black 1973-81, III, p.255).

Jevons' 1870 Address gave no direct explanation for why the Irish immigrants increased the MR in Britain. The argument depended on the posited statistical relationship between the MR and the PIP, which assumed that the Irish MR was greater than that for the rest of the population. That assumption in turn depended on a particular view of Irish living conditions which Jevons signalled in a reference to the "sanitary conditions" of Irish families (Jevons 1883, p.213). It is evident from the comments above that Jevons assumed that the Irish MR was greater because they 'live like animals'. Existing in Ireland on a potato diet with a 'blind obedience to the impulse of nature', they were improvident, did not take the future into account, failed to make 'careful provision' for their children and displayed little 'energy' in pursuing wealth. They could emigrate, but they carried their unsanitary animalistic habits to Britain with the consequent effect upon mortality rates.

This argument reflected the stereotype of the Irish which became increasingly common during the 1830s and which was reinforced following the famine immigration of the 1840s. The immigration was explained primarily as the result of Irish 'over population' which could be seen in large part as "the product of Gaelic improvidence" (Swift 1990, p.6).¹¹ With their habits such as a potato diet, sleeping on straw, allowing their children to go barefoot etc., the immigrants spread disease and lowered living standards generally. This was not simply because of their unsanitary habits but also because of the "contagious example" of their "ignorance and ... barbarous disregard of forethought and economy".¹² It was this stereotype, which has been described as "a fair parade of ill-considered prejudice" (Davis 1989, p.110), that Jevons both reflected and reinforced, using it to structure his statistical argument with the crucial assumption about the Irish MR. Faced with Wilkinson's direct evidence to the contrary, Jevons ignored it, telling his students that the assumption was 'a priori probable'.

From the 1840s the vocabulary of national differences was 'mingled' with that of racial differences "to describe the immigrant Irish and their problems in distinctly racial terms" (OTuathaigh 1981, pp.160-1). With an explanation of behaviour referring to the Irish Celts as a separate race, "literate members of the Victorian middle class" were able to provide a "pseudoscientific ... rationalisation" for "an older English national prejudice" (Gilley and Swift 1985, p.5). This did not mean that the Celts had no redeeming qualities. They could be "chaste, hospitable, witty, kindly and generous" as well as "feckless, stupid, violent, unreliable and drunken". The point was the types of behaviour which predominated. The key to the superiority of the English was not that they were a 'pure' racial group. It was rather that, as the product of a mixture of British Celts, Norse, Danish and Anglo-Saxons, "the best mongrel English had the 'good' Celtic qualities as well as the 'good' Anglo-Saxons ones" (ibid). By contrast, the problem with the Irish Celts was that they had acquired a predominance of negative characteristics. In this way, the stereotype of the Irish immigrant often became that of "a menacing savage" rather than a "lovable rogue" (OTuathaigh 1981, p.162). An increase in the PIP could thus threaten the successful population mixture in Britain.

In his 1882 article on "Married Women in Factories" (Jevons 1883, pp.156-79), Jevons indicated that the role of the Irish immigrants in increasing the British MR was due to their 'race' and 'character'. Changing his position from that in 1870, Jevons argued that a large part of the 'excess mortality' in English towns was due to women with young children working outside the home.¹³ Liverpool, however, appeared to be an 'anomaly' in that account because, Jevons acknowledged, with the highest mortality rate in England, "it has no great textile factories". Nevertheless, the Liverpool result created no real difficulty because an explanation had been in existence for over a decade:

renewed and very careful inquiry has, indeed, quite satisfied me as to the correctness of the explanation which I gave in 1870 of the excessive mortality of such towns as Liverpool and Salford. Until statisticians will constantly bear in mind the fact that the different towns and counties of England are to a great extent peopled by races of different characters, it will remain impossible to understand the profound sanitary discrepancies which they exhibit. It is not, however, to my purpose to dwell upon the influence of a mixture of population; it is only necessary to refer to the point as explaining anomalies ... (Jevons 1883, pp.159-60).

Without providing one piece of evidence from the 'renewed and very careful inquiry', Jevons then referred to Wilkinson's analysis as simply "the opposite opinion" (ibid. p.159n).

