

2005

## A Biographical Sketch of William Edward Hearn (1826-1888): A Slightly 'Irish' Perspective

Gregory C G Moore

University of Notre Dame Australia, greg.moore@nd.edu.au

Follow this and additional works at: [https://researchonline.nd.edu.au/bus\\_conference](https://researchonline.nd.edu.au/bus_conference)



This conference paper was originally published as:

Moore, G. C. (2005). A Biographical Sketch of William Edward Hearn (1826-1888): A Slightly 'Irish' Perspective. *34th Annual Conference of Economists*. <http://doi.org/10.1080/09672560903114883>  
<http://doi.org/10.1080/09672560903114883>

This conference paper is posted on ResearchOnline@ND at [https://researchonline.nd.edu.au/bus\\_conference/16](https://researchonline.nd.edu.au/bus_conference/16). For more information, please contact [researchonline@nd.edu.au](mailto:researchonline@nd.edu.au).



**A Biographical Sketch of William Edward Hearn (1826-1888):  
A Slightly ‘Irish’ Perspective.<sup>1</sup>**

**1. Introduction.**

William Edward Hearn was the first Australian economist of international note. His major publication in the discipline of economics, *Plutology* (1863), was praised by most of the leading economists of the late-Victorian period, including William Stanley Jevons, Alfred Marshall and Francis Ysidro Edgeworth. Hearn’s economic ideas (and to a lesser extent his life) have subsequently been the subject of more books, monographs and essays than those of any other Australian economist.<sup>2</sup>The scholarship contained in these publications is, to say the least, breathtaking. Unfortunately, however, nearly all of the authors of these publications have been pre-occupied with that part of Hearn’s career that transpired after he had migrated from Ireland to Australia in 1854-5. Indeed, with the exception of a paper published by professors T. Boylan and F. Foley (1990) in a relatively obscure ‘conference proceedings’ and a slim, but scholarly, paper by the late professor B. Gordon (1966) devoted to one of Hearn’s early pamphlets, Hearn’s early years in Ireland have not been examined at any length. The way in which Hearn’s early Irish experiences shaped his economic views has consequently been either overlooked or downplayed. Some historians admittedly have argued that Hearn arrived in Australia fully formed as an intellectual and, further, that the Australian environment had little influence on his economic ideas (Copland 1935; La Nauze 1949), but strangely they do not analyse the way in which this earlier, pre-Australian, environment shaped his world-view.

In this biographical sketch I build upon the research undertaken by Boylan and Foley (1990) to present Hearn as an Irish scholar, and more importantly an Anglo-Irish scholar, who formed his world-view within the strong cultural institutions of the

---

<sup>1</sup> I am grateful to John King, Robert Dixon and Mark Donoghue for reading drafts of this paper.

<sup>2</sup> The most prominent of these studies are D. B. Copland’s slim volume *W. E. Hearn. First Australian Economist* (1935); J. A. La Nauze’s essay on Hearn within his influential book *Political Economy in Australia. Historical Studies* (1949); La Nauze’s well crafted entry on Hearn for the *Australian Dictionary of Biography* (1972); as well as the sections devoted to Hearn in P. Groenewegen and B. McFarlane’s study *A History of Australian Economic Thought* (1992). To these influential texts may be added the many other worthy publications that are devoted to particular aspects of Hearn’s life and work (see Scott 1936; La Nauze 1941, 1965; Blainey 1957; Goodwin 1964, 1966; Gordon 1967; Foster 1971; Campbell 1977; Boylan and Foley 1990; and White 1987).

Protestant Ascendancy and during a time of acute economic and social dislocation in Ireland. I do not discount the plausible hypothesis that Hearn's subsequent Australian experiences influenced his economic writings, and, if anything, I provide evidence that this was the case. Instead, I argue that these Australian experiences were secondary to his Irish experiences; that his economic writings cannot be comprehended outside the context of pre-Famine and Famine Ireland; and that Hearn was effectively an Anglo-Irish economist who happened to live a little over half of his life in Australia. The narrative of the biographical sketch takes the traditional chronological form, with the subject's life roughly compartmentalised into its key phases. This structure may be interpreted as the magnified template for a much smaller biographical entry, which will be approximately 2000 words, for the forthcoming *Biographical Dictionary of Australian and New Zealand Economists*. The current paper is, in this context, effectively a marshalling yard for all of the facts and opinions relating to Hearn, so that fellow contributors to this dictionary may scrutinize them. It also, perhaps, serves to indicate to potential readers of this dictionary the volume of research involved in the construction of that most underestimated form of scholarship, the biographical entry bound short by a strict word limit and an authoritarian editor.

## **2. An Anglo-Irish Youth (1826-1847)**

Hearn was the product of the cleric-cum-officer class of the Anglo-Irish Protestant Ascendancy. This heritage placed him in a specific social position within a highly structured society and thereby makes the exercise of tracing a subject's ancestral lineage—which is one of the more tired narrative traditions in biographical introductions—of some importance. Hearn's great grandfather was Archdeacon Daniel Hearn (1693-1766), who was transplanted from Ireland to England in 1713. It is speculated that he had quarrelled with his family in Northumberland, changed his name from Heron to Hearn and come out to Ireland as private chaplain to Lionel Sackville, Marquis of Dorset, Lord Lieutenant of Ireland. He eventually became the Archdeacon of Cashel, a position he held from 1726 to 1766, and sired two sons, one of whom became a clergyman and the other a cavalry officer. The latter, Major Robert Thomas Hearn (1743-92), was Hearn's grandfather and, by two wives in succession, oversaw the extraordinary issue of seven sons and several daughters. All of the sons

took commissions in various regiments except the second, who drowned young, and the sixth, the Reverend William Edward Hearn (1787-1856), who was Hearn's father. The sons who embarked upon military careers (i.e. Hearn's uncles) served king and country during the Napoleonic Wars. One fell at the battle of Abourkir, Egypt, in 1801; another soldiered and died in India; and the others retired as rentiers in various parts of Ireland and England after a lifetime of service. The Reverend William Edward Hearn, by contrast, set out upon a more sedate path, taking a number of rural livings in the northern counties of Ireland. He married Henrietta Alicia Reynolds in 1824 and they quickly produced seven sons and three daughters, the second of whom is the subject of this study.<sup>3</sup>

