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GLADSTONIAN LIBERALISM: A CATALYST FOR SOCIAL REPRESENTATION AND DEMOCRATIC REFORM IN VICTORIAN BRITAIN

An Abstract of the Thesis by
Jason Samuel Belcher

William Gladstone and his political administration demonstrated a unique approach to social representation in nineteenth-century Britain. Most of the research for this thesis focuses on historians who examined both the variable nature of the term democracy in Victorian Britain as well as depict Gladstone’s bureaucratic achievements as an MP. A large portion of the thesis employs information extracted from contemporary nineteenth-century British newspapers in order to provide firsthand perspectives of Britain’s political administration during the Gladstone years of service. Many modern sources of information provide varying outlooks on Gladstonian Liberalism. These sources contribute to a viewpoint of Gladstonian Liberalism as a gradually progressive form of societal management implemented within a consistently transitioning imperial system. Although the general consensus of both contemporary and secondary historic accounts does not typically portray Gladstone as a revolutionary for democratic change, Gladstone’s endeavors in Liberal reform included elements of democratic changes that encouraged Parliamentary policy to be more supportive of typically underrepresented social groups. With these policies, Gladstonian Liberalism introduced, during the Victorian Era, a force through which democratic representation began to emerge in the British Empire prior to the reforms of twentieth-century democracy.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This thesis highlights the significance of Gladstonian Liberalism as a representative medium tailored toward democratic progression for British society in the nineteenth century. The fact that William Gladstone introduced aspects of democratic representation into Britain’s governance during the Victorian Era makes Gladstone’s policies a prelude to twentieth-century democracy and decolonization. When studying the British political system of the Victorian era, the principles of representation of the Britain’s citizens bore various meanings for Members of Parliament (MPs) whose methods of governance often employed a combination of well-intentioned administration and practical compromise. William Gladstone is certainly no exception to these facets of parliamentary operation; however, his energetic pursuit of social reforms and his malleable approach regarding representative measures sets him apart from his contemporaries in regard to his influence on the politics of his day. Gladstone made a concerted effort to give the common man a voice in governmental decisions.

For the purpose of this thesis, Gladstonian Liberalism will be defined as the methods and policies used by Gladstone during a career that incorporated a hybrid of conservative and liberal stances in order to effect positive change for subjects of the British Empire. As Gladstone’s political affiliations evolved from a young conservative
Peelite to an established liberal prime minister, his official position on political issues was not strictly liberal nor fully conservative. Therefore, the thesis will identify the bulk of these policies as Gladstonian Liberalism. Gladstone’s ability to garner support from his respective party and recognition from minority factions in Parliament allowed him to promote policies incorporating specific democratic values that, while not completely new in theory, proved workable under his administrative duties. To clarify, Gladstone did not embrace direct democracy, nor did he desire that the power of governance fall entirely upon the British people. Rather, Gladstone favored a gradually progressive form of democracy made feasible because of his leadership capabilities and his attention to the plight of underrepresented people.

Despite occasionally risking detriment to his own political career or at the very least in contrast to his own ambitions, Gladstone confronted a number of British concerns, both at home and abroad, such as addressing the notion of disestablishmentarianism in Ireland, of reforming budget policies in favor of the British people, of extending enfranchisement to the working class in Britain, of contributing a political voice for nations formerly exclusive to imperial concerns, and of embracing the controversial matter of Irish Home Rule. Each of these issues emerged with a mark of Gladstonian zeal, and Gladstone accomplished what other MPs previously failed to do regarding the transition of Britain into a modern United Kingdom capable of representing numerous communities through a persuasive and adaptive policy. In fairness, Gladstone did not single-handedly revolutionize the practices of the British Empire. However, through his governance British MPs adopted progressive protocols formerly unobtainable
in Parliament and sealed Gladstone as a significant paragon for democratic reform via adaptive representation in the nineteenth century.

Interestingly, Gladstone’s politics, policies, and approach change over time. Beginning as an early conservative Anglican, Gladstone evolved into an effective liberal-leaning politician. He did not compromise his personal principles except where pragmatic decision-making tended to aid democratization or to extend representation for the people. When addressing the characteristics of democratic reform within British society in the Victorian era, it is important to acknowledge the various interpreters of democracy who presented concepts of cultural representation previously foreign to British interests (both domestic and abroad) including Gladstone. By utilizing sources that incorporate ideas both close to and distant from Gladstone’s agenda, a historian gains insight into a broader context of Gladstone’s personal connection between social representation, democratic tendencies, and Liberal reform.

Historians cover a significant range of attributes concerning Gladstonian policies during the Victorian era. Among the issues examined, one finds bureaucratic intrigue, economic tussles, and societal conflicts abounding and rampant throughout nineteenth-century culture in Britain. This perception of national turmoil is of course a repetitive theme in various societal transformations throughout British history. For example, Denis Judd indicates that prior to the Victorian era, England and Ireland were in conflict over the latter’s societal position within Empire. Their differences led to the 1800 Act of Union which aggravated previous tensions between the two countries.¹ Journalist Geoffrey Bolton points to a general consensus by historians that the reason for said strife

---
between nations of the Commonwealth occurred due to a sense of English patriotism that prevented a significant number of parliamentary representatives from observing Irish subjects as equals in the British Empire, thereby prompting the subjugation of Ireland as a nation in need of civilized guidance.

Interestingly, Bolton then counters this theory of English supremacy by alluding to the likelihood that MPs genuinely feared for the stability of English trade interests with Ireland (particularly the commodity of wool), thereby contributing to a “convenience” in union between nations.\(^2\) Martin Pugh adds to Bolton’s perspective by suggesting that, as early as the eighteenth century Ireland, Scotland, and Wales all fell under English disdain to some degree, thereby indicating a prevailing sense of exclusion from the premise of an actual “United” Kingdom.\(^3\) In either case, Britain clearly struggled during the eighteenth century with a proper sense of nationalism and with a debatable concept of what constituted true “British” representation. Gladstone directly addressed the debate over representation throughout the majority of his career and was instrumental in extending democratic changes to previously underrepresented groups such as the people of Ireland.

The sociopolitical status of Ireland within the United Kingdom, however, was only one issue that festered prior to Gladstone’s emergence in the political realm. Industrialization and the aftermath of the French Revolution both brought strife to relationships in the British class system and prompted many within the Empire to seek a voice that could represent them in Parliament. David Eastwood alludes to Elie Halevy’s


works and they jointly label this period of the early nineteenth century as a “Liberal awakening”. This particular revelation seemingly occurred in Gladstone after the 1850s.

Abraham Kriegel reinterprets the terminology used to describe the rise of British liberalism as “Whig liberty.” Interestingly, however, Kriegel does imply that many contemporary historians including John Russell and Henry Brougham were quick to label liberty as a primary feature of “Whiggery” in contrast to the loyalist high-conservatism that once defined a young Gladstone. Although Kriegel goes on to indicate that by the early nineteenth century this particular sense of Whig liberty seemingly appealed to the nobility rather than the common man. Kriegel also implies that the issue of liberty through democratic reform actually began even before Gladstone’s premierships. In other words, Gladstone may have served as a significant catalyst to the nineteenth-century Liberal movement, but considerations aimed at greater democratic understanding and regarding British citizens’ desires for further social representation via government leaders had already taken root prior to Gladstonian reforms.

The socio-political issues which festered in Britain starting in 1832 (after the first of three reform acts) served as catalyst that forever altered the face of Empire. A student of this tumultuous period in British history should not presume that the efforts of a singular individual or the ethics of an enlightened ideal had the capacity to completely revolutionize the structure of the British imperial system. Therefore, as important to the

---

6 Kriegel, "Liberty and Whiggery," 256.
period as Gladstone appears to be, he was part of a larger social transformation that was growing in the minds of various British social groups.

Unlike the initial observations from several of Gladstone’s cabinet and from the writings of his son, the scrutiny of modern historians such as Hugh Cunningham, Jonathan Parry, and Martin Pugh seeks to comprehend a broader picture of the Liberal movement in the nineteenth century rather than viewing Gladstone as a singular entity of political persuasion. That is not meant to suggest that contemporary sources fail to acknowledge the accomplishments of numerous MPs apart from Gladstone, nor is there an indication that current historians readily disassociate Gladstone from the party that he, in a sense, pioneered. However, Gladstone became the champion of several liberal causes and introduced appropriate legislation to transition governmental policies toward said goals.

The conclusion is, therefore, that the modern contributions overseeing Gladstone’s personal approach to governance simply provides an expansive angle focusing on the Gladstonian movement in the grander context of a transitioning Empire. Furthermore, the historiographic presentation of Gladstonian ideals would remain incomplete without the inclusion of the British population’s collective viewpoints regarding his administrative capabilities. Newspapers, both Liberal and Conservative, produced a plethora of content targeting various aspects of Gladstone’s political agenda in such a way as to demonstrate that British people, while largely in agreement over a need for stability within the government, did not readily concede to preferences over leadership and representation. For example, certain newspapers such as *The Evening Telegraph* and *The Derby Mercury* actively support Gladstone’s potential as a Liberal
leader during the Midlothian Campaign whereas journalists and advertisements in

_Grantham Journal_ advocate opportunities in property acquisition that benefit supporters of Gladstone’s opponent, Lord Dalkeith. While understanding the words of Gladstone goes far down the path of recognizing his policies, the accounts of Gladstone’s immediate biographers and the testimonies of various contributors to Victorian era newspapers could provide insight in determining the nature of Gladstonian representation. The perspective of the latter sources must also feature for the sake of defining the uniqueness of this democratic reform.

This thesis will cover several key issues of Gladstonian politics in order to demonstrate the uniqueness of Gladstone’s perception of “true representation” through democratic reform. Thus, it will also prove useful to summarize historians’ explanations of each topic in order to reveal the significance of Gladstonian fundamentals within a former imperial society largely governed through a sovereign English identity. For example, J. Hammond and R. Foot immediately address their purpose to covering several key histories of the British Empire including the accomplishments of Gladstone. In effect, the authors suggest that the comprehension of Gladstonian principle is essential to comprehending the politics of Germany, Soviet Russia, the United States, and the United Kingdom, all of which reflected qualities of imperialistic nations. Based upon the writing’s publication in the mid-twentieth century, it is possible that the aftermath of World War II, the contributions of the Labour Party in wartime, and looming British

---

7 "Decision of Mr. Gladstone to Contest Midlothian," _The Derby Mercury_, February 5, 1879; "Preparing for Mr. Gladstone in Midlothian," _Grantham Journal_, January 25, 1879; "Why Should Mr. Gladstone Not Contest Midlothian?" _The Evening Telegraph_ (Dundee), February 08, 1879.

decolonization served as relevant motivations for Hammond and Foot to comprehend the national identity of Britain within the period in which they wrote. Gladstone then naturally becomes a subject of interest during the mid-twentieth century as a historian from the United States might perceive Franklin Roosevelt in present circumstances as a past figure who brought about significant reform to a nation despite debates between the benefits and detriments of his administration.

This motive to investigate Britain’s identity as a budding democratic society within a period of national concern is actually similar to contemporary accounts of Gladstone such as Richard Cook’s in which he bemoans a period of doubt soon after the passing of Gladstone after the leader’s fourth premiership. Cook writes with a worried tone and indicates that without the source of Gladstonian idealism (Gladstone himself), the progression of Britain’s domestic and international roles as an example of democratic reform remains dubious at best.9 Despite differences in the contemporary sources’ desires to study Gladstone as an individual and current historians that aim to define Gladstonian Liberalism, there exists a repetitive attempt by both groups to utilize his accomplishments to gain a greater sense of Britain’s potential as a democratic society. Gladstone, along with other British leaders, contributed to a modern sense of progressive democracy under a parliament that clings to the banner of a constitutional monarchy.

When addressing academic perspectives surrounding Gladstone, it is crucial to mention the outlook over the transition of the British government throughout the nineteenth century related to democratic reform. Parry suggests that democratic reform fully manifested itself in Britain during the 1830s with the passage of the 1832 Reform

---

Act and the emergence of the Whig Party, both providing counter-points to Conservative assertions that governmental authority should remain jointly shared between the laws of Parliament and the decrees of the monarchy with both subject to a degree of constitutionalism.\textsuperscript{10} Pugh adds to this observation by suggesting that Tory unity began to wane just prior to the Reform Act because of the combined effects of middle class desperation and Whig assurances which led to a rise of opportunists within the Whig party.\textsuperscript{11} Parry continues by identifying the achievements of notable advocates supporting progressive movements. Robert Peel grew disillusioned from High Conservatism and subsequently inspired MPs including William Gladstone to contest former concepts of democratic representation.\textsuperscript{12}

Cunningham makes an essential point that “democracy” was not a clearly defined term in the nineteenth century and that some within the United Kingdom despised the notion altogether.\textsuperscript{13} From a modern standpoint on Victorian Liberalism, the determination that democratic reform began after the 1832 Reform Act is then founded on the possibility that broadened representation and the arrival of Liberal advocation are linked. This is certainly plausible from a purely political standpoint, at least before the arrival of twentieth century policies in which democratic reform no longer conformed to an issue of representation within Britain per se. Rather, democratic representation clearly constitutes a matter of delegation priorities within Empire. With respect to previous descriptions of the Conservative-supported constitutional monarchy, it should also become clear that the

\textsuperscript{11} Pugh, \textit{Britain since 1789}, 48.
\textsuperscript{12} Parry, \textit{The Rise and Fall of Liberal Government in Victorian Britain}, 48.
mainstream Tory agenda did not necessarily exclude democracy from governmental concerns. Jon Lawrence affirms Cunningham’s notion of a subjective application of British democracy, and Lawrence even chides Conservative writers for lamenting the inability of Tory leaders to readily adapt to the needs of various societal groups.\footnote{Jon Lawrence, \textit{Speaking for the People: Party, Language and Popular Politics in England, 1867 - 1914} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 11.} Gladstone appears to follow this path as he transitioned from idealistic Conservatism to pragmatic Liberalism.

It could be argued, however, that democracy as understood by most MPs proved most valid when the cabinet adopted actions in the best interest of the people rather than allowing the general population to directly decide the issue. However, despite this apparent recognition of the term democracy as a genuine feature of British government, William Jennings, in comparison to latter historians, surmises that the 1830s served as a key period in which a largely conservative Britain began to rely on “public opinion.”\footnote{Ivor Jennings, \textit{Cabinet Government} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1947), 12-13.} By this time in parliamentary history, post-Gladstonian historians recognize a tenable fact that the Whigs and, subsequently, the Liberals found a loophole through which to gain greater political acceptance amongst British voters although they had yet to produce a proponent that could reflect the ideals of greater representation and democratic reform.

Ian St. John includes an interesting point that Gladstone’s initial political endeavors in university led him to actively protest the earlier drafts of reform in 1830. St. John then borrows from David Bebbington’s viewpoint concluding that Gladstone seemed apprehensive at the idea of democratic reform, and he believed that the current government lay within the graces of divine sovereignty.\footnote{Ian St. John, \textit{Gladstone and the Logic of Victorian Politics} (London: Anthem Press, 2010), 5-6.} Opinions differ in
contemporary circles regarding the centrality of the 1832 Reform Act as the turning point in the British position on democratic practices. The first Reform Act supported by the Whigs did alter previous notions of a stable voting system by adding more borough seats to Parliament. Parry even argues that the act “indirectly” provided the British populace with greater political sway.\textsuperscript{17} However, Lawrence counters this premise of “genuine” democratic change by indicating that the reform in 1832 did not increase representation on an equal level for British citizens, but rather it hindered the democratic process by cutting the voting rights of the labor force to a third of their initial numbers.\textsuperscript{18} Lawrence is certainly correct and he confirms that democracy was far from the reach of the Whigs at this point, but in fairness the act did imply that MPs became aware that the former method of representation needed to change in order to realize a greater capacity for social representation. St. John then continues by revealing that Gladstone critiqued his own former views that manifested from his idealistic youth and he reassessed the misguided passion that preceded his later principles.\textsuperscript{19} These points by St. John are essential to the premise of this thesis regarding the convictions of Gladstone’s Anglicanism and the influence of his High Conservatism because it shows a willingness by Gladstone to maintain personal ethics rooted in his religion while altering former assumptions about the connection between state and spirituality that in turn redefined his views of democratic legislation.

Gladstone’s emerging and flexible adoption of representation within a nation undergoing democratic reform is a key theme of this thesis. Therefore, it will be

\textsuperscript{17} Parry, \textit{The Rise and Fall of Liberal Government in Victorian Britain}, 72-73.
\textsuperscript{19} St. John, \textit{Gladstone and the Logic of Victorian Politics}, 5-6.
necessary to include in the historiographical examination the viewpoints of initial biographers who seek to determine Gladstone’s character as well as later observers who concern themselves with the significance of Gladstonian policy within Victorian Britain. Undoubtedly, secondary examinations of Gladstone do include attempts to portray Gladstone’s character and do not stray away from the patterns of earlier accounts in tying his personal ethics together with his bureaucratic duties. In this regard, many of the later scrutinizers of Gladstone maintain the theme of their predecessors. However, the transition in historic focus largely appears to shift toward Gladstonian polity as a medium for democratic reform during the latter part of the nineteenth century and as a catalyst for societal change leading into the Edwardian era. Bebbington extends Gladstone’s influence beyond that of the Edwardian period by stating that Gladstonian ideals prove relevant in a modern context of the British political spectrum.  

Taking into account the contrast between Gladstone’s contemporaries and modern commentators, it remains true that there is little to no debate over the intent of Gladstone to bring about democratic reform in Britain, but rather the difference lies between the focus on the motivations behind his personal decisions as a political leader and the context of how a Gladstonian revision could affect the course of Empire. An example of this contrast would be the difference between Richard Cook who focuses on the character of Gladstone as an individual and Parry who indicates that the goal of his accounts is to provide a historic analysis of Victorian Era Liberalism which also includes information on Gladstonian politics.  


Bryce, Richard Cook, and John Morley who all shared closer ties to him than their modern counterparts) focus on an intimate view of Gladstone rather than grouping his influence as a part of the entirety of the Victorian political spectrum.

John Morley’s biographical account of Gladstone alludes to this perspective. Morley readily admits to a struggle of maintaining historiographical relevancy while addressing the “exploits, thoughts, and purposes” of Gladstone as a singular figure of national scrutiny in the British Empire. Although Morley certainly does not exclude Gladstone’s efforts to reform Britain as part of a greater historical contribution to the Empire, his main goal surveys the characteristics of Gladstone which accomplished recognizable feats of political and social acumen throughout his career.22 Likewise, James Bryce also provides a primary source account of Gladstone’s career from a perspective that seemingly aims to exemplify the man rather than democratic reform as a nineteenth century movement. In fact, Bryce begins his writings on Gladstone by informing the reader that they must include three traits that inescapably cling to his accomplishments: “the first his Scottish blood, the second his Oxford education, the third his apprenticeship to public life under Sir Robert Peel”.23 Morley and Bryce both served as Liberal MPs with Gladstone. Historical consideration suggests that their understandings of his contributions to democratic reform in Britain are limited by their immediate concerns within Parliament and their personal views of Gladstone as a parliamentary leader. For example, it is interesting that Bryce opts to exclude Gladstone’s Anglicanism as a fourth motivation in his political endeavors within this particular

This fact demonstrates that contemporary sources appear selective in their examinations of Gladstonian governance.

One might suggest that Gladstone’s religious ethics were not essential to his governmental policies, but Gladstone refutes this possibility through his own correspondence, much of which highlights his belief in the necessity of religion as a staple for running matters of state. Bryce also includes a chapter in his writings that openly concedes to the relevance of Gladstone’s religious influences. Thus, Bryce did not necessarily seek to eliminate Anglican virtue from Gladstonian policy. As a modern scholar reflecting on Gladstone’s motivations, Bebbington creates an entire narrative surrounding his stance on the Church and its relationship to the State, indicating that the man’s faith proved so “transparent” that it permeated the essence of his decisiveness concerning political endeavors. Obviously, Bryce was aware of Gladstone’s loyalty to the Church of England and probably assumed that the reader would include Anglicanism as a given aspect in Gladstonian administration or perhaps recognized that Anglicanism accounted for part of his upbringing. Hammond and Foot issue another possibility for Bryce’s supposed hesitation to label Anglicanism as an isolated trait in Gladstonian politics in that a considerable number of Liberal MP’s did support religious principles. However, Liberals often distinguished between religion and governmental affairs therefore implying that Gladstone’s approach was both controversial and unique.

---

the isolation of issues of state from spiritual matters. Therefore, Bryce may have also
distanced Gladstone’s Anglicanism from that of the overall Liberal pursuit of democratic
reform.

Because religious tenets were only part of the overall perspective, Gladstone’s views on
democratic reform are also instructive regarding his personal philosophy. Gladstone
clearly did not achieve a complete overhaul of parliamentary policies in the form of
direct voting rights indicative of Greek practices or in the model of a federal republic
espousing democratic values reflective of the United States. On the contrary, he did
support to some degree the sovereignty of Britain’s constitutional monarchy, and Roy Jenkins even states that when Gladstone gained his first premiership as a Liberal, there was “nothing of Whiggery about him”. Parry also maintains that Gladstone personally held fast to many religious morals and conservative ethics both prior to and during his time as a Liberal leader. For example, Gladstone emphasized the importance of liberty for the people, yet without religious conviction, these freedoms could never last due to the nature of sin. Bebbington labels Gladstone as a “career politician” yet still maintains that he never left his personal principles although he did often recognize the practicality of party appeasement despite contrast to his own opinions. Lawrence links these bureaucratic elements of Gladstonian politics to the broader term of “conservative Liberalism” as opposed to mainstream Whiggery or radical Liberalism, thereby

---

29 Jonathan Parry, *Democracy and Religion: Gladstone and the Liberal Party, 1867-1875* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 167. This is not to suggest that MPs in the Liberal party shunned religion. Rather Parry is pointing to an important attribute of conservative Anglicanism that remained crucial to Gladstone’s personal identity.
acknowledging Gladstone’s leanings toward Conservative policies. In other words, contemporary historians seem to agree that Gladstone advocated traits of conservatism and combined this attribute with the objectives of the Liberal Party, but never went so far as to lean toward the radical-left position of anti-imperialism. Instead, Gladstone contributed to the transition of a largely Conservative society rooted in English sovereignty into a redefined empire conscious of the need to expand its limited understanding of domestic representation by employing elements of British democracy while he addressed the expectations of his Liberal supporters.

