

Cleveland State University
EngagedScholarship@CSU



ETD Archive

2008

Catharine Macaulay and the Liberal and Republican Origins of American Public Administration

Lisa Thomas
Cleveland State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://engagedscholarship.csuohio.edu/etdarchive>

 Part of the [Urban Studies and Planning Commons](#)

How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!

Recommended Citation

Thomas, Lisa, "Catharine Macaulay and the Liberal and Republican Origins of American Public Administration" (2008). *ETD Archive*. 291.

<https://engagedscholarship.csuohio.edu/etdarchive/291>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by EngagedScholarship@CSU. It has been accepted for inclusion in ETD Archive by an authorized administrator of EngagedScholarship@CSU. For more information, please contact library.es@csuohio.edu.

CATHARINE MACAULAY
AND
THE LIBERAL AND REPUBLICAN ORIGINS OF AMERICAN PUBLIC
ADMINISTRATION

LISA THOMAS

Bachelor of Arts in Political Science and History

Coe College

May, 1976

Master of Business Administration

Baldwin Wallace College

June, 1984

Submitted in partial fulfillment of requirements for the degree
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY IN URBAN STUDIES AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS
at the

CLEVELAND STATE UNIVERSITY

March, 2008

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to my parents. I wish they could be here to celebrate with me.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In considering how this dissertation was accomplished, there are so many people to thank. I am indebted to friends and family for their constant encouragement, unwavering support, and having faith in me despite doubts in myself.

Deserving special attention and fealty for life is my dissertation chair, Professor Michael Spicer. He awakened in me a passion for research and a love of political philosophy. It was Professor Spicer who introduced me to Catharine Macaulay, who found her through his work with the seventeenth-century Commonwealthmen. Under his tutelage I have come to appreciate how human nature impacts our worldview and its repercussions on the practice of public administration. I am grateful for his patience, his encouragement, and his thoughtful criticism. This dissertation carries his imprimatur.

Thanks go to the faculty and staff of the Levin College of Urban Affairs. Norm Krumholz, Roberta Steinbacher, and Senator Grace Drake helped make my studies at Cleveland State University possible and I am grateful for their help and assistance. I am indebted to the Gilder-Lehrman Institute in New York City for access to its private collection of Mrs. Macaulay's letters. I appreciate the help of Case Western Reserve University in providing access to all of Mrs. Macaulay's works through an on-line service.

My sisters Lucy and Kate deserve recognition for the many ways in which they lent support. Additionally, to my proof-reader Jackie Shafer, thank you. To Janet Slack, Polly Silva, and Terri Hallam, thanks for your constancy and tenacity. Finally, to my many friends who stuck with me despite my hermit-like existence, thank you. Writing a dissertation is proof that no one is an island.

CATHARINE MACAULAY AND THE LIBERAL AND REPUBLICAN ORIGINS OF AMERICAN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

LISA THOMAS

ABSTRACT

This dissertation utilizes the history of ideas to explore the philosophy of Catharine Macaulay, an eighteenth-century historian and philosopher, for application to contemporary American Public Administration. Macaulay's view of human nature is paradoxical. Her characterization of man as corrupt and seduced by power is countered by her view that man is perfectible and capable of good works. The darker side of Macaulay's vision supports government that checks power through the expansion of democracy, advocates the separation of powers, and adheres to the rule of law. In this respect she resembles a Lockean liberal. The more magnanimous side of Macaulay reveres ancient Greece and Rome, believes man is capable of civic virtue, and values the role of education in creating leaders. In this respect she resembles a classical republican. Combined, these visions offer a unique model of public administration.

A Macaulay model of public administration rests its authority with the people. It uses the practice of administration as a check on power by the use of administrative discretion and the encouragement of citizen participation. The model advocates a generalist rather than a technical education for public administrators. Finally, the model includes the practice of benevolence, the belief that democratic values of justice, liberty, and equality are to be protected in the daily practice of Public Administration.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	v
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Catharine Sawbridge Macaulay Graham....	4
Importance of Macaulay	10
Statement of the Research Questions	15
Methodology	16
Chapter Outline	21
II. MACAULAY ON HUMAN NATURE: Corruptible or Perfectible?	25
Human Nature as Corrupt	27
Human Nature as Perfectible	35
The Role of Education	41
Conclusion	46
III. A VISION OF GOVERNANCE: Macaulay as a Liberal	48
Democracy	51
Limitations to monarchical privilege ...	51
Limitations to aristocratic privilege	55
Popular Representation	61
Separation of Powers	67
The Rule of Law	73
Arbitrary government	74
Conclusion	77
IV. A VISION OF GOVERNANCE: Macaulay as a Classical Republican	79
Love of Antiquity	80
Civic Virtue	82
Men of Education	86
Conclusion	91
V. A MACAULAY MODEL OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION	94
Authority Rests with the People	96
The Role of the Executive	98

The Role of the Legislature	103
Interest Groups	105
Public Administration as a Check on Power	108
Administrative Discretion	109
Citizen Participation	111
Education and Public Administration	114
The Civil Service	117
Benevolence	120
Social Equity	123
Conclusion	124
VI. CONCLUSION	125
REFERENCES	135

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Public administration theorists struggle with the quagmire of legitimacy, the issue of non-elective officers running the modern administrative state. In a governmental system that eschews a substantive policy role for appointed officers, where is the moral authority for the tens of thousands of managers and administrators that govern and supervise our cities, states, and federal bureaucracies? John Rohr (1986) grounds the legitimacy discussion in the US Constitution, citing both Federal and Anti-Federalist writers as authorities for interpreting the meaning and context of the Founders in creating the Constitution. Rohr opens the door for public administration theorists to explore influences on the Founders' mindset and their ideas in the formation of a new government. He speaks of the "moral vitality" of the Constitution "because it is the great work of the founding period of the Republic" (Rohr, 1986, p. 8).

Following Rohr's footsteps, other public administration theorists have joined the discussion regarding the constitutional origins of the discipline.

Gary Wamsley writes, "The way we define our founding makes all the difference in the way we view ourselves and our place in the political system, or the way we are viewed by others" (1990, p. 23). Brian Cook adds emphasis to the use of the Constitution in forging the origins of Public Administration: "I argue that bureaucracy derives its authority to rule from the Constitution and not from its presumed expertise in administration" (1992, p. 2). Larry Terry continues the conversation: "The primary function of bureaucratic leaders is to protect and maintain administrative institutions in a manner that promotes or is consistent with constitutional processes, values, and beliefs" (2003, p. 24). In a similar vein, Michael Spicer adds "To the extent that an active role in governance for public administration can be justified in a convincing fashion by the Constitution, the more likely it is that such a role will be seen as legitimate" (1995, p. 7). Finally, William Richardson believes that public administrators get "the necessary ballast to survive" in a thorough grounding of constitutional thought (1997, p. 128). Taken together, the Constitutional School within American Public Administration suggests that the Constitution legitimizes the administrative state as compatible with original 1787 thought, fulfilling its obligation to protect the individual rights of its citizens through administrative functions that are subordinate to stated powers within the legislative, executive, and judicial branches.

If Wamsley is correct, our founding shapes our identity and our position in history. To link public administration to the founding secures legitimacy. But how do we know what “original 1787 thought” might have been? To think that political theory of the eighteenth century was whole and complete is to miss the importance of the history of ideas and the links between them. What are the origins of these ideas, from where do they emanate, and who were the players that brought the traditions forward? As Spicer notes, “as is well known, the founders did not invent the Constitution out of whole cloth. Rather, they drew their ideas from a tradition of political thought and practice that dated back, at the very least, to seventeenth century England” (2004a, p. 566).

One eighteenth-century philosopher/historian who deserves reexamination for her contribution to political thought is Catharine Macaulay. American intellectual historians have documented Macaulay’s influence upon our eighteenth-century Founding Fathers, specifically in regard to a republican movement away from monarchy. Does Macaulay’s *History* and philosophy offer lessons for public administration as well? This dissertation attempts to create a model of public administration based upon Macaulay’s vision of governance as described in her history of seventeenth-century England. Looking beyond the Founders to earlier English thought as narrated by Macaulay, this dissertation will examine her version of the roots of republic ideology

emanating from the time of the English Civil Wars. This dissertation will endeavor, through her vision of governance, to develop a model of administration that answers questions debated within public administration today. This model becomes useful as a means of providing a fresh perspective on contemporary public administration thought. Does Macaulay offer a vision equivalent to or different from debates within the field today, such as the classical orthodoxy of Wilson and Gulick, the New Public Management, the Citizen Participation school of thought, and even Rohr's Constitutional School? Using Macaulay's works as the medium, this dissertation will examine primary sources offered through Macaulay's writings, correspondence, and published materials. Her writings will be interpreted by comparison to current public administration thinking. The data for research purposes will be her writings, including books, pamphlets, and correspondence with American friends.

CATHARINE SAWBRIDGE MACAULAY GRAHAM (1731 – 1791)

Born in Kent in 1731, Catharine Sawbridge was the granddaughter of a survivor of the South Sea Bubble, whose fortune was salvaged thanks to the intervention of the Whig Party. An autodidact, she read history and philosophy in her father's library, displaying an unusual independence and self-sufficiency remarkable for a girl in the eighteenth century. Macaulay attributed her republican politics to the early reading of

ancient texts, especially “those histories which exhibit liberty in its most exalted state in the annals of the Roman and Greek Republics, studies like these excite the natural love of freedom which lies latent in the breast of every rational being, till it is nipped by the frost of prejudice or blasted by the influence of vice” (Macaulay, 1763, p. i). In an unusually late event for the times, she married, at the age of twenty-nine, a Scottish physician, George Macaulay, who encouraged her to write. Through her friendship with philanthropist and collector Thomas Hollis, Macaulay was able to acquire and read original pamphlets and primary sources made possible by the free speech and free press movement during the English Civil Wars. Macaulay was also among the first researchers to utilize the resources of the British Museum, perusing original artifacts such as diaries, journals, and handwritten notes. Among the many scholars examining Macaulay’s works (Hill, 1992, Hay, 1994, Hicks, 2002) all agree that her use of primary sources such as original manuscripts and political tracts was unique to historians of the time. As one of the first serious historians to use the collection of the newly opened British Museum (1759), Macaulay had access to, and read, thousands of pages of treatises, diaries, and earlier histories of the seventeenth century. The history of Parliament, maintained in the *Journals of the Commons* and *Parliamentary History* are repeatedly cited throughout her books. So well footnoted are the early editions of *The History* that she was criticized for providing too much detail and later

editions are less comprehensive in the use of citations. Several volumes of her *History* included an index of the legislation enacted by Parliament during the period of which she wrote. Irrespective of the criticism, Macaulay read, catalogued, and digested these historical documents (noted in her 1790 document *A Catalogue of Tracts*, Hill, 1992, p. 48) and became ideally situated to hypothesize about the function and role of government.

Using all these resources, she wrote a 3,500 page, 8-volume history, *The History of England from the Accession of James I to that of the Brunswick Line*, first published in 1763 with the final volume published twenty years later. Considered Macaulay's magnum opus, it is a passionate account of the Stuart monarchy that vividly describes the conditions existing at the time of the English Civil Wars; the contributions of Harrington and Milton under Cromwell; the restoration of the throne to James II; the works of Sidney, Neville, and Locke in expanding republican ideology; and ends with an impassioned account of the extension of liberty through the shared powers established between the monarch and Parliament during the Glorious Revolution. Contrary to David Hume's classic Tory account of the same period, Macaulay was an advocate for a republic, a government that relied more on the people than on a king.

Macaulay's additional works include a rejoinder to Thomas Hobbes's comments on government and society entitled, *Loose Remarks*

on *Certain Positions to be found in Mr. Hobbes's 'Philosophical Rudiments of Government and Society', with a Short Sketch of a Democratical Form of Government, In a Letter to Signor Paoli*, (1767); a criticism of Edmund Burke's support for political parties, *Observations on a Pamphlet entitled 'Thoughts on the Cause of the Present Discontents'*, (1770); a proposal for a new copyright law, *A Modest Plea for the Property of Copyright*, (1774); a pamphlet supporting the American colonies prior to the start of the Revolutionary War, *An Address to the People of England, Scotland, and Ireland on the Present Important Crisis of Affairs*, (1775); and another critical retort to Burke, *Observations on the Reflections of the Rt. Hon. Edmund Burke, on the Revolution in France* (1790). In addition to the *History*, Macaulay wrote three books, including a philosophical examination of the nature of God in *A Treatise on the Immutability of Moral Truth* (1783), a shortened version of her eight-volume history in *The History of England from the Revolution to the Present Times in a Series of Letters to a Friend* (1778), and a popular book reprinted in 1974 titled *Letters on Education with Observations on Religious and Metaphysical Subjects* (1790), a work cited by Mary Wollstonecraft for its contribution to the advancement of women. Wollstonecraft referred to Macaulay as "the woman of greatest abilities whom England has yet produced" (Wollstonecraft, 1790, *afterwords*).

Macaulay's popularity as "the historian in petticoats" and the "republican virago" brought her celebrity, wealth, and attention. She was widowed after six years of marriage yet she opened a salon in her home, attended by her Member of Parliament brother, who represented one of the boroughs of London, his Radical Whig friends, and visiting colonists from America. Josiah Quincy called her home "a club of liberty" (Hill, 1992, p. 185). Radical Whig ideas were the conversation of the day, with discussions focused on republican values such as rule by elected representatives and controls on corruption. Other visiting Americans included James Otis and Benjamin Rush who sent copies of her *History* home. In a letter to Macaulay, Rush noted, "Your views terminate not in the happiness of individuals but of nations, and of nations who are to live centuries hence" (Donnelly, 1949, p. 181). Thomas Jefferson purchased two sets of the *History* - one for donation to the University of Virginia and another for his private library. She was the historian "whom Washington knew best" (Colbourn, 1965, pp. 153-54). Macaulay was claimed 'among the patriots' best English friends' and 'an important intellectual figure of this generation to the colonists' (Bailyn, 1967, p. 41). John Adams liked the eighteenth century temper of Macaulay, and read her *History* with approbation, noting that she was able "to strip off the gilding and false luster from worthless princes and nobles, and to bestow the reward of virtue, praise, upon the generous and worthy only" (Colbourn, 1965, p. 86).

Macaulay and Adams corresponded throughout their lives and met in London while Adams served as Ambassador to the Court of St. James. She met Benjamin Franklin while traveling in Paris and he in turn visited her salon when in London. He compared her *History* to that of Robertson and Livy.

Upon the conclusion of the American Revolution, Macaulay, now married to William Graham, traveled to America to visit with old friends maintained via correspondence before and after the war. Her cadre of friends included both ardent Federalists such as Adams and equally fervent Anti-Federalists such as Mercy Otis Warren. Her one-year visit included stops in Boston to meet Samuel Adams, a stay in New York to meet with Richard Henry Lee and Rufus King, excursions to Philadelphia and Baltimore where she met other delegates to the Continental Congress, and she concluded her journey with a ten-day stay at Mt. Vernon, as the guest of George and Martha Washington. After her departure, Washington wrote to Lee, "I am obliged to you for introducing a lady to me whose reputation among the literati is so high, and whose principles are so much and so justly admired by the friends of liberty and mankind – it gave me pleasure to find that her sentiments respecting the inadequacy of the powers of Congress as also those of Dr. Price coincided with my own" (Donnelly, 1949, p. 195). She corresponded with Washington and others until her death in 1791.

IMPORTANCE OF MACAULAY'S WRITINGS TO AMERICAN INTELLECTUAL THOUGHT

In order to appreciate the importance of Macaulay's writings for America's political thinking, it is helpful to understand the relationship between American and English political ideas. Intellectual historians of the American Revolution trace the origins of American political thought to seventeenth-century England. Pauline Maier (1972) demonstrates the development in colonial thought:

The colonists' attitudes toward civil uprisings were part of a broader Anglo-American political tradition. In the course of the eighteenth century, colonists became increasingly interested in the ideas of seventeenth-century English revolutionaries such as John Milton, Algernon Sidney, John Locke, and the later writers who carried on and developed this tradition – Robert Molesworth; John, Lord Somers; the Anglican bishop Benjamin Hoadly; John Trenchard and Thomas Gordon, whose essays, published together as *Cato's Letters*, were a classic for many Americans; the Scottish philosopher Francis Hutcheson; and the celebrated English historian of the 1760's and 1770's Catharine Macaulay. By the 1760's, this 'Real Whig' or 'Commonwealthman' tradition provided a strong unifying element between colonists North and South (1972, p. 27).

For Americans raised in the belief that their ancestry was English, it is not surprising that they were eager to learn their own history. According to Trevor Colbourn, who traced the impact of Whig history and the origins of the American Revolution, "The more history a colonist read the more Whigs he inevitably encountered, not only because of their weight or

numbers but also because of their popularity and productivity" (1965, p. 10). Colbourn traces copies of Macaulay's *History*, for example, to the libraries of Adams, Benjamin Rush, Jefferson, John Mackenzie, Henry Knox, numerous booksellers along the Atlantic Coast and the university libraries at Harvard and Yale, Rhode Island College, and Franklin's public library in Philadelphia.

The transmission and development of Whig political ideology is best captured in Caroline Robbins' *The Eighteenth Century Commonwealthman*. Robbins chronicles these partisan beliefs through the works of writers such as Neville, Harrington, Sidney, Ludlow, and Locke, recognizing the importance of civic virtue and political participation, the dangers of corruption, the importance of the rule of law, and restraints on arbitrary power. "Their continued existence and activity, albeit of a limited kind, served to maintain a revolutionary tradition and to link the histories of English struggles against tyranny in one century with those of American efforts for independence in another" (Robbins, 1987, pp. 1-2). Robbins further states "The Commonwealthmen could be regarded as the conservators of the older order; they must also be seen as the spiritual heirs and ancestors of revolutionaries everywhere" (1987, p. 3).

Bernard Bailyn uses Robbins' *Commonwealthmen* as the starting point for his assessment of the move toward American independence and argues:

This distinctive influence has been transmitted most directly to the colonists by a group of early eighteenth-century radical

publicists and opposition politicians of early eighteenth century England who carried forward into the eighteenth century and applied to the politics of the age of Walpole the peculiar strain of anti-authoritarianism bred in the upheaval of the English Civil War (1967, p. xii).

Bailyn traces the origins of American political thought prior to the Revolution by examining the various lines of public opinion and belief as published in pamphlets, newspapers, and sermons. In his view, "The ultimate origins of this distinctive ideological strain lay in the radical social and political thought of the English Civil War and of the Commonwealth period; but its permanent form had been acquired at the turn of the seventeenth century and in the early eighteenth century, in the writings of a group of prolific opposition theorists, 'country' politicians and publicists" (Bailyn, 1967, p. 34). Bailyn summarizes the importance of these writers, noting, "More than any other single group of writers they shaped the mind of the American Revolutionary generation" (1967, p. 35).

Both Bailyn and Robbins view Macaulay as important among these writers, keeping alive the belief in natural rights, the heroic efforts to protect liberty, and the heritage of the rule of law despite a corrupt monarchical system. Robbins places Macaulay in the category of pro-Americans, those writers and thinkers who worked for Parliamentary relief from the Stamp and Townsend Acts and whose efforts influenced a generation of American activists.

Furthermore, for Robbins, the Commonwealthmen influence did not end with the Revolution, but continued into the constitutional debates: “anyone reading the debates in Philadelphia in 1787 or some of the radical literature of the nineteenth century will discover an echo of the work of the Commonwealthmen” (1987, p. xiii). It was in America that the ideas of these English Radical Whigs bore fruit. While wishing to reform the English government, it was instead the American Constitution that reflected their ideology - as in a separation of church and state, a balance of powers within the organization of government, and electoral requirements for a rotation in office.

In light of the influence of these Whig writers on the opinions of men we have come to call the Founders, Macaulay's place among these writers deserves closer examination. Her comments concerning leadership and government are as germane today as when she wrote them three centuries ago. Although the language and rhetoric of Macaulay's works may be more baroque than that to which the modern reader is accustomed, its vivid and passionate portrayal of the hazards of corruption, calumny, and vice speaks clearly to the student of public administration. One reviewer called her style “anecdotal, not unpicturesque, emphatic, and full of lively invective” (Hobman, 1952, p. 121). For Macaulay, a good republican was the civic-minded citizen educated in virtue who became a prime contributor to a good society.

Power was not to be held by an absolute monarch, but to be shared within the legislature and protected by a series of checks and balances. The rule of law was paramount and legal precedent was used to justify regicide as well as restrain executive privilege. Suffrage was extended to men of both wealth and menial holdings, while restrictions were placed upon length of service, residence within the voting district, and the selection of Cabinet officers. Education in morals and virtues was the key to creating a good citizen. Macaulay was a champion of the rights of man to assert his liberty in the face of oppression and corruption. The promotion and protection of liberty was the *summa bonum* of government.