Hearn was born on either 21 or 22 April 1826 in the town of Belturbet, in the County of Cavan, which is an inland county in the southernmost part of what then constituted the province of Ulster, one of the four provinces that made up Victorian Ireland. Hearn's father held the position of curate at Belturbet at that time and, given that newspaper records show that twins were added to the family in this town a few years later, it is safe to conclude that Hearn lived his very early childhood there (*Newry Commercial Telegraph* Jan 1 1828). The surrounding region, Cavan, is blessed with poor soil and cold, wet weather. Bogs, wastes, forests, small hills and dales define its irregular, windswept landscape. Its saving grace is the beauty of the northward flowing River Erne, on which Belturbet rests, and the celebrated lake of the same name (sitting on the very northern border) into which it runs. Indeed, the county could only be described as economically backward. It then, as now, could not boast any manufacturing of importance and, even though less than a third of the land was under crops at the time of Hearn's youth, the population was chiefly occupied with agriculture. The town of Belturbet itself (with a population of approximately 2000) was one of only four urban centres in the county with more than 1000 citizens. Contemporary descriptions portray the town as "decayed" and Lewis's *Topographical*

---

<sup>3</sup> The lineage of the Hearn family may be partly reconstructed from the liberal amounts of genealogical information relating to the Irish Diaspora now on the web. Reference to the family is also contained in printed publications, such as William T. Hearne's *Brief History and Genealogy of the Hearne Family* (1907 edition and 1912 Addendum) and B. Burke's *Colonial Gentry* (1891 pp 107-8). However, care must be taken when consulting these sources, as they are plagued by misspellings and simple falsehoods, presumably driven in part by the researcher's quest for reputable ancestors. Conflicting dates also result. Thus some sources claim that Archdeacon Hearn arrived in Ireland in 1732, not 1713, and that he died in 1764, not 1766. I have chosen the most plausible date when there is any doubt.

*Dictionary of Ireland* described the town in 1837 (a little over ten years after Hearn's birth) as containing "several neat houses, but the greater number are indifferently built and thatched". Four in every five of the citizens of Cavan were of the Catholic faith, and this partly explains why this county was detached from British Ulster to be integrated into the Irish Free State in 1922. A cavalry regiment, 101 horses strong, was barracked at Belturbet, and this acted as the local force that sought to prevent the various secret societies for which Ireland was then famous—such as the Whiteboys, Ribbonmen and the like—from committing "agricultural outrages".<sup>4</sup>

Hearn's family moved from Belturbet when his father became the curate (later vicar) of Killargue, in the County of Leitrim, and afterwards, the vicar of Kildrumferton, in the County of Cavan. The precise years in which these changes in residence took place have yet to be determined. It is known, however, that Hearn passed most of his boyhood years in Leitrim (*Argus* Apr 28 1888 p 8). This county rests to the east of Cavan and falls within the Province of Connaught, then within the military district of Dublin. Like Cavan, it was economically backward and boasted little manufacturing. The moist climate was unsuitable for grain crops and although the valleys contained some fertile districts, the higher regions were stiff, cold and rocky. Leitrim still has the reputation for being the poorest county in Ireland and is now the centre for the farming of swine. The population was almost entirely Roman Catholic and more than a third of these still spoke only the Gaelic language—a larger proportion than in other Irish county. The extant records, however, do not shed much light on the way in which Hearn was raised over these years. But, given the social history available for similar clerical families who lived in backward agricultural regions, it may be presumed that they lived a plantation existence in which the members of the family led a life entirely separate from the Catholic-Celtic majority who lived around them. They were a sovereign class who looked down upon a poverty-stricken aboriginal population whose backwardness, they believed, was further magnified by the teachings of an ignorant, if not traitorous, priestly class. Indeed, as indicated at the start of this biographical sketch, if anything the extended Hearn family of Protestant clerics, officers and rentiers was more integrated within the Ascendancy

---

<sup>4</sup> For the topography and socio-economic condition of Cavan in Hearn's youth see Lewis (1837); Anonymous (1877) and various websites devoted to the County of Cavan. The conflict over the date of Hearn's birth arises because Hearn's obituary in *The Argus* states 22 April 1826, whereas La Nauze (1972 p 370) states 21 April 1826.

establishment than usual. It is not known how Hearn's father felt about the tradition of collecting tithes from the Catholic population—who had only recently been emancipated from some of the infamous 'disabilities' in 1829—to finance a living that served the small proportion of the populations of Cavan and Leitrim that belonged to the established Church of Ireland.<sup>5</sup>

Hearn received his early elementary lessons at home from his father, who was a product of Trinity College, Dublin. He was then sent to the Royal School (which is now called the Portora Royal School) in the protestant town of Enniskillen, in the County of Fermanagh, which is an inland county to the immediate north of the County of Cavan. Enniskillen took up the entire island in the river-cum-straight that connects the upper and lower sheets of water that constitute Lough Erne. It was more substantial than any town Hearn had lived in up to that point, boasting a brewery, a few tanneries and other manufacturing establishments. It also, of course, holds a conspicuous place in Irish history as the site on which the Protestant townsfolk held in check a superior force of Popish Celts who were advancing under the banner of James II during the Williamite Wars of 1689-90. Hearn would have certainly been weaned on the stories about the martial prowess of the Enniskilleners and positively revelled in the way in which its town folk sortied south in 1690 to capture and fortify Hearn's birth-town of Belturbet, which had earlier been occupied by James II's men. Indeed, the Royal School, like Enniskillen itself, was a bastion of the Protestant Ascendancy. It received a Royal Charter in 1608, began operations in 1618, moved to Enniskillen in 1643, and relocated to Portora Hill overlooking the town in 1777. In the late-1830s the school contained about 90 children. It had a high reputation amongst the limited number of high quality Irish public schools and, being relatively cheap, served the offspring of the less well-off Church of Ireland clergymen and other Protestant professional men who wished to groom their children for Trinity College, Dublin. Although its claim of being the Eton of Ireland is somewhat exaggerated, the students