Conservative values provide a foundation from which Gladstone evolved as a political leader. Regarding historians’ views on Gladstone’s early influences, Graham Goodlad implies that part of Gladstone’s uniqueness as an advocate for Liberal reforms was in fact his affiliation with the Peelites. Despite the endeavors of other Whig-Liberal MPs to court the affections of the people and even the attention of radicals, whose passions against Conservatives led them to seek options outside of imperialistic rule, Gladstone’s ethical convictions and his oratory skills allowed him to garner a deep-seated respect within the Peelite movement. Goodlad also alludes that Gladstonian politics did not originate solely from Gladstone himself, credence must also be given to elements of Peelite ideals. Considering that the Peelite movement had a profound influence on Gladstone’s political perspective, it is plausible that Gladstonian Liberalism emerged as a hybrid concept between Robert Peel’s movement and Gladstone’s own personal ethics. It

31 Lawrence, Speaking for the People, 47.
32 Judd, Empire, 59. Judd describes the Peelite movement as a “split” from traditional Toryism which occurred largely due to disagreements over the issue of free trade. Gladstone, among other MPs associated with the Peelite movement, and after the fall of Peel’s government, joined the political faction that would become the Liberal Party.
is also true that Gladstone was not without his own critiques of Peel, despite his favorable position amidst the other members of the movement. Historian J. B. Conacher states in an article regarding Peel and his followers that Gladstone questioned an apparent lack of emotion by Peel on the gravity of leaving the Conservative Party. Conacher reveals a significant difference between Gladstone and his mentor in that the former recognized a shift in principle among the Tories that apparently grieved him. In other words, it seems obvious that while Gladstone willingly pursued objectives linked to the Peel movement, he was loath to give up certain ideals that he still attributed to traditional conservatism.

Most of the historiographers covering Gladstone seek to outline his various accomplishments and the motivations behind his career choices, but it is also necessary to examine what historians perceive regarding the definition of Gladstonian Liberalism. Interestingly, most historians do not label Gladstonian Liberalism within one section of their writings, but rather pick out specific ideals held by Gladstone that, when combined, form a greater coherence of the term. David Nicolls borrows from Walter Bagehot’s firsthand perception of the British monarchy and indicates that Gladstonian Liberalism emerged as a response to the dwindling power of the monarchy. Although Gladstone had great respect for Queen Victoria, Nicholls concludes that he and Bagehot recognized a need to embrace “social and ideological influence” while still adhering to the ethical compass of constitutionalism. Martin Pugh alludes to this combination of interests by Gladstone as the staple for at least two decades of his political career. In addition, Pugh lists two principal traits of Gladstonian politics as “the pursuit of free trade and the

development of individual freedom”.\textsuperscript{36} Parry certainly supports the first of these two concepts and asserts that Gladstone’s experience as Chancellor of the Exchequer allowed him a “high profile conception of budgets” which he used to alter earlier Liberal approaches to fiscal responsibilities by “checking spending”.\textsuperscript{37} Eugenio Biagani cites historian John Vincent and alludes to the second of Pugh’s labeled Gladstonian principles, individual freedom, by informing his readers that Gladstone pursued Irish Home Rule with a passion related to a seemingly genuine desire to realize a sense of equality for Ireland within the United Kingdom.\textsuperscript{38} In his biography of Gladstone, Jenkins readily points to religion as a necessary feature of Gladstonian polity since it could not be separated from Gladstone’s professional character, although at times the former prime minister seemingly believed the government incapable of fully employing Christian principles within its daily practice.\textsuperscript{39} Finally, Gladstone, by his own admission, identifies Anglicanism as a central belief throughout his career that provided an ethical absolute within a government immersed in subjective ideals not always reflective of his own.\textsuperscript{40} These all form the body of Gladstonian Liberalism and the impetus behind his reforms.

The general consensus by historians seems to surmise that Gladstonian politics were a conglomeration of several key elements that, when placed together, alter the initial concept of mainstream Liberalism. In summary, a historiographic definition of Gladstonian Liberalism includes the following: that he embraced an innovative approach

\textsuperscript{36} Pugh, \textit{Britain Since 1789}, 100.
\textsuperscript{37} Parry, \textit{The Rise and Fall of Liberal Government in Victorian Britain}, 184.
\textsuperscript{38} Eugenio F. Biagini, \textit{British Democracy and Irish Nationalism 1876-1906} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 15.
\textsuperscript{39} Jenkins, \textit{Gladstone: A Biography}, 70.
\textsuperscript{40} Gladstone, \textit{The State in Its Relations with the Church}, 24-25.
to individual representation relevant to nineteenth century societal progression, that he produced financial reforms supported by Liberal-leaning policy via checking government spending as well as limiting government taxation, and that he retained a number of former conservative principles accompanied by an unmoving devotion to Anglican ethics. The merging of these facets of Gladstonian polity provide an enlightening viewpoint to a modern perspective of his reforms in Empire. Conclusively, Gladstonian Liberalism did not represent a singularly conservative agenda, nor did he conform to a purely liberal philosophy. In retrospect, the emergence of Gladstonian Liberalism incorporated a malleable and gradual progression towards British representation within a Victorian society amenable to democratic reform.
CHAPTER II

DISESTABLISHMENT

Support of state-sanctioned religion is a hallmark of many European countries. Gladstone’s affiliation with the Anglican Church provided him with a loyalty to the institution while the Christian tenets within Anglicanism pointed to the inequity of society. As a result of that expected loyalty, one of the more controversial aspects of his career lie in his approach to the Established Churches in both Scotland and Ireland. It is also prudent to include the idea that England’s religious influence over the rest of Britain did not solely refer to differences in denominational interpretations of the Scriptures. This allowed imperialists to maintain domestic sovereignty through the Church as English and Irish perspectives filtered through an Anglican clergy while Scotland retained, to some degree, its own religious governance. Jonathan Parry asserts that debates over the matter of Church and State prompted an unease amongst politicians due to the “sensitive” nature of the role of the State in religious matters, particularly in Ireland.\(^\text{41}\) One might suspect that Gladstone’s position would not sway in favor of disestablishment for either nation as both fell under a dominant relationship of Church and State which he professedly supported. Furthermore, Gladstone’s former high conservative dogma surely would have at the least reminded the MP of his previous belief in a government structured by

\(^{41}\) Jonathan Parry, *Democracy and Religion*, 3-4.
Anglican principles which would extend to Ireland. However, it is also apparent that even Anglicanism may have taken a secondary position to Gladstone’s desire to appease members of the United Kingdom who were not directly linked to his British conservative priorities. Essentially, Gladstone continuously increased his support of liberal reform to reflect Britain’s progressive interests, which in turn, demonstrated one of the unique aspects of Gladstonian politics in that his policymaking did not remain static in practice, but exhibited malleability for the sake of representative appeasement. For example, Parry explains that Gladstone began as a High Conservative Anglican but altered his political demeanor by the late 1860s in favor of non-conformist endeavors to disestablish the Anglican church in Ireland, thereby ensuring further support of the Liberal Party by Irish citizens.\textsuperscript{42} Ian St. John then addresses an important element that defined the progression of Gladstonian ethics from a conservative base to a liberal platform. St. John states that Gladstone always desired to pursue the “good of the state”; however, his former ideals transformed by recognizing the essential element of individual liberty over that of bureaucratic authority.\textsuperscript{43} From the perspective of these accounts, Gladstone’s decision to entertain notions about disestablishment seems to pose a direct contrast to his personal ethics and to the mainstream Conservative stance in Parliament that insisted that the Church system must retain a position of authority within the immediate boundaries of the British Empire. In short, Gladstone’s differing approach between church disestablishment for Ireland and for Scotland demonstrated a struggle that reflected his considerations of liberal representation over that of traditional practices.

\textsuperscript{42} Parry, Democracy and Religion, 8-10.
\textsuperscript{43} St. John, Gladstone and the Logic of Victorian Politics, 7.
The origins of Anglicanism in the sixteenth-century and its role with government throughout the seventeenth-century may loosely connect to its status in Victorian Britain. However, its association to Ireland, Scotland, and Gladstone must garner discussion to reveal the roots of the relationship with this religion’s sovereignty over the British state. The Church of England historically traces back to Henry VIII and his disputation with Catholicism owing to a dispute over monarchal authority, and particularly regarding his right to divorce Catherine of Aragon. This is not an unknown part of England’s history to be sure and should direct observers to acknowledge that the Church of England did not emerge solely to contest Catholicism, but also arose in protest to the authority of the Pope, exchanging his headship for that of a British monarch. In fact, these facets of the origins of the Anglican Church are directly addressed by author George Bernard who states, more to the point, that despite disagreements by historians over the true architect of Anglicanism that “religious policy was very much the king’s policy”. In other words, the Anglican system allowed England’s ruler a sanctioned level of divine authority previously unrecognized by his subjects, thereby promoting a greater degree of bureaucratic sovereignty which in practice could potentially extend to British Parliament.

The Anglican Church and the responsibilities of Britain’s government transformed yet again in the seventeenth-century in the aftermath of the English Civil War. Under the leadership of Oliver Cromwell, the influence of the monarchy diminished and by default the king’s divine Anglican authority was relinquished to a government led by Parliament. It is also true that Cromwell did not allow Parliament to continue in favor

---

of a temporary commonwealth.\textsuperscript{45} Cromwell’s ideals in the seventeenth-century eventually contributed to the early nineteenth-century notions of democratic reform because he emphasized the importance of a nation led by the people rather than led by an absolute ruler or by a corrupt parliament. Incidentally, Cromwell did not follow through on his promises to install democratic measures as he adopted an autocracy over his Commonwealth, but it is feasible that his initial tendencies towards democracy, limited as they were, retained their value during the Victorian Era. In contrast to this possibility, however, Blair Worden notes that current historians seem to take a perspective that Cromwell’s Puritan religion and even the influence of the Anglican Church may have simply served as a medium through which to discuss the other matters of bureaucratic interest.\textsuperscript{46} If this assertion is accurate then it gives greater credence that religious perception would continue as a tool through which the British government could pursue political agendas by demonstrating a “spiritual responsibility” to the nation. It would not be prudent to suggest that Cromwell or MPs that professed to follow a form of denominational Christianity were false to their own religious principles out of political corruption. Rather, it is probable that Britain’s obvious ties to religious fervor provided opportunities for the government to further its own agendas fueled by a combination of spiritual zeal and bureaucratic responsibility. Furthermore, Cromwell’s actions, according to J. Gordon Eaker, prompted idealists such as Richard Hooker to rethink the validity of Anglicanism as a suitable rival to Puritan leadership, thereby reigniting an interest in the


\textsuperscript{46} Worden, "Cromwell and the Protectorate", 59.
“Divine Law” of the Scriptures.\textsuperscript{47} Despite the former strife between the various movements of the Church and State in Britain, Anglicanism retained its status as an authoritative moral structure intrinsically fundamental to English society, including individuals such as Gladstone, although it was not necessarily representative of other religious denominations in the United Kingdom.

The examination of the events above reveal an important, informative part in understanding Gladstone and his approach to the disestablishment of the Churches in Ireland and Scotland, especially since the latter abrogation did not conform to Anglican sovereignty concerns. Clearly each of these religious disputes, including King Henry’s break from Catholicism and Cromwell’s challenge to an Anglican-led monarchical sovereignty, possesses its own historic individuality within its immediate frame of occurrence. However, these struggles also connect via a continuous pattern of British consideration of the legitimacy of Church-combined-with-State, particularly in relevance to Anglican jurisdiction within Britain. Gladstone himself recognized this Anglican authority to the point of fervent but not wholly undisputed loyalty which was obviously defined by his personal approach to the enactment of Irish disestablishment. In reference to the Anglican Church, Gladstone indicates in his writings that the term “Church and State” is inseparable from the realm of politics, and he believed that the governing body of Britain must “profess” the principles of Christianity to instill ethical guidance for the nation.\textsuperscript{48} It should be noted that this passage in Gladstone’s publication emerged from his zeal as a young and budding politician; one who saw potential in a harmonious

\textsuperscript{48} Gladstone, \textit{The State in Its Relations with the Church}, 27.
relationship between “Church and State” but who did not necessarily assume that British Parliament had already embraced such a practice. In fact, Gladstone seems to infer that, apart from within Britain, the administration of a dominant Anglican Church to every corner of the empire was not realistic simply owing to the plethora of complex belief systems attempting to intertwine under the sovereignty of a single Christian denomination.\(^\text{49}\) John Morley also adds to Gladstone’s perspective, stating that around the MP’s early career some in the government insisted:

The church was not the nation; that it was not identical with parliament who spoke for the nation; that it had no longer a title to compose the governing order; and a more startling disclosure still to the minds of churchmen—that laws affecting the church would henceforth be made by men of all churches and creeds, or even men of none.\(^\text{50}\)

David Bebbington also comments on the state of Anglicanism in the nineteenth-century, indicating that many British citizens believed that the Anglican Church had embraced secular matters to the point that it had become too political.\(^\text{51}\) It is possible that Gladstone applied a similar theory to the Established Anglican Church in Ireland and to the Established Presbyterian Church of Scotland, viewing both regions as individual nations capable of maintaining their own religious principles while remaining adherent to British Anglicanism.

One should not assume, however, that Gladstone utilized an identical solution of reform for the Church of Ireland and for that of the Church of Scotland despite this personal revelation. Those differing responses result from the fact that they did not possess the same level of political interest or religious concern regarding Gladstone as a


liberal mediator of British agendas. It is helpful to understand that Scotland’s Presbyterian majority public accepted its Established Church since the institution was also Presbyterian. The Established Anglican Church in Ireland, on the other hand, only possessed a minority of Anglican supporters while the vast majority of the Irish identified as Catholic. Alan O’Day adds that by the 1860s the Irish Catholics pushed heavily for disestablishment and, coupled with the rising Fenian movement, the issue of the Established Anglican Church in Ireland became extremely significant in comparison to the mildly contested Scottish Church.\(^5\) Irish voters supportive of disestablishment received greater attention under Gladstone’s premiership, whereas their Scottish counterparts met with a less enthusiastic degree of support by Gladstone likely for the sake of garnering dual-sided political backing from Scotland’s constituents. However, the former prime minister’s nearly laissez-faire approach to Scottish disestablishment suggests that Ireland actually proved to be the true priority of Gladstonian reform regarding religious liberties.

At this point of consideration, Gladstone’s stance on spirituality and its position in the Established Churches is relevant to his career because it influenced him in pursuing liberal reform, instilling democratic values, and contemplating disestablishment. His loyalties to the principles of the Church of England cannot distinguish nor depart from his decisions regarding disestablishment since they are so clearly marked through his own correspondence. Parry asserts that the prospect of Church disestablishment was not a subject that met with universal agreement under the Liberal agenda as the Whigs largely contested the benefits of including the spiritual element from British governance.\(^5\) This

point by Parry suggests the likelihood that by the 1860s Gladstone, evidenced by support of Irish and Scottish disestablishment, had reached a position that favored the representation of his liberal followers in those nations over British Whig approval, thereby suggesting that democratic elements were present in the consideration process of contesting the Established Church system. Gladstone effectively broke away from mainstream Whig position to assure Ireland’s appeasement, thereby allowing for political comfort from a Scotch/Irish angle as well as from a nonconformist stance. Furthermore, Gladstone did not abandon his Anglican principles after disestablishment in Ireland even though by appearance he directly contradicted his own desire to maintain a United Kingdom integrated with Anglicanism.

Irish dissatisfaction with Established Church principles arose in British society previous to Gladstone’s involvement. It is difficult to pinpoint the exact year that Irish constituents first expressed annoyance with the Anglican Church, but it is safe to conclude that tensions developed at least as early as 1798. Pugh reveals that just before this date, Prime Minister William Pitt attempted to appease Irish Catholics through sanctions that allowed greater freedoms over societal parameters such as educational stipulations and domestic practices. Pugh continues by indicating that Pitt’s motivations seemed more focused on avoiding potential aggression by the United Irishmen and by the French who were siding with Irish rebels. The French did in fact dispatch an invasion force in 1796, but in retrospect little changed due to their initial coming. The true uprising against England however did not commence until two years after the arrival of French troops to support Ireland.54

54 Martin Pugh, Britain since 1789, 25.
Poor weather initially hindered the efforts of the French navy, thereby jeopardizing efforts to land along Ireland’s coastline and preventing any significant progress for France’s military objectives. A century later, Katharine Hinkson describes the incident of the French invasion as a merely amusing affair in that British families thought France’s attempts to invade Ireland were little more than a blustering endeavor hampered by the tumultuous coasts surrounding the British Isles. Thomas Pakenham provides a differing tone to the issue by stating that Ireland’s rebellion in spite of France’s failures proved anything but humorous, leading to the deaths of over 30,000 men including commoners. This struggle, in turn, prompted Pitt to install desperate measures of subjugation that seeded strife between England and Ireland for decades. In short, the French invasion was a blunder, but it did not prevent Irish Catholics and Protestants from challenging British authority over the matter of their national liberty. Denis Judd also writes on the issue of the 1798 uprising stating that the Irish Catholics’ and Protestants’ defeat against England allowed the latter to subdue the land as part of a “United” Kingdom by the passing of the 1801 Act of Union. Incidentally, Mary Condon produces a key piece of historic context regarding the relationship between the Act of Union and the Established Irish Church. Condon states that although Irish and English Anglicanism shared common ideas, it was from the Act of Union in 1801 that they officially merged as joint bodies of religious governance. Though victorious in an

57 Judd, Empire, 40.
imperial sense, Britain’s subjugation of Ireland administered greater animosity than from previous Irish grievances and thus sparked a desire to seek representation for Church disestablishment from British governance which eventually gained the interest of a newly-elected Prime Minister Gladstone in 1868.

The matter over disestablishment from the Anglican Church garnered further and extensive consideration in Ireland in the 1830s under the Whig-Liberal party in Britain. Robert Mermagen concludes that, although the previous statement is true, it does not mean that the Whigs concurred over the matter of reform for the Established Church. Mermagen along with Condon asserts that the matter of complaint from Irish Catholics related to a mandatory tithing system under the auspices of the Tithe Commutation Acts established in 1823 and 1824. However, Mermagen seems to disagree with Condon on whether the issue of tithing was the sole factor that incurred Irish Catholic wrath, and he argues (in similar fashion to Scotland’s debates regarding disestablishment, discussed later in the chapter) that the discord linked to a greater matter of the relationship between Church and State.59 Hugh Cunningham adds to this debate of Catholic sentiment for antiestablishment and introduces two key features of the issue. First, the Catholics were not alone in admitting discomfort over the Tithing Acts as in fact, Presbyterians also shared this apparent consternation under the Established Church in Ireland. Second, the Anglican Church that incorporated these two denominations amounted to merely seven percent of the population, thereby suggesting that a significant number of Irish citizens did not profess loyalty to the supposed “sovereign” institution of Anglicanism.60 By this

point around the early 1830’s, Gladstone’s political career as a Tory politician was budding, his loyalty to the Anglican Church, and to the High Conservative establishment did not yet contest with the virtues laid down by the Peelite movement.\(^{61}\) St. John stresses that during the issue of Irish dissatisfaction, Gladstone, through his published work *The State in its Relations with the Church* in 1838, maintained that Britain should embrace a “religious nationality” with Anglicanism at the head of government. However, St. John also asserts that, even at the time of publication, Gladstone was already maturing towards a more liberal mindset in which he began to recognize the complexity of Britain and the various needs of the United Kingdom that an Anglican-centered government might fail to address.\(^{62}\) John Hammond affirms that Gladstone’s writings, while reflective of a young man’s passion for his chosen faith, merely echoed the musings of a fervent idealist fired by an Evangelical stance which, in time, transformed toward more practical religious tolerance.\(^{63}\) This set of revelations by Gladstone reveal at least two key elements to his personal approach to liberal politics. The first apparent truth is that Gladstone, while loyal to the Established Anglican Church, did not remain on a fixed set of objectives. Rather, Gladstone’s passions combined with an eventual bureaucratic wisdom to adhere to the expectations of his respective party while still holding fast to his spiritual ethics. A second conclusion includes that the principle of the established religious body in Britain and Ireland served as a significant topic of interest for Gladstone during his first premiership.

\(^{63}\) Hammond and Foot, *Gladstone and Liberalism*, 42-43.
The promotion of Gladstone to Prime Minster in 1868 is partially owed to his decision to support non-conformists on the issue of disestablishment of the Church of Ireland. Cunningham mentions that, until 1865, Gladstone had not yet pushed the issue of religious reform in Ireland although, when he saw potential in garnering non-conformist support for the Liberal Party, he readily adopted the challenge. The author states, however, that while Gladstone’s sudden decision to consider disestablishment may have certainly appeared politically motivated, he was “empathetically earnest and serious” because he refused to ignore the application of spiritual matters within those of bureaucratic goals.\(^{64}\) Furthermore, maintaining good relations with non-conformists forced Gladstone to side with a group considered by some to be radicalized against the High Church of which he himself retained membership.\(^ {65}\) By siding with non-conformists on Irish disestablishment, Gladstone revealed that he would not rely solely on the opinions of properly vested political groups within Britain, thereby extending his democratic sentiments to voters beyond those endowed with political prominence.