This dissertation endeavors, using the works of Catharine Macaulay, to follow the patterns set by Robbins, Bailyn, and others regarding the history of ideas. In this particular instance, it will trace the history of liberal and republican thought as represented in the tenets of the US Constitution and the foundations of public administration. Further, based upon that trace evidence, it will shape a vision of a form of government as espoused by Macaulay. Finally, it will use that vision of government to create a conceptual model of public administration suitable for comparison to contemporary models of public administration. The dissertation will conclude with remarks regarding lessons learned from eighteenth-century political thought that may be applicable to

contemporary thinking. Specifically, with respect to public administration scholars, the dissertation provides an alternative, enriched interpretation for the Constitutional School to use as it examines its origins.

STATEMENT OF THE RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Given that this dissertation is examining the writings of Catharine Macaulay, through analysis of her *History*, pamphlets, letters, and private correspondence for application to American Public Administration, the principal research questions to be addressed are:

Research Question One: What is the conceptual vision of government that Macaulay expresses through her writings?

Research Question Two: What sort of model of public administration is implied in this vision?

Research Question Three: How does this model of public administration compare and contrast with contemporary models of public administration?

In seeking to answer the research questions, this dissertation will examine Macaulay's beliefs pertaining to the nature of man; Macaulay's perspective on freedom as grounded in the rule of law; commentary on the separation of powers gleaned from her perspective on the differences between the Parliament and the king contrasted with her comments on the American Congress and the president; and finally her precepts on

democracy, including expansion of the franchise, elections, education, and representation. Choosing these particular subjects for study provides a lens into Macaulay's perspective on government, society, and man's place within the context of government and society. Her *History* guides the reader toward an understanding of the importance of the rule of law and separation of powers. Macaulay's *Letters on Education* provides a characterization as well as her clear impression of the nature of man that is further developed in *The Immutability of Moral Truth*. By studying her published pamphlets and private correspondence the reader can interpret Macaulay's rules for running a government and appreciate her concepts of democracy. The corpus of Macaulay's work provides two important opportunities for the researcher: 1) a vision of her concept of government, and 2) a model of public administration suitable for examination, analysis, and comparison to contemporary thought.

METHODOLOGY

This dissertation seeks to connect the ideas of Catharine Macaulay to present day American Public Administration. As such, it is an examination of a part of the history of ideas. The study of a history of ideas traces thoughts, beliefs, and concepts within the particular human practices in which they emerged and developed. Roger Hausheer has described a history of ideas as "an attempt to trace the birth and

development of some of the ruling concepts of a civilization or culture through long periods of mental change, and to reconstruct the image men have of themselves and their activities, in a given age and culture" (1982, p. xvii). Intellectual historians offer new facts and details through their chronicles of past events, opening new interpretations and perspectives that come through analysis and insight, typically from philosophers attempting to make sense of the human experience. Thus, tracing the origins of ideas such as liberty, the rule of law, and universal suffrage through historical analysis creates a richer argument for who we are as people, how we came to be governed in the fashion we have, and how we embrace core values such as justice and freedom.

The concept of the history of ideas comes from the philosophical pursuit of inquiry. Questions such as "Why must I obey?", "Who should rule?", and "Where do public administrators get the authority to govern in a democratic republic?" have been asked in various forms since the time of the ancient Greeks. As Isaiah Berlin notes, "Philosophical questions continued (and continue) to fascinate and torment inquiring minds" and "Men cannot live without seeking to describe and explain the universe to themselves" (1979, pp. 7, 10). Spicer (2005, p. 672) describes the history of ideas as making sense of human experience, with political philosophy including those aspects concerned with politics and governance.

Sheldon Wolin points out the importance of combining philosophy and history in a history of ideas:

Here lies the vocation of these who preserve our understanding of past theories, who sharpen our sense of the subtle, complex interplay between our political experience and thought, and who preserve our memory of the agonizing efforts of intellect to restate the possibilities and threats posed by political dilemmas of the past. In teaching about past theories, the historically-minded theorist is engaged in the task of political initiation; that is, of introducing new generations of students to the complexities of politics and to the efforts of theorists to confront its predicaments (1960, p. 1077)

How do we trace the history of ideas? There are no established rules or procedures to follow, no variables to add or delete, no interviews to conduct or words to count. Empirical methods and logical deductions dwell in another realm for the social scientist to use. As Berlin suggests:

It is not only that we may not know the answers to (these) questions, but that we are not clear how to set about to answer them – where to look – what would constitute evidence for an answer and what would not... (W) e are puzzled from the outset, that there is no automatic technique, no universally recognized expertise, for dealing with such questions. We discover that we do not feel sure how to set about clearing our minds, finding out the truth, accepting or rejecting earlier answers to these questions. Neither induction (in its widest sense of scientific reasoning), nor direct observation (appropriate to empirical enquiries), nor deduction (demanded by formal problems) seems to be of help (1979, p. 146).

As one who draws upon the history of ideas in the context of public administration inquiry, Spicer has outlined the following approach:

In seeking to uncover the categories that we use in thinking about public administration and governance, we can draw upon three sources, namely, what people have said about these things, what they have written about these things, and how they have practiced these things. In other words, historians of ideas draw upon an examination of talk, at least as it has been recorded, considered writing, and practice (2005, p. 5).

Terence Ball compares a historian of political thought with an anthropologist studying an alien culture through the texts left behind: "Not only must the texts be read but also ... we must interpret the meaning, for there is no understanding without interpretation, and no interpretation without the possibility of multiple (mis) understandings" (1995, p. 9). These interpretations by their very nature are value laden by the one conducting the interpretation. Ball continues by stating, "Political theory, more than any other vocation, takes its own past to be an essential part of its present" (1995, p. 29).

In synthesizing the remarks of Spicer and Ball, for purposes of this dissertation, pursuing a methodical approach to the history of ideas involves reading, interpreting, analyzing, reflecting, and comparing. The research first begins with a close reading of what Macaulay said and wrote within the context of the time she lived and studied. Macaulay wrote in the eighteenth century about the seventeenth century. Her use of the language, that is, words and their meaning, carry a different

significance from the vernacular we use today. Cultural and contextual care must be taken when interpreting the language. Forrest McDonald offers three guiding principles to students of the eighteenth century:

First, one must pay close attention to the meanings of even the most ordinary words, for these have changed in myriad ways...The second principle is that one must seek out the 'buzz words' or 'code words' that are identifiable with particular ideologies or bodies of thought...third ...one must be cautious in bringing to bear concepts and information that were not available to the eighteenth-century subjects (McDonald, 1985, pp. xi –xii).

Second, passages pertaining to the three research questions will be chosen for examination. When Macaulay discusses the separation of powers, for example, is her intention one of limiting authority or of segregating jurisdiction? Who was her audience? What were her interests in making her argument? Is her argument logical or philosophical or both? Was there a specific target for her suggestions or is she an advocate of normative politics?

The third stage of the process involves reflection. It is needed, Wolin writes, "because the life of inquiry preeminently demands reflectiveness, that is, an indwelling or rumination in which the mind draws on the complex framework of sensibilities built up unpremeditatedly and calls upon the diverse resources of civilized knowledge" (1960, p. 1071). Reflection allows the mind to consider different interpretations when analyzing a text or document. The lens need not focus upon one

interpretation, but may offer for consideration alternatives in meaning, application, and purpose. As Berlin writes, "To think is to generalize, to generalize is to compare. To think of one phenomenon or cluster of phenomena is to think in terms of its resemblances to and differences from others" (1979, p. 75).

The final step in the process is a comparison of Macaulay's thought to the discourse within public administration. If the history of ideas is a viable mode of enquiry and worthy of scholarly pursuit, then its product must add to the body of knowledge. What are the implications of an abusive and tyrannical executive who tries to destroy the legislature? What results when the rule of law is violated? How does the right to vote symbolize equality? Has the nature of man changed over time or have we gained insight into the moral and ethical composition of humans? An examination of these questions will attest to the importance of our historical heritage as a body of knowledge worthy of examination.

CHAPTER OUTLINE

Chapter two examines Macaulay's belief system and attempts to define her view of human nature. Her vision of government cannot be discerned until one understands how she viewed man – as operating from a sense of goodness toward others or by contrast, instilled with ideas for self-promotion and self-aggrandizement. The chapter reviews her

conflicting thoughts regarding human nature, that is, man as perfectible in the image of God, or conversely, man as corrupt through greed and desire. It also examines the role of education in the development of the individual in society.

The third chapter begins the discussion of Macaulay's conceptual vision of government emphasizing her liberal perspective, drawn from the darker side of her view of human nature. Her historical account of men in power evinced the power, seduction, and persuasion of corruption. For government to exist without those arbitrary influences required controls; as in an expansion of democracy, a separation of powers, and adherence to the rule of law. The chapter draws on such efforts from both Macaulay's history and her pamphlets. Arguing from a liberal perspective, Macaulay drew on the works of Harrington, Locke, and Milton to frame her political ideology.

The fourth chapter examines Macaulay's vision of government emphasizing her classical republican perspective. Lauded for her republican principles, Macaulay had a reverence for antiquity, a firm belief in civic virtue, and the desire for men of education to lead government. Based upon these values Macaulay defines a vision of governing in which men participate in government for the common good. Through her program of education, Macaulay believed that social and cultural reforms would bring forth political reforms as well.

Chapter five endeavors to merge Macaulay's two disparate visions of governance into a model for public administration. Four major themes are considered for application to American public administration: first, the source of power; second, the role of public administration in checking power; third, the role of education in public administration; and fourth, the concept of benevolence. What can we infer from her vision of governance for purposes of administration? Who should rule? What are the requirements for governance? What should be the relationship between the administrator and the elected leader? What is the nature of administration?

The final chapter will review the central themes of the dissertation, weigh its implications for American public administration, and offer suggestions for further research. Macaulay was an iconoclast and forgotten shortly after her death. Her writings and political tracts deserve further examination in terms of their contribution to public administration theory. Macaulay's personal correspondence with her American friends provides new insight into arguments over the nature of leadership and the role of the American Congress. Additionally, her lengthy correspondence with Mercy Otis Warren and John Adams offers new opportunities for study into the distinctions between Federalist and Anti-Federalist thought. Her extraordinary talent for capturing historical and personal anecdotes from the seventeenth century provides fresh perspective into the origins of

liberal and classical republican thought. Finally, Macaulay deserves to be included in the pantheon of eighteenth-century political philosophers as an equal voice in the interpretation of political thought.

CHAPTER II
MACAULAY ON HUMAN NATURE:
CORRUPTIBLE OR PERFECTIBLE?

Throughout the greater part of her writing, most notably in the *History of England (1763 – 1783)*, Catharine Macaulay portrayed human beings as selfish and prone to corruption. However, her final publication, *Letters on Education (1790)*, spoke to the perfectibility of those same human beings as capable of becoming civic leaders through the practice of sympathy and benevolence. How did Macaulay develop two such disparate ideas about human nature? What caused Macaulay to spend the greater part of her career portraying man as greedy and desirous of emoluments while at the end of her life she envisioned man as noble and virtuous? As a historian and influential writer at the time of the founding of the American republic, Catharine Macaulay is worthy of examination as to her interpretation of the nature of man. What were her sympathies and inclinations regarding human nature? How did she view the behavior of humans in civil society? More to the point, how does a

Macaulayan interpretation of human nature assist in the practice of public administration?

As is true of any political philosopher an understanding of Macaulay's political philosophy requires an understanding of her views on human nature. The reader will find an emphasis on a darker side to Macaulay's philosophy rendered evident through passages describing man's inability to control his passions for power, wealth, and status. Her *History of England* resonated with stories of real people forsaking themselves for titles, tributes, and accolades. Yet Macaulay's fame was made by her belief in man as a citizen of virtue, intent upon participating in society for the good of all, not selfish interest alone. She avoided luxury and moral depravity and saw both as contributing toward the eventual disintegration of civilization itself (Fox, 1968, p. 131). In portraits and statues she was depicted as the classical guardian of liberty and a bastion against vice. Her religious beliefs, grounded in millennialism (Withey, 1976, p. 59), led all people to a heavenly reward in return for a benevolent life devoted to service and moral goodness. How can these two disparate images of mankind be reconciled? Is ambiguity itself a characteristic of human nature?

In investigating Macaulay's works, clues she left behind help identify her inclinations regarding man's corruptibility or perfectibility. For example, the emphasis she placed on her admiration for Greek and Roman history

helps characterize her views of civic virtue. At the same time, her strong desire for controls on executive power helps depict her fears of corruption. She openly acknowledged throughout her writings the influence she received from Locke in the formation of her political philosophy, yet it is hard to escape her belief in the role of active citizenship. It is her inclination toward one belief or another that influences her contribution to public administration theory. For as Herbert Finer noted, "What we are interested in knowing is, what gods and demons possessed these men to take the sides they did. For what men say in justification of their private selves is an infallible index to their public policies" (1926, p. 340).

Therefore, this chapter examines the writing and philosophy of Catharine Macaulay as it pertains to human nature. Two themes will be developed which are drawn from her writing: the idea of man as a corrupt being who must be restrained within civil society and the idea of man as perfectible and able to govern through disinterested virtue.

HUMAN NATURE AS CORRUPT

Corruption due to desire, manipulation, and exploitation of power were major themes in Macaulay's eight-volume *History* and it was corruption that was the motivating factor for many of the major players who made history. Her writing was replete with the foibles and gaffes man

made in attempting to rule, for “The love of filthy lucre, or the cravings of nature, will sometimes prevail, even over the refinements of genius and science” (1774, p. 14). History was not a repetition of facts that took place in a bygone era; for Macaulay it was the study of the moral authority displayed by its leading characters. History was made based upon the ethical orientation of England’s leaders, or the lack thereof, and the purpose she noted for writing history was to show how the actions of men had curtailed the civil rights of England. She told her readers:

This nation has ever produced a number of bad citizens, who, prone to be corrupted, have been the ready tools of wicked ministers, and the zealous partisans in a cause big with the ruin of the state, and the destruction of that felicity which the individuals of this country have for some years enjoyed (1763, pp. ix – xi).

Macaulay described how those wicked ministers and zealous partisans would lose Liberty, which was so dear to her:

Whoever attempts to remove the limitations necessary to render monarchy consistent with Liberty, are rebels in the worst sense; rebels to the laws of their country, the law of nature, the law of reason, and the law of God (1763, p. xi).

As such, the introduction to her first volume of history began with a lament for the heroes of the Commonwealth who championed the cause of liberty and defended the rights of Englishmen. Macaulay wrote:

Corruption, that undermining mischief, has sapped the foundation of a fabric, whose building was cemented with the blood of our best citizens. The growing evil has spread far and wide, tainted the minds of men with such an incurable degeneracy, that the virtue of our forefathers is become the ridicule of every modern politician... It is become an established maxim, that corruption is a necessary engine of government. How opposite this is to the genius and spirit of our constitution, is too apparent to need a proof. That the consequences of it are already severely felt in this country, our debts and heavy taxes fatally demonstrate. This is a sad but certain truth, that corruption is so general among us that it has dissolved the sacred bonds of mutual trust (1763, xix-xx).

Macaulay feared that during her lifetime, corruption in government had become the *modus operandi*. She wrote:

By the influences of bribery, every man in these days has a triple temptation to sin against his own country: The emoluments of favor; the fear of being laughed at for his honesty; of being abandoned by his associates, and left single to stand the insults of a victorious faction (1763, p. xxi).

From her writing of history, Macaulay understood too well the lure of power, the avarice and greed associated with it, and the repercussions that resulted from its abuses. She amply documented the history of selfishness by the ruling elite and wrote the story of history as an opportunity lost, of mismanaged prospects for change. As one reviewer wrote: "Hers is a chronicle of opportunities missed or deliberately ignored, of a few villains and rather more weak men and women" (Schnorrenberg, 1990, p. 234). Pocock described her purpose behind writing history:

Histories are written in order to praise the memory and hold up the example of those who have public virtue; that this must be done because any republic contains many – normally including the ignorant vulgar or multitude – who cannot be trusted to maintain virtue, as well as the morally weak who will probably, and the wicked who will certainly, betray it” (1998, p. 247).

Macaulay provided many illustrations of man's frailty regarding corrupting influences. First, she believed that God endowed men with varying degrees of “judgment, understanding, sagacity, genius, and industry” (1768, p. 355). Thus, depending upon the individual, these qualities created stronger or weaker personalities able to face the temptations of power. For example, some men supported monarchy as a way to garner fame, and they willingly abused their situation for personal honor, as she explained:

To show the causes of so great a malignancy it will be necessary to observe, that there are in every society a number of men to whom tyranny is in some measure profitable; men devoid of every virtue and qualification requisite to rise in a free state: The emoluments and favors they gain for supporting tyranny are the only means by which they can obtain distinctions; which, in every equal government are the rewards of public service. The selfish affections of these men, exalted above worthier citizens, fancy a recompense in this exaltation ample enough for the sacrifice of their Liberty. To avoid the censures of injured posterity, their children are brought up in the doctrine of necessary servitude, and are taught to regard the champions of Liberty as the disturbers of the peace of mankind. Hence is produced a numerous class of men, who having been educated in the principles of slavery, become the deluded instruments of all the villainous purposes of mean ambition (1763, p. xii - xiii).

Other men shamelessly sought personal financial reward, as when William II imported financial schemes from the Dutch:

The pernicious practice of borrowing upon remote funds necessarily produced a brood of usurers, brokers, and stock-jobbers, who preyed upon the vitals of their country; and from this fruitful source, venality overspread the land; corruption, which under the government of bad Princes had maintained a partial influence in the administration of public affairs, from the period of the revolution, was gradually formed into a system, and instead of being regarded with abhorrence, and severely punished, as in former times, received the countenance of the whole legislature; and every individual began openly to buy and sell his interest in his country, without either the fear of shame or penalty (1778, pp. 82-83).

Worse, some men sacrificed their virtue for the rewards of pensions or titles, as she described:

We should not have to lament so many melancholy instances of human weakness, nor, particularly in this country, such a continued succession of patriots falling from the highest pinnacle of reputation into the pit of shame and infamy, and sacrificing the essential superiorities of virtue and honor to the fancied distinctions of a peerage and a ribbon! (1765, p. 218)

One egregious example, which occurred in her lifetime, was George II's confirmation of a title on former Prime Minister Robert Walpole, despite the accusations of corruption against him. In a move to save him from prosecution, a deal was contrived in which several Members of Parliament would be elevated along with Walpole. Macaulay was aghast

at the ease by which men so easily succumbed to avarice rather than stand for justice:

The bringing a minister to justice, taxed with flagrant acts of corruption, was the point on which the future of good government of the nation evidently depended; but the bait, it seems, was too tempting for modern patriotism to withstand...Mr. Sandys was appointed a Lord of the Treasury, with the office of Chancellor of the Exchequer; Lord Harrington was gratified with the title of Earl, and declared President of the State; the Duke of Argyle, Master General of the Ordnance, Colonel of the Royal Regiment of Horse Guards, and Field Marshall and Commander in Chief of all the Forces in South Britain....and Robert Walpole became the Earl of Orford (1778, p. 419 - 421).

Not just Kings had the influences of corruption at hand. Macaulay noted that Parliament, at the time of the Commonwealth, was ready to abuse its power:

That in the hands of the members of Parliament were lodged all the considerable commands of the army, and all the profitable offices in the civil administration...and there was no end to the war as long as people could enrich themselves by the calamities of the public (1768, p. 155).

Nor was it merely the English for whom Macaulay worried about corruption; in a letter to Samuel Adams shortly before her death she expressed her fears about the American Congress:

The Americans have a little too much of the leaven of their ancestors in them. They appear to have their wishes and desires more to the acquiring of gain than the enjoyment of personal liberty and to have entertained their mischievous

opinion that the felicity of Nations depend on their riches. They have also I think been guilty of a dangerous error in the not instructing the Members of their Congress from the enjoyment of those lucrative offices established by their authority and they may become the source of reprehension and the foundation of autocratic wealth and ambition (C. Macaulay, *personal communication*, March 1791).

It was the people with whom Macaulay sympathized, for they were the ones who suffered from abuse. She documented several instances during the reign of William and Mary in which the people were dupes:

The villainy of defrauding the public of every kind of contract or office was so complicated and general, that a commission for receiving and examining the public accounts had been granted in both the reigns without effect. Thus, through the heat of party, and the lucre of private gain, the public was always defrauded of that justice which is due from every kind of government to the people (1778, p. 101).

During the reign of Queen Anne, shipping merchants, as Macaulay described, were also victimized:

In consequence of a petition from the merchants, a committee of examination was appointed; the merchants were required to prove all their complaints by witness on oath; and in the prosecution of the business it appeared, that ships of war which had been fitted out to put to sea, were suffered to decay in the ports; that cruisers were not ordered to proper places in the channel; that convoys had been often flatly denied the merchants, and that when they were promised, they were so long delayed that the merchants lost their markets (1778, p. 191).