---

<sup>5</sup> This gave rise to the Tithe Wars. The clergy collected the 'shillings, pence and farthings' themselves or employed collectors. The collectors were often murdered and the police protecting them fired upon. Some clergymen were consequently impoverished from an inability to extract their dues. The position had become so dire by 1832 that the British government collected the tithes on behalf of the clergy using cavalry, infantry and artillery. In 1838 this religious tax was reduced by 25% and reworked as a charge on the landlords, who, as any economist would have predicted, simply transferred the charge on to the Catholic cottiers via higher rents (Cornish 1910 pp 142ff). See Le Fanu (1896) and McCormack (1980) for vivid descriptions of the occasional violence experienced by the Protestant clergy in the backward agricultural districts of Ireland during this period.

received a sound grounding in classics and a number of scholarships were provided for those who matriculated to attend Trinity College. Famous pupils of the school include Henry Francis Lyte (the author of the hymn ‘Abide With Me’), Oscar Wilde and Samuel Beckett. Hearn himself, by all accounts, had a distinguished academic career at Royal School and was well groomed for a career as a classicist.<sup>6</sup>

Hearn entered Trinity College, Dublin, in 1842. This institution, which is the only College of the University of Dublin and will hereafter be referred to by its more customary title of TCD, was the educational and spiritual home of the Protestant Ascendency. Catholics were first admitted as undergraduates in 1793, but, until the Fawcett Act of 1873, only members of the established Church could hold fellowships and foundation scholarships. Many potential undergraduates of the Catholic faith boycotted the institution during Hearn’s time on the grounds that it was an “institution that tempted Catholic students to apostasy by reserving its prizes for apostates” (Duffy 1883 p 8). As late as 1970, Catholics could be excommunicated for attending TCD unless they received a special dispensation. In Hearn’s day students embarked upon a compulsory curriculum in classics, philosophy and mathematical physics over a four-year period, after which successful candidates were awarded a pass degree in Bachelor of Arts. This curriculum was far more liberal than those offered at Victorian Cambridge and Oxford, in which students narrowed their efforts to succeed in mathematical physics and classics respectively. The students at TCD could, however, specialise to some extent by reading for honours exams if they had performed well in the pass examinations. Honours examinations were offered in classics, mathematics and ethics and logic. Students who did particularly well in the honours exams were called moderators—a term that is specific to TCD and derived from the time when a successful candidate was asked to be a moderator of less brilliant students. The

---

<sup>6</sup> The secondary references about Portora often contain errors. Since it received its charter, opened, moved to Enniskillen and then to Portora Hill on different dates, very nearly every author provides a different date of its conception. It consequently has the honour of being launched by James I, Charles I and Charles II, depending on which text is consulted. The information relating to Hearn’s career at this school is also limited. The Portora tradition of new students signing their names in the “signing-in book”, as well as the various Honours Boards and detailed records, unfortunately date from 1857, when the reverend William Steele took up the position of headmaster and made the school of some renown. It is, for this reason, not possible to provide the precise dates Hearn was enrolled at this school or the prizes that he won. For details about the school (and Enniskillen) see Lewis (1837); Trimble (c1916); Stuart (1937); Quane (1968). Limited information may also be found in biographies of its Alma Mater, such as Hyde (1976) and Bair (1990 [1978]). I would like to thank T. Thirgood, a master at Portora, for providing me with various details about the school, as well as photocopies of scarce locally produced histories of the school.

moderators were divided into two grades: senior (and thereby given a gold medal) and junior (and thereby given a silver medal). To prevent grade inflation only 2.5% of the class could be awarded the senior grade and 5% of the class could be awarded the junior grade. Hearn received his Bachelor of Arts in 1847 and earned the impressive double of first senior moderator in classics and first junior moderator in logic and ethics. It is noteworthy, however, that he failed to win honours in mathematics, which was crucial at this time for winning a fellowship at TCD.<sup>7</sup>

Hearn wedded Rose Le Fanu in 1847, the year in which he graduated, and thereby married into an establishment family even more illustrious than his own. Rose was the daughter of Reverend William J. J. Le Fanu, who was the rector of St Paul's, Dublin, and a descendant of an old and ennobled Irish-Huguenot line. This family sprung from the stock of Sheridans (the authoress Alicia Le Fanu was the favourite sister of Richard Brinsley Sheridan) and had produced a number of literary figures over the decades. The most famous of these was Hearn's near contemporary, Joseph Sheridan Le Fanu (1814-1873), who gained lasting fame for *Uncle Silas* (1864) and *In a Glass Darkly* (1872), and was a best-selling writer in the 1860s and 1870s. After a period of neglect, he was resurrected in the 1920s by H. R. James as one of the greatest ghost-cum-horror writers to put pen to paper. The nobility and fame of this extended family was sufficient for Hearn and his wife to choose "Le Fanu" as a middle name for their son, William Edward Le Fanu Hearn, who was born on 29 June 1854. This son eventually became a surgeon at Hamilton in Victoria and was, in turn, sufficiently proud of his heritage to submit a detailed (if not slightly pretentious) lineage of his family—complete with arms, crest and motto—to Burke's *Colonial Gentry* (1891 pp 07-8). The issue of family alliances, which often created a hermetically sealed social circle for family members, was certainly important to the Anglo-Irish establishment and would have been carefully dwelt upon prior to the Hearn-Le Fanu union (see McCormack 1980 and Howes 1992).<sup>8</sup> It is interesting to note that the father of the

---

<sup>7</sup> There are numerous institutional histories and catalogues relating to TCD. See Mahaffy et. al. (1892); Dixon (1902); Burtchaell and Sadlier (1924); Maxwell (1946); and especially McDowell and Webb (1982). It also should be noted that there is a slim possibility that Hearn embarked upon his university studies from home under the guidance of his father, as TCD was then unique amongst British Universities for allowing students (under what was called the country-list system) to sit the periodic exams held at TCD without attending lectures or even residing in Dublin (see McCormack 1980 p 42).