Interestingly, Gladstone’s policies supporting Irish disestablishment extended to Jamaica in 1870. Jamaica’s distance from Britain as well as its former ties to slavery might have prompted Gladstone to ignore any cries for disestablishment by the island colonists. However, Gladstone’s former endeavors to protest slavery despite his father’s previous holdings in the colony provided the statesmen with a moral reason to ponder the possibility of Jamaican disestablishment which would ensure extended freedoms for

\(^{64}\) Cunningham, *The Challenge of Democracy*, 108

colonists. Jamaica also shared an essential attribute with the Irish in that the majority of the population did not express loyalty to Anglicanism. Therefore, Gladstone agreed to the disestablishment of the Church of England in Jamaica in 1870 allowing the colony to obtain the same religious independence that Ireland received the previous year. In other words, Gladstone, despite his obvious political motivations, could not refute his Christian duty to realize the needs of British subjects at home and overseas when a majority of them pleaded for religious independence from the established Anglican institution. This trait of representation reflected the facets of Gladstonian Liberalism even when it conflicted with Gladstone’s former principles as a Tory and as an Anglican because in the cases of Ireland and Jamaica, traditional principle gave way to democratic adherence.

Another factor existed which Gladstone could scarcely ignore in the form of an unsuccessful Fenian opposition to British authority in 1867 that coincided with the Irish Catholics’ continued struggle against the Anglican Church. O’Day directly addresses Gladstone’s attitude toward both the Fenians’ imprisonment in England and the Irish Catholics’ complaints of Anglican Church oppression by indicating that confronting Liberal Unionism, advocating Christian principles, protecting Catholic rights to religious liberty, and even furthering Catholic interests in educational reforms all played a role in Gladstone’s decision to enact Irish disestablishment by 1869. This inclusion by O’Day acknowledges a core attribute of Gladstonian Liberalism in that the Prime Minister was willing to abandon former assumptions about Ireland’s status as a British subject by

67 Knaplund, Gladstone and Jamaica, 355.
collaborating with the Fenians and the Catholics against the authority of the Established Church and against English sovereignty.

Perception on the benefits of Gladstone’s Irish Church Act varied within the voices of the British media as some seemingly embraced the potential liberties that disestablishment could bring, whereas other differing opinions suggested cautionary observations so that the act did not make radical changes to the Established Church system. For example, an article from Irish newsletter *Freeman’s Journal and Daily Commercial Advertiser*, openly praises the efforts of Gladstone and others among Britain’s government who involved themselves in the process of the Irish Church Act as it eased debts and land rates for Irish Church Tenants. While it does not directly describe an effect of Church independence from Anglicanism, the article clarifies that through this measure Gladstone and proponents of the Irish Church Act were able to advocate for tenants in Ireland whose previous financial dealings proved incompatible with their societal position. Alternatively, the Irish Church Act was not without its critics in England and some acknowledged that the immediate results of the act in 1869 exhibited minor alterations to the Irish clergy and provided little change toward disestablishment. In contrast, these same journalists recognized that the Irish Church Act served as a bill comprised of stages to conclude in 1871 when the authority of the Anglican Church in Ireland predictably dissolved, thereby completing a promise by Gladstone to his non-conformist followers. Interestingly, the Non-Conformists did not necessarily trust that Gladstone could achieve the full potential of disestablishment.

---

69 “The Irish Church Act and Its Results,” *Freeman’s Journal and Daily Commercial Advertiser* (Dublin), September 5, 1871.

through the Act in 1869. Merely a few days after the publication of the previous article, a source seemingly supportive of a non-conformist perspective openly speculates on the trustworthiness of the bill. That source suggested the change, while apparent, might prove passive with little stable assurance that the act would retain its supposed guarantees of religious liberties. These media accounts suggest a significant risk by Gladstone, who likely understood the failure to pass a viable bill in the dawning of his first premiership, could amount to political suicide or, at the very least, might indicate that his administrative abilities lacked conviction. Gladstone, however, did succeed in producing the Irish Church Act, signifying that his goals seemed genuine and that he willingly embraced the needs of constituents who stood apart from mainstream parliamentary interests. While political manipulation certainly features as an element of Gladstonian Liberalism, the Irish Church Act provided the first official means through which Gladstone demonstrated a propensity for broader representation and progressive reform.

To accurately access the history of the Established Churches of the United Kingdom in the nineteenth-century, it is helpful to understand that Ireland and Scotland did not receive the same approach by Gladstone. The Irish Church’s disestablishment openly met with Gladstone’s active support, yet the same level of response is not seen regarding the Church of Scotland. It is possible that Gladstone simply viewed the troubles in Ireland as a dire situation of religious misrepresentation in comparison to Scottish concerns which, by appearance, seemed more docile in nature. There is also the factor that Gladstone possessed Scottish heritage and strong ties to the Episcopal Church of

---

Scotland which, in turn, may have promoted a reluctance by Gladstone to challenge the Scottish religious bodies.\textsuperscript{72} Bebbington states:

Gladstone was more aware than most Anglicans of other Christian traditions. His Scottish background gave him a personal acquaintance with Presbyterian worship. In Scotland, the Established Church had repudiated bishops in the seventeenth century and preferred more austere orders of service. But when in Scotland, Gladstone was a devoted son of the Episcopal Church.\textsuperscript{73}

Along the same issue of the Church loyalties, Bebbington adds another key fact asserting that “the Scottish Episcopal Church was the counterpart of the Church of England,” thereby suggesting a common root of Anglicanism.\textsuperscript{74} Pugh suggests another likelihood stating that by the latter half of the nineteenth-century Scotland recognized Liberals as their best advocates with a number of British leaders serving as representatives to the Scottish seats in Parliament including Gladstone.\textsuperscript{75} In effect, Scotland seemed more likely to adhere to their representatives in parliament as opposed to the Irish who may have taken a position of aggressive assertion to garner greater attention from the British government over religious freedom. In other words, Scotland seemingly did not show the same level of instability over religious and political matters as did Ireland, thereby prompting Gladstone to focus on the latter as a more prudent target for his liberal reforms. Gladstone certainly did not feign interest in the matter of Scottish disestablishment; however, and it is obvious that he did contemplate religious liberty for the nation at least from an internal standpoint.

Another reason that Gladstone may have opted to observe Scottish disestablishment with less enthusiasm than his interests in Ireland links to the previous

\textsuperscript{72} St. John, \textit{Gladstone and the Logic of Victorian Politics}, 1-2.
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Disruption of 1843. Scotland shared similar dissatisfaction with the Irish over employing a clergy in the form of the Church of Scotland that was answerable to state policy and thereby, by proxy, was under English sovereignty. In response, Dr. David Welsh and Dr. Thomas Chalmers instituted a new form of religious governance titled the Free Church of Scotland. Journalist Harold Laski defines this act as a direct challenge to the Established Church in Scotland, but one that did not erupt from a disagreement over denominational interpretation as both movements professed a Presbyterian background. Rather, the debate fell on whether the Church answered to Christ directly or answered to the State even in religious matters. The term utilized by Laski is societas perfecta which alludes to an idea that the Church is self-sufficient and not bound to State authority, which Laski asserts is a belief found in early Scottish ecclesiastical principles.\textsuperscript{76} To a considerable degree this movement of the Free Church of Scotland proved successful and garnered the support of the Scottish liberals, thus providing a pressure point for Scotland and for the Liberal Party in seeking disestablishment beginning in 1874.\textsuperscript{77} Furthermore, there were those in Ireland who openly supported the efforts of Dr. Welsh and Dr. Chalmers made apparent in an article by the Belfast News-Letter. The author praises the Free Church of Scotland for leaving the “enslaved Church of Scotland” going so far as to criticize landowners for refusing to distribute property to the supporters of the movement.\textsuperscript{78} Interestingly, Kellas acknowledges these resistant individuals as “tory landowners” and alludes to the fact that the Free Church of Scotland incorporated a considerable amount of


liberal supporters as opposed to the Church of Scotland whose conservative clergy members outnumbered liberal clergymen of the denomination by over 1000:1. In retrospect, the emergence of the Free Church of Scotland provided Gladstone with a staunch liberal foothold in the region that might have otherwise fell to conservative influence. This is a key element to Gladstonian reform concerning disestablishment in Scotland which constitutes both personal and political aspirations of the former prime minister. Effectively, the removal of the Established Church in Scotland would force Gladstone to challenge his own personal ties to the practices of his traditional Scottish Presbyterian heritage which likely factored into his reluctance to pursue the issue with the same fervor as he did in Ireland. However, supporting disestablishment appeased Gladstone’s Free Church supporters and provided him with a strong political front in Scotland that remained despite the fact that he did not accomplish denominational Church reform. In short, Gladstone, was willing to place his own position of Church and State authority behind his desire to both acquire Scottish support and to ponder an eventual disestablishment, thereby suggesting that his agenda for reform temporarily overcame his religious principles.

Although Gladstone did not actively pursue Scottish disestablishment, it would be misleading to ignore his involvement on the matter since he clearly derived political comfort from his support of the issue. However, it is equally necessary to address his considerations of Scottish disestablishment during 1880 at Midlothian which presents an early example of a modern democratic campaign. For the Free Church members in Scotland, Gladstone’s campaign was an opportunity to remind Gladstone via his Scottish

---
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Liberal followers about his former assurances that he would support Scottish disestablishment.\textsuperscript{80} Kellas states that Gladstone also advocated for the Scottish electoral body in which provided the proponents of disestablishment with the idea that Gladstone was there for their needs.\textsuperscript{81} Finally, Alan Simon adds that in 1877 Lord Hartington guaranteed that Gladstone would zealously tackle disestablishment if a significant number of Scottish citizens agreed with the need for such reform.\textsuperscript{82} Gladstone, however, made a questionable response to his Scottish supporters by indicating that his priorities did not include disestablishment, though he would consider pursuing the issue if a greater number of Scotsmen voiced their concerns on the matter, thereby repeating his previous pledge.\textsuperscript{83}

Despite his general emphasis on the importance of representation for the sake of liberal reform, this failure seems to be a rare moment in Gladstone’s career in which he seemingly relinquishes the apparent interests of his Scottish political backers, despite his previous assurances that he would address the question of disestablishment. A relative disagreement over the priority of the topic seems unlikely within Gladstone since he would continue to consider disestablishment for Scotland even in the latter period of his parliamentary career. In fact, Roy Jenkins states that as late as 1891 Gladstone, via his immediate followers, included a renewal of the examination over the prospect of disestablishment in Scotland despite evidence that Gladstone’s primary focus was Irish Home Rule at the time.\textsuperscript{84} This concentration is not a surprising development for
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Gladstonian Liberalism since Home Rule proved to be one of the most relevant examples of his progressive reforms. However, Jenkins’ account also suggests that disestablishment never vacated Gladstone’s sympathies. Although Gladstone never did obtain disestablishment for Scotland, that concept still reflects the measure of his interest in representation for constituents who stood apart from the established Church.

Scotland’s religious history is comparable to Ireland’s in that there was at least a measure of societal distress over the Established Church, but, as stated previously, it did not elicit the same amount of concern for Gladstone as did the Irish plight. Citizens from both nations seemed concerned with the level of authority that the State should possess over the Established Church. However, Ireland and Scotland did not share the same denominational majority with the former containing mainly Catholics and the latter professing a large Presbyterian population. This may seem nothing more than a minor difference of spiritual interpretation until one takes into account that the members of the Established Anglican Church in Ireland only constituted a small percentage of potential political supporters whereas that Established Presbyterian Church in Scotland reflected the bulk of its domestic population.

Kellas proposes that Gladstone showed little interest in jeopardizing his goodwill with English voters who still maintained that the Established Scottish Church was acceptable to the alternative.85 Parry adds that since a number of English Whig-Liberals supported the Established Church in Scotland, there seemed little reason to disrupt an existing denominational system that appeared to function adequately in similar fashion to the Church of England.86 In other words, Gladstone seemingly derived minimal benefit

85 Kellas, The Liberal Party and the Scottish Church Disestablishment Crisis, 37.  
86 Parry, Democracy and Religion, 102.
from pursuing disestablishment in Scotland since his Free Church supporters would continue to pursue his favor as long an opposing candidate did not present himself as a champion for Scotland’s *societas perfecta*. Furthermore, by remaining fairly neutral over the status of Scotland’s Church and State, it is logical to conclude that both the Free Church liberals and the pro-establishment conservatives assumed Gladstone might turn to their favor, thereby making him the safest political bet. Cunningham confirms this possibility of retaining political backing for Gladstone by stating that a Conservative weak point toward the latter half of the nineteenth-century was, in fact, the reluctance to provide solutions for the religious issues in Wales and in Scotland prompting both nations to retain their support of the Liberal Party as the medium to embody their cause.\textsuperscript{87}

While an element of bureaucratic tact clearly exists in Gladstone’s position regarding Scottish neutrality, he was also maintaining a democratic front by attempting to appease both sides of Scotland’s sociopolitical spectrum. By appearing neutral over Scottish disestablishment Gladstone demonstrated an aspect of his liberalism that, combined with personal principles, preserved the integrity of Church and State while allowing for the possibility of future change.

In summary, Gladstone’s endeavors in religious reforms for both Scotland and Ireland reflect significant attributes of his unique form of liberal reform. It is true that he never obtained disestablishment for Scotland as Ireland seemingly weighed heavier on both his political agenda and on his personal conscience. The Prime Minister, however, also opted to retain the idea of religious liberty in Scotland for the sake of garnering the nation’s liberal vote while maintaining an assertion that he needed to recognize the
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validity of Scottish Church dissenters and their concerns. Contrary to his previous notions of Church and State, Gladstone readily admitted that forcibly maintaining a United Kingdom by placing all lands under an Established Anglican Church answerable to the government was not realistic if the Scottish and the Irish people were to remain content as British subjects. This conviction by Gladstone is even more apparent when considering his success in passing the Irish Church Act in 1869. Despite doubts from his own non-conformist supporters and those of his English critics over the effective change that the bill could bring to the religious establishment in Ireland, Gladstone defied various expectations and provided a significant representative measure to the nation that abolished the authority of the Anglican Church over Ireland. Gladstone prioritized certain democratic values over his own personal perspectives steeped in his Anglican principles. That is not to say that Gladstone relinquished the importance of Anglicanism to his own person, but rather that he sacrificed a favored ideology in order to maintain a sound relationship with Irish and Scottish supporters, thereby affirming a principle of sincerity regarding individual representation within Gladstonian Liberalism.
CHAPTER III

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Gladstone’s dealings in the disestablishment of the Irish Church and his considerations for the plight of his Free Church supporters in Scotland certainly reflect aspects of Gladstonian Liberalism within the immediate bounds of the United Kingdom. However, Gladstone’s administrative abilities also encompassed British concerns tied to international policies including the tariff reforms enacted during the Crimean War, the feud with Benjamin Disraeli over Bulgaria concerning the Eastern Question, and the controversial nature of Gladstone’s handling of the Khartoum incident. All three of these events portray aspects relevant to Gladstone’s liberal policies and their applications to international affairs. Again, the purpose of the thesis is not to glorify Gladstone’s career, but rather to highlight specific facets of the Liberal MP’s conviction regarding representation which reveal the unique qualities of his sociopolitical practices both nationally and abroad.

An example of international endeavors adherent to Gladstonian influence connects to the Crimean War fought between Russia and an alliance of European powers including Britain, France, and the Ottomans. Gladstone, although generally a pacifist, did not always balk at the prospect of war. He subsequently prioritized British financial subsidies allowing the nation’s budget to contribute to the defense of the Ottomans.
during the Crimean War. Interestingly, Gladstone supported the interests of a non-British nation in protecting what he believed to be an oppressed state although he professedly exhibited reservations over the necessity of an extended war and of relying on the trustworthiness of the Turkish Muslims.\textsuperscript{88} Furthermore, upon Britain’s entry into the conflict, Gladstone doubled income taxes which mandated that the British people consider the merits of war by fronting military costs.

By this action of further taxation, Gladstone seemingly accomplished liberal representation in two ways. First, Gladstone could support his fellow MPs as well as his own ethics by defending Ottoman interests while limiting the ability of the Empire to further war with Russia. Second, he prompted British citizens to accept financial responsibility for a war that they advocated. Deliberately alluding to Gladstone’s personal ethics, Olive Anderson states that Gladstone viewed taxation in wartime as a moral imperative aimed at preventing the people from continuing war for the sake of imperial patriotism alone.\textsuperscript{89} Gladstonian Liberalism seemed less concerned with nationalism and more concerned with extending representation to oppressed people. In the fashion of true Gladstonian Liberalism, the MP’s views shifted from loyal support of one group (the Ottomans) to another (the Bulgarian Christians) in the turmoil of the Eastern Question, particularly related to the Bulgarian Uprising of 1876. The rebellion, which Gladstone referred to as the “Bulgarian horrors,” prompted the MP to openly attack Turkish treatment of the Bulgarians as well as criticize Disraeli’s handling of the situation as head of the Tories. Essentially, Gladstone contested that Britain’s role as a representative

\textsuperscript{88} Jenkins, \textit{Gladstone}, 176.
involved in Ottoman interests did not extend into the allowance of a Bulgarian massacre. These reactions are evidence of Gladstonian Liberalism because they demonstrate a merging of political and ethical considerations subjectively applied to the urgencies at hand.

Gladstone’s choices did not always succeed in appeasing the people regardless of his intention to promote British interests. This method of governance is particularly true concerning his decision to appoint Major-General Charles Gordon as a British representative to Sudan for evacuating the city of Khartoum. Gordon’s death at Khartoum and the subsequent sacking of the Sudanese city by the self-proclaimed Mahdi threatened the validity of Gladstone’s government in the eyes of the people. Despite his predeterminations that Britain’s maintenance of Egypt was necessary in retaining the benefits of the Suez Canal, Gladstone believed military expansion into Sudan did not represent British interests. One can attribute pragmatic policies to Gladstone’s international administration depending on the context. However, his rigid taxation in wartime, active critique of Ottoman aggression on the Bulgarians, and reluctance to pacify Sudan through military force divulge key characteristics of Gladstonian methods.

Understanding some of the reasons for Britain’s entry into the Crimean War allows the observer to comprehend Gladstone’s role in this period as Chancellor of the Exchequer, better highlighting why his involvement in the affair reflects elements of his own personal style of governance. Goodlad states that by the 1850s Britain’s objectives in the Crimean War connected to former fears that France and Russia were the most significant rivals to imperial interests. The Ottoman Empire also provided a considerable
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boundary against potential Russian aggression and prevented Russia from disrupting British trade interests in the Mediterranean, thereby positioning the Ottomans as the most logical ally within the wake of potential conflict. Christopher Hibbert adds that Turkish grievances with Russia, from an Ottoman point of view, accelerated when Tsar Nicholas I learned of Orthodox monks who were slaughtered during riots between themselves and their French-backed Roman Catholic counterparts over Bethlehem’s Church of the Nativity. The reason that Russia included the Ottomans in the incident alludes to an assertion by Nicholas I that the Turkish police conspired with the French to “murder” the monks prompting the Russians to respond with hostility. Subsequently, the Ottoman Empire and France both retaliated, leading to war with Russia in 1853. At this point in Russo-Turkish tensions, Britain’s Parliamentary leaders quarreled over the prospect of war with Russia. Initially, Conservative Prime Minister Lord Aberdeen did not seek an immediate confrontation because he hoped to find common ground with Russia through negotiation. Contrastingly, as the war began, the British populace was generally in favor of combating Russian imperial expansion. However, the slow military progress against Russia, the onset of disease on the battlefield, and unsupportive Parliamentary leaders temporarily soured the idea of continued conflict. At this point, Gladstone advocated war, dissenting with Lord Aberdeen.

Parry points to Lord Palmerston as an MP who gained significant popularity from his approach to Britain’s policies in the aftermath of the Crimean War. The author touts Palmerston as a patriotic and popular MP who, in the eyes of the British Whig-Liberals,
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was the only figure capable of dissuading future Russian aggression.\textsuperscript{95} Gladstone viewed this rise to power firsthand as Chancellor of the Exchequer. Hibbert also notes that Aberdeen doubted his own ability to deal with the Russian crisis and conceded to Palmerston’s authority on the matter.\textsuperscript{96} Apparently, Lord Palmerston seemed ready to curb Russian intentions toward pursuing intrigues against British interests even after the war’s end in 1856. Palmerston, according to contemporary accounts, declared that, even in defeat, Russia proved untrustworthy, and he suggested that the Russians still disputed the victor of the conflict.\textsuperscript{97} However, Palmerston does not necessarily play the role of an avid warmonger. His approach nevertheless was instrumental in producing British supremacy. J. R. Vincent specifically states that Palmerston “was not an agitator for war;” he supported the conflict against Russian aggression with a more calculated political demeanor.\textsuperscript{98} Palmerston’s reluctance to pursue physical confrontation bears similarities to Aberdeen’s position, but was infused with a patriotic flair reminiscent of British imperialism. For both leaders, the question of war against Russia touched on democratic issues within British society because each individual tried to gauge public opinion with Palmerston emerging victorious as an apparent representative to a pro-war citizenry.

Gladstone also shared responsibility with Aberdeen and Palmerston over the reasons for and outcomes of the Crimean War from two perspectives. First, the contrast between Aberdeen and Palmerston over the most effective tactics against Russia relates \textsuperscript{95}\textsuperscript{96}\textsuperscript{97}\textsuperscript{98}
to Gladstone because of his fondness for Lord Aberdeen. Undoubtedly, Gladstone idolized his former Conservative prime minister even while he proclaimed loyalty to the Peelite movement in the 1850s. After the Conservative leader’s passing in 1860, Gladstone remarked of Aberdeen:

History has also caught, and will hold firmly and well, the honoured name of your father. There was no varnish upon his reputation more than upon his character. He will be remembered in connection with the great passages of European policy not only as a man of singularly searching large, and calm intelligence, but yet more as the first man that used only true weights and measures, and ever held evenly the balance of his ordered mind.99

Gladstone’s relationship with Aberdeen is essential to the overall issue of Gladstonian policy and its relevance as a unique approach to British democracy. The reason for this validity is that, despite Gladstone’s obvious admiration for one of his mentors who opposed war with Russia, Gladstone still advocated for war because, from his perspective, the decision to contest Russian aggression was the will of the people.