Corruption was more than securing wealth and advantage for personal gain. Corruption enabled the abuse of power and once in charge, corruption was used to maintain the control of power. For example, elections were bought and sold as easily as cattle in the market place. Macaulay wrote:

The pernicious custom of bribery in elections, which began at the latter end of the reign of Charles the Second, and which had increased with a rapid progress since the revolution, began now to be generally practiced: tories and whigs, placemen and patriots, in defiance of the law, justice, and common decency, openly and avowedly out-bid each other, and bought votes as men would buy cattle in a common market (1778, p. 53).

Political factions were frequent targets of Macaulay's observations:

The corruption of the tories arises from the badness of their hearts, and from thence infect their understanding. This political sect may justly be termed idol worshippers; they make a deity of human power, and expect particular benefits for their servile offerings (1778, p. 31).

Without an honest government to represent them, how were the people to respond?

When government is corrupt, people have no remedy: While the representatives of the people act on the principles of constitutional equity, the people have a legal resource against all abuses in the administration of the government; but when the government is corrupt, and tainted in its popular part, the people have no remedy but an appeal by the sword, or a resource to the dangerous shelter which the

prerogative affords (1778, p. 130).

This theme of corruption pervaded Macaulay's one hundred and seventy-year long saga known as *The History of England*. Kings practiced corruption for political gain, members of the aristocracy used it for personal wealth, and she feared corruption was been bred into the new American Congress. Yet, according to Wood, "Classical republican values forbade it" (1991, p. 104). Citizens were to "sacrifice their private interests for the sake of the community, including service in public office without pecuniary rewards" (1991, p. 104). That high ideal was rarely manifested in the characters that made an appearance throughout Macaulay's history.

HUMAN NATURE AS PERFECTIBLE

Toward the end of her life Macaulay turned from history and political rhetoric to writing a book on education. She opined that if reason was the means by which men and women achieved perfection, then education was vital in developing that reason. Her biographer, Hill wrote:

Her *Letters on Education* range over a wide variety of subjects; nursing and infant care, the upbringing, training, and education of children; slavery, capital punishment, and public executions, the need for improved care of prisoners and the better management of prisons; the importance of personal cleanliness, the treatment of animals, and the conditions of slaughter-houses. The diversity of contents may reflect awareness that time was running out for her. She wanted to express her ideas on a host of questions before it was too late (1992, p. 158).

The book was written in the epistolary form, a style popular toward the end of the eighteenth century. Written as a series of letters to her friend Hortensia (Hortensia being eponymous of a Roman senator's wife who asked for political power and social change for women), the book was divided into three parts: 1) the practical application of an educational system complete with a curriculum from infancy to the age of twenty-three; 2) a review of ancient Sparta, Athens, and Rome with details as to their defects and successes for application to modern civilization; and 3) a reiteration of an earlier work titled *A Treatise on the Immutability of Moral Truth* in which she provided her interpretation of God and the perfect benevolence that comes from nature. The book covered "a bewildering variety of ideas but the thrust was an educational one" (Hill, p. 160). At times, Macaulay compared her theories of education to those of Jean Jacques Rousseau's *Emile*, published in 1762. She differed from his theory of sex-complementarity in which he suggested that woman was subservient to man and should be educated accordingly. Regardless of gender, Macaulay believed that human minds, male or female, were equal in essence and should be educated toward perfection.

Explaining her religious philosophy in the latter part of the book, Macaulay wrote that humans are perfectible because they reflected the divine Mind. Referring to the Stoics, she explained, "It was a principle of

the ancients that nothing can be made out of nothing... [And the ancients] placed man in an equal rank with the first principle of nature, by supposing him an immediate emanation from the Deity" (1790a, p. 430).

Macaulay envisioned God as the Divine Mind, whose absolute omnipotence (p. 353), perfect benevolence (p. 359), perfect wisdom (p. 362), and perfection in justice (p. 366) would admit all believers into a heavenly afterlife. She compared God "to the tenderness of an earthly parent" (p. 5) whose power was equaled by his benevolence. Connie Titone described Macaulay's God as, "an unembodied, omnipotently benevolent divine Mind, a virtuous divine Mind that creates a potentially virtuous humanity (Titone, 2004, p. 40).

Yet despite human reflection of an omnipotent, benevolent, and just Being, humans have not obtained perfection. Why? Macaulay stated, "God has made man capable at arriving at a high degree of perfection; but that the progress we make to excellence must be slow, as it solely depends on experience, and is liable to interruption from ignorance and passion" (1790a. p. 186).

Macaulay asked:

If the benevolence of God extends equally to all his creatures, why is instinct sufficiently strong in the brute to prevent his falling into any evil which is not brought upon him by external force; and why is reason so impotent in man as to render him almost on every occasion the author of his own misery? (1790a, p. 7)

It is only through the use of reason, Macaulay believed, through practice and education, that humans could rise above instinct. To experience perfection and thus happiness, the human mind must be disciplined, educated, virtuous, and able to think critically. Impediments within the human mind, e.g., ignorance and selfishness, prevented humans from reaching the goal. Echoing Plato, Macaulay realized the difficulty of using the power of reason when she stated:

It must be acknowledged then, that the gift of reason and the powers of imagination have indeed made a fatal havoc on human happiness....It is true that from the creation, men have generally exercised their powers in such a manner as to occasion much misery in this world to the far greater number of the species, and to cloud their hopes in the futurity (1790a, pp. 9 – 10).

Macaulay continued, "It is a barbarous ignorance which has defrauded man of the means which he enjoys from his reasoning powers" (1790a, p. 12). The true nature of man is therefore unknown because of blunders, mistakes, and failure to reason effectively. It was the inability of people to reason closely and adequately upon abstract subjects that reinforced known prejudices and opinions. Macaulay's perception of public opinion was keen: "It is a long time before the crowd give up opinions they have been taught to look upon with respect" (1790a, p. 203) and "Opinions taken up on mere authority, must ever prevent original thinking, must stop the progress of improvement, and instead of

producing rational agents, can only make man the mere ape of man" (1790a, p. 127). She believed that education must be tied to reason or it is nothing more than opinion, as she stated: "Learning must be united to judgment, penetration, and sagacity or it becomes a magazine of opinions from which error is oftener produced than truth" (1790a, p. 104).

The road to perfection was slow because reason had to transform the consciousness of thinking, specifically with regards to gender. It is within the second part of *Letters on Education* that Macaulay advocated equal education for men and women. She argued that the differences between the sexes "originate in situation and education only" and that from birth women are corrupted and debilitated in the powers of the mind and body, including a fixation on false notions of beauty and delicacy (p. 207), coquetry (p. 210), and vanity (p. 211). She reasoned:

That there is but one rule of right for the conduct of all rational beings; consequently that true virtue in one sex must be equally so in the other, whenever a proper opportunity calls for its exertion; and vice versa, what is vice in one sex, cannot have a different property when found in another (1790a, p. 201).

Until both men and women reach equality there cannot be perfection – she wrote, "The happiness and perfection of the two sexes are so reciprocally dependent on one another that, till both are reformed, there is no expecting excellence in either. Till this is the case, we must endeavor to palliate the evil we cannot remedy" (1790a, p. 216). Historian Catharine

Gardner suggested that Macaulay's view on gender reform opened a discussion on social reform. If men and women would understand the need for equality toward others, that equality would work toward the improvement of treatment toward women, children, and other classes (Gardner, 1998, p. 127). Regarding the issue of gender equality, Florence Boos wrote, "Other eighteenth and nineteenth century writers – Wollstonecraft, Thompson, Mill – championed the cause of women with greater fervor and effort, but Macaulay was unique in her categorical denial of innate sexual differences (1976, p. 65).

Macaulay's prescient view on gender extended to race as well. A well-known foe of slavery, she thought it the most savage atrocity of her time. She stated:

Persons even of deep reflection have pretended to discover an apparent difference in the mental qualities of the inhabitants of the east and the north, and have given to the effect of climate those virtues which alone depend on moral causes. Others, with an audacity more blameable, have dared to tax the deity with partiality. They give to their own colour only, the quality of external beauty; and they persuade themselves, that the swarthy inhabitants of India and Africa are a degree below them in the scale of intelligent Nature (1790. p. 257).

For Macaulay, what we are and whether we are good or bad is not inherited or innate but is purely the effect of our environment (Gardner, 1998, p. 122). Gender and racial equality were necessary in order to reflect the divine mind, and thus reach perfection and happiness.

According to Titone, who examined Macaulay's philosophy of education for use in modern educational curricula, Macaulay's belief in the perfectibility of the human mind can be summarized this way:

The overarching, unarticulated argument threaded through all three parts and all five hundred pages of *Letters on Education* is summarized in the following propositions: God, the one perfect Mind, comprises elements of what have been called feminine and masculine characteristics, and therefore, properly speaking is a dual-gendered, or all-gendered, or ultimately ungendered Being. Humankind is perfectible and has the capacity to reflect this divine unity, this totality of mind. To experience perfection, the human mind must first learn the clearest, most critical thinking, and the human being must express a virtuous character. Education, as she sees it, would prepare the human being to lead an individually virtuous life. In this state, humanity would understand and accept the added moral necessity of working toward the remediation of individual and social imperfection (Titone, 2004, pgs. 38 –39).

THE ROLE OF EDUCATION

To attain such a state of perfection required education and, according to Macaulay, this education had to be of a particular kind. Macaulay's educational doctrine had three purposes: to prepare the human being for a life of virtue; through virtue come to an understanding of sympathetic benevolence; and through benevolence realize the equality of humankind and achieve the means of reaching perfection.

References to Locke's *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding* appear in the introduction to *Letters on Education*. An understanding of

the mind is first in the establishment of a principled uniform system of education. She wrote:

There is not a wretch who ends his miserable being on a wheel, as the forfeit of his offences against society, who may not throw the whole blame of his misdemeanors on his education; who may not look up to the very government, by whose severe laws he is made to suffer, as the author of his misfortunes; and who may not with justice utter the hardest imprecations on those to whom the charge of his youth was entrusted, and to those with whom he associated in the early periods of his life (1790a, pp. 11 – 12).

If criminal behavior resulted from poor environmental conditions, not innate dispositions, then education and supervision were critical to a proper upbringing. Working from Locke's *Essay*, Gardner asserted that Macaulay went further: People's lack of knowledge of the principles of morality was the reason their "notions of right and wrong are loose, unconnected, and inconsistent" (Macaulay, 1790a, p. 198). Without proper moral education, 'even those who bear the specious title of philosophers are apt to be dazzled by the brilliancy of success, and to treat qualities and characters differently according to the smiles and frowns of fortune' (1790a, p. 198-99) (Gardner, 1998, p. 124).

Morals must be taught on unchangeable or immutable principles, according to Macaulay:

It is one thing, Hortensia, to educate a citizen, and another to educate a philosopher. The mere citizen will have learnt to obey the laws of his country, but he will never understand

those principles on which all laws ought to be established; and without such an understanding, he can never be religious on rational principles, or truly moral; nor will he ever have any of that active wisdom which is necessary for co-operation in any plan of reformation. But to teach morals on an immutable fitness, has never been the practice in any system of education yet extant. Hence all our notions of right and wrong are loose, unconnected, and inconsistent. Hence the murderer, in one situation, is extolled to the skies; and in another, is followed with reproach even beyond the grave (1790a, p. 198).

According to Macaulay, it was the lack of a co-equal system of education that created the inequities between men and women, "All those vices and imperfections which have been regarded as inseparable from the female character, do not in any manner proceed from sexual causes, but are entirely the effect of situation and education" (1790a, p. 202). Gardner interpreted Macaulay's position as follows: "If women remained uneducated, or if they are educated but their position in society is allowed to remain unaltered, then it is doubtful that men can achieve moral excellence in this inconsistent and unjust environment" (1998, p. 128). Titone concurred, noting "Macaulay simply strongly asserts that the attainment of perfection is possible for women" (2004, p. 83).

Who would benefit from her system of education? It was to members of the upper classes that she directed her educational principles with the understanding that it would lead to a "forbearance of his own gratifications, in respect to the feelings of his fellow creatures" (1790a, p. 275). Macaulay did not advocate a general, public education

for the masses, rather she offered: "That the education of the great, were it properly attended to, and pursued on the best rules, would be felt in the improved virtue of all the subordinate classes of citizens" (1790a, p. vi). Therefore, it was left to the upper classes to be educated, and in turn create a moral society in which all the subordinate classes would ultimately be improved as well. Her ideal student would become a humanitarian intellectual, just like Macaulay herself (Boos and Boos, 1980. p. 56).

Macaulay saw the upper classes as the defenders of justice:

If the higher classes of the people have not wisdom, who will be the framers of those laws which enlighten the understandings of the citizens in the essentials of right and wrong? Where shall we find those examples which are to direct the steps of the ignorant in the paths which lead to righteousness? Where that public instruction, which teaches to the multitudes the relative duties of life? And where those decent and well regulated customs, which form the difference between civilized and uncivilized nations? (1790a, p. 237)

In addition to learning the essentials of right and wrong, the next lesson for the upper class was her philosophy of sympathy, or equity:

All human virtue will be found to proceed from equity; consequently, if the principle of equity itself owes its source in the human mind to the feelings of sympathy, all human virtue must derive its source from this useful affection (1790a, p. 275).

Macaulay believed that once the mind was trained in holding “benign affections” superior in the mind, through the practice of example, precept, customs, and laws, all duties would be performed in the interest of humanity. Civilization must improve through the regular course of active sympathy. Humans, as moral creatures, would continue to develop and improve. She stated, “The human faculties rise, by practice and education, from mere capacity to an excellence and an energy which enables men to become the carver of his own happiness” (1790a, p. 10). Thus Macaulay intended education to be a means whereby man sought a morally excellent society in which all people would thrive.

Macaulay wanted her audience to understand not only the right principles of conduct to follow, but “the knowledge also of the mechanism of the human mind, which includes the knowledge of its discipline”, as it will be “not only an useful but a necessary auxiliary in the contest between wisdom and folly, between the dictates of understanding and the tumultuous desires of the passions” (1790a, p. 426).

Thus, education was the means to happiness, happiness was perfection, and perfection was the reflection of the divine mind. Education was the means to correct social ills, direct the appropriate use of power, and overcome human fallibility. More importantly, education “tends to instill the principles of equity and benevolence” (Macaulay, 1790a, p. 236) and it is “the virtue of benevolence ... that contains the

principle of every moral duty" (1790a, p. 112). Sympathetic benevolence was the purpose of an educated person; it was the quality that rendered obvious the equality of all humans and promoted public happiness. It was the antithesis of the tumultuous desires of the passions.

CONCLUSION

At the end of her book on education Macaulay wrote, "Mankind are ever prone to run into the most opposite extremes" (1790a, p. 322). It was as if she were summarizing her own thoughts as to the nature of man. From man as weak in overcoming his passions to man as perfectible in the image of God, she ran the gamut of possibilities in explaining why men acted the way in which they did.

In many ways, Macaulay's arguments regarding corruption and perfection echo the arguments between Lockean liberal and classical republican political theories. The Lockean liberal emphasized checks on power, limited government, and viewed man as easily susceptible to corruption due to weakness and imperfections. On the other side, classical republicans believed in the capacity of man to act in a disinterested manner for the good of the whole, following the models of ancient Greece and Rome. Annie Mitchell described the differences as leading to a "polarizing debate" (2004, p. 588) within the study of political thought influencing the Founding Fathers. Indeed this polarizing debate is

decades old in its evolution with one school in vogue at one time or another. A Macaulayan analysis bears witness for both sides of the debate as seen from the above study and perhaps supports the need for additional research as to why Macaulay's last book was based on the perfectibility of mankind. In changing her opinion from man as corrupt to man as perfectible, was she influenced by the success of the Whigs in advocating Parliamentary reform as evidence of the changes possible in mankind? Or was her belief in millennialism so sincere as to require proselytizing prior to her death?

Any student of Macaulay soon realizes her Lockean liberal roots and understands her calls for control within government. If man came to perfection through education, how was man to overcome the problem with corruption? It is to that point which the next chapter is addressed.

CHAPTER III
A VISION OF GOVERNANCE
MACAULAY AS A LIBERAL

INTRODUCTION

Liberal theorists stress the importance of controls over government, elimination of corruptive influences, and the necessity of the rule of law. Liberalism has been defined as a political theory of limited government providing institutional guarantees for personal freedom (Rosenblum, 1989, p. 5). It is an ideology opposed to political absolutism and arbitrariness; it seeks to restrain corruption through regulations designed to allow less than perfect humans to rule; and its first principle is the rule of law (Shklar, 1989, p. 37). A theory of liberal government relies on history to demonstrate that humans will behave badly, to various forms of excess, unless prevented from doing so (Shklar, 1989, p. 28). History becomes the evidence after centuries of experience that those in power allow personal interest to prevail over the interest of others. Shklar defined it as the liberalism of fear:

a fear of arbitrary, unexpected, unnecessary, and unlicensed acts of force, which ultimately inflicts pain over the weak by the strong (1989, p. 29). It is left to the design of government and its institutions to create the mechanisms by which power is controlled and fear relieved.

It was this fear that Macaulay so aptly described throughout her writing of history and which so strongly ties her to liberal theory. Macaulay vigorously opposed abuse of authority and the arbitrary rule associated with the divine right of kings; she advocated checks on power as defined through her model of limited government and its separation of powers; and above all else, she revered the rule of law. This chapter will review Macaulay's writings in an effort to describe her vision of governance as one based on Lockean liberal inclinations to check power. It begins with a synopsis of her view on the divine right of kings' theory and her efforts to promote democracy rather than continue under the tyranny of absolute power. Macaulay believed in monarchy but not absolutist monarchy, that is, sole authority resting in the sovereign. She opposed the prerogative, a privilege extended to certain rank, she distrusted hereditary power for its reliance on birth order, and she took exception to both the aristocracy and "the great landholders, who held their estates from father to son, by feudal entail" (1772, p. 361). She sought to curtail aristocratic privilege at every turn. The means to do so was through land reform and expansion of democratic proposals, such as popular representation through the

“abolition of rotten boroughs, the extension of the franchise, the expansion of the number of county members, and vote by ballot, a mode used in every wise government in all cases of election” (Macaulay, 1783, pp. 330, 337, 339). Next, the chapter moves to a discussion of Macaulay’s views on the separation of governmental powers between the throne and Parliament. By separating and defining the responsibilities of each branch of government, Macaulay sought to reduce the power of the crown while simultaneously increasing the rights of the people, where she thought true sovereignty lay. She believed that a mixed government of king, lords, and commons “is the only democratical system, rightly balanced, which can secure the virtue, liberty, and happiness of society” (1767, p. 21). The chapter ends with a look at Macaulay’s interpretation of the rule of law and the equality of subject and sovereign before the law. Taken together, Macaulay’s liberal vision of governance supports the ideal suggested by liberal theorist William Galston:

Liberal institutions are designed to neutralize insofar as possible the strength that would otherwise be employed to oppress the vulnerable, and to enhance to the extent feasible the ability of the weak to defend themselves. Liberal rights, and the institutions in which they move may be asserted, afford the most effective bulwark against the worst abuses (1991, p. 12).

DEMOCRACY

Limitations to monarchical privilege

As tools of political understanding, Macaulay's pamphlets offer insight into her views of government and sovereignty. Her first essay, published in 1767, was composed of two parts: she described the evils of absolute monarchy by contesting Thomas Hobbes' support of the crown and she attempted to show the benefits that could be realized through a democratic form of government. She did this by creating a mock republic for the triumphant eighteenth-century Corsican revolutionary general Signor Pasquale Paoli.

Macaulay step by step challenged three arguments she alleged that Hobbes made in preferring monarchy as the best form of government. Here Macaulay characterized Hobbes's argument:

First, that the whole universe is governed by one God: secondly, that the ancients preferred the monarchical state beyond all others: thirdly, that the paternal government instituted by God himself was monarchical (1769, p. 9).

Macaulay responded:

That the universe is governed by one god we will not dispute; and will also add, that God has an undoubted right to govern what he has himself created, and that it is beneficial to the creature to be governed by the Father of all things; but that this should be an argument for a man to govern what he has not created, and with whom a nation can have no such paternal connection, is a paradox which Mr. Hobbes has left unsolved (1769, pp. 9 –10).

Next, she drew from her study of Greek and Roman history to disprove the claim that the ancients preferred monarchy, stating, "The Greeks...disdained this government, and called all pretenders to it tyrants and usurpers" (1769, p. 10).

In her third argument she challenged the assertion that government instituted by God was monarchical: "The power Adam had over his children is not mentioned as of the monarchical kind. We find him nowhere exercising this power or claiming it as his due" (1769, p. 10).

Macaulay's argument with Hobbes continued over a discussion of who was fit to govern. Knowing that some men sought power and privilege for personal reasons, Macaulay advocated controls to ensure the elevation of those who would provide good administration rather than those seeking personal aggrandizement:

The peculiar excellence of a government, properly constituted, is to raise those to the administration whose virtues and abilities render them capable of this arduous task; and to deprive those of that office, who upon trial are found at all defective: therefore, a well-constituted government can never be so long ill administered as to become a grievance to the subject (1769, p. 9).