<sup>8</sup> The nature of these family alliances also explains why Hearn chose Le Fanu as a middle name for his son. As McCormack (1980 p 1) relates: "The comparatively closed ranks of the professional grades among the Anglo-Irish were perpetuated in intermarriage. The Le Fanus were related to the Sheridans

heroine in Le Fanu's *Uncle Silas* extorts his daughter to remember that, when choosing a suitor, the character and influence of an ancient family is "sacred but destructible" and woe to him who "either destroys or suffers it to perish".

Hearn was, in short, a member of an extended Anglo-Irish family of soldiers, professionals and TCD men that mirrored (or perhaps was a poor reflection of) the inter-bred English families that constituted Noel Annan's "intellectual aristocracy". Such families formed a tight-knit social clique that, by drawing in the best and brightest from those individuals who passed through their orbit, created intellectual dynasties that lasted for several generations. Terry Eagleton (1999), who was the first to transcribe Annan's thesis from Bloomsbury and Cambridge to the over-grown market town of Dublin and TCD, centred his (limited, but eye-opening) study on the Anglo-Irish cabal that wrote for the *Dublin University Magazine*. Eagleton does not mention the Hearn family, which has previously not been viewed as an inter-bred whole. The evidence is nonetheless compelling. The son of one of Hearn's cousins was Lafcadio Hearn, the eccentric scholar of Japanese culture; another of his cousins, Richard Hearn, was a Barbizon painter and intimate of Jean Francois Millet; his aunt was the kinswoman of Edmond Holmes, a minor poet, and Rice Holmes, the author of military histories; and, as already mentioned, Hearn became related through marriage to the great J. Sheridan Le Fanu and his multitude of artistic kith and kin. It also must be emphasised that one or two members of these Anglo-Irish families (like their English counterparts) transformed themselves from what Antonio Gramsci called traditional intellectuals—in which the agent searches for transcendent values through disinterested inquiry—to organic intellectuals—in which the agent employs knowledge as a practical emancipatory force (i.e. for Gaelic nationalism). Many of them certainly slummed it with Charles Grant Duffy (with whom Hearn later worked in Melbourne) and the other Young Irelanders who were bent on the Repeal of the Union. Hearn himself, however, could not in any way be described as an organic intellectual. As will be shown in the sections that follow, he was an Anglo-centric ('traditional') scholar from the establishment who employed scientific tools to show that English culture institutions and ideas (including political economy) were

---

by three alliances, to the Knowles by two, to the Dobbins by two, and the Bennetts by two. Furthermore they retained surnames as Christian names, and perpetuated favourite names through four or more generations". The extended Le Fanu family is described in Le Fanu (1925), which is itself based on the extensive unpublished research undertaken by Rose Hearn's brother, W. J. H. Le Fanu.

applicable to Ireland (and later to Australia). He wished to reform rather than overthrow the society within which he was raised. Hearn was effectively a Victorian Englishman who happened to be raised in Ireland and thereby happened to witness first hand some of the greatest tragedies that transpired in that country. It was these tragic events that induced him to turn to political economy.

### **3. The Origins of Hearn's Interest in Political Economy (1842-1851).**

It was while at Trinity College, Dublin, that Hearn (and his contemporaries) became interested in political economy. This must be in part attributed to the state of the economy. The 1820s and 1830s was a time of permanent economic distress in Ireland. The cottier farmers possessed little capital and employed extremely crude agricultural techniques compared to their English counterparts; they refused to undertake any entrepreneurial risk whatsoever and confined themselves predominantly to planting potato crops on small land plots that were not economically viable; and the food reserves in the agricultural districts, which were hopelessly over-populated, were insufficient for any margin of error in any given season. Periodic famines consequently took place in a number of districts over these decades and, indeed, the period from when the cottiers exhausted their stores to when they dug up their new crop was known as the “starving season” (approximately April to August). This economic malaise was then transformed into a national calamity when the potato blight of 1845-8 caused the Great Famine and mass emigration. The scope of the famine was only obvious in retrospect (as reflected in the bets placed on the corn exchanges). No one foresaw that the blight, which was a fungus that rotted the potatoes in the clamps, would reside in the soil for four years due to a series of wet summers. It may therefore be argued that, in the same way that American (and Australian) undergraduates of the 1930s turned to economics after witnessing the unexpected tragedy that was the Great Depression, Hearn and his Anglo-Irish contemporaries became pre-occupied with political economy after witnessing this shocking distress in the agricultural districts. They were bewildered as to why Ireland continued to be economically backward compared to England for two decades and, graduating in “Back 1847”, they could not escape observing (or at least hearing about) the Belsen-like body heaps and the usual barbarities that accompany this way of perishing. The incomes of their parents—whether they were landlords, clerics or

professional men—would have certainly been diminished due to the associated economic dislocation. All and sundry expected a Catholic-Celt insurrection.

It is not surprising, then, that Hearn's junior freshman class of 1842-3 produced one of the finest sets of economists in the history of this discipline. It included John Elliot Cairnes, T. E. Cliffe Leslie, Richard Hussey Walsh and, of course, Hearn himself. Cairnes later gained fame through the publication of *Slave Power* (1862), *Some Leading Principles* (1874) and *Character and Logical Method* (1857, 1875); Leslie, now seen as a minor figure, gained contemporary accolades for *Land Systems* (1870) and *Essays in Political Economy* (1879); Walsh, virtually forgotten today, wrote *Elementary Treatise on Metallic Currency* (1853); and Hearn published *Plutology* (1863). They were men who were patently above the common ruck. It is, moreover, highly likely that these undergraduates became acquainted with John Kells Ingram, who is chiefly remembered for the highly successful *History of Political Economy* (1888), and who had entered Trinity a few years earlier in 1837, graduated in 1843, and gained a fellowship in 1846. These five scholars were roughly of the same age in 1843—Ingram was 20, Leslie was 16, Cairnes was 20, Walsh was 18 and Hearn was 17—and although there is no explicit extant evidence to show that they were especially intimate during their undergraduate days, it is unlikely that they were not aware of each other in the small community that constituted TCD at this time. They certainly corresponded with each other later in life and, more importantly, afterwards paraded the sort of intense friendships and enmities that can only be conceived through early personal (and competitive) contact. The mutual goodwill between Ingram and Leslie, for example, is manifest from their correspondence, while the ferocious dislike Cairnes and Leslie displayed for one another in both private and public is simply breathtaking. These relationships, which already have been made a subject of study (Moore 2001), become important when striving to comprehend the initial reception of Hearn's *Plutology* in the 1860s (a subject analysed more fully in later sections of this paper). Cairnes, for one, had nothing but contempt for Hearn and did everything in his power to prevent *Plutology* from gaining an audience.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> This paragraph draws heavily on Moore (2001). See also Boylan and Foley (1992, 2000). For more detailed appraisals of each individual see Moore (1995, 1999, 2000, 2002). Also note that there is a slim possibility that one or two of these young men kept irregular terms at TCD due to the aforementioned country-list system, in which a student who was short of funds could study from home in preparation for the periodic exams. All indirect evidence, however, suggests that these individuals