Interestingly, this position by Gladstone to maintain favor with British citizens conflicted with his political goals and his ethical qualities during Gordon’s demise at Khartoum as Gladstone reluctantly allowed the people their hero but garnered Britain’s disdain after Gordon’s death. In other words, Gladstone’s fondness for Aberdeen was genuine and so was his pacifist nature, at least from a personalized moral stance, although his adherence to British needs seemingly outweighed personal emotions. John Morley asserts that his former colleague, Gladstone, clearly did not desire war as a primary solution with Russia but conceded that it was justified because the Russians forced British involvement by oppressing the Ottomans. However, Morley continues that by early 1855 Gladstone actively sought to end Britain’s involvement in the hostilities due to the willingness of
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Russia to relinquish certain objectives of expansion and the costs of war becoming detrimental to allied forces in Europe.\textsuperscript{100} Jenkins also supports this claim by Morley and asserts that in 1855 Gladstone’s open opposition to a continuation of war with Russia raised political scrutiny about him.\textsuperscript{101} Nevertheless, Gladstone contested the notion favored by Palmerston that conflict with Russia should continue. Gladstone even argued that the Ottomans, while facing Russian aggression, likewise abused the Eastern Christians, thereby calling the moral ground of defending Turkish interests into question.\textsuperscript{102} For Gladstone, prolonged international violence jeopardized British society by potentially fueling an imperialist spark amidst the British people, leaving a bleak outlook for the overall resolution to the Eastern Question from a progressive perspective.

As stated previously, the Crimean War embodies one of the primary examples of Gladstonian policy concerning international affairs. Although Gladstone initially vocalized his opinion to support the people and their desire to confront Russian aggression with the might of the British Empire, he also applied a democratic policy through economic administration. Gladstone again held the office of Chancellor of the Exchequer during the Crimean War and possessed direct influence over Britain’s financial priorities, including government spending in wartime. In this position of financial liability, Gladstone distinguished himself as a political individual determined to act on immediate issues of foreign policy, including taxation during the Crimean War. Interestingly, Gladstone, although initially supporting the war, placed the burden of financial responsibility on the British citizenry rather than upon the government or on
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exterior sources. Gladstone’s reasoning stemmed from a notion that is arguably democratic in that he believed that if the people supported war then the government must oblige, but, in turn, the people should bear the costs out of their own pockets. Hammond and Foot suggest that this position on war taxation disrupted Gladstone’s initial plan to curb tariffs due to the immediate needs of war funding. Gladstone also refused to borrow money from exterior sources as Britain did against Napoleon’s previous imperialistic advances and against the former American colonial conflicts. Gladstone clearly possessed a cautious war agenda based on his financial methods because he hoped that taxation would prove an effective deterrent against a prolonged conflict with Russia. Furthermore, Gladstone’s decision to tax income during wartime undoubtedly met with opposition from political rivals who argued that the lower classes would not be able to supply a sufficient share from their limited income. However, Gladstone exhibited another democratic trait by placing the responsibility for war into the hands of the British population, despite his own desire to see an end to continuous conflict. In summary, Gladstone’s involvement in the Crimean War, although limited in time and authority, allowed the MP to emerge as a notable political figure whose policies extended recognition to the British people through, ironically, taxation.

While the following passages will discuss Gladstone’s role as a liberal-based deterrent to Disraeli’s pro-Turkish agenda, it is also important to mention their contrasting positions during the Crimean War because it reveals the long-term animosity between the two British leaders, especially regarding the Eastern Question. As previously reported, Gladstone initially advocated a pro-war stance to a degree, but he did not
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wholly support Palmerston’s agenda due to its zealous demeanor on the nature of international conflict for the sake of maintaining British honor. Disraeli, on the other hand, sided with Palmerston in a pro-Turkish intention which, according to Vincent, furthered Palmerston’s desire to accent a distinction between the Peelites, of which Gladstone was a member, and the Derbyites, the party to which Disraeli had once professed loyalty.\(^\text{105}\) It is relevant to mention that Disraeli’s affiliation with Lord Derby (Lord Stanley) is partially comparable to Gladstone’s following of Peel. The reason is that while both men seemingly shared the confidence of their mentors, neither MP conformed wholeheartedly to their respective ideas. Interestingly, like Gladstone, Disraeli also served as Chancellor of the Exchequer (under Derby in 1852) although he did not enjoy the continuity of trust with Derby’s successor, Aberdeen, who favored Gladstone.\(^\text{106}\) Vincent, however, states that Disraeli eventually left the Derbyites and implies that, like Palmerston, he did not conform to the characteristic of an avid warmonger simply seeking glory for Britain. It is also true that Disraeli, similar to Gladstone, considered peaceful alternatives to war with Russia despite openly supporting the continuation of the conflict.\(^\text{107}\) In contrast, however, Hibbert dissents by indicating that Disraeli may have avoided actual conflict with Russia, but seemed eager to meet Russian aggression with British might should escalation prove inevitable.\(^\text{108}\) This position of Disraeli departs from Gladstone since both men initially supported war, but Gladstone rejected notions of continued international strife. The information laid out by Vincent, Hammond, and Foot suggests that Disraeli and Gladstone may have shared a common

\(^{105}\) Vincent, “The Parliamentary Dimension of the Crimean War,” 42.  
\(^{106}\) Hammond and Foot, Gladstone and Liberalism, 65.  
\(^{107}\) Vincent, “The Parliamentary Dimension of the Crimean War,” 42.  
\(^{108}\) Hibbert, Queen Victoria, 363.
interest to see Russia give in to allied European concessions before escalating into a
greater international calamity. Politically speaking, however, their actions suggest a
rivalry of bureaucratic interests which would inevitably manifest between the two MPs
over the nature of how best to represent British interests.

From the perspective of the British people, during the Crimean War, Gladstone
and Disraeli both exhibited merits of leadership that garnered domestic admiration. The
two MPs expressed their own budget plans during wartime with Gladstone emerging the
political victor. Gladstone proved he could meet the fiscal expectations of the British
people as well as the objectives of the government.109 While Disraeli endeavored to
prepare an income tax capable of matching any deficiencies brought on by post-war
expenditures, he was unable to compete with the economic strategies of his Peelite
counterpart. British citizens took note of Disraeli’s initial budgetary failures before the
full onset of the Crimean War since he was then Chancellor of the Exchequer. The
*Liverpool Mercury* openly acknowledges Gladstone’s fiscal prowess as a success,
surpassing Disraeli’s budget plans which failed to correctly calculate a balanced contrast
between expenditures and deficiencies in the early 1850s.110 Post-war journalists from the
*Chester Chronicle* tout Gladstone as a near-savior of Disraeli’s apparent inability to meet
the financial needs of Britain’s citizens and the writers acknowledge the clear animosity
between the two before the emergence of Bulgarian issues in the Eastern Question in the
1870s.111 Despite their varying solutions to budget reforms, Gladstone and Disraeli each
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undoubtedly endeavored to solve Britain’s financial struggles both at home and abroad. Disraeli’s efforts should not obscure his early budgetary failures because he did return to British politics as a beacon of conservatism after the fact. Gladstone, however, through domestic fiscal manipulation, addressed an international concern and gained sociopolitical recognition as an MP who could accomplish promised financial feats that were beneficial to the British people, thereby revealing an early example of his reform capabilities.

Nearly two decades after the results of the Crimean War, the Eastern Question remained unanswered for MPs on both sides of the British political spectrum. The Eastern Question in the 1870s (specifically the event seen by Gladstone as Turkish atrocities committed on Bulgaria) verified a continuation of British imperialistic enthusiasm over the nature of the empire’s relationship with the Ottomans. By this period, Gladstone represented the head of the Liberal Party and the Leader of the Opposition against Benjamin Disraeli who served as prime minister in Parliament and his Conservative rival from 1874-80. The appointment of Disraeli should not be overlooked since the Liberal Party carried a long-standing dominance in Parliament until Disraeli exploited dissent between the Whig-Liberals and their radical counterparts. Gladstone’s inability to coalesce the Liberal Party, in turn, allowed the Conservatives to emerge with a united front by appealing to a sense of traditional nationalism fueled by new invigoration in British society.112 Seaton-Watson contributes that, contrary to Gladstone, Disraeli’s succession, while not a surprise, revealed an inevitable transformation from mainstream Conservatism to a party entranced by Disraeli’s “active” approach to
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imperialist interests, including Britain’s relations with Turkey. Furthermore, Gladstone’s continuous considerations for disestablishment in 1885 led Whig-Liberals to conclude that Gladstone might not carry their best interests to the fore-front of parliamentary procedure, thereby weakening the Liberal Party and allowing for a Conservative takeover. Disraeli now enjoyed a measure of authority above that of Gladstone and, as a result, Britain’s direction in the Eastern Question fell largely to the Conservatives’ administrative prowess. This acquiescence to Conservative leadership in Britain’s government challenged Gladstone’s ability to achieve progressive objectives until his second premiership in 1880.

The massacre in Bulgaria by Turkish forces appears to have ignited the potent feud between Gladstone and Disraeli to the detriment of the latter who seemingly did little to quell Ottoman aggression against the Bulgarians in order to maintain the British Empire’s pro-Turkish stance. Gladstone, through his pamphlet *Bulgarian Horrors and the Question of the East*, openly berates Disraeli and his cabinet’s “unpreparedness” on the matter, suggesting that the Conservative prime minister practically ignored the gravity of the Bulgarians’ plight. Conversely, Disraeli became plagued by multiple intrigues including several rebellions within Bosnia and Bulgaria against the Ottomans’ treatment of resident Christians. Gladstone’s account of these affairs is important since it reveals a key transition from his initial support of the Ottomans at the onset of the Crimean War to an extensive critique of those whose methods he deemed barbaric. Likewise, groups that shared Gladstone’s confidence, including non-conformist Liberals and High Churchmen,

openly expressed their disapproval for the treatment of their oppressed eastern “brothers” by Turkish Muslims, thereby allowing Gladstone to appear as a representative of both British religious organizations. Gladstone also championed the “downtrodden” Bulgarians by displaying a sense of humanitarianism, further promoting his progressive sympathies.\textsuperscript{116} Disraeli, however, disregarded Gladstone’s position and contested his Liberal counterparts’ account of the affair as it appeared uneducated in its assessment Nodding to Disraeli’s assertion, Jenkins does concede that Gladstone’s pamphlet about the Bulgarians did appear impulsive in its publication leaving little sympathy to either an Ottoman or a Conservative response to the incident.\textsuperscript{117} British media largely paralleled Gladstone’s position on the Bulgarian incident ineffectively dealing with the complexities of the matter. Initial reports by The \textit{Birmingham Daily Post} borrow from the \textit{Times} and pertain to a Turkish attack on a Bulgarian village alluding to the occurrence of both rape and murder and casting a demonizing portrayal of the Ottomans.\textsuperscript{118} Several months later the \textit{Northern Echo} cites a comparison between Turkish reports claiming at least 18,000 casualties compared to the more dramatic Bulgarian account of up to 30,000 people affected by Ottoman brutality.\textsuperscript{119} While the media may have tallied the casualty numbers so as to gain Britain’s sympathies, popular opinion largely sided with Gladstone against the Turkish regime, thereby enabling the Liberal MP to acquire said sympathies as a representative of British compassion toward Bulgaria.
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Public opinion, while seemingly in favor of action against the Ottomans in the wake of the Bulgarian uprising, did occasionally split on the matter. In opposition to Gladstone’s assessment, the *Pall Mall Gazette* presents an article doubting the validity of the casualty reports concerning the Bulgarian uprising, going so far as to suggest that Britain withdraw from the affair completely.\(^{120}\) Disraeli concluded that the reports of the Bulgarian atrocities were not substantial enough to warrant immediate retaliation against the Ottoman Empire. Decision making was hampered by limited intelligence and by untrusted sources leading Seaton-Watson to conclude that continued Conservative support of the Ottomans was justified, especially as imperialist protocol demanded that Britain remain pro-Turkish for the sake of maintaining imperial stability.\(^{121}\) One might also consider Disraeli’s previous dealings in the Crimean War specifically the parameters laid down by the Treaty of Paris in 1856. Harold Temperley highlights Article VIII stating that any European power-seeking aggression towards Turkey must adhere to its neighboring nations concerning the validity of such a measure. In other words, if Britain attacked the Ottomans on a whim, the government then risked the retaliation of their European counterparts if the aggression did not garner unanimous support.\(^{122}\) Plausibly, Disraeli sought to avoid antagonizing other imperial powers, including France and Germany, by not rashly contending with the Ottomans in spite of an apparent affront to humanitarian ideals. Disraeli’s handling of the Bulgarian incident appears to conform with an imperialist perspective of Britain’s role in European affairs. That is not to say that Disraeli, to the disdain of popular opinion, favored international confrontation, but rather
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he endeavored to maintain strong international boundaries for the sake of a stable empire. Contrastingly, Gladstone maintained his own idealism by supporting the plight of Bulgarian Christians and by favoring action against Muslim aggression, thereby championing a more Liberal-sided approach to Ottoman aggression. In short, Gladstone, although not holding a position of political power at the time of the Bulgarian uprising in comparison to Disraeli, still exhibited aspects of his own Liberalism by prioritizing the representation of the oppressed over that of British pro-Turkish priorities.

Of the numerous international affairs affiliated with Gladstone’s Liberal policies, the most controversial might be the incident in Sudan leading to the death of British paragon General Charles Gordon and the related fall of Khartoum to Mohammed Ahmed. Undoubtedly, the aftermath constituted conflicting perspectives with Gladstone attempting to prevent British expansion into Sudan no matter the cost and with the public viewing Gordon as a patriotic hero meeting his martyrdom at the hands of the self-proclaimed Mahdi. Issues leading to Gladstone’s decision to send a single man in place of a full military expedition merits further discussion before addressing the siege of Khartoum. Gladstonian policy prior to Gordon’s inclusion into the Sudanese uprising bears pertinence, especially considering that imperial intrigue already existed with Egypt, a nation whose “interests” Britain protected largely due to the benefits of defending the Suez Canal. Cunningham states that a primary reason the British government maintained a military presence in Sudan’s neighboring nation of Egypt was imperial trade objectives. Essentially, the British Empire might control commercial passages around South Africa via the Cape of Good Hope while simultaneously dominating naval routes throughout
North Africa after the opening of the Suez Canal in 1869. Judd further indicates that the benefits of the canal proved advantageous to the objectives of the British Empire more so than to other nations. The importance of the canal is paramount because its influence over Egypt provided Britain with significant commercial prowess, lessening the necessity to conquer the whole of the African continent or to assimilate the entirety of the Arabian peninsula to achieve the same result. In short, control of the canal meant that British imperial sovereignty benefited without further military expansion.

The considerable capacity of the Suez Canal’s trade potential seems complimentary to certain Gladstonian administrative goals that included a desire to maintain the strength of the empire without resorting to aggressive expansion. Gladstone specifically praised the functional qualities of the canal as reported by the *Western Mail*. According to its article, Gladstone viewed the Suez asset as a two-pronged solution to imperial concerns, including a means of rapid commodity distribution to various subjects of the empire, and perhaps more relevant to Gladstone’s personal ideas, a promising symbol of international peace through trade. Additionally, Judd concludes that Gladstone acknowledged an Egyptian interest towards its own nationalist potential although apparently he possessed ulterior motivations including personal fiscal gains related to “Egyptian shares”. Interestingly, Bebbington implies that Gladstone professed an initial reluctance to enter Egypt and did not intend to place it under permanent British subjugation. Judd counters Bebbington, however, by pointing out
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that Gladstone possessed no illusions regarding the fact that Egypt’s government was actually British, demonstrating that the Liberal MP fully intended to label the Egyptians as an imperial protectorate. These accounts by Bebbington and Judd suggest the probability that Gladstone’s interest in the British administration over Egypt included political and personal motivations although they were not solely imperialist in nature. In short, the conservation of Egypt’s Suez Canal furthered the parameters of Gladstonian policies, whereas by the early 1880s the continuation of a military presence in Sudan yielded few attractive prospects for the goals of his government.

The previous statement does not aim to suggest that Britain’s imperial ventures failed to grace the borders of Sudan before Gladstone’s complete removal of British forces from the region in 1885. Pugh argues that protection of the Suez Canal theoretically included the need to secure the Egyptian/Sudanese boundary because of its strategic military positioning. Gladstone’s further involvement in Sudan arose from a previous series of conflicts between British-led Egyptian forces and Mahdist fighters led by Mohammed Ahmed escalating in the early 1880s. Donald Featherstone asserts that British military endeavors in Sudan derive from affairs merged into a broader spectrum of what one might label a Sudanese Question that lasted nearly two decades. Furthermore, Featherstone concludes that, due to an Egyptian nationalist revolt in 1882, Gladstone’s cabinet opted to install a British-led “Egyptian government” which extended authority to Sudan, thereby threatening the Mahdi’s dominion. It would be an understatement to suggest that Mohammed al-Mahdi succeeded in garnering a significant
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following in his Muslim cause to eliminate British-backed Egyptians from Sudan. John Clarke, in examining the characteristic of the Mahdi, states: “As his popularity and following increased, the British and Egyptian rulers of his country became alarmed over the discontent he was spreading among the people and ordered his arrest”.\(^{131}\) In 1883 Egyptian forces led by Colonel William Hicks arrived in Sudan to challenge the Mahdi in perhaps one of the most doomed militant ventures attributed to the British in the nineteenth century. Full blame does not rest with Hicks for his downfall since his expedition consisted of a majority of mostly ill-trained Egyptian conscripts travelling through dense forest terrain combined with the soldiers’ lack of enthusiasm toward fighting a British war over Sudan. Contrastingly, Hicks’ opponent, Mohammed Ahmed led an army of zealous followers determined to win their jihad against imperial Britain, resulting in a one-sided slaughter and in the death of Hicks at Shaykan.\(^{132}\) In the aftermath of Hicks’ poorly fought campaign against the Mahdi, Gladstone opted for withdrawal of the British/Egyptian military presence from Sudan in 1884 because he correctly assumed that continuous intrigue with Egypt would only pull Britain further into international conflict with Sudan. Gladstone’s assertion connects to an imperialist sentiment identifiable with his Liberal sensitivities since he prioritizes the preservation of British assets over the expansion of the empire. Effectively, Gladstone’s initial response to the Sudanese Question poses an opposite solution compared with his approach to the Eastern Question. In one situation, Gladstone, as the political opposition, advocated for


immediate retaliation against Ottoman oppression while as prime minister he reluctantly confronted Mahdist aggression in Sudan with the goal of eventually removing forces. Pursuing this British withdrawal from Sudanese borders, Gladstone warily appointed famed war-hero Charles Gordon to evacuate the residents of Khartoum with the apparent expectations by Gladstone that Gordon would avoid conflict with the Mahdi. Gladstone rightly asserted that sending the passionate Gordon, who had already gained experience from previous campaigns including in the Crimean War, in China, and relevantly in Sudan, might gain the sympathies of the patriotic British people at home, and in turn, they would demand increased military aggression against the Mahdi. The British media clearly portrayed Gordon as a Christian warrior crusading against the Muslim forces for the sake of protecting the oppressed occupants of Khartoum. London’s newspapers readily depicted Gordon as a “gallant” hero tirelessly preparing the city and laying mines in readiness of the Mahdi’s advance. An article from the *Citizen* further concludes that the troops in Khartoum became relieved at Gordon’s presence in the city, likely owing to his former accomplishments in Sudan. Undoubtedly, Gordon’s intentions proved noble; however, Gladstone did not want Gordon to continue fighting in Khartoum and, at Gordon’s request for military aid, Gladstone denied the request despite popular demand. In fact, Gladstone “stalled” against rising pressure from Britain to intervene on behalf of Gordon because he did not want to sink financial assets or military
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units into a potential war that he had consistently protested. Gladstone’s judgment regarding his hesitance to aid Gordon garnered ill-favor in the minds of Britain’s populace, especially given that Gordon’s position was one of defense rather than conquest. In August 1884, Prime Minister Gladstone reluctantly conceded to rescue Gordon by sending troops led by Lord Wolseley to Khartoum. Wolseley arrived in Khartoum in January 1885, two days after the fall of the city and after the death of Gordon at the hands of Mahdi forces. Responsively, British sentiment lost little time in blaming Gladstone for the unfortunate incident, largely citing him as the politically-minded murderer of a British martyr. Historically, it is fair to conclude that Gladstone certainly shared at least a degree of political responsibility for Gordon’s demise; however, as stated previously, the prime minister’s administrative policy on the matter of imperial expansion remained firmly Gladstonian in principle. At no time did Gladstone assume a political position that the British government should take an offensive stance with an imperialist agenda, in spite of popular demand. Instead, the Liberal MP opted to focus on the preservation of Britain’s current holdings. In other words, Gladstone focused on internal development rather than on imperial extension.