Having compared her argument with Hobbes, Macaulay's first political pamphlet established her reputation as one who opposed absolute authority and who believed that man was capable of governing himself. According to historian Wendy Gunther-Canada:

Thus her [Macaulay] argument with Hobbes in “Loose Remarks” encapsulated the central thesis of her historical project in the multivolume *History of England*: the prerogative of an absolute monarch is incompatible with the practice of good government (Gunther-Canada, 2006, p. 158).

Hobbes was not the only target of Macaulay's critique of absolute power. In telling the story of history Macaulay sought to “attack the formidable pretensions of the Stewart (sic) family, and set up the banners of Liberty against a tyranny which had been established for a series of more than one hundred and fifty years” (1763, p. viii). She demonstrated her accord with the theory of liberalism with her opposition to absolutism. She did this by recounting exhaustive tales of the manner and means by which each member of the royal family used the throne for personal enhancement, be it foreign wars, religious doctrines, or political prosecutions. Her theme was simple – absolute power was rarely used for the common good; it was fashioned for personal reward alone. She wrote:

The common pomp of a court is a heavy burden to society; and a man who had but few kindred and favorites, may lavish on them few the spoils of a whole nation. This...has been the constant practice of every absolute monarch (1769, p. 14).

The purpose of these *ad hominem* attacks was to enlighten her readers of the abuses that arose from nothing more than hereditary right and the power associated with it. Showing the monarchy in a consistently

negative light was Macaulay's way to educate her readers on the abuse of royal power. For instance, Macaulay attacked James I for insisting that "Kings sat in the throne of God and from thence all judgment is derived...Encroach not upon the prerogative" (1763, pp. 97 – 98). In relating an account of Charles I she reported his request of Parliament to surrender its powers over taxation. "Give me your purse", he had, in effect, said, "and you will no longer suffer the injury of violence. Surrender willingly your liberty, and what you now complain of as tyranny will become law" (1765, p. 31). Macaulay claimed James II had sought to strengthen "the power of the reigning prince" by "every diabolical engine which the power of a statesman could invent" (1770, p. 12). She was critical of William of Orange in his pursuit of "an independent revenue" and "a standing army" and thought him either "ignorant on the subject of those nice balances which are necessary to the preservation of civil liberty" or "as fond of the idol power as his unfortunate predecessor" (1778, p. 38). Regarding the last of the Stuart line, in Macaulay's view, Queen Anne was "a bigot to the forms of religion, a slave to her favorites, and a victim to her timidity." Anne was no more than a "football of all who had an opportunity of taking advantage of her weaknesses, for the promoting [of] their private views" (1772, p. 271). Macaulay's acrimony toward absolute power appeared also in her private conversation.

Speaking with American diarist Syllas Neville in her home in 1768, she is purported to have said:

Tyranny is contrary to all our ideas of God; indeed, if men worshipped the Devil, the principles of arbitrary power would be very agreeable to the end of his government. But some cannot bear the light – it is too strong for them (Ditchfield, 1974, p. 73).

If assessed as a liberal based upon her antipathy toward absolute power Macaulay rated very highly indeed.

Limitations to aristocratic privilege

Macaulay's pessimism regarding monarchy, the rule of one, applied equally to the aristocracy, the rule of a "best" few. In her 1769 argument with Hobbes she noted, "The question of government is here artfully, or perhaps ignorantly, confined to two classes, which are equal usurpations on the rights of men, viz. absolute monarchy, and absolute aristocracy" (1769, p.11). In order to limit the power of aristocracy, Macaulay sought radical land and voting reforms to dilute the negative effects of privilege determined by nothing more than birth order. For Macaulay,

Governments formed on principles which promise the equal distribution of power and liberty, attach to their service every generous inclination which exists in the human character: Monarchy, stripped of its trappings, and exposed naked to the eyes of reason, becomes odious in the comparison; partial benefit is exploded, the generous plan of universal

happiness is adopted, and common good becomes the common care (1771, p. 18).

Macaulay believed that "inheritance of title [was] a caprice of human nature" (1769, p. 140); aristocracy was a "rank weed" (1771, p. 32), and its titles mere "fanciful distinctions" (1771, p. xii). Privilege did nothing to promote the common good and was more a reflection of vanity and self-interest (Beckwith, 1954, p. 144). Men who assumed a peerage from the King were guilty of "the temptation of aristocratic privilege" (1768, p. 297) and she related many instances in which former heroes to the cause of liberty succumbed to "a title fixed immutably to the crown" (1771, p. 5). She believed it impossible for a man to both hold a title and have a true interest in the welfare of the people. A sinecure was anathema to the virtue necessary for impartial governance. While she believed in natural superiorities she did not believe in artificial manifestations of rank (Beckwith, 1954, p. 146). Macaulay wrote:

It is necessary that all the means by which a personal influence may be established by the grants of lands and large pensions, should be taken away: and for the same reasons of policy, it is necessary that the executive power should not be capable of deluding the imaginations of men, by creating artificial distinctions among them (1790b, pp. 39 – 40).

Political influence and access to power were previously based upon this firmly established hierarchy. She knew that "the extension of popular

powers have ever been regarded with a jealous eye by misinformed and selfish nobility" (1770, p. 11).

According to Robbins' account of the period, eighteenth-century Whigs, like Macaulay, feared that "too great an accumulation of wealth in the hands of a few might disturb the balance of the state" (1959, p. 13). Her lifelong pursuit of land reform resulted from her observation of the connection between wealth and power. She wrote:

I have always considered the boasted birthright of an Englishman, as an *arrogant* pretension, built on a *beggarly* foundation. It is an arrogant pretension, because it intimates a kind of exclusion to the rest of mankind from the same privileges; and it is beggarly, because it rests our legitimate freedom on the *alms* of our princes (1790b, p. 15).

The problem for Macaulay was the traditional law of inheritance, which fostered concentration of land and influence among a few large property holders. In order to change the tradition, Macaulay suggested "fixing the Agrarian" or eliminating the law of primogeniture with regard to inheritance of land and property. She wanted to eliminate the presumption to power that came solely by birth. In recommending land reform, Macaulay embraced the tenets of Commonwealthman James Harrington and based her argument on doctrine found within Harrington's *Oceana* (1649). Macaulay shared with him two beliefs: history was key to understanding politics, and property was the source of political power. Both writers held that reform of inheritance laws was a prerequisite to

democracy. Further, she supposed that if the Roman republic had addressed land reform, it would not have devolved into anarchy with its attendant rise of absolute power. She wrote:

Had the agrarian ever been fixed on a proper balance [in ancient Rome], it must have prevented that extreme disproportion in the circumstances of her citizens, which gave such weight of power to the aristocratical party, that it enabled them to subvert the fundamental principles of the government, and introduce those innovations which ended in anarchy. Anarchy produced its natural effect, viz. absolute monarchy (1767b, p. 25).

Macaulay saw the connection between power and wealth derived from large estates and considered land reform necessary as an interdict to corruption. For her, broader land ownership fostered citizenship. Like Jefferson, Macaulay viewed small farms as promoting strong morals:

For every citizen who possesses ever so *small* a share of property, is *equally* as tenacious of it as the most opulent member of society; and this leads him to *respect* and *support* all the laws by which property is protected" (1790b, p. 19).

Therefore, in order to reduce the power and influence that came from landed wealth, Macaulay encouraged dramatic changes to the rules of inheritance. No longer would the oldest son inherit all the wealth according to the exclusive right of primogeniture. The landed and personal effects of every man would be equally divided, between the male heirs only, at his death. An equal division of property would prevent

the concentration of wealth and power in any particular family. Her reforms included provisions for the widows, the education of the female children, and allowed annuities for unmarried adult females.

Other reforms Macaulay sought included modifications to dower rights, another tradition by which the aristocracy was sustained. Macaulay noted that within the growing commercial class, daughters of wealthy merchants were being matched with impoverished, but titled, young men. Bringing a dowry perpetuated a cycle of privilege based upon nothing more than position, rankling her sense of political equality and undermining the merits of industry and work. Only a decade after Macaulay published these ideas, Jane Austen vividly showed the effects of this practice by fictionalizing the accounts of many daughters, land poor but dowry rich, who married land rich but struggling young men, with characters appearing in the novels *Mansfield Park*, *Persuasion*, and *Sense and Sensibility*. As eighteenth-century literary critic Susan Greenfield described, Austen wrote of women who lacked “rightful property” but who could be made whole for a willing husband (2006, p. 339). Rather than a dispersal of wealth among the new merchant class, wealth remained within the aristocracy and controlled by a few select families, perpetuating the rule of the few.

Macaulay's views on the effects of disparities in land ownership exhibit the mix of both liberalism and classical republican elements in her

thinking. A small landowner next to a large landowner (“a little hovel contrasted with a princely palace”) highlighted “an inequality of property which is incompatible with a wise and just government” and required reform so that “the virtue of citizens will be in a greater security where the wholesome restraint of sumptuary laws, banish [passions] from society, which are adapted to inflame cupidity, and excite a vicious emulation” (1790a, p. 307). Aristocracy promoted distinctions among men contrary to her view of society in which all men were entitled to seek the good life.

While she avoided artificial manifestations of rank, Macaulay applauded the qualities of industry and work. As a writer she had a personal interest in the copyright and she offered her next reform measure concerning this issue. She wrote a short pamphlet defending the exclusive rights of authors at a time when no common law existed for their protection. Observing, “An empty stomach is a bad on spleen and melancholy” (1774, p. 16) Macaulay warned that more than pecuniary interests were involved in depriving authors of the reward of their literary labors. Without proper copyright laws Macaulay saw further inequalities between rich and poor. “If literary property becomes common,” she wrote, “we can have but two kinds of authors, men in opulence, and men in dependence” (1774, p. 37). She feared that the art of writing, a result of learning and education, would either be lost or be relegated to those serving the rich, who would only wish to preserve their own prejudices and

views. Having made a fortune based upon her book sales, Macaulay was interested in guaranteeing future generations the opportunity to succeed without patron support “and thus to encourage useful literature, by rendering it convenient to the circumstances of men of independent tempers to employ their literary abilities in the service of their country” (1774, p. 46). Writing and the income derived from it was a personal freedom for Macaulay. The copyright protected the personal property created through the occupation of writing and secured the liberty of its owner by removing the fear that others would benefit from something they did not create. Enactment of a copyright law protected the weak from abuse and protected the ownership of property rights.

Her ideas of reform, including land, inheritance, and the copyright, were intended to reduce the concentration of power in the hands of the few while nurturing good citizens through broader land ownership. For Macaulay, “true nobility constituted those characteristics which promoted the happiness of all men” (1781, p. xii). Providing greater opportunity for all men was the best way to check the power of the few, as Publius attests in *Federalist#84*:

Nothing need be said to illustrate the importance of the prohibition of titles of nobility. This may truly be denominated the corner stone of republican government for so long as they are excluded, there can never be serious danger that the government will be any other than that of the people (Hamilton, 1787, p. 473).

Popular Representation

The Glorious Revolution of 1688 changed the line of succession of the English throne from the Catholic James Stuart to his Protestant daughter Mary and her husband William of Orange. To Macaulay, the legal machinations symbolized the provision of a new power to the people. She wrote:

A change in the succession, and this on the freest principle of freedom, it must be owned, was a great point obtained for the people. The crown was no longer regarded as private property, nor the right of one family to govern, except by a few political bigots, respected as sacred and unalienable. The people, instead of being considered beasts of burden, and livestock on a farm, transferable from father to son, were now looked up to as the only legal source of sovereign authority (1778, p. 72).

For the people to be the legal source of sovereign authority and to take their rightful place within representative government required drastic changes within the parliamentary system. These reforms would include controls required to balance the power between the king, the people, and the law. Macaulay, considered a spokesperson for the radical Whigs within Parliament, articulated a number of arguments demanding reform and promoting republican government. Robbins summarized her opinions, "She supported ...rotation in office, and advocated annual parliaments, equal electoral districts, and manhood suffrage" (1959, p. 352). Hill called her reforms more far reaching than the radicalism of the 1760's and the

Country Opposition, as Macaulay called for an extension of the franchise and a redistribution of seats (1992, p. 76).

Believing that “Parliaments have always been considered as one of the indisputable privileges of Englishmen” (1769, p. 245f) Macaulay was convinced of the legislature’s role in a republic, but not as currently constituted, for “impositions, fraud, and rapacity” were evident throughout the body. For the radical Whig faction, representation was key, and it came about through rotation in office to reduce corrupting influences, more frequent elections, providing a more equitable basis for representation, and expansion of the franchise.

Had the Roman republics instituted term limits, republican government would remain extant Macaulay opined:

The rotation of all the places of trust is so strong a preservative against the decay of a republic, that the Roman constitution, though otherwise defective, might perhaps have stood to this day, had the Romans never dispensed with that salutary ordinance (1769, p. 24).

Corruption was constantly on Macaulay’s mind. Controlling corrupting influences was paramount because, “No state can wisely be confident of any public minister continuing good longer than the rod is over him” (1768, p. 403). Macaulay believed that rotation in office was one of the best means of preventing corruption among officeholders “That as democratical power never can be preserved from anarchy

without representation, so representation never can be kept free from tyrannical exertions on the rights of the people without rotation" (1770, p. 19). Rotation applied equally to elected officials as well as administrative personnel, with deputies, generals, admirals, and civil magistrates all subject to its limitations and checks on power.

In describing her ideal government she suggested:

Let the whole senate be changed once in three years, by a third part at a time yearly. Let the vacant posts be supplied from the body of representatives, by the election of the people. If any of the representative members should be elected into the senate, who are not by the course of the rotation to go out of the representative council, their places must be supplied by the people. Let no member of either the senatorial or representative body, be capable of re-election under the space of three years (1769, p. 26).

Responding to Burke, Macaulay was critical of the existing seven-year maximum term for Parliaments and recommended more frequent elections:

If triennial parliaments will not serve the turn, change the half, or the whole of your corrupt parliament yearly, and deprive your representatives of a corrupt and standing interest in the legislature, (The depriving every member of parliament of a corrupt and standing interest in the legislature, by rendering them incapable of serving any sinister views of the court, must effectually destroy the venom of that influence which the author of the Cause of the present Discontents seems to think irremediable) by debarring every member of parliament of the capacity of re-election under a certain term of years (1770, p. 17).

Burke, to his credit, wrote, "Mrs. Macaulay's performance was what I expected; there are however none of that set who can do better, the Amazon is the greatest champion amongst them" (Burke, 1770, p. 150).

Next to be addressed, according to Macaulay, was the elimination of the rotten boroughs, as "The problem with the current English government is the lack of even representation" (1790b, p. 23). Crown men, whose appointments rendered them nothing but slaves to the King, led the rotten boroughs. The Members served at the pleasure of the crown and were beholden to the King for position, household officers, and pensions. Macaulay expressed her concerns on this matter, noting "For that which constitutes the defects in all governments, are those principles in them which support a *partial interest*, to the injury of the *public one*" (1790b, p. 36). According to Macaulay,

The subject of the friends of equal representation is, that the important interests of the great body of Commons is, by our *present inadequate state of representation*, sacrificed to the ambition of *private* individuals, who, by their command over boroughs, may make their *market with government* at the expence (sic) of the public. The *strong* and *firm* opposition which the *ruling powers* have given to every step towards this *reasonable* reformation is not one of the *happiest* effects which arise from the continued war of *interests* so much admired by Mr. Burke and others (1790b, p. 24).

Macaulay asserted that only through *fair* and *equal* representation could democratic influence be exerted. Macaulay's argument was made in her second reply to Burke, published in 1790, challenging his

observations on the French Revolution. Fully in support of the French in their struggle against the *ancien regime*, she thought the National Assembly heroic for its stance on political equality and its promotion of liberty. She admired the energy displayed in the taking of ecclesiastical lands in France and the reforms to the juridical system.

The final argument espoused by Macaulay and the radical Whigs to bring a check on power and expand democracy focused an expansion of the franchise, or the right to vote. The expansion of the right to vote meant lowering eligibility requirements in order to allow more persons the opportunity to elect their representatives. Macaulay wrote, "A more extended and equal power of election [is] a very important spring in the machine of political liberty" (1770, p. 19). In both her *History* and her last pamphlet commenting on the French Revolution, Macaulay specified the requirement for voting privileges as "industry"; either the price of three days labour or property ownership. A pauper living off societal alms was disqualified from voting but a man able to be taxed due to the fruits of his labor "had the ability to obtain the highest honours of his country" (1790b, p. 37). Macaulay's proposed voting requirements were much more lenient than those in use at this time in eighteenth-century England. She wrote "It is on the basis of industry alone, the only principle which exactly squares with a native right, and not on rent tolls, that the legislature has formed the rights of representation" (1790b, p. 38). By allowing workers, not just

landowners, franchise privileges reduced the concentration of power in the hands of a few. Expansion of the franchise was, of course, controversial and it must be realized that, although Macaulay's views were radical for her time, even she did not support universal suffrage. In this regard, her views were similar to those of her fellow Commonwealthmen. As Robbins noted of these writers, "Not many Real Whigs or Commonwealthmen had troubled about the dregs of society" and their egalitarianism, such as it was, "looked not to the leveling tracts, but to the great Whig canon for support" (1959, p. 315).

SEPARATION OF POWERS

Macaulay's favorite period of English history, the Commonwealth, taught her to question:

Why should one man alone possess all what men desire? And that every other individual in a whole nation, however fruitful that nation is of worthy men, should be thus deprived of their share of the government? (1767b, p. 13)

For Macaulay, the sharing of government meant the separation of powers. The separation of powers had a different connotation in Macaulay's era than we use today. Separation of powers meant mixed government, a balanced blend of monarchy, aristocracy, and democracy sharing the powers of government. Macaulay's concern was that a strong king and an ineffective parliament led to a diminution both

in liberty and representation for the people. Domination by one institution created loss in another. The legislature was meant to be a check on the tyranny associated with the executive, as she wrote:

Parliament, viz. a right in the people of assembling by representatives, to assist at the making new laws, the abolishing old ones, or to give an assent or negative to extraordinary levies of money, a precious privilege, which the people had yet preserved from the ruins of the Gothic constitution, had in it many latent resources to preserve Liberty, which had given way, though not entirely yielded, to the encroachment of successful tyranny (1763, p. 262).

Having previously noted Macaulay's belief that first, absolute privilege was abhorrent to the promotion of the good of society, and second, that Parliament was an indisputable privilege of Englishmen, how could powers be separated to achieve a balanced government and protect the liberty of the people?

The answer came in a response to Burke where she reviewed the negative consequences of the Glorious Revolution of 1688. It was a time Macaulay wrote, when the House of Commons, "who had been taught by experience of what followed the restoration of Charles the Second, that it was a much easier thing to make kings, than to limit their prerogatives after they were made" (1783, p. 314), failed to exercise their authority. The end result was that Parliament undermined its own power and established an overly strong king. Parliament had rendered:

The crown strong enough to set all parties [whig, tory, jacobites] at defiance, to put them on their good behavior, and to treat them with that contempt which is natural to a sovereign in the plenitude of independent power (1770, pp. 12 – 13).

Why did Parliament abdicate its role - for the allurements of power and the sinecures that come from deference to power? Yes, the men in Parliament succumbed to the temptations of favoritism and privilege. Had Parliament stood its ground, the result would be a body that made the crown more accountable not less. Macaulay stated her vision of the role of parliaments, a true check on power that came through accountability:

A vigilant and jealous eye over executory and judicial magistracy, an anxious care of public money, an openness approaching toward facility to public complaints; these seem to be the true characteristics of a house of commons.... An independent parliament, the true parliament of the people, is entrusted with sufficient powers to keep the executive parts of the government in subordination, which must prevent any possible infringement either of the form or the spirit of the constitution...a parliament fulfilling its duty will on no pretence whatsoever suffer more money to be raised on their constituents than is necessary for their defense, and the decent magnificence of their governors (1770, pp. 15, 18, 19).

However, corruption had taken root within parliament, liberty was expiring, and “every salutary principle in the constitution calls instantly and loudly for a speedy and effectual reform” (1770, by. 17). Macaulay accused its members of failing to act in a manner that would bring about

reform, such as rotation in office and direct election of representatives.

The result, she wrote, was:

The destructive grievance of a debt of one hundred and forty million, a grievance which operates powerfully and variously against public freedom; a strong military standing force, contrary to the very existence of real liberty; an army of placemen and pensioners, whose private interest is repugnant to the welfare of the public weal: septennial parliaments, in violation of the firmest principle in the constitution; and heavy taxes imposed for the single advantage and emolument of individuals, a grievance never submitted to by any people, not essentially enslaved (1770, pp. 10 – 11).

Macaulay's ideal vision of parliament – vigilant and jealous, having anxious care and openness – represented an active entity rather than a passive one. By keeping the executive body in subordination she revealed both her preference for legislative responsibility and the legislature's obligation to control executive power. In this respect Macaulay's theory was again in accord with liberal theory, as it set forth her plan for a defense against oppression and abuse of authority by individual leaders.