The question arises as to what were the main doctrinal influences on this set. Hearn and his freshman class would have almost certainly been exposed to the heretical ideas disseminated from the Whately Chair of Political Economy at Trinity College, Dublin. Reverend Richard Whately, the Archdeacon of Dublin and one time holder of the Drummond Chair of Political Economy at Oxford, donated £100 for the endowment of a chair in political economy at TCD in 1831. The tenure of the office was restricted to five years and each incumbent was required to publish at least one of his lectures. The early holders of the chair included Mountifort Longfield (1832-6), Isaac Butt (1836-41), James Anthony Lawson (1841-1845), and William Neilson Hancock (1846-1851). Ever since the path breaking work of Professor R. D. C. Black (1945, 1947a, 1947b), these early Whately professors have been interpreted as constituting a (near) doctrinal school, sometimes referred to as the Dublin School, in which subjectivist or demand-side theories of value were championed over labour or cost-of-production theories of value. This received view is usually supported by the recovery of a proto-marginal utility theory of market value via careful readings of Longfield's *Lectures on Political Economy* (1834) and by tracing the way in which this initial intellectual standpoint influenced each successive holder of the chair. Although this gives a rather one-dimensional view of a rich and complex set of publications, it is not completely misleading. It is certainly true that Longfield was held in high esteem at TCD and that his published lectures were still being prescribed to students as late as 1872. The lectures of Butt, Lawson and Hancock also patently contain passages that resemble a subjectivist theory of value of sorts. In any event, according to the rules of the day, the Freshman class of 1842-3, keen to tackle the problems of Ireland, could have listened to Lawson's lectures as undergraduates (after gaining permission from their tutor) and to Hancock's lectures as graduates (free of charge). If they did not attend (and the limited extant archives do not signal with certainty that they did), they would have had access to the published lectures.

It cannot, for all this, be argued that the subjectivist doctrines of the Dublin School had a defining influence on the body of knowledge eventually articulated by Hearn's generation. The TCD men who graduated in the 1840s were, if anything, defined by

---

became acquainted with one another before graduation. See the *Ingram Papers* and the *Cairnes Papers* for their correspondence.

the strikingly different doctrinal positions they adopted later in life. Cairnes became the great defender of the “Ricardian” labour theory of value and the associated deductive method; Leslie rejected the Ricardian system out of hand and called for a complete reshaping of political economy through the inductive construction of historicist laws of stadial development; Ingram, to some extent in alignment with Leslie, called for the construction of historicist laws of development within a Comtean sociological framework; while Walsh wrote too little, and even then confined himself largely to monetary theory, to be categorised in any way. Hearn is, as we shall see shortly via an analysis of *Plutology*, the only one of this set who could conceivably be supposed to have articulated a demand-oriented theory of value. His central objective eventually became to analyse the way in which “wants” could be satisfied through the more efficient organisation of the “industrial aids” available in a world defined by scarcity. Hearn, however, read so widely and drew from so many sources (especially French sources) that to argue that he was set on this intellectual path by the subjectivist teachings of the Dublin School is to draw a somewhat long bow. There is simply no explicit piece of evidence supporting this (albeit plausible) link. It *can*, however, be argued that the early Whately professors had a much more subtle (but equally important) influence on the TCD men of the 1840s and on Hearn in particular. They, like the undergraduates of the time, were preoccupied by the calamitous state of the Irish economy and provided the institutional environment in which Hearn’s and his contemporaries could air their views on these (and allied) subjects. The lack of respect shown by the members of the Dublin School for Ricardian orthodoxy also provided an environment that allowed Hearn’s generation to adopt the divergent lines of enquiry upon which they eventually embarked.

The most important single forum in which most of the Whately professors were active members, and in which Hearn’s class had a chance to articulate their first economic ideas, was the Dublin Statistical Society. Hancock and Lawson had, under Whately’s instigation, founded this institution in 1847, at the height of the Famine, to provide solutions to the pressing social and economic problems of Ireland. It changed its name to the Statistical and Social Inquiry of Ireland (its present name) in 1862 when it broke its links with the Royal Dublin Society, of which it was initially an appendage, over the then serious issue of admitting women as associate members (Daly 1997). The even more violent social fissures caused by the political and religious differences

in Ireland during these lean times induced the founders of this society to prohibit such controversial topics from discussion. Indeed, as Boyland and Foley (1990, 1992) have convincingly argued, at a time in which all of Ireland—Orange and Green, Repealers and Unionists, Protestants and Catholics—were drilling in preparation for violence, the Dublin Statistical Society was seen as a vehicle for measured and practical solutions to the economic malaise. Its scientific output was designed to be the inverse of the emotionally charged nationalist literature that appeared in Young Ireland’s best selling organ *The Nation*. The predominant number of authors presenting papers in this forum therefore naturally tended to call for the reform, rather than the overthrow, of the existing socio-economic arrangements in Ireland. They restricted themselves to proposing changes to the land or poor laws, or abolishing some obstacle that prevented free trade. One or two authors, such as Hancock, were more radical in orientation and quick to attribute some of the blame to the inactivity of the Anglo-Irish landlords, but even these authors adopted a relatively mild tone. In short, the nationalist revolution, when it did come in 1848, may have been confined to “a cabbage patch in Tipperary”, and indeed it may have been Young Ireland’s cheap imitation of the uprisings on the Continent in the same year, but the threat of violence over these years was always in the minds of the members of the Dublin Statistical Society. This society was not designed for Gramsci’s ‘organic’ intellectuals.