Jevons had previously referred to the racial mixture problem in connection with another 'hypothesis' - that it was the Irish who played a key role in explaining the different 'intemperance rates' of English towns. The problem with substantiating this argument was similar to that regarding the mortality rates in that the aggregate data published in the Census, for example, did not provide sufficient information. In this case, however, Jevons did attempt to obtain more specific information (at the borough, city or county level) by having a circular printed in 1879 which asked for possible sources of information. (A copy of the circular from the Jevons Archive, dated April 12, is reprinted in White 1993, pp.83-4). Jevons informed potential respondents that

the problem with the available statistics was that they provided no information "concerning the character, and especially ... the nationality of the persons apprehended for drunkenness". He then added that "the principal point on which I need information relates to the proportion of the drunken who are of Irish birth or extraction; there is reason to think that the differences of drunkenness are much a matter of race ..." Since "direct information" was required concerning "the character of the drunken", Jevons appealed for any "facts or hints which you could give me".¹⁴

There is no record of any responses to the circular in the Archive, but Jevons was in no doubt what the 'facts' really were. On April 15, three days after the date on the Archive circular, a paper by E. Ravenstein, "On the Celtic Language in the British Isles: A Statistical Survey", was read to the Statistical Society in London. During the discussion of the paper, Jevons took the opportunity to make some wide-ranging comments. He "believed", for example, that the "real explanation" for the "rates of mortality and the degrees of drunkenness of the northern towns ... was to be found in the ethnographic character of the people." He indicated also that the problem was specifically concerned with the Irish Celts and that prevailing migration patterns would change the population mix of England: "The Irish migrate into England, but it was doubtful whether they migrated out of it again. Now if the Irish should continue to migrate into England and the English migrated to Australia, and all parts of the world, the result would obviously be that our population would become Celticised" (Jevons 1879b, p.640). Given Jevons' beliefs about the effects of Irish immigration on mortality and drunkenness rates, it seems doubtful that he would have viewed that possibility with equanimity.

In referring to Jevons' statements on the effects of Irish immigration which followed Wilkinson's critique, Hutchison continues to present Jevons as a cautious formulator of 'hypotheses' which he was prepared to jettison if confronted with evidence to the contrary. For example, with regard to Jevons' 1882 comments about his 1870 explanation for the mortality rate, Hutchison claims that, because in the intervening twelve years there had been no "new, additional statistical information forthcoming on the problem", there was "no substantial reason for Jevons to withdraw his original, suggested and unestablished, working hypothesis or belief" (Hutchison 1994, s. VIII). In part, the validity of this statement depends upon Hutchison's preceding assessment of Jevons' 1870 Address and Wilkinson's critique. It also depends on Hutchison's failure to inform the reader that, in 1882, Jevons insisted that his original argument, far from being a 'working hypothesis', was actually 'correct'.

Hutchison then claims that in the comments made at the Statistical Society in April 1879, "Jevons again made it clear that he was concerned simply with an unestablished hypothesis by noting that the variations in rates of mortality 'could not at present be explained'" (Hutchison 1994, s.VI). The internal quotation here provides another example of Hutchison's citation methods. The actual quotation is as follows: "The rates of mortality and the degrees of drunkenness of the northern towns were facts which could not be at present explained and he (i.e. Jevons) believed the real explanation was to be found in the ethnographic character of the people" (Jevons 1879, p.640). While Jevons had no substantive information to support his 'belief' about either the MR or 'drunkenness', he nevertheless made it clear in 1882 that he was 'quite satisfied' that his explanation for the MR was 'correct'. His form of words at the Statistical Society in 1879 thus suggests he was arguing that the lack of a satisfactory explanation being established other than in his own work was due to statisticians not exploring the 'real' causes of the problems. Jevons made much the same point in 1882. While referring to his own 'correct' explanation, he averred, as noted above, that until "statisticians will constantly bear in mind the fact ... (of) races of different characters, it will remain impossible to understand the profound sanitary discrepancies" of different towns and counties (Jevons 1883, p.159). Jevons had also used the same rhetorical style in 1870 when he noted that the excess MR appeared 'perplexing' because it could not be explained by women working outside the home or by the 'situation' of the relevant towns. He went on to claim, however, that his statistical evidence provided 'the strongest possible corroboration' for his argument (see above). Hutchison has thus reduced Jevons' complaint in 1879 that statisticians

were not considering the 'fact' of race and character to the erroneous claim that Jevons presented his argument as an 'unestablished hypothesis'.