Macaulay tipped her hand toward the legislature in an earlier work published in 1769. At the conclusion of her attack on Hobbes's support of the divine right of kings she created an ideal republic in a short sketch on government. She outlined a bicameral legislature, reinforced her views on term limits, and identified members of the governing body, or Cabinet. In her pamphlet Macaulay addressed both the separation of powers

between the executive and legislative branches of government, as well as within the legislature itself. There were to be two houses, the senate and the people. She described it thus:

In a well-constituted senate there is wisdom; and, if this order is prevented by proper restraint from invading public liberty, they will be the surest guardians of it. The second order is necessary, because without the people [who] have authority enough to be thus classed, there can be no liberty (1767, p. 22).

Additionally, she wrote:

The design of a general assembly must ever be the good of the commonwealth, as conducive to their own general and particular good: this leads them to pitch on those persons, whose virtues and abilities are most capable to serve the public (1767, p. 15).

The senate was to number no more than fifty, culled from the lower house. The lower house, also referred to as *the people*, was to include no more than two hundred and fifty persons. The country was to be divided into districts and the lower house elected directly from these districts. *The people*, or the lower house, would elect the members of the cabinet from the senate, including the generals, admirals, civil magistrates, and "officers of every important post". Cabinet members were entitled to vote in the senate during their tenure in office. Legislation emanated from the general public, in a manner not defined but taken as being derived from citizen participation and interest in the affairs of government. Legislation

was first to be debated by the senate and then to the representative body. She wrote, both the senate and *the people* “must debate the power of determining peace and war, imposing taxes, and the making and altering laws” (1767, p. 24). The whole senate had to be changed once every three years and vacancies were to be filled by the house of *the people*. Vacancies occurring in the house were filled by a general election. No person could serve longer than one three-year term. All members of the cabinet were to resign at the end of one year.

Regarding the executive, she wrote:

If the exigencies of the republic should ever find it necessary to lodge the executive powers of government in the hands of one person, let there be a law to limit it to one month. The representatives have the power of nominating the person, and the powers may continue up to one year (1767, p. 27).

Her liberal affection for rotation in office is clearly evidenced in these passages. What is more obvious however, is her fear of the accretion of power in the hands of any one person, officer, or institution. Clearly her sketch is naïve in its understanding of the complexities of governmental operations; it is also emblematic of her liberal approach to limited power. Inchoate as the model might be for a fledging republican government it nonetheless illustrates the trepidation attendant to a strong executive branch ruling government. Limiting the executive to a one-month term is tantamount to granting no power at all.

THE RULE OF LAW

The theory of liberalism requires strict adherence to the rule of law; the means whereby arbitrary power is suppressed and freedom is promoted. For Macaulay, the rule of law was the means by which authority was bridled and liberty was allowed to flourish, for “Law was Liberty” (1769, p. 13). In this quote Macaulay echoes John Locke’s exhortation from *The Second Treatise of Government* (1690), “Where there is no law there is no freedom”. Both emphasized the importance of law to the securing of natural rights granted to man. She wrote, “The law is the ground of all authority; all authority and rule are dependent on the law” (1765, p. 78). The rule of law required consistency in its application, something that the king’s prerogative made very difficult to follow. In applying the concept of the rule of law to all, Macaulay knew it must be equally applied to ruler and ruled:

Power is regarded by all men as the greatest of temporal advantages. The subject can only be bound to obedience on the considerations of public good; but the Sovereign, on these considerations, and a thousand others equally binding, is tied to the exact observance of the laws of that constitution under which he holds his power (1775, p. 19).

Macaulay’s traced her concept of the rule of law to the Magna Carta tradition that government should not proceed except in accordance with the law of the land. Consistent with her thoughts regarding education, she equated reason with the law:

That the law of the land is the perfection of reason carried into practice in all matters of dispute between man and man. The perfection of reason is the power of judging agreeable to the external rule of right, and moral fitness of things (1774, p. 10).

In Macaulay's view of the world all people were equal before the law. Therefore, eliminating personal influence and abolishing the use of the prerogative, in order to allow government to operate on a level basis was necessary. Without artificial distinctions, "the same laws which limited the privilege of subjects limited the prerogative of the Prince" (1778, p. 72).

Arbitrary government

Liberal theory respected the rule of law because it eliminated the arbitrariness of absolute rule. To support her belief, time and again Macaulay inveighed against the Stuarts and illustrated how their reigns were infused with the tincture of arbitrary power. In portraying James the First's arbitrary caprice, she described an incident after he was crowned King, just "six hours after Elizabeth's decease" and was marching from Edinburgh to London:

His ignorance of the laws of England, and the high idea he had conceived of his present power by the arbitrary proceedings of his predecessors, made him, upon his arrival at Newark, guilty of the absurd violence of hanging a thief without form or trial (1763, p. 2).

Shortly following his ascent to the throne James was asked to affirm the position of religious toleration in a petition sent to him by Puritans.

Macaulay described the outcome in a footnote:

The Puritans about this time suffered so severe a persecution, that they were driven to offer a petition for relief to the King, whilst he was taking the diversion of hunting. James was something startled at this unexpected intrusion, and very graciously directed them to depute ten of their members to declare their grievances to the council. These deputies no sooner made their appearance before the council than they were sent to jail (1763, p. 7).

Convinced of his own abilities and seduced by the flattery he met with upon accession, James was confident of his supreme power as monarch. When Parliament found this idea “not only destructive to the constitution, but irreconcilable to every rational principle” (1763, p. 42), James prorogued both houses for months at a time. Only when money was needed to pay the debts of the crown was Parliament called to order.

In discussing the theory of liberalism and the law, Shklar stated, “There is no reason at all to abandon it. It is the prime reason to restrain governments....Without well defined procedures, honest judges, opportunities for counsel and for appeals, no one has a chance” (1989, p. 37). Macaulay illustrated that point with her description of the usurpation of the rule of law that resulted when James gained control over the judges and courts. Sentences to the Tower of London, torture, and loss of property were the standard result of anyone disagreeing with the King or

his minions. Without controls or limitations, no one could be certain how laws were to be interpreted. Fear was bred into the hearts of law-abiding men when the rule of law was trammled for the benefit of the few.

In the ultimate example of how no man is above the law, Macaulay defended the killing of King Charles. Defeated in battle and brought before Parliament for his impeachment, Macaulay described how:

The numberless instances in which Charles had violated the laws of the land, roused the attention of the nation to develop the real genius of the constitution; and the accuracy with which the Commons at this period examined the legal rights of the monarchy, which crowded into one point of view all the oppressive usurpations of the crown (1765, p. 3).

One critic wrote of Macaulay's passages:

Given her point of view on the Civil War, Macaulay's description of Charles' character was remarkably judicious...he showed genuine dignity and courage in the face of his condemnation. But on the other hand, men should not be blinded by Charles' brave end to the point of forgetting his actions which led to that fate...on balance she found Charles's passion for power to be his worst vice, and concurred completely in the verdict against him (Withey, 1976, p. 75).

In the closing pages of her *History* Macaulay quoted directly from John Locke's *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding* (1690) to justify the regicide:

When a sovereign, by enlarging the limits of that power with which he is vested for the protection of the people, weakens the authority of the laws, and consequently the security of the subject; when he acts in opposition to the just ends for which government was instituted, and from a protector of the commonwealth becomes an enemy; when, by the breach of trust and nonperformance of obligations, the good purposes of his institution are inverted; his trust and right to government from that period are forfeited, the tie of allegiance is dissolved, and the law and the constitution being rendered incapable of affording the subject protection, he is no longer bound by the forms or dictates, and may justly, by the right of self-preservation, take every probable means to secure himself from the lawless power and enterprises of the tyrant (1768, pp. 406 – 407).

CONCLUSION

Macaulay's brand of liberalism jumps from the pages of her history. Built from the premise requiring abolition of absolutism, checks on power, and equality before the law, Macaulay clearly fit the liberal mode. Whether advocating for the elimination of royal prerogative or seeking reforms to limit the rank weed of the aristocracy, Macaulay envisioned a society based less on corruption and influence and more upon merit. Opportunity was created through reforms within Parliament, such as expansion of the franchise, term limits, and more frequent elections. In addition to reform, the separation of the powers of government was also necessary to prevent any one group from using its advantage over another. Not only were powers to be separated between branches of government, but within the branches as well. As a final point to illustrate her liberal convictions, she believed the rule of law was paramount for the

operation of government. Violation of the law had consequences as demonstrated by the death of Charles I.

There has been little to no assessment of Macaulay's liberalism in the analysis of her contribution to the history of ideas. Historians tend to categorize her as a radical republican yet it is hard to reconcile this with the cynical view of human nature she brings to her model of government. If government can only be trusted to men for short periods of time, are term limits merited? How are men to be brought into government service? What qualifications are necessary to serve? It is an examination of her classical republican roots to which the next chapter is addressed.

CHAPTER IV
A VISION OF GOVERNANCE
MACAULAY AS A CLASSICAL REPUBLICAN

INTRODUCTION

Classical republicans stressed civic virtue and political participation as emphatically as liberals stressed controls on power and the rule of law. Both groups of eighteenth-century theorists favored the mixed government of king, lord, and commons and feared the consequences of a corrupt political regime that upset this balance. Yet liberals and republicans differed in their view of human nature and in what estate should rule. According to Gordon Wood's widely cited account of the American Revolution, republicanism was characterized by a love of antiquity, especially Greek and Roman history; belief in civic virtue, or a disinterestedness in pecuniary reward for service to government; and for having a traditional patrician view regarding service within government, that is men of liberal education in a governing role (1991, pp. 100 – 108).

Having established Macaulay's credentials as a Lockean liberal, how does she compare with Wood's description of a classical republican?

LOVE OF ANTIQUITY

Beginning with her first volume of history which she opened with, "From my early youth I have read with delight those histories which exhibit Liberty in its most exalted state, the annals of the Roman and Greek republics" (1763, p. i) to her final book where she avowed, "No assembly of men ever displayed such graceful virtues as the Roman senate" and "[The Greeks] acquired a degree of perfection which has distinguished the Athenians before all the civilized world" (1790a, p. 239 and p. 242), Macaulay clearly displayed her enthusiasm for the Greek and Roman republics. So classically republican in her sentiment toward these two ways of thinking, she devoted the first six letters in part two of *Letters on Education* to a recital of the high points and low of each civilization.

Wood claimed Athens, Sparta, and Thebes were familiar to educated people in the eighteenth century (1991, p. 100) and Macaulay facilitated that familiarity with accounts of the merits of Socrates, Lycurgus, and Cincinnatus. She praised the Spartans for their simplicity and disdain for money; she approved of the nobility of Athenian leaders for their wisdom to govern, their military skill and courage, and the ability of an Athenian to "acquit himself in public debate;" and she admonished

“the Christian world would suffer much in a comparison with the Romans of the first four centuries after the building of the imperial city” (1790a, p. 265). The generosity of the Romans in extending the rights of Roman citizenship to conquered nations was especially pleasing to Macaulay who saw this as evidence of great sagacity on the part of the leaders. Unfortunately, due to the frailties of man, the luster of this simpler time was lost to the spoils of war:

The spoils of conquered nations flowed in with a full tide on the commonwealth, and offered to individuals the most inviting opportunities for rapacity and plunder. The simplicity and frugality of primitive times were turned to every mode of luxury which invention could furnish, either to delight the sense, to soothe the caprice of taste, or to gratify the pride of wealth (1790a, p. 260).

It was now that an elegantly chafed silver vase could excite a Roman pro-consul to the most flagitious acts of tyranny and violence. Simplicity and virtue of ancient Rome were lost to some of the most profligate kind and turned her mighty empire of freedom into an absolute despotism (1790a, pp. 255 – 256).

In earlier chapters Macaulay's use of Roman examples was meant to exemplify the best that governments could offer as well as the lessons to be learnt from past times. Macaulay preached these lessons from the decline of the Roman Empire – the avarice of men and the corrupting influence of power – and compared it to eighteenth-century England. The republican appellation she used was to remember the virtues of integrity and selflessness associated with the greatness of Athens and Rome,

“When we admire the virtue of the ancients, we admire only that inflexible conduct which carried them to sacrifice every personal interest to principle” (1790a, p. 272). Of the number of opportunities lost to past history, she wrote, the failure to learn the lessons of the past was the hallmark of man, “But though the education of the world will give a turn to the passions, yet it cannot teach the way to moderate and subdue them” (1790a, p. 236).

CIVIC VIRTUE

Macaulay believed that humans lived in society for the common good, as she wrote:

When the happiness of an individual is properly considered, his interest will be found so intimately connected with the interests of the society of which he is a member, that he cannot act in conformity to the one, without having a proper consideration for the other (1790a, p. 271).

True to her republican roots, Macaulay believed that good government required good people; those human beings of virtue who were disinterested, that is obliged to serve on behalf of others, not on behalf of themselves. She wrote, “These are the virtues which ennoble human nature: self-denial, general benevolence, and the exalted passion of sacrificing private views to public happiness” (1768, p. 22). The educational curriculum she espoused would provide the necessary

training to bring forth these virtues. Education was the foundation to creating a society based on civic virtue, and teachers had to be symbolic of those virtues, in order to appropriately educate their students. She described the ideal tutor:

His learning must be accompanied with modesty, his wisdom with gaiety, his sagacity must have a keenness which can penetrate through the veil of prejudice, and attain to the high superiority of original thinking; and the virtues of his mind must be accompanied by the tenderness of feelings which produces the most valuable of all excellencies, and unconfined benevolence (1790a, p. 105).

Parents were to hire tutors to teach the children, both male and female. "Of all the arts of life, that of giving useful instruction to the human mind is the most important" she wrote in *Letters* (1790a, p. 1).

The most important lesson for the tutor and parents to bestow was in the area of sympathy, or benevolence. Benevolence was the basis of civic virtue, the root of disinterestedness. She obliquely defined it:

Though we should not confine benevolence merely to the not doing injury, yet it is certain that benevolence and injury are opposites, which can never unite; and if strict equity does in some points of view bear a distinction from benevolence, yet the distinction can only be seen in the inferior and superior degrees of the same virtue.

None can be acquainted with the happiness annexed to a truly benevolent mind, who is not in the possession of it. We are all partially good, and some are more extensively so than others; but there are few, very few of sons of men, who are benevolent (1790a, pp. 113 – 114).

How does one acquire a benevolent spirit? She answered:

It is example only which can fire the mind to an emulation of disinterested actions, which can call its attention to distresses without itself; and by retrospect of its own capabilities of misery, can teach it with the celerity of thought to transport itself into the situation of the suffering object (1790a. p. 115).

First, Macaulay advised parents to allow young children to keep as many animals as they could possibly tend as one way of practicing benevolence. Second, she devised a curriculum for children ages twelve to twenty-one, designed to educate them toward both benevolence and curiosity, for, as she described:

Pupils trained after the manner I have proposed in these letters, will be docile to every advice which points out to them the way of gaining any addition to the fund of knowledge already acquired: for the love of knowledge is a growing and an insatiable appetite. Beside, man, when properly educated, is the gentlest of all animals, affectionate to all who surround him, and particularly so to those from whom he has received important benefits (1790a, p. 139).

Unfortunately, Macaulay's system of education was not the norm, and thus, civic virtue was in short supply. She wrote:

The modes of domestic education, Hortensia, as practiced by the moderns, are not calculated to instill that wisdom into youth which is necessary to guard against the dangers that surround it. In a total ignorance of the nature of those things which constitute the happiness and the misery of the species, young persons are commonly initiated into the circles of conversation and the dissipated amusements of the age, at that period of life when the affections of childhood are by

repeated impressions strengthened into passions, and when the passions of adults spring up in the mind (1790a, p. 235).

Macaulay's belief in the power of civic virtue was also expressed in a letter to a friend. Reverend John Ryland wrote to her, complaining of the lack of leaders in Parliament. He inquired as to who should serve in government. She replied:

He must be capable of understanding this great Truth that every individual is interested in the prosperity of his fellow Citizen and that in a general sense the welfare of the Community at large and the interest of the individual who compose it is intimately connected... He must be a man who has added to his wisdom Virtue to his virtue Knowledge to his knowledge Temperance to his temperance Charity to his Charity a superlative love of God and his Country (C. Macaulay, *personal communication*, August 1773).

Happily for the Americans, there was such a person on this side of the Atlantic who embodied Macaulay's ideal. Shortly after his election to the American presidency George Washington responded to a letter he had received from her:

The establishment of our new Government seemed to be the last great experiment for promoting human happiness by reasonable compact in civil Society. It was to be, in the first instance, in a considerable degree a government of accommodation as well as a government of Laws. Much was to be done by *prudence*, much by *conciliation*, much by *firmness*. Few who are not philosophical spectators can realize the difficult and delicate part which a man in my situation had to act. All see, and most admire, the glare which hovers round the external trappings of elevated office. To me there is nothing in it, beyond the luster which may be

reflected from its connection with a power of promoting human felicity. Under such a view of the duties inherent to my arduous office, I could not but feel a diffidence in myself on the one hand; and an anxiety for the Community that every new arrangement should be made in the best possible manner on the other (G. Washington, *personal communication*, January 1790).

Washington's conduct in office established a precedent that gained Macaulay's approbation regarding the role of a civic leader, a person who placed the good of the commonwealth above his or her own. Once Washington was elected president, her fears regarding the control of power were allayed; Washington would "check the progress" of enemies to liberty and would be "a bright example" (C. Macaulay, *personal communication*, June 1790) to future presidents.

How was civic virtue to be inculcated? Where were the classes of men who would provide leadership and governance, as in the model established by Washington? As Wood noted, and as Macaulay described, it came from a traditional source, a group of liberally educated men of wealth and higher class.

MEN OF EDUCATION

According to one historian, "Macaulay, and her friends, saw themselves as the enlightened vanguard leading the rest of England along the path of virtue and reason" (Withey, 1976, p. 67). Was her vanguard an elite group of men without distinction from the aristocracy or

was there a more noble cause in effect? Was education the means to enlighten the masses for their own protection of liberty or was education limited to the intelligent, enlightened few?

Macaulay was a republican reformer and an ardent advocate for change; her goal was to enable the masses to protect themselves from encroachment of unlimited power. A more enlightened public would help to purge corrupt institutions. Ironically, the first step was educating new leadership - a prince - both in the transformation of knowledge and improvement in the social status quo. She wrote:

In all monarchies, Hortensia, the national prosperity, and the domestic felicity of a people, so entirely depend on the wisdom and goodness of the reigning prince....For the histories of all nations demonstrate, that one feeble and wicked reign is often sufficient to mar the wisdom of the ages (1790a, p. 223).

The reputations of the monarchy, she wrote, “depend on the personal virtues of the prince” (1790a, p. 223) and better it was that men of “first worth and knowledge” be hired to teach the prince rather than men “of the most elevated rank” so as to prevent the prince’s mind from being “corrupted by the designing sycophants who crowd about him before his reason is sufficiently strong to perceive the difference between vice and virtue” (1790a, p. 224). The ideal tutor, for a prince, was

A man of the first virtue, and of the most extensive learning; a man, who to the justest (sic) ideas of the rights of his species,

unites a thorough knowledge of the domestic and foreign interests of the kingdom, its internal situation in regard to the state of the poor, the distribution of property, and other matters of intelligence, necessary to a just equality in the levying taxes, and in the encouragements to be given to national industry (1790a, p. 225).

Once found, this person, commoner or noble, was to be trusted with hiring the personal staff, choosing visitors, and guarding the prince against "the vice, servility, and pageantry of the court, till his understanding is sufficiently informed to despise its snares" (1790a, p. 225). In addition to history, philosophy, political science, mathematics, and science, Macaulay insisted that the tutor expose the prince to life:

Let my philosophic prince...be often carried into those scenes of want and misery adapted to move even the obdurate heart to pity. Let him mingle his tears with those of the wretched, and let him enjoy the luxury of sympathy (1790a, p. 227).

To know the interests of humanity is the true study of a prince...to know himself, and the nature of man, the operations of habit, the specific qualities of character, the influence of opinion, the powers and weaknesses of our frame...with a generous encouragement to those who have the spirit to call aloud for the redress of grievances committed in the prince's name (1790a, p. 228).

By inculcating moderation, sympathy, and incitements to virtue, Macaulay intended to create a ruler who would perceive that "The exalted privilege, that every act of virtue, every performance of duty,

every instance of propriety in conduct, affect the public weal" (1790a, p. 232). She wrote:

He would perceive the necessity of making the laws the sole rule of conduct; he would perceive, that no sovereign can reign in freedom, who is under the necessity of intriguing with parties; and that a prince, who closely united himself to his people by mutual interest and mutual support, will have nothing to fear from the opposition of designing men (1790a, p. 229).

As noted earlier, not just the prince needed to be educated in the principles of civic virtue, the people themselves required education.