The ‘traditional’ scholars of this society published their papers in the *Transactions of the Dublin Statistical Society* (1847-1854) and its other manifestations, namely, the *Proceedings of the Social Inquiry of Ireland* (1851-5), *Journal of the Dublin Statistical Society* (1855-63) and *Journal of the Statistical and Social Inquiry Society of Ireland* (1864-). Of the early Whately professors, only Butt did not contribute to these journals. Longfield, Lawson and Hancock published 7, 16 and 92 papers-cum-addresses respectively. Hearn’s generation were also highly active. Leslie delivered and published papers in 1851, 1852, 1853, and 1855; Cairnes in 1854 (twice), 1856 and 1859; and Walsh in 1851, 1855, 1856 (four times) and 1858. Walsh was actually honorary secretary of the society from 1851 to 1856 (Carlyle 1917). Ingram, although active in this forum from its very beginning, did not publish papers until the 1860s

(five).<sup>10</sup> Hearn himself presented two papers before this Society, both of which reflected his belief in the existing socio-economic system and the need for, at most, minor changes in the legal framework that governed this system. The first paper, entitled “On the Coincidence of General and Individual and General Interests”, was delivered on May 20 1850, but it was unfortunately not published in the *Transactions* (see Boylan and Foley 1990). From newspaper reports, however, it is evident that Hearn’s main argument was the Smithian notion that individuals, by pursuing their own selfish interests, invariably serve the community’s interests. He stressed, rather contentiously given the calamitous events of the previous years, that even the corn dealer’s interests coincided with the people’s interests. These extreme Panglossian views are intimately connected to the religious beliefs that Hearn articulated in the early 1850s and are considered in greater detail in the next section. The second paper, entitled *On Cottier Rents*, was published in the *Transactions* in April 1851 as well as in pamphlet form, and, since it possesses merit and anticipates a number of the theoretical innovations articulated later in *Plutology*, it needs to be analysed at length.

In this paper Hearn developed an economic model to determine the value of cottier rents and thereby to explain why Irish cottiers lived in poverty. The model has already been the subject of detailed study by Barry Gordon (1967), who correctly argues that it amounts to half-blind stumble towards a neoclassical position in which all factor incomes are set simultaneously through the adjustment in demand at the margin. Hearn’s main contention is that the rental charge for land tends to equal the difference between the productiveness of the land and the productiveness of the ordinary application of capital in other industries. This is because if it were lower, agents on the fringes of agriculture would seek leases to gain a higher profit from cultivating the land compared to the profit earned in other industries, and if it were higher, the incumbent agents would seek to give up leases to avoid the lower profit from cultivating the land compared to the profit earned in other industries. The demand for land will, in short, adjust until the return derived from employing capital to cultivate

---

<sup>10</sup> Not all of these papers related to the condition of Ireland. As the 1850s progressed, contemporary events such as the discovery of gold in Australia and the Crimean War induced some of Hearn’s generation, most notably Cairnes, to tackle topical issues such as the effects of war and the influx of precious metals on prices. The existing economic state of Ireland was still, however, a priority for most contributors to the Dublin Statistical Society. It also should be noted that it was not until 1851 that the number of people requesting poor relief receded to pre-famine years.

land is equal to the ordinary rate of return from employing capital elsewhere.<sup>11</sup> Hearn then relaxes the assumption that there are indeed outlets for the employment of capital beyond the cultivation of land. In this situation, which obviously mirrors the state of Victorian Ireland, the upper value of rents will not be limited by the ordinary rate of profit, but by the ordinary wage rate. In other words, Irish-cottier or subsistence farming emerges. Hearn next explains that the wage rate in Ireland is particularly low, and hence the cottiers' rents are particularly crushing, because of a vicious circle in which a glut in the labour markets (and therefore low wages) afford no opportunity for the rise of manufacturing outlets, while the failure of the rise of manufacturing outlets affords no opportunity to eliminate the glut in the labour markets (and therefore increase wages). Hearn's solution to this economic problem was, like that of many papers read before Dublin Statistical Society, mild legal reform within the existing socio-economic structure. He proposed that the land under cultivation in Ireland should be expanded. No doubt recalling the idle forests, boggy wastes and rocky outcrops from his childhood in the poverty-stricken counties of Cavan and Leitrim, Hearn argued that four million acres of idle land could be brought under cultivation if the restrictions on land title transfers under the then semi-feudal land laws were removed. Hearn was proposing the more intense cultivation of the land via a slow and legal de-feudalising of Ireland.<sup>12</sup>

In the same year in which Hearn published his paper on cottier rents, he also won the Cassell Prize Essay. This prize, offered by the publisher Cassell for a disquisition on the social and economic condition of Ireland, brought in the handsome sum of 200 guineas. Again reflecting the influence of the early Whately professors, one of the adjudicators was Hancock and the ultimate umpire was Longfield. Hearn's essay was

---

<sup>11</sup> This insight does not, of course, necessarily refute the Ricardian notion that rental charges on more fertile land will rise as, through time, less fertile land is brought into use. It merely contends that the rental charge for any given plot of land cannot rise beyond what is governed by the laws of demand and supply, since there is a field elsewhere for the employment of capital. It does imply, however, that rental charges on more fertile lands will only rise indefinitely (and hence rent as proportion of total income will only rise in the Ricardian fashion) if agents are forced to demand more infertile land due to the inadequate outlets for capital (and labour) elsewhere (see Gordon 1967 on this point).