In conclusion, Gladstone’s political policies regarding international affairs proved subjective to the various issues to which he concerned himself. As a young Peelite, Gladstone readily advocated the defense of the Ottomans in the wake of Russian aggression, yet he also contested popular opinion, stating that the Crimean War should not continue beyond a reasonable conclusion should Russia agree to relinquish its objectives. Furthermore, Gladstone’s position as Chancellor of the Exchequer allowed
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him to place fiscal responsibility for the Crimean War on the people, thereby assuming a position of representation through taxation. Gladstone altered his previous pro-Ottoman stance to an anti-Turkish standpoint during the Eastern Question in the 1870s. Effectively, Gladstone became an avid critic of both the Ottomans’ treatment of the Bulgarians as well as Disraeli’s administrative responses to protecting imperial interests over that of those being oppressed. It may have been easier for Gladstone to attack Disraeli’s government as, at the time, Gladstone did not bear the responsibilities of prime minister as compared to his Conservative opponent who faced the burdens of imperial maintenance. Ironically, Gladstone exhibited a similar strategy to Disraeli’s during the Liberal MPs second premiership when opting to withdraw from Muslim aggression in Sudan. By pulling British/Egyptian forces from the region and temporarily abandoning the country to the Mahdi, Gladstone affirmed an anti-expansionist principle in spite of overwhelming support for Gordon by the people. Contrastingly, Gladstone’s notion of democracy manifests in his initial backing of British popular opinion on the Crimean War. He also sided with the British populace by defending the Bulgarians against Ottoman oppression in the Eastern Question. Gladstone faltered, with respect to public opinion, during the incident at Khartoum through his opposition to remaining in Sudan. This vacillation challenges consistency in the democratic ideals that Gladstone espoused; however, Gladstonian Liberalism typically did not pursue democracy in a direct sense. For example, Gladstone frequently advocated popular opinion when it paralleled his vision of representation and reform. On the other hand, Gladstone pragmatically adjusted his policies when British prospects were minimally affected. Ideally, Gladstone seeks to utilize democratic tendencies through representation by government, but not at the cost of
English isolationism. While Gladstone did not always follow the favored position of the British people, he often pursued the course of action he believed best represented the international interests of Britain.
CHAPTER IV

DOMESTIC POLICIES

While international policies incorporating Gladstonian Liberalism are demonstrated by certain aspects of his political practices, Gladstone’s domestic endeavors are equally relevant to the analysis of his career. Gladstone effectively influenced national programs in Britain regarding relief of tariffs on British consumers, extension of voting rights to the disenfranchised via the Second and Third Reform Acts, and expansion of educational opportunities to the working class. Interestingly, several of Gladstone’s notable accomplishments on the national level emerged in the first half of his political career, especially during his administrative duties as Chancellor of the Exchequer. A hallmark of his overall domestic achievements incorporated Gladstone’s pursuit of broadened inclusion for the British people. Furthermore, Gladstone’s bureaucratic experience as a Peelite Conservative significantly contributed to the overall structure which defined the MP’s perception of moral governance and true representation. The democratic aspect of Gladstonian reform within the domestic element of Britain initiated or continued to develop the inclusion of the commoner in national political discourse. Gladstone’s policies mark a major stride toward redefining British democracy that continues into the present.
The importance of and relationship between these three issues will display the intricacies of Gladstonian politics. This interrelatedness connects several fronts into a systematic transformation. The lessening of tariffs on goods that were required by the lower classes revealed Gladstone’s understanding that the poor needed further protection by its government. Hammond and Foot describe this endeavor of tax relief as “relieving hardships for the poor”.139 Gladstone’s representative efforts to alleviate taxation on the commoners extended into his resolution to lessen disenfranchisement. Gladstone furthered the extension of the voting franchise for the working class through a combination of his own reform efforts in 1866 and, as Kristen Zimmerman states, a “radical” decision by Disraeli to pass the Second Reform Act of 1867, thereby strengthening democratic tendencies in the British political structure.140 Secret voting, although controversial to English sentiments and provocative to Gladstone personally, bestowed an even greater sense of democracy for Britain because its institution allowed minority groups, who were previously reluctant to acknowledge a chosen candidate, to gain a broader political voice.141 Implementation of the Third Reform Act in 1884 allowed Gladstone to emerge successfully as an advocate for rural enfranchisement. The malleability of Gladstonian Liberalism as demonstrated by the reforms in education in 1870 allowed various denominational teachings into British school systems and boosted Gladstone’s endeavors to provide local education boards with greater autonomy rather

than relying on a singular national curriculum.\textsuperscript{142} While Gladstone did not necessarily support a number of these reforms on a personal level, his political backing of each of these issues reveals a Liberal tendency of the Gladstonian method that often incorporated a “greater good” style of governance despite apparent affronts to Gladstone’s intimate idealism.\textsuperscript{143} All of these endeavors by Gladstone are inseparable and highlight his distinctive form of legislation supporting increased delegation for British commoners. In spite of the times when Gladstone’s aspirations and the practical application of parliamentary capabilities conflicted with his ethical identity, Gladstone fostered greater representation to British citizens.

Many Gladstonian domestic achievements emerged through the implementation of a Liberal framework during the latter stages of his career, those accomplishments also included various aspects of progressive representation which developed during his duties as a Peelite. In fact, Gladstone’s personal understanding of governance shared complete loyalty to neither party; rather, Gladstone viewed the party system as a means by which he could achieve his own political goals. St. John describes Gladstonian Liberalism as a unique political structure because Gladstone set himself apart from mainstream Whiggery, maintained a considerable amount of fundamental Conservatism within his Peelite principles, and incorporated aspects of Liberal radicalism.\textsuperscript{144} Bebbington utilizes Gladstone’s own wording and affirms St. John’s premise regarding Gladstone’s declarations. According to Gladstone, the structure of his politics should remain “liberal in the sense of Peel, working out a liberal policy through the medium of the conservative
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party”.

That statement does not imply that Gladstonian Liberalism is an incorrect term as he certainly demonstrated various traits of progressive thinking. Politically speaking, however, one should not assume that Gladstone’s conservative methods remained within the exclusivity of his own idealism or that his techniques exhibited purely liberal attributes. In some regards such as contention over the secret ballot, Gladstone personally identified with debatably conservative “English” tendencies, i.e. maintaining the honest vote, but conceded to the expectations of his fellow Liberal MPs in order to preserve party solidarity. In other words, Gladstone occasionally proved reluctant to support progressive initiatives backed by the Liberals. However, he also frequently conceded to governmental realities for the sake of maintaining both political favor and the support for his overall objectives which centered around increased delegation.

Gladstone also gradually embraced liberalism as a progressive movement and recognized similarities between his own ideas and the proponents of reformist goals. Hammond and Foot remark of Gladstone:

> His association with Liberalism was inspiring and creative because his was the influence of a man ready for large ideas, steeped in history, and sustained by the study and understanding of the past. That was why he was able to give a character of his own devising to Liberalism and give strength to causes that had poor prospects when left to the play of the rivalries and stratagems of persons and parties.

---

146 Pugh, Britain Since 1789, 27. This section is referring to a point made by Pugh that the conservative based Tories held to traditional values that espoused the virtues of English aristocracy and recognized the authority of the Church of England. While Gladstone believed in both of these facets of conservatism he also recognized the need for changes to Britain’s imperial policies in favor of a more politically malleable society.
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Conclusively, Liberalism did not define Gladstone, but rather he brought new meaning to the party. This realization of the nature of Gladstonian government is essential when examining his proficiency in national affairs. Gladstonian reforms on the domestic level focused on faithfulness to a variety of classes and groups that Gladstone perceived as underrepresented, even when such acknowledgements did not parallel the politician’s personal ethics, i.e. the implementation of secret ballots. Gladstone’s amendments within British Parliament critiqued previous notions of traditional governance, periodically exceeding the MP’s personal convictions, and favored progressive reforms aimed at broader representation of the British community.

Gladstone’s achievements in tariff reform occurred in 1853. However, the actual skills he acquired coalesced during Gladstone’s transition from High Conservatism into Peelite idealism. Peel initially promoted the young Conservative Gladstone successively to the offices of Vice President of the Board of Trade and to President, positions through which the latter could realize his administrative talents in the field of commercial economics.\(^{149}\) As early as 1841, Gladstone became fascinated with the free-trade movement whose principles generated a medium through which he could mobilize the Board of Trade’s regulations to alleviate heavy tax burdens on Britain’s commerce. St. John adds that Gladstone actively broke away from previous notions of Britain’s financial state due to his initial disinterest in the economic field. Subsequently, Gladstone, from a Peelite standpoint, hypothesized that an effective recognition of free-trade must incorporate relief on national tariffs.\(^{150}\) During this same period in 1842, Peel, Gladstone, and John Bright backed repeals of the Corn Laws that were garnering Conservative
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support owing to Tory agricultural holdings that benefited from tariff enforcement.

Cunningham indicates that the mindset of anti-Corn Law sentiment emphasized the strengths of free trade as representative of middle-class manufacturers.¹⁵¹ Morley adds that Gladstone embraced the intricacies of the British commercial system and adhered to the complaints of various parties such as the “coal whippers” and “frame-work knitters” who were concerned that their respective tariff regulations did not compare equally.¹⁵² Although much of Gladstone’s fiscal plan did not take effect until his budget reforms in 1853, the Peelite MP already demonstrated adaptable politics centered on greater recognition of British trade interests and its relationship with the domestic economy of the United Kingdom.

Benjamin Disraeli’s prior failed attempts at budget reform in 1852 may have provided the spark that allowed Gladstone’s skills as a financial administrator to merit political favor among his fellow MPs. As indicated previously, Disraeli was appointed Chancellor of the Exchequer before Gladstone and proposed his own fiscal reforms by appealing to a series of policies appealing to both Conservative and Liberal sentiments. Both men perceived the financial branch of government as a potential medium for effective representation for Britain:

A stable democracy embodies the successful representation in political terms of the relationships of social and economic groups, whether their members be enfranchised or not. These relationships are two-fold, between the various groups and the State. Both Gladstone and Disraeli saw government finance, and especially the great drama of the budget, the annually renewed social contract of the Victorian State, as the context in which those relationships could be both fiscally and politically expressed.¹⁵³
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In consideration of Matthew’s comment, it is also apparent that Gladstone was genuinely willing to represent even the disenfranchised, inferring that his interests were not solely linked to garnering more votes. As a result of the Corn law repeal, Disraeli recognized that the previous Conservative proponents of secure agricultural representation no longer possessed the same support by voters. Therefore, Disraeli seemingly sought to appease the radical voters by increasing property tax and decreasing the tariffs on labor in 1852 which naturally raised Gladstone’s disapproval. St. John includes this information however, he also adds that Gladstone considered Disraeli’s proposal disreputable and desperate with little accountability left for further expenditures.\footnote{154} Jenkins also supports Gladstone’s appraisal that Disraeli’s motivations for the budget seemed less affiliated with a true propensity for representative reform and more akin to a political “smokescreen”.\footnote{155} Subsequently, Parliament rejected Disraeli’s budget and in 1853 Gladstone replaced him as Chancellor of the Exchequer. One should interject a key point by St. John that historians, including Agatha Ramm and David Bebbington, attribute Disraeli’s failures to Gladstone’s oratory abilities in which the latter attacked Disraeli’s budget recommendations. However, St. John provides a differing opinion stating that by this point in Victorian politics, Disraeli’s budget was neglecting key aspects of Radical and Liberal expectations and, considering that Conservative strength was dubious at best owing to their reliance on vacillating Peelite support, the death of the budget was inevitable.\footnote{156} The inability of the Conservative government to harness support from both
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sides of the political spectrum seemingly fueled Gladstone’s proposal of an alternative solution to budget reform which proved agreeable to a greater number of constituents.

After his appointment to Chancellor of the Exchequer, Gladstone proposed a budget promoting what Bebbington labels as the MP’s “single greatest achievement”. Essentially this financial reform reflected Gladstone’s comprehension that the current establishment of tariffs amounted to unequal taxation of the working classes and that equity must manifest in Britain’s fiscal policies. Gladstone then decreased tariffs on customs meaning that commodity prices became less burdensome to consumers.157

Furthermore, the Chancellor actively addressed income tax levies by installing a gradual decrease of over a period of seven years. Property taxation became another target of Gladstone’s fiscal policies, thereby initiating a greater balance between property and income payments.158 By enacting these budget policies, Gladstone effectively alienated the Whig aristocracy, but gained the admiration of the working class. British media outlets also touted Gladstone as an admirable figure sporting an intelligent solution to Britain’s economic challenges.159 Two elements of Gladstonian idealism emerged through the Budget of 1853 as Gladstone contested Whiggish benefits in favor of fairer taxation for the common man and, despite the interruption of the financial demands of the Crimean War, Gladstone introduced a new form of economic representation previously unattainable by Parliament.160 Conclusively, Gladstone’s full budget potential, interrupted by war expenditures, did not peak until 1860 after his fiscal proposals had
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already undergone several alterations yet maintaining the need to phase out income tax while extending further tax levies on landed property owners.\textsuperscript{161} The extensive scrutiny of and adjustment to his own budget reform supplements one of Gladstone’s primary methods of financial reform in the mid-Victorian era. Obviously, the fiscal accomplishments of a pre-Liberal Gladstone demonstrated some levels of imperfection and political intrigue. However, it is also clear that his achievements as Chancellor of the Exchequer paved a means by which Gladstone broadened the definition of British representation. This facet of Gladstonian economic reform indicates the Chancellor’s insertion of democratic renovations into British policy, albeit through a Victorian perspective. That is to say that Gladstonian reform mirrored aspects of the British comprehension of democracy which was gradually evolving toward a modern context.

The extension of the voting franchise presented another opportunity for Gladstone to demonstrate a propensity for broader representative measures aimed at the working class of Britain. Through financial administrative reforms, Gladstone garnered new-found loyalty from British laborers, although his economic authority as Chancellor did not extend over voting rights. This caveat is important to Gladstone’s involvement in enfranchisement because he was limited in his ability to legislate effective change. His gradual shift toward Liberal affiliation via the support of Lord Russell provided the vehicle through which the MP pursued another aspect of parliamentary representation that in time assumed the title of Gladstonian Liberalism. That is not to say that Gladstone’s and Russell’s decision to expand the franchise served as the defining virtue of Gladstonian Liberalism; however, this attempt, along with a respective nod to
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Gladstone’s reluctant adoption of secret voting, certainly echoes a propensity for the MPs’ contributions to the Liberal cause. In fact, Britain recognized that Gladstone’s support of franchise extension demonstrated his proclivity for democratic change via Liberal policy, although disagreement exists within the media regarding the nature of democracy as it pertains to the established national customs at the time. For example, an article from the *Aberdeen Journal* acknowledges Gladstone’s parameters for enfranchisement that limit the voting rights to those who could pay for the privilege. This same article also criticizes the supposedly misinformed *Times* for insisting that Gladstone’s democratic allowances were unchecked because he was allowing a majority of citizens to vote regardless of any qualifications.\(^\text{162}\) One should acknowledge that, in the Victorian Era, the term “democracy” did not yield an absolute definition within British society. Cunningham emphasizes that democracy as a broader idea often challenged mainstream imperial policy and reflected the expectations of the disenfranchised.\(^\text{163}\) This assertion by Cunningham is relevant to Gladstone’s support of expanding the franchise because the MP, in this regard, breaks away from the empire’s societal priorities by politically backing greater representation for the working class.

It was not Gladstone but Disraeli who produced the bill in 1867 which greatly expanded voting rights to males within the United Kingdom. Gladstone, along with Russell and Bright, proposed extensions to enfranchisement in 1866 although they did not survive the scrutiny by fellow MPs to pass a law which led to the resignation of Russell’s cabinet.\(^\text{164}\) One may assume from the preceding statements that Disraeli rather

---
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than Gladstone demonstrated the greater sense of broadening representation within the empire. However, at least two components differentiate the positions of the two MPs regarding voting revisions. Gladstone’s propensity for reform proved selective in a manner identifiable with his own assertion that only a paying voter from the working class should merit the right to engage in a British democratic process. Interestingly, this deliberate classification of the qualified voter by Gladstone attached “moral” traits to the method. Stephen Lee states that, by the 1860s, Gladstone asserted that the upper portion of the working class matured into a responsible community capable of forming an intelligent constituency. Moreover, by incorporating said group into the voting franchise, Gladstone hoped to prevent a rise in socialistic tendencies, citing capitalism as the viable alternative.\(^{165}\) Richard Cook adds that Disraeli immediately attacked Gladstone’s proposition by implying that the act demonstrated a reliance on American ideas, thereby playing on the concerns of British sentiment about the detriments of democracy.\(^{166}\) Gladstone, however, did not aim out of personal disdain to alienate lower class individuals, but ostensibly repeated a similar position instituted during his taxation strategies with the Crimean War. He thought that British citizens who exhibited financial responsibility should be the constituents having a voice in the government. Disraeli, on the other hand, sought to garner the support of working class citizens beyond the exclusivity offered to the “paying voter,” thereby increasing enfranchisement to a greater number of male homeowners. Bebbington indicates that Disraeli’s 1867 Reform Bill borrowed heavily from an idea that was fundamentally Gladstonian and expanded on it by exhibiting traits obviously more radical than Gladstone’s viewpoint and arguably

---


more anti-Conservative in its structure, thereby attracting a measure of Liberal
reinforcement.\textsuperscript{167} Parry also agrees that a genuine appreciation for the working class
existed in Gladstone and his Liberal supporters, possibly owing some progression of
democratic reform in Victorian Britain to his endeavors.\textsuperscript{168} Robert Johnson adds that by
adopting the position held by Liberal MPs who wished to see greater enfranchisement,
where Gladstone was unsuccessful, Disraeli managed to pass a bill through gaining
support from his own loyal Conservative colleagues and from a number of Liberals.\textsuperscript{169} In
contrast to Bebbington’s and Johnson’s assertion that Disraeli’s bureaucratic
manipulation provided the dominant factor, St. John appears a bit more critical of
Gladstone’s failure to prevent the Liberals from siding with his Conservative opponent
over the 1867 Reform Bill. St. John attributes a degree of Gladstone’s inability to
maintain his party’s support to his harsh demeanor and his “inexperience as Leader of the
Commons”.\textsuperscript{170} Furthermore, since the death of Palmerston in 1865, the Liberal Party did
not enjoy a unified front containing a significant section of Whigs who were showing
Toryish sentiments.\textsuperscript{171} However, in any case, principles originating in Gladstonian
Liberalism were incorporated in a democratic feature of Disraeli’s voting reform bill.
Disraeli merits the credit for passing a successful bill extending the franchise to working
class males. However, expanding voting rights to fiscally responsible constituents and
furthering democratic progression is inherent to Gladstonian Liberalism rather than that
of a conservatism.
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Undoubtedly, the Liberal adoption of the secret ballot remains one of the most controversial features of Gladstonian reforms relating to the voting franchise. Unlike the extension of suffrage rights to the British working class, which aimed to increase the voting population while retaining reliance on open opinion, secret ballots ideally limited intimidation and bribery attributed to general elections. Kinzer writes that Gladstone’s predecessors, including Peel and Russell, expressed concern that the secret ballot would push democratic progression beyond comfortable limits and would undermine English sentiments of honorable governance. St. John states that Gladstone openly disliked the idea of secret voting because he surmised that it removed the element of honesty from the political system. Essentially, Gladstone believed that voting rights should be extended but not by incorporating any deceptive methods. This personal disdain for secret voting, however, did not prevent him from politically supporting the act since he believed that doing so promoted greater unity within his party. Another reason that Gladstone decided to vote in favor of the secret ballot possibly links to the Irish Question. Firstly, by enacting the Irish Church Act of 1869, Gladstone already demonstrated that he was willing to compromise his personal ideologies to appease his supporters. During Gladstone’s first premiership in 1868 he stated that one of his main goals would constitute the pacification of Ireland. During the emergence of the Ballot Act of 1872, British politicians noted an interest by supporters of Irish Home Rule, and Michael Hurst suggests that the secret ballot strengthened the influence of the Irish seeking greater
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independence from political intimidation. In the wake of the potential benefits that secret voting bestowed on Irish constituents, Gladstone recognized that supporting the Ballot Act allowed him yet another medium through which he garnered Irish support. The decision by Gladstone to pass the act allowing secret voting demonstrates representative prowess on two fronts. Primarily, Gladstone desired to maintain a united Liberal Party which he perceived to be the vehicle of his own reform goals. Promotion of secret voting rights also provided Gladstone with a possible, though not guaranteed, Irish backing similar to the motivations surrounding his disestablishment endeavors. Although some may assert that secret balloting is essential to democracy, Gladstone reluctantly endorsed the process though he did not connect secret voting with democratic reforms. By backing the secret ballot, Gladstone preserved the fundamentals of Gladstonian Liberalism by warily expanding the voting franchise.

Secret voting and enfranchisement both provided facets through which Gladstone could realize representative aspects of Liberal progression. However, Gladstone’s efforts in expanding the franchise did not cease with the Second Reform Act. During his second premiership in 1883, Gladstone proposed another franchise bill in Parliament, leading to its adoption in the subsequent year. Parry asserts that this Third Reform Act carried at least two major alterations to previous voting parameters administered by the Second Reform Act, including the expansion of household suffrage to numerous boroughs and an increase in the amount of eligible constituents by over three million. Hammond and Foot surmise that the new electorate was actually closer to an increase of two million;

---
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however, in either case, Gladstone succeeded in broadening the voting franchise to considerable proportions. Furthermore, the period in which Gladstone enacted the bill proved complimentary to its emergence as Mary Chadwick indicates that the redistribution of electoral seats dominated parliamentary intrigue and became the “most profound” inclusion of the three major British reform acts. Contrasting, Chadwick states that Tory opinions regarding the bill critiqued Gladstone and the Liberals, promoting a measure that only served as a diversion from other important issues. However, the Liberals, including Gladstone, maintained that a key theme of their party was in fact the struggle for reform, thereby confirming that the redistribution of seats identified with progressive priorities. Of the various accomplishments in Gladstonian enfranchisement, it is likely that the Third Reform Act represents the most significant achievement for Gladstone in furthering progressive goals linked with British democracy.

During Gladstone’s first premiership, education was a considerable and joint concern among parliamentary debaters. The working class, now enfranchised, exerted influence in parliamentary priorities. The direction of the commoners’ education began to dictate British governmental proceedings because MPs were reliant on appeasing a new population of voters. Furthermore, the addition of working class voters also challenged the stability of voluntary schools which were supported financially by the Church of England. Initially, the middle class education in Victorian Britain at best proved limited, and it certainly did not reflect the measure of calculated curriculum accorded to
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the elite in society. St. John points out that the student bodies only accounted for roughly a third of the overall British population in need of schooling, thereby presenting the need for a national organization that could accommodate all who qualified. Writing during this period of discussion, Rowland Hamilton observed that the lack of schools had plagued Britain from the early nineteenth century, meaning that the addition of working class students in 1867 produced a greater sense of urgency regarding educational reform. Gladstone now faced challenges to the relationship between religion and education, but he also recognized a necessity to extend the representation which he advocated in voting rights to that of a national education system. Gladstone’s solution to the gravity of education reform integrated locally selected school councils with expanded educational facilities to effectively and quickly meet the increasing population of working class students. In short, the passage of the 1870 Elementary Education Act apportioned British schools so that fewer limitations impeded the ability of the working class to receive a higher quality curriculum.