In referring to Jevons' "research programme" regarding the Irish and alcohol consumption, Hutchison argues that in the 1879 circular, "*Jevons explicitly did not claim his hypothesis as 'established'*" and that, "quite obviously", any information which he might subsequently have received could "have been *either* in favour, and supportive, *or* damaging or opposed" (Hutchison 1994, s. VI. OE). This is not particularly helpful. Quite 'obviously', Jevons did not have the requisite statistics to support his belief, nor did he know where to find them. If he had, the circular would not have been printed. By the same token, if Jevons had received 'damaging' information, his response to Wilkinson's paper shows that he was quite capable of ignoring it. But Hutchison has missed the point about the circular. It was one thing for Jevons to ask for information about the 'nationality of the drunken'. It was quite another to lead potential respondents by writing, as was noted above, that the "principal point on which I need information relates to (those) who are of Irish birth or extraction; there is reason to believe that the differences in drunkenness are very much a matter of race".

Apparently unable to see the bias in the circular and without any examination of the way that Jevons' racial prejudice informed his 'a priori probability' about the Irish MR, Hutchison concludes that Jevons was a five per cent racist with regard to the Irish because his only 'contribution' to the Irish stereotype was the "comparatively harmless adjective 'intemperate'". Indeed, Hutchison claims that I cannot "offer a single quotation" showing that was not the case (Hutchison 1994, s. IX). The textual evidence discussed earlier in this section, which explains why Jevons made and how he refused to budge from his assumption about the Irish MR, shows that Hutchison's assertion is nonsense.

IV 'Our Irish Poland'

Hutchison also asserts that I did not discuss a paragraph from one of Jevons' articles because it was "fatal to (White's) purpose of vilifying Jevons as one guilty of 'racist abuse'". Further, according to Hutchison, I failed to mention some of Jevons' correspondence, especially with Harold Rylett (see below), because there Jevons "repeatedly demonstrated his good-will towards the Irish" (Hutchison 1994, s.vii). Perhaps I should explain that in a Note which was concerned with considering the 'Irish factor' in Jevons' statistics, I made no mention of that material because it contained no discussion of statistics. Nevertheless, the material can be considered here.

The comments to which Hutchison refers were all made between April 1879 and July 1882 (Jevons drowned in the following month). Their context was the Irish agrarian crisis which was triggered in the winter of 1878/9 when wet weather, crop failures and falling prices "threatened the rural population in the West of Ireland with the worst economic disaster since the great famine" (Bew 1980, p.31). In April 1879, Jevons wrote to Rylett that his interest in Ireland was "rapidly increasing". Also "increasing" was his "impression ... that landlordism is a terrible burden on the country, and that the just laws of England are rather a myth" (Black 1973-81, V, p.54). The need to change the system of land tenure in Ireland was a theme which Jevons restated in different ways over the next three years.¹⁵ By October 1879, when the Irish Land League was established with Charles Parnell as president, most 'peasants' had "determined not to pay ... due rents" (Bew 1980, p.49). Jevons' proposal for the reform of land policy in that context was announced in the February 1880 *Contemporary Review*, where he suggested that the government should undertake a "small experiment" in peasant proprietorship. With the customary swipe at J. S. Mill, whose peasant proprietorship proposals would entail a "revolution in the land-owning of Ireland", Jevons made the following remarks about the experiment:

'Earth hunger' is a very potent passion, and I believe it is that from which the Irish people are really suffering. Bread and bacon are not the only good things an Irish peasant might aspire to; a place to call his own, a share of the air and sun-light of his native isle, and a land-bank in which to save up the strokes of his pick and spade might work moral wonders. It is not safe to predict the action of human motive; but, at any rate, try it although the trial cost as much as

one or two first-rate ironclads, or a new triumph over a Negro monarch. Surely the state of our Irish Poland is the worst possible injury to our prestige (Jevons 1883, p.274).

In citing the first and second sentences from this passage (from which he omits the word 'moral'), Hutchison argues that it makes "quite clear that, in Jevons's view, the sufferings of the Irish were due to alterable, environmental conditions, and not entirely to genetic factors" (Hutchison 1994, s. vii). While the passage is interesting in suggesting that Jevons was not completely enamoured of imperial ventures in Africa, it should be noted that, although Ireland constituted 'the worst possible injury to our prestige', the most that Jevons could suggest was a small experiment in peasant proprietorship. If this revealed that he was poorly informed about the Irish situation, the quotation does not suggest that Jevons was particularly optimistic about the success of the 'moral' experiment since how the Irish would behave was 'not safe to predict'. By July 1882, with a further worsening of conditions in Ireland, Jevons thought that "the state (should) risk a good deal of money on the enterprise" since "(a)nything is better than the present state of things ... whatever may be the economic results, the social and political results of an opposite agrarian policy are infinitely superior to what we experience" (Black 1973-81, V, pp.196-7). Rather than characterising this as evidence of Jevons' 'good-will towards the Irish', it could be more accurately described as a policy of desperation.