<sup>12</sup> Hearn rejected the other solutions that were being advocated around this time. The obvious solution of government sponsored non-agricultural industries as an alternative channel for capital and labour was not in alignment with his laissez-faire belief in the natural evolution of industry within a market economy. The possibility of transforming the cottiers into peasant proprietors (which was Leslie and Mill's ultimate solution in the 1860s) was ruled out on the grounds that his iron rule of rent determination holds no matter whether the farmer is a cottier or proprietor. The then widely accepted view (by McCulloch and Senior) that the demand for land should be reduced via emigration was dismissed as impractical without sufficient explanation.

published as *The Cassell Prize Essay on the Condition of Ireland* (1851). Although this monograph does not have the same analytical merit as *On Cottiers* and therefore does not deserve the same attention, it beggars belief that Professor J. A. La Nauze, the individual who has invested more time and effort into studying Hearn's work than any other scholar, would dismiss it without further comment as having "nothing in it to attract attention" (1949 p 49). Hearn's *Condition of Ireland* is important simply because it once again reinforces the way in which the "Irish problem" moulded his (and his generation's) vision of political economy. In any event, as in the case of *On Cottier Rents*, this publication was defined by both a strong belief in market forces once the appropriate legal framework was in place and a complete distrust of government intervention. Hearn attributed the backward state of Ireland to the years of ruinous commercial policies of the government: "In short, the whole commercial history of Ireland presents a picture of ruinous intermeddling, such bounties and such restrictions, such monopolies given against the country abroad, and such a crushing of private enterprise at home, that it seems almost miraculous how any description of trade at all survived" (1851 p 13). The suppression of the wool trade, Catholic disabilities and other past wrongs had forced the population on to the land as cottier farmers, an occupation made further stagnant because of the feudal land laws that prevented appropriate title transfer. If this narrative of woes is linked to the more analytical model presented in *On Cottier Rents*, it is clear that Hearn is providing further explanations as to why there were few non-agricultural outlets for capital and labour and thereby why subsistence cottier farming under crushing rents was the norm. Given this history of government error, he concluded that the correct role of government was to preserve order, protect the national borders and, above all else, enforce contracts within a suitable legal system. This would "leave the powerful motive of individual interest to determine what those arrangements may be which best suit the circumstances and disposition of each" (1851 p 13).

It is evident from this brief analysis of *On Cottier Rents* and *Condition of Ireland* that Hearn sought to solve Ireland's economic (and social) problems by altering the legal system, especially in relation to land, to allow a modern market economy to evolve over time. In other words, Ireland's economy was to be placed on a convergence path to England's more advanced economic state without any direct government interference. Hearn was not alone amongst the 'traditional' scholars of the Dublin

Statistical Society who placed their faith in tweaking the legal framework. This should not be surprising. As has already been mentioned briefly by Black (1947 p 73), nearly all of the Whately professors were lawyers by training, if not by profession, so that their attention was often devoted to problems that had a legal aspect. The same could be said about the TCD class of 1842-3. They viewed a career in law as a fallback option in case an academic position did not become available, or if one did become available, to supplement the rather poor stipends attached to these positions. The study involved was not demanding and could be undertaken in a part-time, haphazard manner. Hearn himself studied law in the late 1840s under Longfield, who had resigned from Whately Chair in 1834, before the five-year tenure was up, to become the TCD regius professor of Feudal and English law. Hearn then proceeded to King's Inn, Dublin and Lincoln's Inn, London, and was called to the Irish bar in 1853. Leslie similarly became a law student at Lincoln's Inn, London, and reported that his approach to political economy was a direct product of the lectures delivered by Henry Maine there (Ingram 1888 pp ix-x). It is also believed that Ingram enrolled to study law at TCD after graduating in case he was unsuccessful in obtaining a Queen's Letter dispensing with the Fellow's obligation to take Holy Orders (Lyster 1909 p 6). Walsh also admitted himself as a student at Lincoln's Inn, but soon abandoned these studies (Carlyle 1917). The role played by law (and, of course, lawyers) in shaping Victorian political economy—which has been overshadowed by the extensive research programme devoted to analysing the influence of mathematical physics on political economy—deserves further attention from historians of thought.

##### **5. Professor of Greek at Galway (1849-1854).**

Hearn wrote these papers on political economy while he was performing his duties as foundation professor of Greek at Queen's College, Galway. Hearn had gained this position in 1849 and held it until 1854. The "Godless" Queen's Colleges of Galway, Belfast and Cork, which were formed by Peel's Irish Colleges Act of 1845, constituted a single university and had opened in 1849. The colleges were designed to cater for the members of the Catholic middle class who refused to send their children to TCD. However, due to their non-sectarian statutes, the Catholic hierarchy deemed them to be dangerous to the faith and morals of the Catholic youth. The Galway arm of this institution, which consisted of a quadrangular structure in the Tudor-Gothic

style, was further handicapped by the fact that the surrounding region was effectively de-populated and impoverished during the famine years. Hearn's chair, like all of the Queen's College chairs, was lowly paid and, unlike the chairs offered by today's universities, was seen as a part-time position in which the incumbent could either pursue other occupations, such as law or journalism, or supplement a private inheritance. The lowly-paid professorial positions in Ireland were nonetheless both scarce and sought after, as they offered prestige and a base salary upon which to build an income that befitted one's station. There were some 580 applications (some say 1600) for the 60 foundation chairs and 6 administrative posts within the Queen's Colleges (Moody and Beckett 1959 p 62). Indeed, one can easily imagine the mad, competitive scramble amongst Hearn's generation for the limited posts then available. Ingram held various professorial and administrative posts at TCD (and became an examiner for the Whately Chair); Walsh held the Whately Chair himself from 1851 to 1856 before relocating to Mauritius to become an inspector of schools and to meet an early death in 1862<sup>13</sup>; Cairnes succeeded Walsh as holder of the Whately Chair from 1856 to 1861 and then held the chair of Jurisprudence and Political Economy at Queen's College, Galway, from 1859 to 1870 (i.e. after Hearn had departed); and Leslie held the chair of Jurisprudence and Political Economy at Queens College, Belfast, from 1853 to his death in 1882 (while residing most of the year in London).