Macaulay asked:

If the higher classes of the people have not wisdom, who will be the framers of those laws which enlighten the understandings of the citizens in the essentials of right and wrong? Where shall we find those examples which are to direct the steps of the ignorant in the paths which lead to righteousness? Where that public instruction, which teaches to the multitudes the relative duties of life? And where those decent and well regulated customs, which form the difference between civilized and uncivilized nations? (1790a, p. 237)

After reviewing the differences between educational systems in civilized and uncivilized nations, she concluded:

When the manners of society refine, when standards of taste are established, when arts are practiced, when sciences are studied, and when laws are numerous; it is then that the education of citizens, and more especially, of the better sort, becomes a matter of the highest importance and difficulty (1790a, pp. 238 – 239).

What would educating the higher classes bring?

Public education, if well adapted to the improvement of man, must comprehend good laws, good examples, good customs, a proper use of the arts, and wise instructions conveyed to the mind, by the means of language, in the way of speech and writing (1790a. p. 274).

Would an educated elite solve the problems of the lower classes?

Shall the fine gentleman and lady leave the pleasures that belong to opulence, and amuse themselves in the drudgery of business for the advantages of wretches fed by public charity? Shall all the pleasures be laid aside for a system of accounts and economy, never used in the management of their own concerns – and this without any probability of gaining by it a title, or reaping the distinctions or emoluments of office? Forbid it fashion – forbid it common sense! (1790a, pp. 289 – 290)

In actuality, after lengthy discussions of the arts and sciences to be studied, the vices to be rejected (amusements, hunting, the reading of novels), and the virtues to be adopted (gardening, architecture, philosophy) Macaulay believed that the upper classes would assist the lower classes. Through knowledge of the tenets of sympathy and benevolence, one would come to know the personal satisfactions that derive from service. Luxury and dissipation would be replaced by accomplishment and love of moderation. Virtues, like vices, would become habits over time.

Her advocacy for social and educational reforms were but part of her overall desire for political reform, that is a more democratic government and equal justice for all people, which taken together, would improve the general well being of society (Beckwith, 1953, p. 166, Withey, 1976, p. 72). In America, the concept of benevolence appeared as citizen participation in society and public life, not just participation in government. Wood acknowledged that the belief in benevolence led to an image of a new and better world emerging. According to Wood, "We still yearn for a world in which everyone will love one another" (1991, p. 218). Macaulay's goal of societal reform through education had lasting possibilities. She wrote:

Oh magistrates! Oh legislators! Consider, that in attempting to teach others, you may gain truth of the utmost importance to yourselves. Consider the solid satisfaction a benign temper must feel, in becoming the instrument of the present and future welfare of numberless beings (1790a, pp. 13 – 14).

CONCLUSION

Most intellectual historians and writers of the "Long" century place Macaulay firmly in the classical republican camp. Pocock acknowledged that she was one who considered civic virtue to be the end of political life (1998, p. 248). He added, "She begins to look like an eighteenth century Hannah Arendt, a woman wholly committed to the ancient ideal of active citizenship and wholly undeterred by its hyper-intense masculinity"

(1998, p. 251). Macaulay historian Kate Davies said, "By 1774 Catharine Macaulay was regarded as the figurehead and public voice of British and American republicanism...she represented the ideal of public virtue which Britain, in the years preceding the war with America, seemed so obviously to lack" (2005, pp. 30, 43). Hicks wrote that Macaulay held William III responsible "for erecting a bloated Whig monarchy that made active citizenship impossible to practice" (2002, p. 171) and ignored the lessons of the Commonwealth "when love of country and love of liberty reached their zenith" (2002, p. 172). Donnelly characterized her as "a godsend against Hume in the conflict of the early years of George III that divided the English world quite simply between those who loved liberty and those who did not" (1949, pp. 174 – 175) while her biographer, Hill, produced documentation in which Horace Walpole recalled Macaulay as chief among the republicans of the day (1992, p. 164). Withey emphasized Macaulay's view of perfection when she wrote, "ultimately the dominant theme which emerges from all her ideas about human nature, reason, and religion, was the possibility of perfection, both in individual understanding and morality, and in society as a whole" (1976, p. 61). According to historian Davis, Macaulay believed "A righteous God had planned a world of ultimate human perfectibility through the use of reason" (1988, pp. 9 – 10). These historians allude to a republican

Macaulay steeped in virtue and an overriding confidence in the perfectibility of mankind.

Macaulay's faith in republican government, composed of an educated elite serving through a sense of benevolence for the common good of all citizens, was an eighteenth-century ideal she passionately possessed. Her republican side saw a vision of governance based upon emotion not fact. She wrote:

Government can never stand on better, never on firmer, never on equitable grounds, than on its good behavior. Just government will be felt, its advantages will be seen, its security will be fixed in the hearts of its subject, not to be shaken by the fantastic or selfish ends of individuals (1768, p. 408).

On the other hand, as discussed in the previous chapter, her liberal side saw a vision of governance in which power was derived from the people, power had to be checked and controlled, and without laws to control it, power had a totally corrupting influence. What lessons do these conflicting visions of governance have for the practice of public administration?

CHAPTER V

A MACAULAY MODEL OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

This dissertation began with the premise that the U.S. Constitution legitimizes the practice of public administration because public administration protects the individual rights of citizens through its subordination to the stated powers within the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of government. From the Macaulay perspective, the protection of rights and liberty is the rationale behind government for, “the just ends of government [are] the full and impartial security of the rights of nature” (1770, p. 8). Based upon the legitimacy discussion, the purpose of this dissertation was to examine the writings and theories of Catharine Macaulay in an attempt to create both a vision of governance and a model of public administration for comparison to the discourses taking place in American Public Administration today. Given the rationale for government, how would the Macaulay model protect citizens, define its separate powers, and answer the question, who should rule? While Macaulay would concur that the protection of a citizen’s individual rights

is a key function of the administrative state, an elucidation of her ideal constitutional state is somewhat difficult and made more so by the issue of anachronism. Compounding the problem, the tension between Macaulay's liberal and classical republican views of governance might suggest dissonance and inconsistency for the modern public administrator attempting to operationalize her beliefs. How does one reconcile conflicting views of human nature while permitting administrative discretion and/or defining the role of the executive? Despite the dissimilar bodies of thought to which Macaulay ascribed in her visions of governance, there are several concepts that a public administrator might adopt in the formation of a model administrative state. First, and most importantly, the source of all authority must emanate from the people, not God, nor the king, nor the top executive; second, through the rule of law, public administration must be active in the practice of checking power; third, there is an important role for education within public administration; and fourth, the concept of benevolence must be reconsidered within twenty-first century public service. Drawing from discussions in earlier chapters, one can extrapolate from her writings a model of an administrative state that details the formation of public administration, focusing on the checking of power, the role of the executive, the use of discretionary authority by administrators within the framework of the law, the function of the civil service, citizen participation,

and the practice of sympathetic benevolence. This chapter will re-examine Macaulay's body of work in an effort to align eighteenth-century thought with contemporary public administration. Should there be lessons to be learned from Macaulay, will they meet the standard she set in 1790?

We cannot with any grounds of *reason* or *propriety*, set up our own constitution, as the model which all other nations ought *implicitly* to follow, unless we are certain that it bestows the greatest possible happiness on the people which in the nature of things any government can bestow (1790b, p. 15).

AUTHORITY RESTS WITH THE PEOPLE

With the change in the line of succession following the Glorious Revolution of 1688 determined by Parliament and not heredity, Macaulay stated, "the power of the Crown was acknowledged to flow from no other fountain than that of contract with the people" (1778, p. 4).

Revolution was again on her mind in her last pamphlet commenting on the events of France in 1789. Publicly challenging Edmund Burke for the second time, she wrote in support of the activities in France and unequivocally defended the will of the people. She wrote:

That the people have often abused their power, it must be granted; for they have often *sacrificed* themselves and their posterity to the *wanton will* of an individual, and *this* is the foundation of all the regal tyrannies which have subsisted in society; but *no abuse* of their power can take away their *right*, because their rights exist in the very constitution of *things*. If the French people therefore should be so *capricious* as to fling off their new constitution, and subject themselves

to more *unequal* forms of government, or even to *tyranny*, it will be agreeable to the course of past experience; but such an exertion of power *cannot injure their right*; and whatever form or complexion any future government in France will bear, it can have no *legitimate source, but in the will of the people* (1790b, p. 45).

In that final pamphlet before her death Macaulay emphasized the point she had been arguing for nearly three decades - the legitimate source of power comes from the people. Her argument supports two important concepts for the public administrator: one, it legitimizes the U.S. Constitution with its emphasis as being derived from "We the people"; and two, it legitimizes the separation of powers in the sense that precautions are made to prevent abuses of power by the people, whom we know from Macaulay's views on human nature, as being both perfectible and corruptible. As Publius asked, "What is government itself, but the greatest reflection of human nature? It may be a reflection on human nature, that such devices [separation of powers] should be necessary to control the abuses of government" (Madison, 1787, p. 288). The simple concept of authority resting with the people yet requiring controls to administer that authority sets up the argument for the formation of the administrative state. Macaulay's admonition was:

The people, instead of being considered beasts of burden...were now looked up to as the only legal source of sovereign authority; and it was confessed, that the same laws which limited the privileges of the subject, limited the prerogatives of the Prince (1778, p. 72).

Raadschelders and Stillman corroborate Macaulay's stance although in slightly different language, "After all, elected officeholders are accountable to the public and career civil servants are accountable to their political superior" (2007, p. 5). Once warned that powers must be limited, Macaulay saw the nobler vision of government, as stated here:

Government can never stand on better, never on firmer, never on equitable grounds, than on its good behavior. Just government will be felt, its advantages will be seen, its security will be fixed in the hearts of its subject, not to be shaken by the fantastic or selfish ends of individuals (1768, p. 408).

When viewed from the perspective of human nature, the separation of powers becomes more than the checks and balances between the various branches of government. It is the method by which man's corruptible nature is prevented from assuming absolute control and concentrating the sources of power into the hands of a tyrannical few. The separation of powers is the planned limitation of executive authority; it is the empowering of the legislature with rule-making authority and accountability for government actions; it is a safeguard against interest groups or factions assuming tyrannical control; and it is rooted in the premise that everyone is equal before the law.

The Role of the Executive

In describing a model of the administrative state, it is to the executive that the public administrator would turn first. In fashioning a model, Macaulay reminded us “that it was a much easier thing to make kings, than to limit their prerogative after they were made” (1783, p. 314), thus her constitutional model would place severe limitations on the executive. Passages extracted from her earlier quoted works revealed an executive who was to be nominated from the legislative house representing the people, the executive would be limited to one month service with the possibility of a full year of service, and limited in power as, “the affairs of commerce, and all matters relative to the state and executive powers of government, be determined by the representative body” (1767, pp. 23 – 24). Quite clearly, Macaulay saw her executive as being subordinate to the legislature with the majority of controls coming from the representative assembly. She also established a Cabinet (“generals, admirals, civil magistrates, and officers of every important post”) to be chosen from the senate, with full voting privileges while holding the Cabinet position. Macaulay does not delineate between the powers of the Cabinet and the powers of the executive, only to note that the executive is appointed “if the exigencies of the republic should ever find it necessary to lodge the executive powers of government in the hands of one person” (1767, p. 27).

Shortly after the pamphlet was published, Macaulay received a review from a Pennsylvania reader, possibly Benjamin Rush, who questioned allowing members of the military to serve in her model government. She responded:

I see you have very strongly one essential quality to the composition of a great legislator, viz. distrust: which according to the expression of a philosopher is one of the nerves of the soul. The contrary to this virtue, viz. confidence, has rendered all civil establishments abortive of their just ends; and I do assure you, that I should not have suffered generals, admirals, and such dangerous officers, to have a vote in the senate of my republic, if I had not thought I had sufficiently guarded against the selfish evils of such an assembly, or individuals of such an assembly, by only allowing them the privilege of giving their advice. The senate, you see, has no coercive power to put any of their resolutions into practice: rotation sufficiently secures the popular assembly from corruption; and, without corruption, they never would be guided by the selfish views of their superiors (1767, pp. 33).

Joyce Appleby noted that republics, by their very nature, had no strong executive position in which to emulate (1992, p. 293). Thus, Macaulay is left to protect her republic by balancing the ideal of a classically republican man of virtue, offering advice from a position of disinterest, with the Lockean liberal restraint on power coming from a rotation in office. Macaulay tempered her optimism with moderation in the formation of the executive, preceding Heinlein's admonition by two hundred years that "goodness alone is never enough. A cold hard wisdom is required too, for goodness to accomplish good" (1961, p. 59).

Woodrow Wilson, who was more trusting of persons in official positions and more willing, than Macaulay, to grant large powers to officials, offered an opposing view:

Suspicion in itself is never healthful either in the private or in the public mind. *Trust is strength* in all relations of life; and, as it is the office of the constitutional reformer to create conditions of trustfulness, so it is the office of the administrative organizer to fit administration with conditions of clear-cut responsibility which shall insure trustworthiness.

And let me say that large powers and unhampered discretion seem to me the indispensable conditions of responsibility....if...he feels himself intrusted with large freedom of discretion, the greater his power, the less likely is he to abuse it, the more is he nerved and sobered and elevated by it (1997, p. 22).

Wilson's strong executive would have been anathema to Macaulay's vision of the executive. There were to be no unfettered powers, no prerogative associated with office, and no chance that the responsibilities of office would act as a self-control mechanism in her model of government. While both Wilson and Macaulay aspire to having a man of education and culture acting on behalf of the best interests of society with sense and vigor, once in office, Macaulay would give that executive limited scope and authority and ensure a short term in office in order to warrant the possibility of less tyranny and corruption.

Similarly, Macaulay would not support Luther Gulick's focus on executive functions and the role of upper-level management.

Considering these too similar to the king's Privy Council and sycophant advisors, Macaulay would distrust such a narrow focus of power in the hands of an appointed few and would rather share powers among an elected Cabinet with advice coming from the representative assembly. In fact, from her brief sketch of a model government, the legislative branch would be more involved in planning, organizing, directing, and coordinating than the executive branch would be, similar in view to the legislative-administrative plan espoused by William Willoughby (Shafritz & Hyde, 1997, p. 64). She offered this example: "The true parliament of the people, is entrusted with sufficient powers to keep the executive parts of the government in a subordination, which must prevent any possible infringement either of the form or the spirit of the constitution" (1770, p. 17).

Likewise, Macaulay would not consider advice from classical public administration theorists in establishing a hierarchical work structure in which the executive would issue orders, manage projects, or supervise employees toward the efficient accomplishment of objectives and goals. Her executive would be checked at every step along the way.

What happens when the executive oversteps constitutional authority? Was regicide the only recourse left to an abuse of executive power? Fortunately, eighteenth-century society had more progressive ideas of punishment than the axe and halter. The legislature would be

empowered with the tool of impeachment, "that great guardian of the purity of the constitution" (1770, p. 15). When required, impeachment by the legislative branch was permitted for persons guilty of "endeavoring the subversion of the constitution; in changing, by a tyrannical administration, the government into an absolute monarchy; and subjecting the liberties and properties of the subject to arbitrary will and pleasure" (1769, pp. 174 – 175). Macaulay would put her executive on notice that exceeding the limits of the constitution would not be tolerated.

The Role of the Legislature

In an earlier chapter, the Macaulay ideal of a legislative assembly was defined; it was composed of two houses, the senate – offering wisdom, and the representatives – drawn from the people, who protect liberty. Through the legislature the executive was chosen, and from the senate the Cabinet was chosen. The people's assembly filled the vacant seats and initiated legislation; similar in fashion to Baron Charles Louis Montesquieu's "reworking of the republican thesis that the best way of ensuring the legislation reflected the common interest was to have it made by the people" (Bellamy, 2001, p. 445). Montesquieu, like Macaulay, thought the elected representative should be geographically based in order to prevent the types of corruption that arose from

representation based upon rotten boroughs, those areas of land represented by appointed, not elected, king's men. It was understood that members of the assembly would be those of a disinterested nature, only willing to serve the public good. As she noted:

The design of a general assembly must ever be the good of the commonwealth, as conducive to their own general and particular good: this leads them to pitch on those persons, whose virtues and abilities are most capable to serve the public (1767, p. 15).

The functions of the legislature were primarily to enact legislation, especially with respect to money, and to hold the government accountable for its actions. Macaulay wrote:

Parliament, viz, a right in the people of assembling by representatives, to assist in the making of new laws, the abolishing of old ones, or to give an assent or negative to the extraordinary levies of money.... It is against the franchises of the land for freemen to be taxed, but by their consent in Parliament (1763, p. 262, 369).

The legislature was entrusted with the making of new law, changing old laws, and protecting the rights of the people. She argued:

That government is the ordinance of man; that, being the mere creature of human invention, it may be changed or altered according to the dictates of experience, and the better judgment of men; that it was instituted for the protection of the people, for the end of securing, not overthrowing, the rights of nature; that it is a trust either formally admitted, or supposed; and that magistracy is consequently accountable (1768, p. 403-404).

There was to be transparency in the operation of the legislature. Macaulay was suspicious of “the chicanery of practitioners and the vexatious prosecutions of the quarrelsome and the litigious” (1778, p. 240) who wanted to write the rules for their own purposes and not for the good of society. Instead, she saw the writing of legislation in the following terms:

Every law, my friend, relating to public or private property, and in particular penal statutes, ought to be rendered so clear and plain, and promulgated in such a manner to the public, as to give a full information of its nature and contents to every citizen (1778, p. 369).

The legislature also had power of the purse and was solely responsible for the raising of taxes in support of governmental operations. Finally, the legislature was to hold the executive branch accountable through inquiry into abuses. According to Macaulay’s view:

When ministers are in disgrace with the sovereign, parliaments are encouraged to exercise their duty in enquiries into abuses (1778, p. 240).

The legislature was thus justified for holding hearings into abuses of power, or misapplication of funds, and/or entry into foreign wars.

Interest Groups

When discussing the concept of the power to govern as emanating from the people, the people themselves become part of the argument.

Political philosophers are apt to see the people as units – families, communities, or possibly members of political parties. Macaulay observed society as a class-based unit. Given her aversion to the aristocracy, it is easy to understand her fear of interest groups as well.

Publius defined the problem of interests groups in *Federalist #10*, when he wrote:

Factions are a number of citizens, whether amounting to a majority or minority of the whole, who are united and actuated by some common impulse of passion, or of interest, adverse to the rights of other citizens, or to the permanent and aggregate interests of the community (Madison, 2006, p. 52).

A faction, or an interest group, was typically organized around the desire for control. Macaulay, a supporter of popular representation and the expansion of democratic endeavors which would dilute the concentration of power, knew the perils a faction could bring, “for that which constitutes the defects in all governments, are those principles in them which support a *partial* interest, to the injury of the *public* one” (1790b, p. 15). She addressed her remarks toward those she saw as the source of the problem; the aristocracy, as seen in their intrigues at the time of the Glorious Revolution, and the Tories, who frequently controlled Parliament and lay in servitude to the king, “for the lucrative prospect which a seat in Parliament gives for the enriching the representative” (1770, p. 17). The problem with factions was obvious, according to

Macaulay; they were simply a congregate of individuals, all prone to the foibles of a corruptible human nature:

The generality of mankind are too fond of accustomed establishments, however pernicious in their nature, to adopt material alterations; and this propensity has ever afforded full opportunity to the interested to reject every part of reformation which tends effectually to establish public good on the ruins of private interest (1770, p. 9).

Pensioners, placemen, and others sworn to fealty with the crown had no cause for change as their powers flowed from the executive in charge, and "Thus control of parliament upon the executory power is lost" (1770, p. 15). The party in power expected benefits for their services.

Macaulay accused the Tories of such behavior:

The corruption of the tories arises from the badness of their hearts, and from thence infect their understanding. This political sect may justly be termed idol worshippers; they make a deity of human power, and expect particular benefits for their servile offerings (1778, p. 31).

In order to minimize the problem with factions, Madison in *Federalist* #10 suggested removing the causes or controlling the effects. Since the removal of the cause was essentially the denial of liberty, relief was to be sought in controlling the effects, a suggestion Macaulay had made earlier. The number and situation of the majority had to be changed in order to prevent their controlling interest and this was accomplished through democratic policies, such as expansion of the franchise, a

rotation in office, and residence within the district one represented. As noted earlier, as concentrated power becomes diluted through the expansion of rights, democracy becomes a check on power. Unfortunately, that check on power was only as good as were the people, as Macaulay admonished:

My friend, in a country like this, where party prejudice prevails in a manner to destroy even common sense; where the interested and the ignorant make up the great mass of the people, the favor of the multitude, as it is always founded on whim and error, is as uncertain as the favor of princes (1778, p. 217).

PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION AS A CHECK ON POWER

Some public administration theorists argue that public administrators, in the performance of their duties, have an obligation to act as a check on power. Spicer notes:

Public administrators can check the power of political leaders by raising questions with political leaders, by trying to persuade them to sometimes change course, and by interpreting political directors in a fashion that permits them to limit the costs imposed upon citizens (1995, p. 68).