Harold Rylett (1851-1936) was a Unitarian minister who had attended Jevons' lectures at Owens College in 1875-6.¹⁶ As a student, he was a "supporter and friend" of the trade unionist Joseph Arch. In 1879, he became minister at Moneyrea near Belfast, "where he plunged into the campaign for Irish Home Rule and the activities of the Land League" (Webb 1987, pp.20-1).¹⁷ In complaining that I did not examine Jevons' correspondence with Rylett, Hutchison divines that the explanation for that 'careful and complete' omission was that "Jevons repeatedly demonstrated his good-will towards the Irish, supporting conciliation and Gladstone's measure of land reform, and opposing coercion" (Hutchison 1994, s.vii and n.3). This summary of the correspondence is both inaccurate and misleading.

'Coercion' refers to the Gladstone government's internment policy which was implemented with the Protection of Person and Property Act (Ireland) of March 1881. With its suspension of *habeas corpus*, the Act was used to imprison members of the Land League and to suppress the organisation. In November 1881, Jevons defended this policy in a letter to Rylett, stating that while the Act was 'regrettable', it was also 'necessary'. If Gladstone had "made any mistake", it was in allowing the "milder" coercion Act of the previous "Tory Government to lapse when he might have insisted on its re-enactment" (Black 1973-81, V, pp.150-1). During the next few months, Jevons decided that the 1881 Act was quite ineffective. In this, he was not alone. From early 1882, coercion "was increasingly distasteful to the Liberal Party - especially now that it did not appear to be working" (Bew 1980, p.56). In March of that year, Jevons told his brother that the Act was a "mistake", that an amnesty for "suspects" should have been introduced the previous year and that he had "told" this to "a member of the Government" the preceding September (cf. the November 1881 letter to Rylett, mentioned above). Finally, Jevons told Rylett in July that he had "never believed" in the government's "coercion policy, which struck at the wrong parties, and was calculated rather to irritate than to amend or suppress what was wrong" (Black 1973-81, V, pp.179, 197). The problem with the 1881 Act was thus that it was clumsy and ineffective. This is quite different from concluding that Jevons 'opposed coercion and supported conciliation' per se, which is the impression a reader might draw from Hutchison's summary.

So far as the government's land tenure reform Act of August 1881 is concerned, Hutchison cites no statements by Jevons 'repeatedly demonstrating good will towards the Irish'. What is evident from Jevons' comments, however, is a demonstration of good-will towards Gladstone and a vehement rejection of criticism of the Act by the Land League. While other reforms were required, Jevons the Act was "a noble gift" by Gladstone, the "greatest concession that could be made, and one which is a sufficient step towards setting Irish affairs right. Every real friend of Ireland will be found as a supporter ... of the Act". Notice that here 'real friendship' towards Ireland was defined as supporting Gladstone. Indeed, Jevons was "quite unable to understand" why

Rylett was so critical of the Act, referring to the "intense ingratitude to Mr. Gladstone shown by those who ought to have been his truest followers" (Black 1973-81, V, pp.150,151).

While Hutchison is incorrect in stating that Jevons visited Rylett in Ireland, he makes no mention of the strained period which followed Rylett's strong defence of the Land League in its decision to 'test' the 1881 land Act. After Jevons told Rylett in November 1881 that he and the League were ungrateful for Gladstone's 'noble gift', Rylett wrote explaining why Jevons had misunderstood the League's policy. Jevons then showed the letter to the editor of *The Economist*, R.H.I. Palgrave. Without consulting Rylett, Jevons gave Palgrave permission to reprint the letter. When it appeared in *The Economist* with the removal of Jevons' and Rylett's names, it was introduced by a patronising editorial note. It would not be surprising if Rylett was taken aback by Jevons' behaviour and he apparently wrote to Jevons about the use of his letter. Jevons was unapologetic although, with the Irish situation unravelling in July 1882, he did acknowledge that "the progress of events tends to justify your position more than it was formerly easy to see".¹⁸ It might have been 'easier to see' had not Jevons been so dismissive of Rylett's position.¹⁹