The establishment of expanded facilities for working class students was an alternative to existing voluntary schools and provided a broader field for educational institutions. However, the issue of religious based teaching still posed a significant concern to Gladstone, especially considering his loyalty to the Anglican Church. On the other hand, Gladstone’s education advisor, W. E. Forster, determined that the implementation of non-denominational teaching afforded the better method of school

---

This stance put pressure on Anglican oriented academic instruction. Gladstone’s Non-Conformist supporters also sought to decrease the authority of the Anglican Church in matters of education. Therefore, Gladstone needed to appease Liberal radicals while maintaining his portion of the Conservative vote if he hoped to produce a valid basis for reform. Jenkins indicates that Gladstone actually contested the Non-Conformists by retaining the authority of the Anglican Church. This, in turn, led to a significant loss in the support he had received from the radical Liberals before 1874. Bebbington clarifies that Gladstone disagreed with the Non-Conformists, yet he acquiesced to the majority opinion of his party, a tactic that he would similarly employ in the secret ballot issue nearly two years later. By twice acclimating to the will of his colleagues in education and in the secret ballot, Gladstone demonstrated a political shrewdness indicative of one striving to maintain a united party. Gladstone also relinquished his stance on Anglican dominance as he had done with Irish disestablishment, prioritizing the representation of the working class over his idealistic measures. Both stances of compromise indicate that “selective working-class democracy” and harmony with his chosen party emulated preferences by Gladstone indispensable to the facilitation of Gladstonian Liberalism.

While Gladstone’s education reforms included a plethora of alterations to British learning institutions, his efforts did not cease at the boundaries of England. Ireland also faced concerns regarding the direction of denominational teachings in schools. The question of religious inclusions in Irish schools became more apparent after Gladstone’s
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decision to concede to a non-denominational addition to English schools, despite his misgivings of lessening the dominant Anglican structure. Additionally, while the Irish Church Act of 1869 relinquished Anglican religious dominance, the same parameters did not bind the Irish State’s education systems to abolish Anglican-led higher education.\footnote{Biagini, \textit{British Democracy and Irish Nationalism}, 113.} Interestingly, Trinity College in Dublin began to incorporate non-denominationalism as a challenge to Gladstone since they assumed that he would attempt to maintain a strict Anglican presence in Irish schools. The Tories, in turn, recognized that the installation of a secular system in Trinity only aggravated the uneasiness between Catholics, Liberals, and Conservatives, all of whom had invested interests in the direction of Irish education.\footnote{Parry, \textit{Democracy and Religion}, 299.} In fact, Parry suggests that even before Gladstone’s focus on Ireland, MPs that disagreed with the non-denominational aspects of his Elementary Education Act would set a misguided foundation for Irish reform.\footnote{Parry, \textit{Democracy and Religion}, 296.} Three years after his passage of the Elementary Education Act in 1880, Gladstone proposed that Ireland should also embrace a similar bill allowing for higher education to conform to a non-denominational curriculum devoid of any topics covering “theology, philosophy, and modern history”. This decision by Gladstone harmed his reputation and his efforts to reform education in Ireland, partially accounting for the resignation of his first premiership.\footnote{Cunningham, \textit{The Challenge of Democracy}, 111.} Gladstone’s failure to unite Parliament on the matter of Irish education reveals an oversight on his assessment of the relationship between Ireland’s religious loyalties and their schooling. Contrastingly, Gladstone seemingly sought to appease all the parties concerned with the direction of Irish educational reform in the hopes of acquiring broader political favor and
ensuring a stable education system in Britain altogether. Conclusively, Gladstone’s curricular endeavors in Ireland failed although he still maintained a position that adherence to domestic education should be an issue of a United Kingdom rather than a solely English concern.

The domestic talents of Gladstone are undoubtedly numerous, and this chapter highlights key aspects of his national achievements. For example, much of the previous discussion centers around national concerns occurring during the first half of his political career. One could have easily included Gladstone’s addressing of the Irish Question as a primary example of his liberalism and reforms. However, Gladstone’s solution to the Irish concerns merits deeper examination and will therefore be discussed below. Issues immediately addressed in the current chapter aim to reflect specific traits of Gladstonian Liberalism, including his venture to ease the fiscal burdens of British laborers, his resolve to expand greater delegation to the working class, and his willingness to compromise personal goals for the Liberal agenda. Budgetary reforms in 1853 and 1860 both targeted tariffs between the working class and the British elite. Although the Crimean War interrupted Gladstone’s tax alterations, he managed to decrease tariffs by an impressive amount which nearly eliminated the process altogether. Gladstone’s success in tax reform proved the young Peelite’s eagerness to support British laborers through financial relaxation while maintaining a stable national economy. Despite an initial failure to expand the voting franchise, Gladstone’s particular enfranchisement goals garnered recognition from both sides of Parliament and, ironically his ideas endured the Second Reform Act under implementation by political rivals. Subsequently, Gladstone administered the adoption of the secret ballot in spite of his personal apprehensions
regarding deceptive voting tactics. Political motivations undoubtedly laced Gladstone’s eventual support of the secret ballot as he conceded to a notion contrary to his opinion in favor of governmental unity and national stability. Additionally, Gladstone was able to realize the Liberal goal of progressive reform by passing the Third Reform Act, which, despite attracting Conservative opposition, succeeded in redefining enfranchisement with a more democratic framework. Gladstone also accommodated sentiments outside of his own convictions concerning his education reforms. Gladstone successfully increased the amount of educational facilities available to working class students while capitulating to the positions of Forster and Non-Conformist supporters by incorporating non-denominational infrastructures. Although he retained various aspects of conservative and Anglican idealism, Gladstone integrated his own beliefs with a growing liberal movement that, in turn, provided him with several opportunities to increase representation of the British working class. Finally, Gladstone’s deficiencies in Irish education indicate, at the very least, that he considered reform issues extended to the United Kingdom centering solely on English needs. Gladstone’s employment of these aspects of domestic representation reveal Gladstonian Liberalism as a sociopolitical mechanism reflecting a relationship between the man’s devotion to his own beliefs and his adherence to radical revision on a national level.
CHAPTER V

HOME RULE

The greatest strain on the link between representative changes and traditional practices of the British Empire occurs in the Irish Question particularly regarding the issue of Home Rule. Britain’s tumultuous relationship with Ireland during the Victorian era presented Gladstone with an ambitious task that potentially risked the already threatened unity of the Liberal Party and proved challenging to his political obligations as Prime Minister. Undoubtedly, the Irish Question yielded no simple solutions that could appease either of the involved parties, whether they identified with England’s imperial sovereignty or whether they supported Ireland’s nationalist cause for independent governance. Gladstone’s decision to bring greater representation to the Irish people did not reflect static traits for his administration. Over the course of his four premierships, the Irish Question became definitive to Gladstone’s progressive agenda, culminating in his greatest representative pursuit of Home Rule for Ireland. Initially Gladstone’s solution to Irish unrest was focused on pacifying the nation through religious amendments, land reform, and educational improvement. Gladstone continued that strategy to relieve Ireland’s plight in two regards during his second premiership: through initializing his Coercion Act and through a second Land Act. By the mid-1880s, however, Gladstone’s position evolved toward a realization that his agenda should expand to incorporate greater
freedoms for Ireland if Britain was to retain a truly United Kingdom. In both of his last two premierships, Gladstone gradually embraced Irish Home Rule as a personal crusade dedicated to establishing a progressive collaboration between England and Ireland. The long-term struggle to accommodate Irish interests within the British Empire validates the most significant example of Gladstone’s unique approach to Liberalism as a progressive medium because he successfully strengthened his personal political standing by uniting the Liberal Party, gaining the Irish vote, and supporting Irish representation.

While the Home Rule movement did not officially begin until 1870 under Isaac Butt, Ireland clearly held a deeply rooted animosity toward British sovereignty that intensified in 1800 when the passage of the Act of Union placed the Irish under English subjugation. Essentially, the implication of “Union” was a deceptive concept since England clearly dominated national relationships, preventing Ireland from developing a sense of independent decision-making within the Empire.193 By the onset of Gladstone’s first premiership, the Irish Question was unresolved and Gladstone, along with others in the Liberal Party, sought a passible legislative approach that could maintain a peaceable stance between England and Ireland. Incidentally, Cunningham states that Ireland’s concerns and unrest proved to be the deciding factor that allowed the Liberals to gain power in Parliament over Conservatives in 1868.194 Parry places an ascension of Liberal interest for Ireland prior to Gladstone’s first premiership, stating that in 1834 the Liberal consensus centered on the recognition that Ireland needed further recognition by the British government.195 These truths by Parry and Cunningham reveal that, of the two
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major political parties in Britain, the Liberal Party seemingly provided the best vehicle through which a reformer such as Gladstone could address Ireland’s complicated situation.

Gladstone’s first attempts to respond to the Irish Question came in the form of pacification rather than liberation through the disestablishment of the Irish Church in 1869. While this topic of disestablishmentarianism has been discussed in the first chapter, the 1869 Church Act also defines Gladstone’s dealings with the overall Irish Question because his decision to represent Irish Catholics partially alleviated Ireland’s tensions with the Anglican community and increased Irish favor for the Liberal Party. In other words, while the religious struggles between Catholics, Presbyterians, and Anglicans did not cease with disestablishment, Gladstone managed to create a foothold of trust between Irish voters and the Liberal Party, although he did not specifically consider Irish independence a feasible solution at the time. O’Day further links disestablishment of the Church with the Irish Question by asserting that Gladstone’s Church Act functioned as a response to the escalation of Fenian hostilities toward Britain in 1867. The author implies that the disestablishment process inspired greater nationalist sentiment within Ireland while elevating the status of Liberals as the Party genuinely concerned itself with Irish affairs. Furthermore, Gladstone’s legislation with regard to the Church of Ireland, combined with a growing “sympathy” for the Fenian cause, gave rise to the Irish Amnesty and Home Government Associations with future Home Rule leader Isaac Butt at the head. This persuasive analysis by O’Day supports the likelihood that Gladstone, as early as 1869, inadvertently contributed the spark that evolved into the movement for
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Irish Home Rule despite the fact that he would not openly support the premise until the 1880s. Gladstone’s disestablishment achievement obviously did not answer the Irish Question despite the significance of relinquishing the Church’s Anglican authority over the Irish Catholics and Presbyterians. However, disestablishment allowed Gladstone to gain a political foothold as a representative of Irish needs. It also marked a turning point for the Liberal Party’s movement in the direction of supporting Irish Home Rule which would eventually be championed by Gladstone.

The act of disestablishing the Irish Church was not the only attempt by Gladstone to pacify Ireland during his first premiership. In 1870 Gladstone fronted a Land Act aimed at allowing Irish peasants a means by which to maintain fair rent prices and to compensate evicted tenants.\(^{198}\) Essentially this Land Act represented, according to Cook, the second of a three-pronged approach by Gladstone to further his goals for Ireland’s pacification with disestablishment serving as the first measure in 1869 and education reform encompassing the third in 1863.\(^{199}\) Because the parameters of the bill did not truly improve the plight of peasant farmers, Biagini suggests that this land measure was merely “half-hearted” by Gladstone.\(^{200}\) While Biagini’s perspective is certainly valid, he fails to acknowledge that the main target of this particular land act was not necessarily the betterment of the Irish farmer’s lot. In fact, Gladstone’s approach regarding landowners seems conservative in nature because he exhibited no desire to alter the hierarchy of Ireland’s agricultural structure.\(^{201}\) The significance of the 1870 Land Act relates to Gladstone’s outlook on the Fenian uprising as was part of the case concerning
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disestablishment and he sought a valid means by which to prevent further aggression. Gladstone linked the Fenian aggression with his land act by providing opportunities for evicted tenants and freed prisoners to gain compensation for their financial losses. By these parameters in the land bill, Gladstone apparently hoped that the Fenian movement would dissipate. In other words, Gladstone’s method ideally strove for Irish pacification through representation of peasant farmers and evicted tenants, allowing them to have greater involvement in their agricultural assets while simultaneously providing an alternative to Fenian hostilities. While the 1870 Land Act did not succeed in transforming Ireland’s societal position toward Britain, Gladstone conceivably created a step toward recognition for Irish commoners as well as a realization that the Irish Question would need greater support from the Liberals if Ireland was to be pacified.

Despite the obvious failures of this attempt at land reform Gladstone continued in his mission of representation for Ireland by passing the 1873 Universities Bill. This issue merited discussion previously because of its connection to Gladstone’s broadened endeavors regarding reform of British education policies. The Universities Bill also substantiated a three-step process to allay Irish tensions by bringing its citizens better representation. Rather than attempting to manage a complete overhaul of the Irish school system, Gladstone asserted that alterations to Ireland’s university policies would allow for unity between various denominations, including schools run by Catholics, Anglicans, or Presbyterians. However, rather than appeasing the religious groups through a harmonized non-denominational curriculum, Gladstone’s policy alienated his
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supporters to a degree that forced him out of his first premiership. As in the case of the first Land Act, the alteration of Ireland’s educational framework did not succeed in its ambitions regarding Irish conciliation. Therefore, Gladstone’s initial attempt at solving the Irish Question proved a futile, undertaking. Undoubtedly, one can conclude that Irish independence was far from Gladstone’s mind during his first premiership. However, his struggle for Ireland’s pacification, albeit flawed, established a foundation upon which Gladstone demonstrated his liberal policies to progressively adjust governmental policies concerning Irish representation.

In his second premiership, Gladstone demonstrated further attentiveness toward endeavors for Irish needs although this paled in comparison to the latter half of his career in which he championed Home Rule. O’Day implies that when Gladstone took office in 1880 he did not bring a distinct Irish agenda to the forefront of his administration, although he concedes that Gladstone was still resolved to meet the needs of the Irish people. Cook states that in 1881 Gladstone’s cabinet focused almost exclusively on “Irish affairs” and at least two undertakings concerning the Irish Question manifested: coercion and land reform. It may be true that during his second premiership Gladstone hesitated to leap fervently into the policies dedicated to Ireland’s reforms due to the complicated position of maintaining parliamentary favor. However, Irish discontent still plagued imperial interests, and the Home Rule Party began to view Gladstonian Liberalism as an ideal vehicle through which to garner representation. These two facets

of the Irish Question seemingly motivated Gladstone to continue parliamentary priorities regarding improvements to the nation’s instability.

As the second premiership commenced, Gladstone and his Irish Secretary, W. E. Forster, wanted to focus on land legislation as a first step toward the reexamination of Irish reforms. However, Gladstone concluded that the failure of earlier coercion attempts combined with a rise in discord between the England and Ireland over an increase in tenant evictions prompted a necessity for a measure that would maintain order, so that a viable land act could emerge.208 Interestingly, Hammond and Foot imply that Gladstone exhibited reluctance to initiate this 1881 Coercion Act because it marred his liberal sensibilities and he knew it challenged his goals toward greater Irish rights.209 Effectively, coercion allowed authorities to imprison suspects without cause, a policy which in turn, angered most Irish MPs. A number of newspapers outside of Ireland praised the Coercion Act because it challenged Irish nationalists who were led by Charles Parnell and confirmed that at least some sources in Britain agreed that coercion would work to pacify Irish discontent.210 On the other hand, newspapers from Ireland cite a clear position by Home Rulers that coercion only solidified their argument that England still unfairly ruled the Irish, and the passage of the act, if it did anything, strengthened Parnell’s resolve to resist.211 In either case, one can label the 1881 Coercion Act as a measure which led toward greater Irish representation because from Gladstone’s perspective, through coercion, pacification provided him with further assurances that
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Parliament would now adhere to future reforms. Undoubtedly, the concept of coercion does not advocate representation in a direct sense. However, Gladstone viewed pacification as a stepping stone upon which Ireland and England might come to terms and thereby actually prompt greater considerations for Irish rights which, unbeknownst to him, eventually took the form of Gladstonian-backed Home Rule.

After passage of the Coercion Act in 1881, Gladstone moved to facilitate his second Land Act supporting reform through the “Three Fs, Fair rent, Fixity of Tenure, and Free Sale (of tenant right).” Essentially, this act limited the ability of landlords to unfairly manipulate rents and promoted probabilities that tenants would be able to afford proprietorship, ideally creating a more balanced relationship between those two involved parties. Gladstone understood that this new land act was not a permanent solution to Ireland’s economic problems and stated (somewhat humorously) that, at best, the bill provided “three little fs.” However, Gladstone still conceded that, because of the Act, the tenants and the leasers now shared dual ownership, thereby solidifying a measure of representation previously unavailable to Irish commoners. Incidentally, Gladstone possessed a secondary objective for the land act that was connected to his original goal of pacification. Coercion, on its own, could never pacify the Irish nationalists who, as previously mentioned, saw that method as another example of imperial intimidation. Gladstone, however, believed that the installation of fairer land reforms might balance the harshness of the Coercion Act that had agitated patriotic Land Leaguers led by Michael
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Furthermore, Parnell and the Irish Nationalists began to ally with Gladstone’s Irish Secretary and although Liberals had previously failed to pass a tenant-favored measure in the form of the Compensation for Disturbances Act, Parnell indicated that Irish nationalists would be willing to coalesce with Gladstone. Matthew argues that the 1881 Land Act was successful in both representing the Irish tenants and defeating the opposition set by the Land League, resulting in a double triumph for Gladstone although it still did not solve the Irish Question, nor did it pacify Ireland. Gladstone failed to achieve the goal of his first two premierships, but he still managed to maintain his unique political qualities by pursuing various solutions that would set a foundation for his later work in the Home Rule movement. The prime minister’s land reforms, though probably insignificant in an imperial sense, proved to Irish subjects that Gladstone was, at the very least, concerned with their struggles, and in turn, his progressive efforts brought greater representation for Ireland which otherwise may not have manifested under Liberal management.

Before discussing Gladstone’s personal affiliations with Irish Home Rule, one should note the progress of the movement prior to Gladstonian involvement. By 1880 Irish nationalists including Parnell and William Shaw initially displayed disappointment and dissatisfaction with Gladstone’s original solutions. Coercion and land reform likely did not promote the general welfare of Irish dissenters. However, Biagini suggests that after Gladstone’s campaign at Midlothian, Home Rule supporters viewed Gladstonian
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 Liberalism as a potential means by which to gain greater political recognition. O’Day adds that in 1881 Gladstone, experienced an epiphany which altered his approach to a solution to the Irish Question suggesting that Home Rule now posed a viable alternative to pacification. Furthermore, Parnell, who had been recently released from imprisonment, began to work reluctantly with Gladstone against Joseph Chamberlain’s Unionist agenda which desired to “avoid full Home Rule”. Perhaps most relevant to the relationship between Gladstone and Irish constituents, was the passage of the 1884 Reform Act which extended the voting franchise to households in Ireland like it had to those in in England. In short, the Liberals now began to court a new Irish voting group that could shift the balance of Parliament in favor of their party. Pugh adds that by 1885 the Home Rule supporters gained a majority of the Irish seats in the House of Commons, thereby allowing them to greatly influence the direction that parliamentary leaders would lean. Combining this expansion of political affiliation with the fact that Gladstone had already exhausted his options to pacify Ireland via other programs, there remained only one logical conclusion to Irish appeasement: Gladstone needed to avidly support the groundswell for Home Rule. Acknowledging the inevitable outcry for British recognition of Irish nationalism provided Gladstone with new opportunities for his administration because he could further his goals of greater representation while maintaining political favor with new constituents. In retrospect, Home Rule seemed an imminent issue that Gladstone could either ignore or embrace. Due to the controversial
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nature of debating Irish rights in a British Parliament, Gladstone could have opted to maintain a position of neutrality thereby erring on the side of bureaucratic caution. By choosing the latter option of championing the cause of Home Rule, M. K. Thompson concludes that Gladstone effectively strengthened his political security although it is also arguable that risk was involved because, while he gained the Irish vote, Gladstone did lose some Liberal members to Chamberlain’s group, and in turn, they would eventually take the form of the Liberal Unionists.223 In fact, Thompson suggests that the issue of Irish Home Rule redefined Liberalism, creating contention between Gladstonian loyalists and Liberal secessionists who sided with the Conservatives on the matter.224 However, Gladstone’s maneuver to increase his representation of Ireland succeeded and his consideration of adopting Irish Home Rule allowed him the advantage over the Conservatives during and after the 1885 election.225 Cunningham further indicates that Gladstone began viewing Ireland as a “distinct nation,” and although he did not promote an Ireland that was independent from the Empire, he exceeded the caution of Chamberlain’s position regarding the Irish by seeking to bestow greater responsibilities of governance to the nation.226 In this case, Gladstone’s adoption of the Home Rule cause brought him into uncharted territory because the possibility remained that siding with Ireland’s cause could jeopardize his standing as the Liberal leader. However, Gladstone
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openly supported the endeavor toward greater Irish representation in the spirit of his progressive tendencies, in spite of unknown outcomes.