By acting in a professional capacity, public administrators, through the use of administrative discretion, in the following of rules and regulations, and with the active participation of citizens, are entrusted with the duty of checking the power of both the executive and the

legislative branches in the event of a breach of public policy. At the same time, public administrators must also be checked to prevent their own abuse of administrative authority.

Administrative Discretion

In relation to the exercise of administrative discretion, the actions of public administrators may be viewed as either independent or instrumental; that is, the public administrator acts as an independent agent within the confines of governmental policies and procedures to promote the public interest, or public administrators may only act to carry out the will and wishes of the elected representatives of the people (Spicer, 1995, p. 55). Friedrich (1940) represented the independent view and was known for believing in “internal checks” held by the public administrator in concert with education, training, and the involvement of citizens in the action of government to promote the public interest. Finer (1941) argued from an instrumental perspective, requiring public administrators to be responsible to elected officials and the course of action of their choosing, rather than using independent judgment. Macaulay would argue that both views fail to account for human foibles: Friedrich failed to control the public administrator and Finer failed to control the elected official. Macaulay would favor the use of administrative discretion, within the boundary of law, as long as it was the

means to control arbitrary power and not used for purposes of self-interest.

Two examples serve to demonstrate Macaulay's view of discretion checking the power of the executive. In 1631 Charles I was searching for ways to raise money without the approval of Parliament. He decreed that every man in possession of forty pounds a year for three years was to be summoned to the throne for knighthood and pay a commission for the service. Macaulay described the outcome:

It is said, that above an hundred thousand pounds were brought into the treasury, extorted on this business of knighthood. The imposition was so universally disliked, that many of the sheriffs neglected to execute their orders and return the names of the persons qualified (1769, p. 102).

The sheriffs acted on their own authority, failing to follow the political directive in order to protect the pending violation of their constituents, that is, the extortion of money in lieu of parliament-imposed taxes.

In this next display of administrative discretion, the players are caught between two branches of government. Macaulay described the visit of Charles I to the town of Hull, the site of Parliament's munitions magazine on the eve of the First Civil War:

[The King] dispatched a messenger to Sir John Hotham with a letter, signifying he intended to visit his town of Hull and the magazine; that Sir John Hotham must provide for the reception of him and his train; he doubted not his obedience, else he must make his way into the town, according to the

laws of the land. Sir John Hotham called the chief magistrates of the town and officers of the garrison to council. It was resolved not to admit the King. A respectful message was sent, entreating him to forbear his intended visit. On his nearer approach, the bridge was drawn up, and the garrison put into a posture of defence (1769, p. 240).

Hotham's example illustrates the difference between Friedrich and Finer. By consulting with the chief magistrates and officers of the garrison, Hotham was involving other citizens in deciding what was in the public interest, a method Friedrich advocated as an appropriate use of discretion. Had Hotham followed Finer's recommendation, that is, to be responsible to the top official and follow that course of action, the munitions at Hull would have been secured for the Crown rather than for Parliament.

Citizen Participation

Another way in which public administration acts as a check on power is through encouraging active citizen participation. Since the reign of Edward I, an Englishman had the right to petition for a redress of grievances, thereby giving voice to complaints against the government. Macaulay's history documented the many instances in which citizens delivered petitions to the King and the Parliament requesting relief from burdensome policies. Macaulay championed as heroes those men and women who acted with courage and determination to point out

weaknesses and defects to the ruling elite, "That there is an example of this kind in the history of my country, gives me infinite pleasure; that there are few I feel with sensible regret" (1769, p. 217). Citizen petitions and street demonstrations were among the few ways in which citizens could make their opinions known in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Here she described the people's reaction to Charles's offer to pardon followers of Parliament in turn for laying down arms against the King:

The ill success which the popular party had met with had not so quelled their courage as to accept, on terms thus destructive, the arrogant mercy of the king: rather animated than subdued with the prospect of danger, a petition, signed by a large number of citizens, for raising every individual of the party at once, was presented to the Commons (1768, p. 25).

Macaulay's advocacy for land reform and broader voting privileges suggests her support for greater citizen participation within government. Additionally, her system of education was designed to enlarge the numbers of qualified citizens to serve in government, training them in the sympathetic feelings necessary to govern. Macaulay would be leery of mob rule and majority factions assuming control, but she would support interested, active, citizen participation in the administration of government, in the accountability over government actions, and in the voicing of opinions to legislators and executives. As an example, during the English Civil War, Macaulay described a group of women who

petitioned Parliament to end the war. Receiving a less than desirable answer, the women held a public demonstration to make known their request and influence the outcome of the war:

A petition on this subject was accordingly...presented to the Commons by two or three thousand women, with white silk ribbons in their hats. The house had the complaisance, after giving it a reading, to appoint a committee to wait on the petitioners, to assure them of the earnest desire of the house for peace, and that they did not doubt, in a short time, to answer the end of their petition. This general, though very civil answer was far from satisfying: The number of females, which crowded round and up to the doors of the house, and of men disguised in women's clothes, were by noon increased to five thousand, crying out in a tumultuous manner, Peace! Peace! (1768, p. 30)

Citizen participation becomes another check in the arsenal of controlling the arbitrary exercise of power. Spicer notes how citizen participation provides an opportunity for citizens to make known how they may be potentially harmed by government policies (1995, p. 63).

Macaulay interpreted this type of action in 1641 prior to the start of the Civil War when the House of Commons first began to exert its political strength. Many questioned the role of ecclesiastics in the House of Lords, as members of the church were typically most indebted to the King and most anxious to preserve the status quo. Macaulay wrote,

Bishops maintaining their seats in parliament was an impediment to the progress of those good laws and motions which had been sent up by the Commons to the Peers. This declaration of the sense of the city was further enforced by a

petition, subscribed by aldermen, common-council men, subsidy men, and other inhabitants of the city of London ...that bishops should be removed out of the house of Peers (1767, pp. 120- 121).

As expressed by the citizens, the presence of the bishops was harmful in their attempt to establish more democratic representation.

Inclusion of citizens into the broadest possible involvement with government was supported in recent Public Administration history at both the Minnowbrook Conference of 1972 and within the later Blacksburg Manifesto, published as part of the refounding public administration movement. Stivers (1990) calls for active relationships between citizens and administrators; Goodsell (1990) desires a reorientation between public administrators and citizens; and Box (1995) and Ventriss (1995) support redefining public administration to include a more active citizenry. Macaulay would be at the forefront of this movement as it is the culmination of her two prime theories of governance: virtuous citizens getting involved in government, acting as a check on power on the grounds that, "The active consent of the people was the only legitimate justification for government" (1790b, p. 6).

EDUCATION AND PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

American Public administration pedagogy, since the founding of the discipline, had wavered between the education of generalists and specialists. Regarding the latter, Wilson's desire was to "prepare better

officials as the apparatus of government" (1887, p. 23); Taylor was interested in "the deliberate gathering in on the part of those on the management side of all of the great mass of traditional knowledge...into a form of scientific management" (1912, p. 30); and Weber later taught that specialized management "usually presupposes thorough and expert training" (1946, p. 38). The early teaching of public administration was considered an applied one, focusing on finding solutions to practical problems, using the techniques and methodologies of social science, engineering, and economics.

On the training of generalists, Paul Appleby wrote, "Governments exist precisely for the reason that there is a need to have special persons in society charged with the function of promoting and protecting the public interest" (1945, p. 124). Catharine Macaulay would concur with Appleby and would oppose the emphasis placed on experts, technicians, and scientists running government. Rather, she would suggest her educational system as the means by which Appleby's special persons would learn the function of protecting the public interest:

The peculiar excellence of a government, properly constituted, is to raise those to the administration whose virtues render them capable of this arduous task; and to deprive those of that office, who upon trial are found at all defective: therefore a well constituted government can never be so long ill administered as to become a grievance to the subject (1767, p. 9).

Macaulay's educational theories have been earlier described. Her curriculum provided a broad, liberal education for both men and women in the belief that education was the means to happiness and perfection.

She stated:

A system of education aims at bringing the human mind to such a height of perfection that it shall induce the practice of the best morals.... Education tends to instill the principles of equity and benevolence (1790a, p. 173, 236).

Eschewing the Grand Tour of Europe for a curriculum steeped in the rigors of mathematics, history, philosophy, and languages, Macaulay intended to educate a class of citizens interested in the promotion of the public interest, through an understanding of reason, morals, and virtues:

If the higher classes of the people have not wisdom, who will be the framers of those laws which enlighten the understandings of the citizens in the essentials of right and wrong? (1790a, p. 237)

In Ralph Chandler's review of the teaching of public administration, he requested more training in professional standards and ethics, as currently these areas "are not enough to deal with the conundrums which occupy much of the manager's time and place heavy demands on his discretion. Knowledge and power are the stuff of public administration" (1989, p. 651). Macaulay, in both her republican and liberal capacities, would agree. She believed:

The education of the people may be said to comprehend the most important duties of government. Public education must comprehend good laws, good examples, good customs, a proper use of the arts, and wise instructions conveyed to the mind, by the means of language, in the way of speech and writing (1790a, p. 274).

An educated citizen provided with the opportunity for land ownership, the right to vote, and the ability to participate in government, was the best means by which the force of society could continue to improve.

The Civil Service

Any discussion of public administration and education would be remiss without including the civil service, the public personnel system based upon knowledge of the job to be performed, tested through impartial means, and awarded without bias. The federal Civil Service was reformed in 1883 to eliminate the tradition of the spoils system, in which the winning executive, typically through the political party, placed persons loyal to the party and the elected official, throughout administrative positions. The spoils system favored loyalty over competency, partisanship over principle. Frederick Mosher described the Pendleton Civil Service Reform Act of 1883 as resulting from a need to eliminate corruption from within governmental operations while attempting to attract more talent to the government service (1968, pp. 65 – 66). Mosher's twentieth-century rationale reeks of eighteenth-century

republicanism. Woodrow Wilson strongly supported the creation of an impartial civil service, for it was, “the creation of statesmen whose responsibility to public opinion will be direct and inevitable” and who embodied the “motives, objects, policy, and standards of the bureaucracy”, not politics (1887, p. 23). To Wilson, the civil service represented the removal of politics from administration and created a class of “public spirited instruments of just government” who would conduct the business of government just as the business of a corporation.

Macaulay, like many Progressives, would have been in favor of the elimination of corruptive influences from any and all sources of governmental operations. Her comments regarding the education of a class of people to serve in government gives credence to both to the formation of civil service boards as well as Rohr’s theory that the higher reaches of the career civil service fulfill the framer’s original intent for the U.S. Senate (Rohr, 1990, pp. 38 - 39). Both Macaulay and Rohr’s see that the Senate would have wisdom and expertise not found in the lower house, that the Senate, like administrators, would be a check on power, and that both would exercise supervisory power over government personnel issues. Macaulay’s educated class was instilled with the wisdom to govern, meant to control the passions of men, and hold those in power accountable for their actions. Regarding the impartiality of the civil service, this would be most appealing to Macaulay. The opportunity for

any citizen, motivated by ambition and education, to successfully enter the administration of government would be an extension of democratic values. Entrance into government through civil service testing and appointment would be an encouragement to citizens committed to accountability, expansion of opportunity, and participation.

What Macaulay would fear would be experts running government. She was a champion of the citizen who actively participated in government. She espoused an educated workforce, not a trained one of managers making decisions based on management principles (Barnard, 1938), or behavioral sciences as suggested by Simon (1947), or organizational theories typified by Katz & Kahn (1966). She would instead see public administrators as model citizens demonstrating their civic interests as responsible administrators (Cooper, 1998, Rohr, 1986, Wamsley, 1990). Macaulay would view public administration as based on law, not management (Rosenbloom, 1983) and she would abhor the concepts promulgated by devotees of New Public Management (Bozeman, 2000, Kettl, 1994, Moore, 1995, Lynn, 1996) and the reinventing government movement (Osborne & Gaebler, 1992) with its focus on efficiency, aggressive entrepreneurship, and outcomes over the most desired concepts of values, process, and deliberation. Macaulay would view New Public Management as returning to corrupt practices, noting a lack of transparency when private businesses assume public powers through

outsourcing and privatization of government; she would observe the possibility of manipulation in the effort to manage by measuring outcomes; and she would decry the failure to follow the rule of law.

BENEVOLENCE

Whether referring to the character of Lady Bountiful or capturing the essence of republican ideology, Macaulay believed in the virtue of benevolence, a sympathetic understanding of the equality of mankind instilled with a desire toward service, observing that "When this benign affection holds a superiority in the mind to other affections, inclination will lead to the performance of the duties of humanity" (1790a, p. 275).

Benevolence was the culmination of right action:

If we trace the origin of those virtues in man, which render him fit for the benign offices of life, we shall find that they all center in sympathy. A strict adherence to the principles of equity may be said to include the perfection of moral rectitude (1790a, p. 275).

Benevolence was a virtue that could be taught: to children through acts of charity, to the Prince through exposure to the lower elements of society, and to all classes of citizens through the practice of sympathy toward others. Practicing benevolence, Macaulay believed, would instill a motivation to do more for others and result in less selfish indulgences for purely pleasurable purposes. Benevolence was a moral principle as well

as an act of kindness; through repeated practice it would improve society. She wrote:

Thus it will appear, that where we have power to direct the course of impression, we have power to command the state of the passions; and as laws, example, precept, and custom, are the prime sources of all our impressions, it must be greatly in the power of government to effect, by a proper use of these sources, that improvement on which true civilization depends (1790a. p. 276).

The practice of benevolence, coupled with governmental action to reinforce feelings of sympathy, would promote peace, happiness, and the welfare of society. Specifically, Macaulay attached to this discussion comments regarding the care of the poor, the treatment of animals, houses of correction, and public executions (1790a, pp. 277 – 282), the latter similar in nature to Foucault's (1977) treatment of the condemned.

The word benevolence has many definitions within the field of public administration, with connotations ranging from eighteenth-century concepts denoting goodness and sympathy (Roberts, 1973) to Arendt's twentieth-century ideal to care for fellow citizens (Dossa, 1984, pp. 165 – 166). Niebuhr suggested that the concept of benevolence was included in almost every moral theory along with the ideas of justice, kindness, and unselfishness (1932, p. 27). Gawthorp (1998) described it as the desire for happiness for another, Hart (1989) grounded it in theories of civic humanism and the concept of civic obligation, and Frederickson and Hart

declared that public servants should be motivated by benevolence as a form of patriotism (1985, p. 547). Read all together, these authors suggest the concept of benevolence is found within the regime values of democracy, that is, justice, equality, liberty, fairness, and respect for common human dignity. Macaulay would agree.

The extension of the Macaulay concept of benevolence to twenty-first century public administration lies in the connection to regime values and the protection of individual rights. Macaulay would want a public administrator to be infused with these regime values and act as their guardian in the daily performance of duties. As Frederickson and Hart suggested:

The ideal of American democracy assumes that a special relationship should exist between public servants and citizens. Stated briefly, it is the belief that *all* public administration must rest upon, and be guided by, the moral truths embodied in the enabling documents of our national foundation (1985, p. 548).

Public administrators properly educated in these regime values at the time of oath-taking become the guardians of liberty and equality. Based upon the rule of law, public administrators develop a special relationship with citizens, "For where much is given, much may be with justice required" (Macaulay, 1790a, p. 273). Macaulay would expect public administrators to embrace these concepts and practice them within the course of their daily activity. Discrimination, bias, and unequal

treatment would not exist in the practice of a benevolent public administration. Macaulay believed justice, fairness, and equality would endow the public good:

Whatever the sanguine expectations formed from discoveries made in science, the convenience and happiness enjoyed by the world will be moderate, unless the united force of society is used toward the glorious work of improvement (1790a, p. 274).

Social Equity

Following closely upon the tenets of Macaulay's view of benevolence is the concept of social equity, defined by Frederickson as, "activities designed to enhance the political power and economic well-being of minorities" (1971, p. 330). Frederickson argues that public administrators should be committed to both good management and social equity and demonstrate that commitment by acting as change agents against institutionalized policies and structures that inhibit the political power and economic well being of others. Macaulay would concur, as "Political equality and the laws of good government are so far from incompatible, that one never can exist to perfection without the other" (1767, p. 12). Her views on gender and race, as previously discussed, indicated an openness to include all members of society in the social order and have them participate in government. Her advocacy on behalf of the common laborer to be eligible to vote, to own property, and to be educated indicates her predilection for equal opportunity.

Macaulay, considered a radical reformer in her time, used her political writings, personal correspondence, and her Member of Parliament brother to advocate for change. Macaulay embodied the spirit of Frederickson's New Public Administration social equity theory. She provides the modern public administrator with a model for imbuing the practice of public administration with the values of social equity.

CONCLUSION

The Macaulay model of public administration derives its authority from the people. The model is based upon a separation of governmental powers, including distinct roles for the executive and legislative branches. The separation of powers is meant to control the corruptive influences of human nature as well as provide checks and balances within government itself. The model seeks to check power through the practice of public administration that permits the use of administrative discretion as prescribed by law; promotes active citizen participation in the operation of public administration; and is regulated through a strong civil service system. Finally, the model is characterized by benevolence, the belief that the democratic values of justice, liberty, and equality are to be protected in the daily practice of public administration.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

With the twenty-first century emphasis on efficiency and effectiveness within American public administration, it is easy to lose sight of the values behind those concepts. The routinization of daily administrative practice may cause the practitioner to overlook the depth and complexity of such concepts as equality, democracy, and liberty. Fuller appreciation of the practice of public administration improves with an understanding of its basic, core values. One method by which this appreciation may be obtained is through an examination of the history of ideas. This dissertation has attempted to follow the history of ideas as presented by England's eighteenth-century historian and philosopher Catharine Macaulay, by tracing the origins of core values held within the discipline of American Public Administration. Further, the purpose was to glean from Macaulay insight into the theories behind these concepts and draw from them applications for its practice. Finally, the intent of the dissertation was to contribute to the body of knowledge with respect to the legitimacy issue that pervades the field and to demonstrate that

centuries of political thought have presaged this discussion. Macaulay's arguments regarding checks on power, the separation of powers, and the expansion of democratic practices plus her influence upon the men who helped guide it, grounds the legitimacy debate within the U.S. Constitution. The study of a variety of influences, including this specific one on Macaulay, weaves a richer tapestry displaying the evolution of American Public Administration, its understanding of self, and its contribution to daily life.

For purposes of this dissertation, the findings reveal a Macaulian paradox regarding human nature. She has both a dark cynical view of people and their passions as well as seeing a generous side capable of benevolence. In this respect she reflects beliefs held by those with a Lockean liberal interpretation of human nature as well as those of a more classical republican ilk. In turn, these disparate views of human nature result in two different schemes for how government should be organized and operated. Macaulay the liberal, demands the end to arbitrary rule, strict control on the use of power, and delineation between the powers of government with a firm emphasis upon the rule of law. Macaulay the classical republican, reveres ancient civilizations for the lessons they teach, is insistent upon education to achieve opportunity and increase freedom, and believes in the ability of humans to govern others out of a sense of impartiality and disinterestedness. Combining these ideas,

Macaulay offers a new interpretation to the values of the discipline, which includes an emphasis on limited government, democracy and participation, education, and a benevolent public administration grounded in service. Her contribution deserves additional analysis because it improves our understanding of what the good life is and who should rule.

Nearly everyone who hears the Macaulay story for the first time is fascinated by her life, her alliance with American friends at the time of the American Revolution, and her remarkable abilities as a writer and historian. As is apparent from this brief analysis of her writings, she brings complexity and nuance to the study of eighteenth-century political philosophy through her paradoxical views on human nature and her pioneering contribution to the inclusion of women into educational and social systems. Contrary to what some may believe at first glance, Macaulay has not been lost to the ages. Intellectual historians have found and noted her contribution to the development of political thought on this side of the Atlantic Ocean. Her rousing republican-oriented pamphlets and *History* inspired a new generation of government leaders to focus on popular sovereignty as the guiding principle for American government rather than monarchy (Bailyn, 1967, Wood, 1991). Similarly, educational theorists have acknowledged her role in the formation of educational curricula designed to transcend images of gender (Titone, 2004, Boos,

1976). Recently, feminist theorists have begun studying Macaulay's contribution within the public space of eighteenth-century Europe (Gardner, 1998, Gunther-Canada, 2006). It is now left to public administration theorists to find a place for her in the pantheon of political theory.

Assessing Macaulay's impact, the first issue for students of public administration theory will be to place Macaulay in context to the thinking and orientation of others. The volumes of books arguing the ideological origins of political thought are numerous, and, like fashion, appear to change according to the seasons. Classical republican ideology gained dominance at a time when American theorists were looking to nobler causes behind public service and hoped that true disinterestedness actually existed. Macaulay's high regard as the leading republican of her day coupled with her own esteem for the republicans of the Commonwealth era might suggest Macaulay's inclusion under the label classical republican. She would be studied for her contribution to republican thought, the idolization of the man of virtue, and the emphasis on the need for a liberal education as a prerequisite for serving in government.