At the time, support for Irish land reform did not, as Hutchison seems to think, preclude a racist view of the Irish. Indeed, "Anglo-Saxon racism was not identical to hatred of the Irish, and some of the exponents of Celtic racial theory also supported Home Rule" (Gilley and Swift 1985, p.5). While I can find no evidence that Jevons supported Home Rule, he did endorse Gladstone's land policy while continuing to repeat his claim about the Irish and mortality rates. Jevons' behaviour with regard to the latter was, as indicated in my Note (White 1993, p.82), quite contrary to the picture previously painted by Hutchison (1982). Without any examination of Jevons' statistical work, Hutchison had depicted him as employing a "cautious, critical, empirical fallibilism" which was completely opposed to an "a priorist dogmatism" (Hutchison 1982, p.375).²⁰ When I wrote in another paper that Jevons engaged in 'racist abuse' (White 1994, p.75), it was in the context of summarising the argument that, using an 'a priori probability', Jevons had continued to attribute 'excess mortality' to Irish immigrants despite the direct contrary evidence provided by Wilkinson. I still think that singling out the Irish in that way constitutes abuse.

V The Invisible Jevons

Hutchison suggests that a "study of attitudes among nineteenth - century economists to national, ethnic, or 'racial' groups, including the Irish - (and British) - might perhaps prove of interest if undertaken with some breadth of historical understanding and empathy regarding earlier attitudes, terminology, and presuppositions ..." (Hutchison 1994, s.XII). While substituting 'would' for Hutchison's 'might perhaps', I agree (and look forward to future empathetic references by Hutchison to Marx and Engels). Concerning terminology, I now think that my use of the phrase 'genetic deterioration' (White 1993, p.81) to characterise Jevons' discussion of 'population mixture' at the Statistical Society in April 1879 (see above) was anachronistic since an explanation for hereditary differences couched in terms of 'genetics' did not exist at the time. It would be more accurate to say that, like Marx and Engels, Jevons assumed that organisms adapted to their environment "by acquiring characteristics (both physical and behavioural) that over a period of time became inherited" (Paul 1981, p.117). With the environment producing biological effects, it was possible, in principle, for a 'degenerate' race to be 'improved' over time, although this would depend upon the reasons for the degeneration.²¹ For Jevons, the character of all forms of animal life depended in part on 'hereditary' and in part on 'environmental' conditions (Jevons 1875).

In this context, it can be noted that, in May 1879, Jevons commented on a paper, 'The Feasibility of Compulsory Education in Ireland', presented to the Statistical Society by W. N. Hancock. With a rather liberal interpretation of Hancock's text, Jevons observed that "Dr. Hancock had shown that there is, especially in the towns, a serious number of poor Irish labourers, and he (i.e. Jevons) quite agreed that the congregating together of poor ignorant Irishmen might be the source of very grave evils. It could not be known how much mortality, drunkenness and crime might be ultimately due to the ignorance of those allowed to grow up uneducated in Ireland and who migrated here. He hoped that some good practical result might ensue from the statistics which

Dr. Hancock had submitted" (Jevons 1879a, p.474). Jevons thus supported compulsory education for children in Ireland which might help mitigate 'grave evils'. The tone of these comments is similar to those which Jevons made in his peasant proprietorship 'experiment' proposal in 1880, where he argued it was necessary to 'at least try it' although he did not seem particularly optimistic about the results.

Jevons nowhere provided a systematic account of his understanding of the relation between the relative influences of hereditary and environmental factors, although there is relevant material in his published writings and in the Jevons Archive. That material makes clear that Jevons relied upon a version of 'natural selection', which owed a good deal to the work of Herbert Spencer. In this perspective, even the extermination of a race could wear a Panglossian aspect. As Jevons commented after the bombardment of Alexandria in July 1882: "The Arab race are evidently preparing the way for their complete downfall and eventual extermination, and we can only console ourselves that they are opening the way to a better civilisation" (Black 1973-81, V, p.299).

The relevance of recovering Jevons' views on these matters will be apparent if the extent and the role of the category of 'race' is identified in his work. To take one example, when discussing work hours in *The Theory of Political Economy*, Jevons argued:

It is evident that questions of this kind will depend greatly upon the character of the race. Persons of an energetic disposition feel labour less painful than they otherwise would, and, if they happen to be endowed with various and acute sensibilities, their desire of further acquisition never ceases. A man of a lower race, a Negro for instance, enjoys possession less, and loathes labour more; his exertions, therefore, soon stop. A poor savage would be content to gather the almost gratuitous fruits of nature, if they were sufficient to give sustenance; it is only physical want that drives him to exertion (Jevons 1871, pp.177-8).