In 1885, before his third premiership, Gladstone merged his newfound focus on Home Rule with the ambitions of Parnell and the Irish Nationalists. According to St. John, Gladstone and Parnell possessed a significant common parameter regarding Home Rule. Both insisted that while Ireland should form a national government to deal with immediate domestic affairs, the nation should remain loyal to the British Empire. In other words, the initial approach to Home Rule support would not imply independence from Britain but did allow Ireland to control a greater measure of its own affairs, including gaining a stronger voice in the British government. Meanwhile, the present state of devolution did not allow for Irish politicians to exert an active voice in parliamentary proceedings. Gladstone viewed devolution as beneficial to British Parliament because it meant that he could represent Irish interests by allowing them self-governance while simultaneously “cleansing” the House of Commons from an unstable element of the Irish Nationalists. These proposals over the direction of Ireland’s future prompted Gladstone to propose a bill in 1886 supporting the “devolution to an Irish Parliament,” isolating the responsibilities of international policy and defense to British authority while leaving all other questions to be answered by Ireland’s governance. The bill went through two readings with Chamberlain protesting against its passage on both readings and Lord Hartington joined the challenge on the second. Each MP countered Gladstone by charging that his bill proposed an experimental government that
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would undermine British sovereignty. Pugh adds that Hartington and Chamberlain contributed to the bill’s defeat by persuading a considerable number of MPs toward the Liberal Unionist faction, further splitting the party and guaranteeing failure at Gladstone’s first attempt at obtaining Home Rule for Ireland. On examination of the bill’s potential effects, Gladstone apparently sought to appease both Irish and English sympathies by creating a compromised approach to Home Rule. The compromise required all to bend their expectations for the sake of consensus. Unfortunately for Gladstone, the Conservatives, the Liberal Unionists, and the Irish Nationalists each possessed specific objectives that did not concede a middle-ground solution, thereby insuring incompatibility and defeat. Despite this setback, Gladstone continued to pursue the representative aspect of Home Rule connecting the movement to his Gladstonian sensibilities and adapting his notions to further focus on Irish needs.

The proposal of the first Home Rule bill did not gain majority support for passage through Parliament; however, public opinion on the matter recognized Gladstone as someone concerned with the Irish plight. One key feature of the bill challenged the relationship between Ireland and Britain as dictated by the Act of Union, and although it did not address every complaint that emerged from the people’s concerns, the Irish likely understood that Gladstone was looking to alter aspects of the imperial status quo. On one end of the Irish representation spectrum, the people praised Gladstone’s endeavors in Parliament, stressing the importance of gaining a greater voice in the British government and even acknowledging a possible answer to the previous strife caused by the Act of
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Union.\footnote{233 "Irish Public Opinion and the Home Rule Bill," \textit{Freeman’s Journal and Daily Commercial Advertiser} (Dublin), April 14, 1886.} On the other side, facets of the Irish media predicted the inevitability that the bill would not pass through Parliament without modifications favoring the institution of British sovereignty.\footnote{234 "The Home Rule Bill," \textit{The Belfast News-Letter}, April 14, 1886.} Public outlets also expressed further doubts as to the validity of the bill concerning constitutionalism which seemingly forbade Irish Home Rule but conceded that continued coercion would be a worse alternative. Gladstone himself referenced this last impediment to passage. In \textit{The Evening Telegraph}, Gladstone is referenced in his perspective regarding the two choices between Home Rule or coercion:

> Whenever we have failed to govern Ireland successfully we have blindly resorted to coercion. What is the alternative from the measure now proposed? If the Bill for the future, and we may now add the better, government for Ireland is defeated we must perforce go back to the old and, alas, unsuccessful panacea of coercion.\footnote{235 "Gladstone’s Home Rule Bill," \textit{The Evening Telegraph} (Dundee), April 09, 1886.}

These various opinions prove that Home Rule was a considerably difficult issue and if passed it would transform the domestic face of Empire, forcing Britain to recognize the Irish as relevant partners rather than mere subjects to the English crown. Although the first Home Rule bill failed, its proposal moved Britain into a transition period in which Parliament had to consider the possibility of a separate Irish government capable of a limited degree of self-rule. Many Irish citizens demonstrated the propensity to view Gladstone as a champion of their cause of greater representation. Gladstone contributed to this significant transformation of British policy, thereby adding revolutionary traits to his attributed Liberalism.

Despite the setbacks that prevented his first Home Rule bill from passing through Parliament, Gladstone continued his efforts to represent Ireland during his fourth and
final premiership. Interestingly, and perhaps more significant to his fourth premiership than to his former dealings with Ireland, Gladstone openly risked powerful opposition by insisting upon radical changes to the 1886 bill. Gladstone fervently defended the validity of the bill in the face of resistance because it represented Irish needs more distinctly than what Parliament had previously been willing to concede. In 1893 Gladstone drafted the second Home Rule bill with new parameters allowing for a bicameral legislature elected by constituents and promoting the election of an executive leader, regardless of his denominational belief or party affiliation. This facet of the second bill demonstrated greater propensity for democratic alteration than his previous solution for Home Rule. However, the most significant addition to the 1893 bill was that Gladstone now supported the inclusion of Irish MPs to the House of Commons, although they could not vote on British matters. Gladstone’s new measures for Home Rule passed in the House of Commons, but ultimately faltered in the House of Lords, ensuring the bill’s downfall and preventing Gladstone from accomplishing Home Rule for Ireland by the end of the nineteenth century. Undoubtedly, Gladstone’s Home Rule endeavors did not succeed in a direct sense nor did Gladstone bring unchecked democratic reform to the Irish people. However, this final bill by Gladstone confirms that a significant portion of his leadership career was dedicated to Ireland’s concerns and its representation. The measures he championed did create the framework for future attempts and for final passage of Home Rule legislation.
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The finality of Gladstone’s fourth appointment to the office of prime minister suggests that his last political ambitions largely targeted Ireland, thereby reflecting his long-term goal to answer the Irish Question. MP Justin McCarthy states that Gladstone’s primary reason for seeking a final office term was to complete his work with Ireland, indicating a quality of genuine enthusiasm by Gladstone to represent that nation’s interests to the end of his career. In fairness, McCarthy’s position, that Gladstone’s intentions were strictly noble, is unsurprising as he was counted among a number of liberal based Irish Nationalists loyal to the Gladstonian cause. Ireland’s people seemed divided over Gladstone’s motivations, but similar to McCarthy’s perspective they acknowledged that the Liberal prime minister’s efforts could not be ignored. His contribution, while controversial, certainly shook the existing state of affairs between England and Ireland. English opinion also varied with some newspapers such as the Star and the Echo praising Gladstone’s efforts to represent Ireland in Parliament and other media including the Evening News and the Westminster Gazette, expressing doubts of any benefits that the second Home Rule bill would bring to Britain. In either case, the bill’s testament to Gladstonian policy was not determined by whether Gladstone had succeeded in passing a revolutionary Home Rule act or whether he had failed to win over Parliament. Rather, the continuous endeavor by Gladstone to represent an oppressed people, despite the risk to his own career and the likelihood that British Parliament would
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not accept Irish Home Rule, validated a constant attribute of democratic progressiveness inherent to his method of governance.

The Irish Question provided a decisive pursuit for Gladstonian policy because, from the point of his initial methods of pacification for the country within his first premiership to his avid support for Ireland’s right to self-rule during his final days in office, Gladstone remained fixed to a position of representative administration for the Irish people. When first becoming Prime Minister, Gladstone hoped to conciliate Ireland through church disestablishment, land resolutions, and education revisions. Largely unsuccessful in appeasing Irish nationalists, Gladstone reconstituted his measures to meet Irish demands, resorting to increased coercion but pursuing progressive treatment for tenants, thereby indicating a recognition by Gladstone that Ireland needed greater delegation in Parliament for its struggles. Although short-lived, Gladstone’s third administration amounted to the most significant shift in his career. Unlike his previous notions of viable Irish representation, Gladstone’s loyalty shifted further in favor of Irish desires to form their own government even going so far as to ally with the nationalist Parnell, both compromising for Ireland’s benefit. Gladstone had not fully embraced the concept of Home Rule. However, he challenged the established relationship between Britain and Ireland dating back to the 1800 Act of Union. In the closing years of his career, Gladstone yet again strived for Irish Home Rule and conceded the need to adhere to an Irish government concerning Irish interests. Despite setbacks and failures over several of his political enterprises relating to Ireland’s plight, Gladstone tirelessly aspired to solve the Irish Question throughout the entirety of his parliamentary administration. The culmination of his achievements in Ireland’s representation and Home Rule,
although limited, marked a defining theme of progression towards an independent Irish state and consequently, a democratically conscious British government.
CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

This thesis has aimed to highlight the unique representative qualities of Gladstone’s political practices by discussing various accomplishments throughout his career both before and during his four premierships. As a group those political achievements vary within the political spectrum in a way that allows for them to be defined as Gladstonian Liberalism. Gladstone’s considerations for disestablishment of both the Irish and Scottish Churches were initially featured to convey a significant decision that partially defined his first premiership. Despite Gladstone’s devotion to the Anglican Church, he, through both a practicality aimed at political shrewdness and a sincerity for extended religious freedoms, promoted the disestablishment of the Church of Ireland. By doing so, Gladstone decreased to some measure the authoritative hold that England had placed over the Irish since the 1800 Act of Union. Although Gladstone never achieved the same solution, concerning disestablishment, for Scotland, the situation was different due to the overwhelming Catholic dissention in Ireland, allowing Gladstone to address the needs of both nations while garnering favor from various interested parties. In retrospect, Gladstone’s objectives in disestablishment distanced Britain further from strict imperial sovereignty. Gladstone moved the British Empire closer toward an
identifiably United Kingdom conscientious of its population’s underrepresented communities that set a foundation for reforms in the twentieth century.

The second chapter conveys a broader look at Gladstone’s achievements throughout the entirety of his career and describes key components of his international policies. In the onset of the Crimean War, Gladstone’s budget policies allowed for successful war funding. More to the point, Gladstone essentially placed the fiscal responsibility of war into the hands of Britain’s citizens, thus bestowing the power of international conflict on them rather than solely on the government. In the midst of Ottoman aggression toward Bulgarians, Gladstone proved that his adherence to representation did not halt within the bounds of Britain as he maintained a strong front as Leader of the Opposition to the Conservatives and he extended a political voice in favor of protecting Bulgarian Christians abroad. Effectively, Gladstonian policy bridged liberal sentiments and compassions to a forceful international presence. After his dealings with the Ottomans and after contemplating practical traits connected with a Conservative approach to imperial trade interests, Gladstone met with his own controversial incident against Mahdist forces in Sudan. Of the various agendas linked with Gladstonian Liberalism the death of Gordon at Khartoum reveals flaws within Gladstone’s governance, but also confirms a constant desire to maintain imperial interests so long as they represented what he believed to be in Britain’s best interests. In other words, while failing to meet the immediate desires of the people, Gladstone looked toward future possibilities in hopes that diminishing a military presence in Sudan would also prevent further aggression against Britain, thereby promoting pragmatism in place of imperialism. These three global policies by Gladstone all indicate a likelihood that the people of
Britain, and by extension various groups within the international community as is the case with Bulgaria, garnered his personal interest and added to the scope of Gladstonian Liberalism. He extended his progressive sentiments beyond the borders of Britain and on occasion Gladstone did so regardless of the potential impairment to his favor on the home front.

When discussing the various elements of democratic legislation in Gladstonian Liberalism, the issue of social representation must be included. The third chapter also bestows a broad perspective of Gladstone’s achievements, although the major considerations in this case targeted his domestic obligations which were largely successful in promoting his progressive tendencies. The obvious reflections of Gladstone’s leadership qualities appear in his representation of the working class in Britain. This is true regarding his budget reforms aimed at easing the economic burdens of the working class. However, the identifiable democratic traits of Gladstone’s administration manifested when he pursued broader enfranchisement to the working class and when he relinquished his own desires regarding honorable voting in political favor of the secret ballot. In these acts Gladstone yet again demonstrated that his priority, while laced with bureaucratic practicality, adhered to the voice of the British people, thereby signaling another attribute linked with the democratic process backed by governmental legislation.

Finally, of the numerous pursuits and achievements included in Gladstone’s premierships, his continuous yet adaptive pursuit of a solution for the Irish Question reflected some of the most significant attributes of Gladstonian Liberalism and its adherence to progressive democratic elements. Initially his approach lacked the
recognition of Ireland as a distinct nation capable of its own governance although he still committed to various reforms to meet Irish needs. By his third premiership, if not sooner, Gladstone recognized a fundamental truth that if Britain hoped to maintain a semblance of peace and unity with Ireland, Parliament would need to adopt a cooperative stance by allowing Irish constituents a plausible degree of control over their own legislation. Despite an initial setback with his first Home Rule bill, Gladstone proposed another act with the potential for more leniency toward Irish rights by allowing them a greater voice within the British Parliament and thereby he hoped to extend limited political authority to Irish MPs. Since Gladstone endured to find a viable solution to the Irish question until the finality of his political career, Irish Home Rule feasibly retains a place as the most recognizable representation of his relentless determination to gradually introduce democratically progressive opportunities to underrepresented societal groups throughout Britain.

In conclusion, Gladstonian Liberalism demonstrated both an evolving sense of social representation and a personal adoption of finite democratic traits through the malleability of Gladstone’s political policies as a British MP. The application of democracy was never targeted toward a complete transition of power to the British citizenry, but rather to broaden the voice of the people so that Parliament could address the varying needs of a vast and complex Empire. Furthermore, Gladstone’s objectives did not pertain solely to England alone, but he did include various subjects of the British Empire while still maintaining particular attentiveness to nations situated within the United Kingdom. Respectively, this method of Gladstonian administration emerged from a hybrid of sociopolitical governance combining personal moral principles, selective
Conservative values, and versatile Liberal qualities. These measures along with the manifestation of a gradual transition toward a more democratic United Kingdom allowed Gladstone to garner a place among Britain’s most influential leaders through his unique and adaptable legislation. It produced an effect that is recognizably Gladstonian Liberalism, which changed the Victorian Era politically, and which precluded democratic and decolonization reforms of the twentieth century.
BOOKS:


Cook’s personal experience with Gladstone as a fellow MP allows the observer to gain firsthand perspectives reminiscent of Bryce and Morley. Cook appears favorable to Gladstone in many of his accounts and laments at the death of the former prime minister touting Gladstone as both a moral and political example that would be difficult to reproduce, seemingly placing Britain in uncertain times.


Gladstone’s own words add weight to Worden’s and Eaker’s discussion of Cromwell and the Anglican Church. Despite Cromwell’s attempts to defy Anglican authority by deposing the monarch, the Church of England still remained the established religious system in England, a structure that Gladstone adhered to as a devoted Anglican. This publication of Gladstone’s marks a point in his early life where spiritual idealism outweighed practical measures. However, despite Gladstone’s later conclusion that the British Empire would not fall under a united Anglican morality, he still held fast to the religion as a personal influence throughout the entirety of his career which further influenced his evolving viewpoints regarding democratic representation.


Morley’s biography of Gladstone is helpful to the thesis as, in similar fashion to Bryce and Cook, the author worked with Gladstone closely as a fellow Liberal MP. One must be careful when utilizing this source as Morley glorifies Gladstone, often limiting cross-examination of Gladstone’s accomplishments. Although a goal of the thesis aims to highlight the uniqueness of Gladstonian Liberalism, there must be considerations that Gladstone still faced socio-political matters with a combination of moral and bureaucratic attributes and is therefore a complex historic figure.
JOURNALS:


This source covers the motivations of Gladstone’s government regarding Ireland’s "pacification," thereby adding material to the examination of his actions before his adoption of Home Rule.


Hamilton confirms that enfranchisement to the working class increased the need for a greater number of educational institutions simply due to the sheer number of new voters that would need fundamental schooling. Theoretically, Gladstone stood to benefit if he could accommodate the education of a rising number of working class constituents because they counted as potential votes for the Liberal Party.

Hinkson, Katharine Tynan. "The French Invasion of Ireland in 1798." The Pall Mall Gazette (London), September 8, 1898.

This article was largely utilized to reveal the continuous and long-winded tension between the British and the Irish. It also indicates that antagonizing the Irish became a risk for Britain on an international scale because the French saw the opportunity to exploit the strife between Ireland and England. In short, Britain needed to subjugate and/or pacify Ireland to maintain a strong front against French naval aggression.


McCarthy contributes a personal view of the potential of Gladstone’s fourth administration, but more importantly, he suggests the primary motivation of the Liberal MP for accepting office connected specifically to Home Rule.


This source mentions various aspects of the Home Rule Bills, including those passed by Gladstone. Shepard provides insight into the fact that Home Rule and even the first two
bills contested former English notions of Ireland’s place in the empire, thereby signaling Gladstone’s efforts as revolutionary.

NEWSPAPERS:


This source provided a counter article concerning what Gladstone referred to as the “Bulgarian horrors”. In similar fashion to Disraeli, some media outlets in Britain proved reluctant to accept reports of Turkish brutality in Bulgaria at face value. There were political motivations behind both views of the event but challenging the Ottomans outright over the issue might have led to inevitable conflict with a valuable trade partner to the Empire.


Taking a completely different position from the *Pall Mall Gazette* regarding the Turkish actions against Bulgaria, this passage reflects a similar position that Gladstone assumed by openly attacking the Ottomans based on reports acquired from the Bulgarians. Again, these articles were likely politically motivated at least to some degree and Gladstone as Leader of the Opposition most certainly understood that inaction concerning the Ottoman aggression with Bulgaria might prove detrimental to his Conservative rival’s position as prime minister.


The Irish media clearly protested the use of coercion by the British and this article, in particular, suggests that among the leaders of the Home Rule movement, Parnell only pushed harder against the forceful British method.


The *Citizen* added weight to the description of Gordon as a heroic figure in Khartoum even before the *Penny Illustrated Paper* depicted its flattering portrayal of the general. According to the article, Gordon was already famous in Sudan and when he arrived to assess the situation at Khartoum, the city’s moral rose considerably.

"Decision of Mr. Gladstone to Contest Midlothian." *The Derby Mercury*, February 5, 1879.

This article allows for a favorable demeanor towards Gladstone’s character as he prepares to campaign by printing his personal correspondence revealing the Liberal MP’s acceptance to “contest” the Conservatives in Midlothian.

This article highlights the efforts of Dr. Chalmers and Dr. Welsh, both of whom pursued disestablishment from the Church of Scotland and advocated disruption in an attempt to maintain that the spiritual authority of the Church set apart from the secular jurisdiction of the State.

"Full Success of Mr. Gladstone's Budget." *Chester Chronicle and Cheshire and North Wales General Advertiser*, July 30, 1853.

This article highlights the efforts of Gladstone to decrease tariffs which further illustrated his objective to meet the needs of working class citizens in Britain rather than those of aristocracy.


British propaganda, such as this source, quickly painted the patriotic General Gordon as a hero of the empire and subsequently as a martyr at the hands of Gladstone after the fall of Khartoum to the Mahdi.

"Gladstones Home Rule Bill." *The Evening Telegraph* (Dundee), April 09, 1886.

Gladstone is referenced in this article as comparing Home Rule to the alternative of coercion, a measure he himself conceded to during his second premiership. In Gladstone’s mind, Home Rule was a far better solution because he hoped it could appease Ireland and England without resorting to force.


Interestingly, some media outlets, such as this article from Scotland and others from England, favored the use of coercion because from their perspective Britain was maintaining order in a region (Ireland) that was unstable due to Fenian uprisings and Nationalist fervor. Although Gladstone seemingly disliked coercion, he still advocated the tactic in his second premiership garnering support from groups that believed coercion to be the most effective method of maintaining Ireland’s subversion to British authority. The difference between Gladstone and said coercion advocates is that Gladstone seemingly viewed coercion as a pacification method for Ireland through which he could achieve the evolving goal of Irish representation, whereas others who supported coercion largely focused on maintaining English sovereignty.

Linked with the article “Irish Public Opinion and the Home Rule Bill,” this passage reflects doubt amongst the Irish media as to the potential success of Gladstone’s first attempt at achieving Home Rule.


This post from the *Citizen* incorporates a valuable comparison of British press opinions of Gladstone’s second Home Rule Bill.

"The Irish Church Act and Its Results." *Freeman's Journal and Daily Commercial Advertiser* (Dublin), September 5th, 1871.

The Irish Church Act garnered various opinions from both the Irish and the English. This particular newspaper appeared favorable toward Liberal efforts to disestablish the Anglican Church in Ireland, giving contrast to the Irish who perceived that the act would do little to alter England’s hold over Ireland.


Typically, one might expect non-conformists to support Gladstone, particularly regarding disestablishment, which was true at least in the case of Scottish disestablishment. However, this article alludes to non-conformist opinions implying that Gladstone’s efforts, while well-intentioned, might not be adequate in transforming the religious state of Ireland in favor of the Irish. Rather, the bill would seemingly do little more than allow Ireland a few greater freedoms while still remaining under an imperial yoke and still bound to an established religious structure controlled by England.


This article provides a favorable outlook of the Liberals reviewed by Irish public opinion, particularly concerning Gladstone’s first Home Rule Bill in 1886.

"Lord Palmerston's Manifesto against Russia." *Berkshire Chronicle* (Reading), November 8, 1856.

The purpose behind using this article aimed to reveal the concerns Lord Palmerston had over Russian aggression and intrigue. In Palmerston’s mind, Russia could not be trusted even after their defeat in the Crimean War.
"Moslem Atrocities in Bulgaria." *Northern Echo* (Darlington), June 24, 1876.

Among the various media outlets covering the massacre of Bulgarians by the Ottomans, the *Northern Echo* clearly provided a one-sided account indicating that Turkish brutality in the wake of a Bulgarian uprising was linked with Muslim aggression.

"Mr. Disraeli’s Defeat on the Budget." *Chester Chronicle and Cheshire and North Wales General Advertiser*, February 28, 1857.

Disraeli’s failure to bring a coherent budget to the forefront of Parliament was recognized by the media who acknowledged his efforts but also concurred that Gladstone’s budget served as a superior alternative promoting the latter as a promising administrator.


While the *Aberdeen Journal* appeared critical of Gladstone’s selective extension of the franchise to workers qualified only by his “pay to vote” system, it also inadvertently reveals that Gladstone directly altered enfranchisement to a greater number of constituents, introducing a more progressive democratic policy to British society.


Irish media was not solely supportive of Gladstone’s Home Rule endeavors. This article lists activities of Gladstone and the Irish Nationalists leading to further examinations of the second Home Rule Bill and predicts that it will undergo further scrutiny by the latter party.

"Mr. Gladstone and the Late Lord Aberdeen." *Aberdeen Weekly Journal*, October 17, 1883.