However, as earlier noted in this dissertation, Macaulay could also be classified as a Lockean liberal intent upon the checking of power. Her suspicion and antipathy toward unregulated power fills 3,500 pages of

English history. In telling story after story, in the detailing of wars, in the preparation for battles, and in actual military conflicts, Macaulay clearly made her case for the checking of power, the controlling of the methods of corruption, and the expansion of democratic principles in an effort to decentralize sources of power. She expounded on the merits of the separation of powers and the dangers resulting from interest groups to illustrate how humans, whose passions must be contained lest their lower natures gain hold, ought to be controlled against the unbridled self-interest of power. Macaulay reveled in the theory that all persons are equal before the law.

Our difficulty in labeling Macaulay as either clearly a liberal or a classical republican offers an interesting lesson for the first decade of twenty-first century America. Caught as we are between blue states and red states, each representing the platforms and beliefs of the two dominant national political parties, perhaps we could learn to see the areas in which we agree rather than disagree. Macaulay as a republican and a liberal championed the liberty of individual citizens within society. She believed in the primacy of the rule of law and its corollaries that no one person was above the law and all citizens were equal before the law. Finally, in both her roles she was against the influences leading to corruption – the gifts in exchange for political support or the votes in exchange for political favors. Even with our deep divisions along

ideological lines it is hard to argue with the promotion of liberty, the obedience to fair and equal treatment under the law, and revulsion toward corruption. While our private natures may harbor misgivings and misdeeds, our public natures revere life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Macaulay offers a lesson in understanding.

The second lesson to be gained from a study of Macaulay, and most suitable for students within a graduate program of public administration, concerns the role of education. Should there be an educated Guardian Class or are we better with open enrollment and equal opportunity? Macaulay would not favor an emphasis on narrowly trained technical experts measuring roadways and quantifying statistics. Instead, Macaulay would prefer a liberally educated citizen, as familiar with the republics of Greece and Rome as with Washington, D.C., with their attendant flaws, problems, and downfalls, to be qualified for government service. To understand government service, Macaulay's student must understand the tenets of democracy and be as thoroughly grounded in the practice of benevolence as in the principles of efficiency and effectiveness. For Macaulay, benevolence was the external manifestation of democracy – all people are equal, all people deserve the same opportunity, and everyone is free. To practice Macaulayan public administration requires belief in this creed and its equal application toward all.

As with most things pertaining to public administration theory, one turns to Dwight Waldo for assistance in political theory research. In the preface to the second edition of *The Administrative State* he reflected upon the larger picture in which public administration existed and acknowledged that it came from a study of history. Macaulay and Waldo would have had an interesting conversation on the development of Anglo-American political thought and traditions. Waldo's refrain for more political theory affirms the need for additional scholarly research into Macaulay and other Commonwealthmen and women of the seventeenth century who were so influential upon her, as well as the Founders (Robbins, 1959). With respect to Macaulay, there are three specific areas, germane to the study of Public Administration, which deserve more attention. First, the material presented in this dissertation represents her published material, which is part of the public domain. There exists substantial private correspondence held by libraries along the East Coast that could be examined for additional insight into her beliefs and practices. Her letters between John and Abigail Adams, Samuel Adams, and Mercy Otis Warren deserve further reading and analysis. Just as Macaulay can be labeled either republican or liberal, she at times argues as a Federalist and at other times as an Anti-Federalist. There is room for additional research in this area also.

The second study area is related to the first and concerns a comparative study between Macaulay and Publius. At this point in time, a connection between Macaulay and Alexander Hamilton and Macaulay and James Madison has not been established. Macaulay spent a large part of her year in America in New York City and was known to have met both Richard Henry Lee and Rufus King, friends of Hamilton's. Macaulay's ten days with George and Martha Washington in Mount Vernon, Virginia, puts her within traveling distance of Madison's home. A personal acquaintance between these giants of political thought would be keen to establish. More importantly, an analysis and/or comparison of Macaulay to Publius regarding the formation of the U.S. Constitution would add new insight into the legitimacy discussion so alive within American public administration today. It would also strengthen how the history of ideas flows from one continent to another, from one country to another, and from one theorist to another. The short comparison of thought between Macaulay and Publius done in this dissertation demonstrates the need for additional in-depth research.

The final area recommended for additional research in an effort to expand public administration theory concerns Macaulay herself. There is now a woman's voice to add to the study of eighteenth-century political ideology. As a contemporary of Hume and Burke (Davies, 1988) she offers a counterpoint to the skepticism and conservatism previously thought of

as the dominant paradigm within political philosophy at the time. While she was neither the first female English historian nor the first female English philosopher, she was the first and only historian and philosopher who came to America and befriended the Founding Fathers. Although seldom told, the story of the American Revolution includes many women and Catharine Macaulay is on that list. Equally as important, as more women enter politics and government it is comforting to know that other women have come before and elegantly blazed a trail for the rest to follow. This remarkable and talented woman deserves inclusion in the legion of women who have ably served without notice, recognition, or fame. Perhaps through the study of more women and their contribution to the history of ideas, Macaulay's goal to raise the consciousness of men will finally be achieved.

It is to service that the final advice is offered. Thousands of public administrators are daily seeking some panacea to make the travails of public life easier. Any lessons learned from Macaulay and applied to the practice of public administration would be appreciated. Pocock wrote that political philosophers study ideas of the past in order to determine what is worth keeping, criticizing, or using for reflections about what ought to be in the consideration of politics (1965, p. 549). What is worth keeping about Macaulay is her emphasis on liberty, democracy, education, and benevolence. David Rosenbloom's recent proposal for democratic-

constitutional impact statements and scorecards (2007) may provide a possible means to operationalizing these values in administrative practice. These impact statements and scorecards offer a methodology whereby administrative reforms might be assessed for their possible impact, both positive and negative, upon democratic-constitutional values.

Macaulay, if alive today, might well have encouraged the development of such assessments to guarantee no infringement on personal liberty, to maintain the constitutional integrity of the separation of powers, to facilitate the transparency of government through open records, and to reinforce the importance of the rule of law (Rosenbloom, 2007, pp.32-35).

To Rosenbloom's list, Macaulay might add appropriate measures regarding education, as in the No Child Left Behind Act, and the impact of homeland security issues with respect to individual liberty as evidenced within the American Patriot Act. As Rosenbloom admonishes, it is left to public administration to safeguard democratic-constitutional values intrinsic to our way of life. Public administration must not forget that its values represent the nexus of both liberal and republican attitudes toward government, as Macaulay so well stated two hundred and forty years ago:

Government can never stand on better, never on firmer, never on equitable grounds, than on its good behavior. Just government will be felt, its advantages will be seen, its security will be fixed in the hearts of its subject, not to be shaken by the fantastic or selfish ends of individuals (1768, p. 408).

References

- Appleby, Joyce. (1992). *Liberalism and Republicanism in the Historical Imagination*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Appleby, Paul. (1945). Government is Different. In Jay M. Shafritz and Albert C. Hyde, (Eds.). *Classics of Public Administration, 4th edition* pp. 122 – 126). New York: Harcourt Brace.
- Bailyn, Barnard. (1967). *The Ideological Origins of American Politics*. New York: Random House.
- Ball, Terence. (1995). *Reappraising Political Theory: Revisionist Studies in the History of Political Thought*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Barnard, Chester. (1938). *The Functions of the Executive*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Beckwith, Mildred. (1953). Catharine Macaulay: Eighteenth-Century English Rebel. A Sketch of her life and some reflections on her place among the historians and political reformers of her time. (Doctoral Dissertation. Ohio State University. 1953).
- Bellamy, Richard. (2001). The Political Form of the Constitution: the Separation of Powers, Rights and Representative Democracy. *Political Studies*, XLIV, pp. 436 – 456.
- Berlin, Isaiah. (1979). *Concepts and Categories: Philosophical Essays*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Boos, Florence. (1976). Catharine Macaulay's Letters on Education: An Early Feminist Polemic. *The University of Michigan papers in Women's Studies*, 2, pp. 64 – 78.
- Boos, Florence and William Boos. (1980). Catharine Macaulay: Historian and Political Reformer. *International Journal of Women's Studies*, 3, 6, pp. 49 – 65.
- Box, Richard C. (1995). Critical Theory and the paradox of discourse. *American Review of Public Administration*, 25, 1, pp. 1 – 19.
- Bozeman, Barry. (2000). *Bureaucracy and Red Tape*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

- Burke, Edmund. (1770). To Richard Shackleton, ante 15 August 1770. In T.W. Copeland, L. Sutherland, (Eds.). *The Correspondence of Edmund Burke* (p. 150). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chandler, Ralph Clark. (1989). Public Administration Pedagogy: Evolutionary Paradigms in Theory and Practice. In J. Rabin, W.B. Hildreth, and G. Miller (Eds.). *Handbook of Public Administration* (pp. 633 – 655). New York: Marcel Dekker, Inc.
- Colburn, H. Trevor. (1965). *The Lamp of Experience: Whig History and the Intellectual Origins of the American Revolution*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Cook, Brian J. (1996). *Bureaucracy and Self-Government, Reconsidering the Role of Public Administration in American Politics*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Cooper, Terry L. (1998). *The Responsible Administrator*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Davies, Kate. (2005). *Catharine Macaulay & Mercy Otis Warren: The Revolutionary Atlantic and the Politics of Gender*. Oxford: University Press.
- Davis, Natalie Zemon. (1988). History's Two Bodies. *The American Historical Review*, 93, 1, pp. 1 – 30.
- Ditchfield, G.M. (1974). Some Literary and Political Views of Catharine Macaulay. *American Notes & Queries*, pp. 70 – 75.
- Donnelly, Lucy Martin. (1949). "The Celebrated Mrs. Macaulay". *The William and Mary Quarterly*. 6, 2, pp. 173 – 207.
- Dossa, Shiraz. (1984). Hannah Arendt on Eichmann: The Public, the Private, and Evil. *Review of Politics*, 46, pp. 165 – 166.
- Finer, Herbert. (1926). Jefferson, Hamilton, and American Democracy. *Economica*, 18, pp. 338 – 344.
- (1941). Administrative Responsibility in Democratic Government. *Public Administration Review*, 1, pp. 335 – 350.
- Foucault, Michel. (1977). *Discipline and Punish*. New York: Random House.

- Fox, Claire Gilbride. (1968). Catharine Macaulay, An Eighteenth Century Clio. *Winterthur Portfolio*, 4, pp. 129 – 142.
- Frederickson, H. George & Hart, David K. (1985). The Public Service and the Patriotism of Benevolence. *Public Administration Review*, 5, pp. 547 – 553.
- Frederickson, H. George. (1971). Toward a New Public Administration. In Jay M. Shafritz and Albert C. Hyde, (Eds.). *Classics of Public Administration*, 4th edition (pp. 329 – 341). New York: Harcourt Brace.
- Friedrich, C. J. (1940). Public Policy and the Nature of Administrative Responsibility. *Public Policy*. In C.J. Friedrich and E.S. Mason, (Eds.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Galston, William. (1991). *Liberal Purposes*. Cambridge: University Press.
- Gardner, Catharine. (1998). Catharine Macaulay's Letters on Education: Odd but Equal. *Hypatia*, 13, 1, pp. 119 - 133.
- Gawthorp, Louis. (1998). *Public Service and Democracy*. New York: Chatham House Publishers.
- Goodsell, Charles. (1990). In G.L. Wamsley, C.T. Goodsell, J.A. Rohr, P. Kronenberg, O. F. White, Jr. J.F. Wolf, & C. Stivers. *Refounding Public Administration* (pp. 246 – 273). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Greenfield, Susan. (2006). "The Absent-Minded Heroine: Or, Elizabeth Bennett has a Thought." *Eighteenth- Century Studies*, 39, 3. 337-350.
- Gulick, Luther. (1937). Notes on the Theory of Organization. In Jay M. Shafritz and Albert C. Hyde, (Eds.). *Classics of Public Administration*, 4th edition (pp. 81 - 89). New York: Harcourt Brace.
- Gunther-Canada, Wendy. (2006). Catharine Macaulay on the Paradox of Paternal Authority in Hobbesian Politics. *Hypatia*, 21, 2. pp. 150 – 173.
- Hamilton, Alexander, Madison, James, and Jay, John. (2006). *The Federalist*. New York: Barnes and Noble.
- Hart, David K. (1989). A Partnership in Virtue Among All Citizens: The Public Service and Civic Humanism. *Public Administration Review*, 3, pp. 101 – 105.

- Hausheer, Roger. (1982). In *Against the Current*, by Isaiah Berlin, xiii-liii. New York: Penguin Books.
- Hay, Carla H. (1994). "Catharine Macaulay and the American Revolution." *Historian*. 56, 2, pp. 301 – 317.
- Heinlein, Robert. (1961). *Stranger in a Strange Land*. New York: Berkley.
- Hicks, Philip. (2002). "Catharine Macaulay's Civil War: Gender, History, and Republicanism in Georgian Britain." *The Journal of British Studies*, 41, 2, 170 -198.
- Hill, Bridget. (1992). *The Republican Virago: The Life and Times of Catharine Macaulay*, *Historian*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Hobman, Daisy. (1952). Mrs. Macaulay. *The Fortnightly*, 171, pp. 116 – 121.
- Locke, John. (1987). The Second Treatise of Government. In L. Strauss and J. Cropsey (Eds.). *History of Political Philosophy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- (1690). An Essay Concerning Human Understanding. As cited in Catharine Macaulay, *History of England*, Vol. IV. London: Dilly.
- Lynn, Laurence. (1996). *Public Management as Art, Science, and Profession*. New Jersey: Chatham House Publishers.
- Katz, Daniel & Kahn, Robert L. (1966). *The Social Psychology of Organizations*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Kettl, Donald. (1994). *Reinventing Government? Appraising the National Performance Review*. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution.
- Macaulay, Catharine. (1763). *The History of England from the Accession of James I to that of the Brunswick Line*, 8 vols. London: Dilly & Dilly.
- (1767). *Loose Remarks on Certain Positions to be found in Mr. Hobbes's 'Philosophical Rudiments of Government and Society,' with a Short Sketch of a Democratical Form of Government, In a Letter to Signor Paoli*. London: Dilly & Dilly.
- (1770). *Observations on a Pamphlet entitled 'Thoughts on the Cause of the Present Discontents.'* London: Dilly &

Dilly.

----- (1774). *A Modest Plea for the Property of Copyright*. Bath: Dilly & Dilly.

----- (1775). *An Address to the People of England, Scotland and Ireland on the Present Important Crisis of Affairs*. Bath: Dilly & Dilly.

----- (1778). *The History of England from the Revolution to the Present Time in a Series of Letters to a Friend*. Bath: Dilly & Dilly.

----- (1783). *Treatise on the Immutability of Moral Truth*. London: Dilly & Dilly.

----- (1790). *Letters on Education with Observations on Religious and Metaphysical Subjects*. London: Dilly & Dilly.

----- (1790). *Observations on the Reflections of the Rt. Hon. Edmund Burke, on the Revolution in France*. London: Dilly & Dilly.

Macaulay, Catharine, personal communication, August, 1773.

Maier, Pauline. (1972). *From Resistance to Revolution: colonial radicals and the development of American opposition to Britain, 1765 – 1776*. New York: Knopf.

McDonald, Forrest. (1985). *Novus Ordo Seclorum: The Intellectual Origins of the Constitution*. Lawrence: University of Kansas Press.

Mitchell, Annie. (2004). A Liberal Republican Cato. *American Journal of Political Science*, 48, 3, pp. 588 – 603.

Moore, Mark H. (1995). *Creating Public Value: Strategic Management in Government*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Mosher, Frederick C. (1968). *Democracy and the Public Service*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Niebuhr, Reinhold. (1932). *Moral Man and Immoral Society*. New York: Scribner & Sons.

Osborne, David & Gaebler, Ted. (1992). *Reinventing Government: How the Entrepreneurial Spirit is Transforming the Public Sector*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Pocock, J.G.A. (1965). Machiavelli, Harrington, and English Political Ideologies in the Eighteenth Century. *William and Mary Quarterly*, 22, 4, pp. 549 – 583.

----- (1972). Virtue and Commerce in the Eighteenth Century, *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, III.

----- (1998). Catharine Macaulay: Patriot Historian. In, *Women Writers and the early modern British political tradition*. Hilda Smith, editor. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Raadschelders, J.C.N. and Stillman II, Richard J. (2007). Toward a New Conceptual Framework for Studying Administrative Authority. *Administrative Theory and Praxis*, 29, 1, pp. 4 – 40.

Richardson, William D. (1997). *Democracy, Bureaucracy, and Character, Founding Thought*. Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas Press.

Robbins, Caroline. (1959). *The Eighteenth-Century Commonwealthman*. Indianapolis: Liberty Fund.

Roberts, T.A. (1973). *The Concept of Benevolence: Aspects of Eighteenth Century Moral Philosophy*. London: Macmillan.

Rohr, John A. (1986). *To Run a Constitution: The Legitimacy of the Administrative State*. Lawrence: University of Kansas Press.

Rosenbloom, David H. (1983). Public Administration Theory and the Separation of Powers. In Jay M. Shafritz and Albert C. Hyde, (Eds.). *Classics of Public Administration, 4th edition* (pp. 432 – 443). New York: Harcourt Brace.

----- (2007). Reinventing Administrative Prescriptions: The Case for Democratic-Constitutional Impact Statements and Scorecards. *Public Administration Review*, 67, 1, pp. 28 – 39.

Rosenblum, Nancy. (1989). *Liberalism and the Moral Life*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

- Schnorrenberg, Barbara. (1990). An Opportunity Missed: Catharine Macaulay on the Revolution of 1688. *Studies in Eighteenth Century Culture*, vol. 20, 231- 240.
- Shklar, Judith. (1989). The Liberalism of Fear. In N. Rosenblum (Ed.). *Liberalism and the Moral Life* (pp. 21-38). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Simon, Herbert. (1945). *Administrative Behavior*. New York: Macmillan.
- Spicer, Michael W. (1995). *The Founders, the Constitution, and Public Administration: A conflict in worldviews*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- . (2004a). The English Levellers and American Public Administration. *Administrative Theory and Praxis*, 26, 4, pp. 566-587.
- . (2005). *Keynote Address of Normative Dimensions in Public Administration: The History of Ideas and Normative Research in Public Administration*. Leiden, The Netherlands.
- Stivers, Camilla. (1990). Active citizenship and public administration. In G.L. Wamsley, C.T. Goodsell, J.A. Rohr, P. Kronenberg, O. F. White, Jr. J.F. Wolf, & C. Stivers. *Refounding Public Administration* (pp. 246 – 273). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Taylor, Frederick W. (1912). Scientific Management. In Jay M. Shafritz and Albert C. Hyde, (Eds.). *Classics of Public Administration, 4th edition* (pp. 30 – 32). New York: Harcourt Brace.
- Terry, Larry D. (2003). *Leadership of Public Bureaucracies* (2nd ed.). New York: ME Sharpe.
- Titone, Connie. (2004). *Gender Equality in the Philosophy of Education: Catharine Macaulay's Forgotten Contribution*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Ventriss, Curtis. (1995). Emerging perspectives on citizen participation. *Public Administration Review*, 45, pp. 433 – 440.
- Waldo, Dwight. (1984). *The Administrative State*. New York: Holmes and Meier Publishers.
- Wamsley, Gary L. (1990). Introduction. In Wamsley, Gary L., Bacher, Robert

N., Goodsell, Charles T., Kronenberg, Philip S., Rohr, John, Stivers, Camilla M., White, Orion F., Wolf, James F. *Refounding Public Administration*. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

Weber, Max. (1946). Bureaucracy. In Jay M. Shafritz and Albert C. Hyde, (Eds.). *Classics of Public Administration* (pp. 37 - 43). New York: Harcourt Brace.

Willoughby, William. (1918). The Movement for Budgetary Reform in the States. In Jay M. Shafritz and Albert C. Hyde, (Eds.). *Classics of Public Administration* (pp. 33 - 36). New York: Harcourt Brace.

Wilson, Woodrow. (1887). The Study of Administration. In Jay M. Shafritz and Albert C. Hyde, (Eds.). *Classics of Public Administration, 4th edition* (pp. 14 – 26). New York: Harcourt Brace.

Withey, Lynne E. (1976). Catharine Macaulay and the Uses of History: Ancient Rights, Perfectionism, and Propaganda. *The Journal of British Studies*, 16, 1, pp. 59 – 83.

Wolin, Sheldon. (1960). *Politics and Vision: Continuity and Innovation in Western Political Thought*. Boston: Little, Brown & Co.

Wollstonecraft, Mary. (1790). *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman*. London: Dent.

Wood, Gordon S. (1991). *The Radicalism of the American Revolution*. New York: Random House.