Much the same point was made in Jevons' discussion of the "intelligence and foresight" required for wealth accumulation through work and saving:

That class or race of men who have the most foresight will work most for the future. The untutored savage is wholly occupied with the troubles of the moment; the morrow is dimly felt; the limit of his horizon is but a few days off. The wants of a future year, or of a lifetime, are wholly unforseen. But in a state of civilisation, a vague though powerful feeling of the future is the main incentive to industry and saving (ibid. pp.41-2).

As the quotations above suggest, both race and class were important for explaining different types of economic behaviour in *The Theory of Political Economy*. While the Negro of a 'lower race' 'loathes labour', there was a similar, though not identical behaviour exhibited by many of the working classes. This was quite different from the 'learned professions' and the "rich man in modern society" (ibid. pp.176-8). It will be remembered that, elsewhere, Jevons claimed that the Irish displayed a lack of 'foresight' and 'energy in getting wealth' (see above).

So far as I am aware, there has been no commentary on the relevance of the above passages from the *Theory* so that Jevons' comments have apparently been invisible to historians of economics such as Hutchison. After publications concerning Jevons which span some forty years, it is rather late in the day for Hutchison to now acknowledge that a study of 'racial attitudes' by nineteenth-century economists 'might perhaps' be of some interest.²²

VI Conclusion

In a voice trembling with rage, Hutchison has accused me of ignoring and/or misrepresenting relevant textual material, pursuing an 'ideological vendetta', displaying 'uncontrolled' and 'excessive prejudice', indulging in a 'tirade' with 'wild exaggeration' and, possibly the worst crime today in the lexicon of the right, exhibiting 'political correctness' amplified by 'obscurantist shrieks'.²³ Apart from the silly PC claim, the news that Hutchison has levied these charges against someone else might generate amusement in some quarters. While thus acknowledging Hutchison's sense of humour, the analysis above has shown that his charges bear no relation whatsoever to my Note. They are, however, quite useful for characterising his 'rebuttal'.

* Department of Economics, Monash University, Clayton, Vic 3168. While the usual caveat on responsibility applies, I would like to thank Peter Kenyon, John McCarty and Judith Rich for helpful suggestions and comments.

Appendix

Table 1: The Irish and Mortality in Nine English 'Towns'

Town	Mortality Rate per 1,000 (Av. 1851-60)	Proportion Irish Population (1861)
Liverpool	33.3	34.9
Manchester	31.6	20.6
Sheffield	28.5	5.2
Leeds	27.8	7.5
Newcastle	27.4	9.0
Birmingham	26.5	7.3
Salford	26.1	12.7
Bradford	25.7	8.6
London	23.6	5.7

Source: Adapted from Jevons 1883, p. 213.

Table 2: The Irish and Mortality in Eight Scottish 'Towns'

Town	Mortality Rate per 1,000 (Av. 1855-63)	Proportion Irish Population (1861)
Greenock	31.1	22.0
Glasgow	29.8	23.0
Dundee	27.3	23.8
Paisley	26.5	18.1
Perth	24.9	6.4
Edinburgh	24.7	7.4
Aberdeen	23.1	1.8
Leith	22.6	6.6

Source: Adapted from Jevons 1883, p. 215.