This passage supported a part of the thesis which sought to highlight the relationship between Gladstone and Aberdeen. Gladstone was fond of Aberdeen and served under him as Chancellor of the Exchequer though the latter proved less popular when dealing with the Eastern Question and Aberdeen’s leadership waned to the benefit of Palmerston’s agenda.

"Mr. Gladstone on the Suez Canal." *Western Mail* (Cardiff), July 8, 1870.

This article portrays Gladstone as one who understood the potential of British ownership of the Suez Canal. Although not seemingly imperialist in a political sense, Gladstone believed that the Suez would extend British influence in the world through greater commercial/diplomatic prowess.

The death of Gordon most assuredly ties back to Gladstone and his cabinet. Though it is historically arguable as to the true motivations of either Gladstone or Gordon, Gladstone willingly allowed a war hero to single-handedly evacuate the residents of Khartoum and initially refused to send military aid to the city. While one could suggest that Gladstone’s desire to avoid an imperialist agenda in Sudan it would not have been difficult for articles such as this to paint Gladstone as the alleged killer of a patriotic British paragon.


The purpose of this article was to reveal in the historiography that the British media was not completely supportive of Gladstone, despite the significance of his Midlothian campaign. The *Grantham Journal* seemed more supportive of Gladstone’s rival, Lord Dalkeith, going so far as to advertise going rates for housing with higher benefits for Dalkeith’s supporters.


The Scottish supporters of disestablishment acknowledged Gladstone as a potential champion for their cause partially because he led the Liberal Party, but this was also accentuated during his Midlothian campaign in Scotland, thereby making the issue more personal to those who viewed the him as one who might listen to their concerns. Gladstone still proved reluctant to openly support Scottish disestablishment, but also implied that the issue was in consideration, allowing him to maintain support from dissenters and non-conformists without having to fully back the disestablishment cause.

**SPEECHES/PAMPHLETS:**


This is a collection of sources including excerpts by Bryce and Gladstone concerning the subject of British administration in Ireland. Both MPs held certain opinions on how best to address the troubles in Ireland with Bryce continuing a Liberal representation for Ireland after Gladstone’s death.

In order to prove Gladstone’s devotion to Anglican principles, it is essential to read from Gladstone’s own wording which, in the case, reflects his strong faith as a motivation for several aspects of his political career.


Like various media accounts of the massacre of Bulgarians by Ottoman Turks, Gladstone, as Leader of the Opposition, was quick to criticize both the Ottoman Muslims for their blatant aggression and, likewise, Disraeli for his apparent inaction. Gladstone seemingly possessed two motives behind this pamphlet. Firstly, Gladstone indicated a genuine reluctance to trust Ottoman motivations even though he supported their protection in the Crimean War. The “Bulgarian Horrors” only fueled his animosity towards the Ottoman Empire. Secondly, Gladstone’s attack on Disraeli’s reluctance to retaliate against the Turkish treatment of Bulgarians may have appeared brash, but also utilized British zeal that, in turn, allowed Gladstone to politically represent the Bulgarians overseas by maintaining a sympathetic view toward their plight.

"The Two Budgets; Or Mr. Disraeli and Mr. Gladstone." *Liverpool Mercury*, April 22, 1853.

This article adds weight to Matthew’s assertion regarding Gladstone’s fiscal talents in comparison with Disraeli. Unlike his rival’s budgetary objectives, Gladstone proved adaptable to both war and post-war economics, garnering respect as one who could manage money even in a tumultuous period of international conflict.

"Why Should Mr. Gladstone Not Contest Midlothian?" *The Evening Telegraph* (Dundee), February 08, 1879.

This Scottish news source incites obvious support of Gladstone’s pending decision to embrace a campaign in Midlothian. One of the main reasons given for the paper’s advocacy of the maneuver is Gladstone’s Scottish heritage, which *The Evening Telegraph* indicates will make him a natural friend of Scotsmen.


Contesting with Irish opinion, several British media outlets viewed Gladstone’s disestablishment measures as radical or at the very least inadequate to appease both the Irish and the British while maintaining British sovereignty. In this case, the article pinpoints some of the potentially negative outcomes that the Church Act might bring, suggesting an initial reluctance by some British groups to accept disestablishment as a viable component for the solution to the Irish Question.
SECONDARY SOURCES


Anderson points to Gladstone’s financial strategies during the Crimean War and includes that Gladstone’s decision to increase tariffs, despite assurances to do the opposite, connected directly with the onset of international conflict. Gladstone apparently supported the war, but seemingly more from a bureaucratic standpoint than a moral position. While he had previously hoped to decrease taxes as Chancellor of the Exchequer, he shunned the idea that Britain should seek exterior funding for a war that its own people supported. In response, Gladstone extended tariffs to fund war-costs, indicating that if the British people wanted war, they must then front it themselves. To a degree, Gladstone’s tariff policy actually complimented his representation qualities because he agreed to give the people what they desired while expecting them to share fiscal responsibility for the decision to confront Russia.


While Bebbington provides a modernized biography of Gladstone, his approach is somewhat unique in that he provides a religious perspective centered on Gladstone’s ethical viewpoints which defined his political career. The author further acknowledges that Christ was at the center of Gladstonian Liberalism and proved an inescapable motivation in the prime minister’s methods that incorporated facets of Conservatism, Liberalism, and Anglicanism.


Despite the understanding that Gladstone possessed of General Gordon’s war-hero status, Behrman seems to indicate that the prime minister hoped he could achieve popularity from two angles. On one end Gladstone would represent the people’s desire to save the people of Khartoum and secondly, he could maintain a non-aggression policy if Gordon simply evacuated the city rather than defending its residents against the Mahdi. In short, Gladstone apparently underestimated Gordon’s vanity and patriotism as the zealous general disregarded Gladstone’s expectations by staying in Khartoum.

The main purpose behind this source was to convey a connection between the origins of the Anglican Church and Gladstone’s own devotion to the denomination as it became the established Church of England.


Biagini’s book is not entirely dedicated to Gladstone; however, the historian focuses on the relationship between Irish nationalists seeking Home Rule and a growing progressive movement toward democracy in the British Liberal Party. Although he never achieved Home Rule for Ireland, Gladstone championed the cause from his position of leadership within Parliament, defining his own Liberalism and furthering democratic representation in Britain.


Despite the obvious objective to maintain English sovereignty over Ireland, Bolton stresses that subjugation was not the sole purpose and that Britain desired to maintain a stable market system and to benefit from various Irish commodities such as wool. In other words, the Act of Union incorporated a complex set of expectations by Britain which gradually took the form of a “United” Kingdom.


Chadwick affirms the significance of Britain’s Third Reform Act in that Gladstone was the prime minister who accomplished this progressive bill for greater representation and that when the act was introduced, the distribution of parliamentary seats proved ripe for its passing.


The point of using Clarke’s description of the Mahdi was to convey that the British realization of his potential influence over Egypt and Sudan was clearly enough to consider him a threat to imperialist objectives. Although Gladstone did not appear to
desire further expansion into Sudan, the Mahdi clearly represented an anti-Western force challenging Britain’s might.


Despite Peel’s mentoring influence on Gladstone, Conacher provides a clear distinction between the two MPs in that Peel broke all ties with Conservatism while Gladstone remained loyal to certain facets of that party. Gladstone’s transformation from High Conservative to Liberal was not instant and, even after he acquired the position of leadership over the Liberal Party, he continuously merged some Conservative influences with his own Liberalism.

Condon, Mary D. "The Irish Church and the Reform Ministries." *The Journal of British Studies* 3, no. 02 (1964): 120-42. JSTOR.

Condon’s article includes that the Act of Union did not just imply British subjugation over Ireland solely through social means, but also through religious manipulation. Being a largely Catholic nation, Ireland now answered to Britain through a new branch of the Anglican Church which became the established religious system for the Irish. In response, Irish tensions escalated due to their Catholic/Presbyterian loyalties and their disdain for British authority. Condon further suggests tithing as a major factor of debate between the Irish and the English.


Cunningham serves as one of the main sources that is featured in this thesis as it largely focuses on Gladstone’s unique approach to progressive democratic reforms through broadened social representation. A key inclusion by Cunningham is his position that democracy was a subjective idea in British society and, depending on the context, could either imply negative or beneficial connotations. Gladstone pursued his own understanding of democratic change and, while he did not embrace a complete overhaul of Britain’s constitutional monarchy, he did recognize a need for fundamental alterations to the Empire’s conservative concept of acceptable social representation.


Eaker adds support to the inclusion of Worden’s article concerning the validity of Cromwell and the Anglican Church as influences toward Victorian ideals of democracy and the established Church of England.
Commenting on both Parry and Elie Halevy’s works regarding the Liberal Party in Victorian Britain, Eastwood suggests that the early nineteenth century became a period in which the Liberals gradually garnered influence due to an Empire leaning toward progressive tendencies over the course of several decades.

Before discussing the siege of Khartoum, Featherstone indicates that Gladstone may have inadvertently escalated the Mahdi’s retaliation against Sudan as he established a British-led government in Egypt, thereby suggesting a possible interest in further imperialism which, by nature, would challenge the Mahdi’s authority in the region.

Goodlad’s writings in this book are short, but also clear regarding tactics enacted by Britain in its international policies. Though the book largely focuses on issues occurring in the British Empire from the latter half of the Victorian Era to the Edwardian era and onward, Goodlad alludes to previous issues that culminated into the topics he specifically covers. For example, the Crimean War is included in the book as it pertains to the overall Eastern Question and Goodlad informs the reader that Britain’s involvement in the conflict represented an imperial concern that Russian aggression might remain unchecked without the use of British force.

Hamer gives a counter argument to the possibility that Gladstone was in any way risking his political career by pursuing Home Rule. According to the author, the Liberal Party was far from united; therefore, from Gladstone’s perspective the decision to adopt the Home Rule cause gave the Liberals a new purpose by consolidating under this representative measure.

The authors of Gladstone and Liberalism describe Gladstone’s career from the perspective that the man’s political and moral compass was not the same as other Liberals in the party. They concur that Gladstone managed to gain popularity amongst other
 Liberal MPs but forged his own personalized administration that did not prove static but adaptive to various issues linked with British concerns.


The selected content from *Nineteenth-Century Britain* discuss the efforts of both Gladstone and Disraeli during the Crimean War with Gladstone emerging as the popular choice for budget management.

**Hibbert, Christopher. *Queen Victoria: A Personal History*. Cambridge, MA: Da Capo Press, 2001.**

While Hibbert mostly concerns himself with British imperial history from the perspective of Queen Victoria, he also provides insight into the overall issues occurring internationally during her reign. Hibbert also discusses specific issues of tension between France, Britain, the Ottomans, and Russia which led to further aggressions and eventually to war.


Hurst reveals a link between Irish Nationalists and the secret ballot which seemingly strengthened Ireland’s resolve to become more involved Britain’s political system. As the Irish did not necessarily share the same disdain for secret voting in comparison with England, the Ballot Act encouraged Irish constituents who were previously concerned with retaliation in open in open balloting to vote with new confidence as their identities would be theoretically protected.


Although not as extensive as John Morley’s three volume account of Gladstone’s life and career, Jenkins faithfully reproduces a detailed perspective of Gladstone’s life ranging from his early achievements to his passing. Jenkins also personalizes Gladstone in a way that doesn’t reflect most modern sources, many of which try to portray him in a grander scheme of Empire.


In similar fashion to Eastwood, Jennings describes a period around the 1830s in which Britain entered a progressive era where the voice of the British people garnered greater recognition within Empire. In response to the rise of public opinion, political parties, both
Conservative and Liberal, were forced to adapt to a transforming Britain in need of greater representation.


St. John is undoubtedly one of the most useful sources centered on Gladstonian policy. The main pattern of his chapters incorporates a step-by-step labeling of various acts and policies enacted by Gladstone. While other sources do detail certain acts that proved significant to British parliamentary practices, St. John meticulously describes the complexities and relevance of Gladstonian reform as it evolved into a personalized method of governance.


The rivalry between Gladstone and Disraeli is relevant to comprehending the contested position of British representation between the Conservative and Liberal Parties. Johnson pinpoints key differences in the political strategies of the progressive Gladstone and the radical Disraeli, touting both as paragons of their respective parties and strengthening sources that seek to highlight Gladstone’s role as Leader of the Opposition to the Conservative agenda.


Judd’s *Empire* may be among the most informative narratives concerning the evolution/decline of the British imperial system from a broadened perspective. He produces various chapters targeting specific events in British history, but then describes the issues, both national and international, surrounding said topic including how Gladstone contributed to the progressive aspects of the Victorian era.


Kellas discusses the connections between disestablishment supporters in Scotland and Liberal sympathizers. The disruption of 1843 paved a route by which Free Church advocates could garner the attentions of Church dissenters in Britain, many of whom identified as Liberal, thereby allowing said political party to adopt the cause for disestablishment in Scotland.

Kinzer provides a significant attribute highlighting Gladstone’s ethical character because the MP supported the secret ballot as Liberal representative; however, he did so reluctantly since it employed deceptive means. Although Gladstone wanted to bring various forms of democratic progression to British society, he did not want to concede the honor of the honest British voter to retain popular support.


Knaplund’s article strengthens the likelihood that Gladstone differed to a democratic option regarding disestablishment of the Anglican Church. It is conclusive that Gladstone understood the importance of supporting majority public opinion in both the case of Ireland and that of Jamaica. However, Gladstone had to forfeit the hope that Anglicanism would unite the empire by admitting to himself that this goal was not realistic and would not satisfy the cultural dynamics within the British Empire.


Kriegel stresses a key difference between the Whigs and other Liberals in that the latter group sought to bring greater representation to Britain as a whole, whereas the Whigs, while progressive in comparison with the Tories, prioritized the land-owning elite above that of the working class.


The main point of utilizing Laski’s article was to convey the nature of the Sottish Churches in relation to the term *societas perfecta* which indicated that Church authority must be kept apart from state matters. The Established Church answerable to a British government directly challenged this notion, giving the Free Church of Scotland a clear motivation for desiring disestablishment.


In his writings, Lawrence is not so quick to assume that the apparent democratic changes to Britain’s society by Parliament were genuine. He pinpoints issues such as the 1832 Reform Act and argues that, while some change did occur, it was not significantly in
favor of the British labor force. Lawrence provides a fair analysis of British politics in the Victorian era and, although it seems obvious that democratic changes were occurring in Britain during this period, there is a clear truth that these changes were not all revolutionary and certainly carried political connotations.


Lawrence’s book strives, among other topics, to describe the perspective of the British political parties regarding how best to represent the British people. Added to this, Lawrence, like Cunningham, confirms that democracy and representation were not singular definitions, especially when comparing the Conservatives, the Liberals, and the citizens of the British Empire.


Lee suggests that Gladstone’s anti-socialist tendencies played a role in his enfranchisement and that by promoting a selective section of the working class he could achieve greater representation while maintaining a free-market society.


Gladstone’s political backing did not just come from Liberals since he managed to acquire the loyalties of several political groups, largely because he compromised certain parameters in his progressive objectives. Among said groups were non-conformists who desired to see alterations to the status-quo of Britain’s administrative policies. While not strictly adherent to non-conformist expectations, Gladstone understood that by addressing their concerns rather than ignoring them as a minority, he was able to gain their support further strengthening his political status.


Marsh’s article confirms that Gladstone’s motivations for criticizing the Bulgarian massacres were both political and ethical in that he openly disagreed with the method that the Ottomans resorted to, but his zeal also garnered support by sympathizers of the Bulgarians.

Matthew makes a clear point that Gladstone and Disraeli both recognized potential in the field of economics as a means of adhering to the needs of the British people. However, a key inclusion by Matthew is that Gladstone understood the budgets as a medium that could bring broader representation even to the disenfranchised, meaning that when as Gladstone served the people he demonstrated sincerity rather than just bureaucracy.


Mermagen adds to Condon’s contributions regarding the unstable religious relationship between England and Ireland. While agreeing that mandatory tithing proved a considerable element in the strife over Church matters, Mermagen suggests that Ireland’s true reason for resisting the Anglican Church related to the fact that Britain could impose greater control over the nation through an established religious institution answerable to their government.


Nicholls indicates that although Queen Victoria carried a lot of prestige in Britain, the position of the monarchy was weakening to the rising authority of Parliament. The author also suggests that Gladstonian Liberalism may have been a responsive form of politics aiming to represent the British people in place of the traditional monarchal/Conservative power.


The purpose of using O’Day’s book was to incorporate his view as well as other sources such as Biagini to explain Gladstone’s purpose and motivations regarding the Irish Question. In fairness, Gladstone was certainly not the only major historic figure concerned with Home Rule; however, his involvement may have sparked greater strides by Parliament to find a viable solution for the troubles in Ireland by incorporating Home Rule in the twentieth century. O’Day does not focus on Gladstone alone, but expresses a broader picture spanning many years through which Ireland strove to gain recognition from Britain for independent rule.

Pakenham seems to be one of the few historians to focus a sole narrative on the Irish Rebellion in 1798. The author provides a moving description of the Irish resistance against British oppression, despite the fact that the rebellion was short-lived and also contributed to the establishment of the 1800 Act of Union.


Just as in the case with Gladstone, many English citizens, particularly Conservative-leaning voters, viewed the secret ballot as a dishonorable method of voting. In fairness, secret ballots theoretically limited bribing and also increased the potential number of voters; however, to a plethora of British people, balloting through deception came at the cost of integrity.


Parry, as in the case with his book The Rise and Fall of Liberal Government in Victorian Britain, addresses various aspects and accomplishments of the Liberal Party in Britain. However, the difference with this publication is that Parry focuses more on Gladstone’s approach to Liberalism by revealing his constant morality combined with a shifting progressive policy.


Of the various sources utilized for this thesis, Parry proved among the most invaluable because he prioritizes the agenda of the Liberals throughout Victorian Britain while also discussing the significance of Gladstonian progression within the Liberal Party. One might suggest, based on Parry’s descriptions, that Gladstone altered various traits of Liberalism to incorporate both conservative and radical elements while introducing a degree of democratic progression both into the Party and to the British people.


Despite possessing a broadened view of the rise of British Imperialism, Pugh provides several interesting facts about Gladstone’s role as a significant influence in government policies during the Victorian Age. Moreover, Pugh admittedly focuses on Britain’s development through its “chronology,” thereby allowing the reader to understand where individuals like Gladstone fit into the progressing narrative of British history.

One of the main purposes in utilizing another of Pugh’s texts is his coverage of Britain’s administrative methods on the Eastern Question. Furthermore, Pugh highlights the combined ethical/political approach that Gladstone often applied to his bureaucracy, i.e. his critique of Disraeli’s reluctance to retaliate against Ottoman aggression toward Bulgarians.


Saunders gives an additive to Gladstone’s inability to maintain Liberal unity against Disraeli’s Second Reform Act by indicating that, at this time, many Whigs saw an advantageous opportunity in siding with the Conservative Party, thereby eliminating a considerable section of the Liberal Party to combat the Tory agenda.


Seaton-Watson highlights a key component of British involvement in the Eastern Question which was in fact the rivalry between Gladstone and Disraeli. Both MPs produced their own approaches to issues surrounding Ottoman intrigue with Gladstone viewing the Ottomans as untrustworthy and Disraeli comprehending the Turkish Empire as a considerable boundary to Russian aggression as well as a valuable trade asset. Of the various incidents linked with the relationship between the British and Ottoman Empires, the treatment of Bulgarian Christians by Ottoman Muslims proved among the most controversial events splitting the opinions of Gladstone and Disraeli with each citing their own motivations concerning their chosen side in the matter.


In this article, Simon alludes to Lord Hartington as an observer of Gladstone’s position on Scottish disestablishment. While Gladstone did support representation of various groups that were not directly adherent to imperialist measures, he also exhibited caution when supporting said groups. Lord Hartington understood while likely favorable to the disestablishment movement, Gladstone, to some degree, decided against pursuing the movement as a Liberal leader because he felt that the advocates of disestablishment did not number enough against those who supported the established Church of Scotland. While Hartington may have been critical of Gladstone’s reluctance to follow a conviction to represent this minority group, it is also likely that Gladstone’s method was shrewd because he could keep the possibility of disestablishment in check until greater support arrived without risking political criticism from pro-establishment supporters, thus simultaneously retaining the vote from both sides of the argument.

Temperley provides a possible reason for Disraeli’s reluctance to retaliate against Ottoman aggression toward the Bulgarians. The Treaty of Paris of 1856 provided that any nation rising against one of its counterparts risked retaliation by other countries involved in the Crimean War.


Dr. Thompson’s article describes the transforming status of Liberalism during and after the 1885 election in which the Liberal Party had become contentious with itself. Irish Home Rule provided a means by which Gladstone might unite the Liberal Party, thereby making his adoption of the cause both risky and shrewd at the same time with the latter trait rewarding his efforts.


Vincent provides a counterpoint to the article from the *Berkshire Chronical* regarding Lord Palmerston’s Russo-phobic tendencies. While it is true that Palmerston initially wanted to continue fighting with Russia, this seemed more of a response to their potential escalation until Alexander II gained the Russian throne and vied for peace.


The idea of democracy was not foreign to Britain, at least not in base sense of the term. British historical figures including Cromwell considered the merits of pursuing democratic reforms to contrast the authority of both the church and the king. This is important to note when discussing Gladstone and the Victorian era because Cromwell’s controversial approach to new governance for Britain did not take the form of a democratic body, despite his assurances. In other words, Worden’s contribution adds to Cunningham’s perspective that British democracy was not a singularly defined term nor did British subjects view the concept as an exclusively beneficial venture.

Interestingly, Gladstone and Disraeli both considered the merits of extended enfranchisement, but initially the Conservatives seemed reluctant to alter the “status quo” of the British voting system. Zimmerman suggests the possibility that after Gladstone’s failure to pass an initial enfranchisement bill, Disraeli borrowed from Gladstone’s idea and even extended the voting parameters further which, to many Conservatives, would seem a radical movement. Furthermore, this move by Disraeli indicates Gladstone was progressing toward a process of greater representation that would also add to the Liberal vote and threaten the Conservative Party unless their leader could adapt to the cause.