Notes

- ¹ Letter to Hyde Clarke, June 1871, in Black 1973-81, III, p.244.
- ² For references and further discussion, see White 1994, pp.58-9.
- ³ A. Ransome and W. Royston, "Infant Mortality in Manchester", *The Manchester Guardian*, 14/6/1870, p.6.
- ⁴ Following Baxendell, "Manchester mothers are ... exonerated from the charge of neglect" (Jevons 1883, p.208). Although Jevons provided a misleading summary of Baxendell's argument [White 1994, p.59], he was to subsequently change his mind on this matter (see below).
- ⁵ The statistics were only for the population aged twenty years and older because, Jevons argued, "if an Irish family live for a few years in England, they may have children registered as English born, although they live under the same sanitary conditions as their Irish parents" [Jevons 1883, p.213].
- ⁶ For an example of the difficulties this could create, see Playfair 1845, pp.79-80. Jevons subsequently noted the problem with a one year MR when it suited his argument [Jevons 1883, p.167].
- ⁷ Despite Jevons' disbelief, the MR in Ireland was actually lower than that for England and Wales at the time [Tranter 1985, p.46].
- ⁸ See Konekamp 1973, p.16; Schabas 1989, p.13.
- ⁹ For a contemporary analysis of the same point, see Playfair 1845, p.80. In this paper, OE = original emphasis; EA = emphasis added.
- ¹⁰ Jevons Archive, John Rylands Library, University of Manchester, JA6/42/32. The note is dated 10 December 1875, the same date as the published record of the lecture [Black 1973-81, VI, p.54]. For the quotation in the note, see Scrope 1833, p.290.
- ¹¹ For a summary of the reasons why that explanation of Irish emigration is now regarded as unsatisfactory, see Swift 1990.
- ¹² The 'contagious example' and 'barbarous disregard' quotations are taken from J.P. Kay's *The Moral and Physical Conditions of the Working Classes of 1832* [Kay 1970, p.22; cited by Davis 1989, p.110]. Davis [1989, p.109] argues that Kay's pamphlet was a "key influence in identifying the Irish presence with the evils of squalid living conditions". Wilkinson referred to Kay in his critique of Jevons (see above) and Engels had drawn on Kay in his *Condition of 1845* [Engels 1972].
- ¹³ For a detailed examination of the argument, see White 1994.
- ¹⁴ See also, in this regard, Jevons' subsequent references to 'our turbulent Anglo - Irish towns' [Jevons 1883, p.268; White 1993, p.79].
- ¹⁵ See Jevons' preface in Cossa's *Guide to political economy*, reprinted in Black 1973-81, VII, p.100; see also *ibid.*, V, p.197.
- ¹⁶ Rylett's record of Jevons' lectures is reprinted in Black 1973-81, VI. See also *ibid.* IV, pp.241-2.
- ¹⁷ For Rylett's career, see Black 1973-81, IV, p.241n; Webb 1987, pp.20-22.
- ¹⁸ "Irish Opinion on Ireland", *The Economist*, 24/12, 1881, pp.1589-90; Black 1973-81, V, pp.111-16, 150-1, 157, 196-7.
- ¹⁹ In late 1881, Rylett had sent Jevons a copy of a pamphlet, *The Irish Question*, by Henry George. In July the next year, Jevons informed Rylett that he had not bothered to read it. Nor was he "inclined" to read George's *Progress and Poverty* "while so many better books are available" [Black 1973-81, V, pp.151, 197].
- ²⁰ Hutchison contrasted the "cautious, critical, empirical fallibilism" of Jevons with "the confident, *a priori* dogmatism" of James Mill and Ricardo, "with their claims to certainty and their comparisons of their 'laws' of the science of political economy, with the laws of physics" [Hutchison 1982, p.375]. It is not clear how this contrast can be reconciled with passages in Jevons' *Theory of Political Economy* such as the following: "A few of the simplest principles or axioms concerning the nature of the human mind must be taken as its first starting-point, just as the vast theories of mechanical science are founded upon a few simple laws of motion." Then, after mentioning a number of "laws" which could be "deduced" from the marginalist theory, Jevons noted that it "may, perhaps, be described as the mechanics of human interest ... I conceive that in its main features ... whether useful or useless, [the theory] must be the true one. Its method is as sure and demonstrative as that of kinematics or statics" [Jevons 1871, pp.24-5].
- ²¹ For a useful discussion of Engel's references to the Irish in his *Condition*, see Paul 1981, pp.134-5. Hutchison is tedious in writing that "[n]aturally White does not refer to the well-known work of Engels - (though the precise reason for his omission is not clear)" [Hutchison 1994, s.IX]. In a Note specifically concerned with Jevons, I did not mention Engel's text published some twenty-five years before. For the same reason I did not mention the work of other writers such as Kay and Playfair.
- ²² I have discussed the relevance of the above passages from the *Theory* in White 1992, which was referred to in my Note. Because the paper was unpublished, Hutchison accuses me of engaging in an "unusual and unconvincing scholarly ploy" [Hutchison 1994, s. VIII]. The paper is due to be published in the July 1994 number of *Economic Inquiry*. Hutchison then proceeds [1994, s. XII] to cite and to jeer at the manuscript of another paper of mine (Hutchison's reference is to Ursula Bright). An interested reader can now compare the

relevant section of the published paper [White 1994, pp.55-7] with Hutchison's version for another example of his peculiar methods of citation.

- ²³ Whatever that might mean, although I take it that Margaret Schabas was also 'shrieking' when she noted that Jevons' essay on Utilitarianism revealed his "racism" [Schabas 1989, p.150].

References

- Bew, Paul, 1980, *C. S. Parnell*, Gill and Macmillan, Dublin.
- Black, R.D.Collison (ed.), 1973-81, *The Papers and Correspondence of William Stanley Jevons*, Vols. II-VII, Macmillan in association with the Royal Economic Society, London.
- Davis, Graham, 1989, "Little Irelands", in Roger Swift and Sheridan Gilley (eds), *The Irish in Britain 1815 - 1939*, Pinter, London.
- Engels, Frederick, 1972, *The Condition of the Working Class in England (1845)*, Panther, London.
- Gilley, Sheridan and Roger Swift, 1985, "Introduction", in Gilley and Swift (eds), *The Irish in the Victorian City*, Croom Helm, London.
- Hutchison, T.W., 1982, "The Politics and Philosophy in Jevons's Political Economy", *The Manchester School*, 50 (4), 366-78.
- , 1994, "White on 'the Irish Factor' in Jevons's Statistics: A Rebuttal", this issue.
- Jackson, John Archer, 1963, *The Irish in Britain*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London.
- Jevons, W. Stanley, 1871, *The Theory of Political Economy*, Macmillan, London.
- , 1875, "Hereditiy", review of T. Ribot, *Hereditiy (1875)*, *Nature*, 11, no. 287, 503-4.
- , 1879a, "Discussion" of paper by W. Neilson Hancock, 'The Feasibility of Compulsory Education in Ireland', *Journal of the Statistical Society*, 42 (2), June, p. 474.
- , 1879b "Discussion" of paper by E. Ravenstein, 'On the Celtic Language in the British Isles: A Statistical Survey', *Journal of the Statistical Society*, 42, September, p. 640.
- , 1883, *Methods of Social Reform*, Macmillan, London.
- Kay, James Phillips, 1970, *The Moral and Physical Condition of the Working Classes (1832)*, second edition, Cass, London.
- Konekamp, Rosamond, 1972, "Biographical Introduction" in *The Papers and Correspondence of William Stanley Jevons*, Vol. I, edited by R.D.Collison Black and Rosamond Konekamp, Macmillan in association with the Royal Economic Society, London.
- OTuathaigh, M.A.G., 1981, "The Irish in Nineteenth - Century Britain: Problems of Integration", *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, fifth series, 31, 149-173.
- Paul, Diane, 1981, "'In the Interests of Civilization': Marxist Views of Race and Culture in the Nineteenth Century", *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 42 (1), 115-138.
- Playfair, Dr. Lyon, 1845, "Supplement to the Report on the Sanitary Condition of Large Towns in Lancashire", in *Second Report of the Commissioners for Inquiring into the State of Large Towns and Populous Districts*, Appendix, Part II, British Parliamentary Papers, (610) Vol. XVIII, 73-82.
- Schabas, Margaret, 1990, *A World Ruled by Number. William Stanley Jevons and the Rise of Mathematical Economics*, Princeton University Press, Princeton.
- Scrope, G.P., 1833, *Principles of Political Economy, Deduced from the Natural Laws of Social Welfare and Allied to the Present State of Britain*, Longman, Rees, Orme, Brown, Green and Longman, London.
- Swift, Roger, 1990, *The Irish in Britain 1815 - 1914. Perspectives and Sources*, The Historical Association, London.
- Trantor, N.L., 1985, *Population and Society 1750 - 1940*, Longman, New York.
- Webb, R. K., 1987, "Flying Missionaries: Unitarian Journalists in Victorian England", in J.M.W. Bean (ed.), *The Political Culture of Modern Britain*, Hamish Hamilton, London.
- White, Michael V., 1992, "The Natural and the Social: 'Science' and 'Character' in Jevons' Political Economy", forthcoming.

- , 1993, "The 'Irish Factor' in Jevons' Statistics: A Note", *History of Economics Review*, No. 19, Winter, 79-85.
- , 1994, "Following Strange Gods: Women in Jevons's Political Economy", in Peter Groenewegen (ed.), *Feminism and Political Economy in Victorian England*, Edward Elgar, Aldershot.
- Wilkinson, T.R., 1871, "Observations on Infant Mortality and the Death Rate in Large Towns", *Transactions of the Manchester Statistical Society*, Session 1870-71, No. 4, 49-55.