Queen's College, Galway, struggled in the first years of its establishment to attract a sufficient number of students. The aforementioned combination of Catholic opposition and the famine effectively hampered its progress until at least the early twentieth century. The foundation professors nonetheless created a lively scholarly environment. As revealed by Boylan and Foley (1990), the research activities of the Galway scholars, including their inaugural addresses, were reported in the local press, especially in the *Galway Vindicator*. The main forum in which they presented this research was the Royal Galway Institution, which was a literary, scientific and philosophical body established by the Amicable Society of Galway in 1791. The research presented in this forum again reflected the preoccupation of scholars with

---

<sup>13</sup> Walsh's brilliant prospects were handicapped by his religion. He was senior moderator in mathematics in 1847 and won the John Law mathematics prize in the following year, but as a Roman Catholic he was precluded from competing for a TCD fellowship. His mentors obviously assisted him to get other posts, including a Barrington lectureship and the (non-fellowship) Whately Chair in 1851, but he was eventually forced to find work in Mauritius (Carlyle 1917).

Ireland's economic malaise and the belief that political economy (and law) could provide remedies. This explains the strange situation of Thomas William Moffat and Hearn, holding the chairs of "Logic and Metaphysics" and "Greek" respectively, joining Dennis Caufield Heron, who actually held the Galway chair in Jurisprudence and Political Economy, in animated discussion on socio-economic issues at the Royal Galway Institution. It was on March 1850, for example, that Hearn test rant the earlier mentioned paper that he later delivered (and failed to get published) at the Dublin Statistical Society—namely, "On the Coincidence of Individual and General Interests". In fact, it is only because this paper was printed in full in the *Galway Vindicator* that we have a record of its contents. Hearn delivered another paper entitled "Legal Impediments to Agricultural Improvements" in April 1851, but unfortunately this was not reported in the press. A third paper, entitled "Evidence of Design in the Universe" and delivered in May 1853, was reported at length in the *Galway Vindicator*. It is obviously the basis of a more ambitious monograph, of some 247 pages (bound in black morocco) entitled *Essays on Natural Religion*, which from internal evidence can be dated as having been written in 1853-4 (see La Nauze 1965).

Most of these Galway publications, or at least those passages of which we have a record, may be interpreted as Hearn's effort to show, partly through the aid of political economy, that earthly events demonstrate the existence of a just and merciful God. At a time in which the country was ravaged by famine, pestilence and outrages of every description, it is understandable why Hearn—conservatively minded and a deeply religious son of a cleric—would strive to provide such a proof. His central argument, which is known in theological circles as an "Argument by Design", is that every aspect of nature is proof of an intelligent creator and that no scientific discovery—including evolutionary theory, which was at this stage Lamarckian in character—can possibly interfere with this proof. In relation to political economy, he argued that it demonstrated that individuals, pursuing their interests, spontaneously create a "natural" and harmonious social order in which the interests of the collective body are served. This Panglossian outcome, he argued, provides proof that God is a wise "disposer of human affairs, by whose fiat the chaos of human actions...assumes a magnificent yet simple system" (*Galway Vindicator*, 6 March 1850, quoted in Boylan and Foley 1990 p 11). Even the evils of the 1840s are presented as events that man caused (via government mismanagement) and hence as events that man can cure.

As La Nauze states, such a position can be described as “Paley plus the Industrial Revolution plus the science of the first half of the nineteenth century” (La Nauze 1965 p 120). One can easily understand the way in which this religious philosophy permitted Hearn to integrate Darwin’s *Origin of Species* (1859) into his vision of political economy a little over a half a decade later (especially in *Plutology*) without suffering the intellectual crisis that most of his contemporaries experienced.

It is safe to speculate that Hearn quickly came around to the view that Queen’s College, Galway, was a base from which to build a career elsewhere. He was delivering papers before the Dublin Statistical Society and reading law in both Dublin and London, while carefully noting that students had failed to materialise in adequate numbers at Galway. It is nonetheless clear that Hearn’s Galway years were highly productive and many of the ideas he later expressed were articulated in one way or another during this period. Hearn also formed some deep friendships during his tenure at this institution. This is conveyed in a letter from Moffat (by then president of Queen’s College, Galway) to Hearn in 1887, in which Moffat updated Hearn on the comings and goings of the Galway scholars of the 1850s. He related that many of their mutual friends had recently died, including Heron, who dropped dead while fishing in Galway; how another associate had resigned a few years back without leaving behind him single friend in Galway; and so on. Moffat also conveyed the sad fact that “The Royal Galway Institution exists, but it is not too active in the way of Lectures as in the old times. I delivered two lectures (On Oratory) in the course of the last fifteen years” (*Hearn Correspondence*, 25 August 1887). This last comment indicates that the lively intellectual activity that defined the early days of Queen’s College, Galway, declined after Hearn left this institution.

## **6. Migration and Political Economy at the University of Melbourne (1854-1878)**

Hearn was recruited in 1854 as one of the four foundation professors of the newly established University of Melbourne in the Colony of Victoria. He accepted the chair of Modern History and Literature, Political Economy and Logic—the very title of which reflected Hearn’s wide-ranging interests, if not expertise. The London-based committee that was made responsible for selecting the four professors included the famous astronomers Sir John Herschel and George B. Airy; the classicist Henry

Malden, who was then Professor of Greek at University College, London; the chief justice of Victoria, Sir William a'Beckett, who was then visiting London; and the semi-blind albino M.P., Robert Lowe, who was known for his classical scholarship and rigid attachment to a vulgar kind of laissez-faire political economy. Lowe was no doubt added to the committee because of his recent colonial experience as a politician-cum-landowner in Sydney, where, partly because of his imperious manner, he gained fame "as the most hated man in NSW". He was a fortunate inclusion for Hearn, as he would have approved of the laissez-faire views expressed in Hearn's publications to that date. Indeed, it was Lowe who later took to task Hearn's fellow TCD economist-cum-sociologist, Ingram, for daring to propose Comtean historicism as a possible replacement for what then stood for orthodox political economy (see Moore 1996). In any event, three of the four foundation professors hailed from the Queen's Colleges and paraded degrees from TCD. They were attracted to Melbourne by the offer of £1000 annual salaries and free housing on campus, which was an attractive package compared to the £200-250 salary that they received from their Irish institutions. They were also, of course, leaving a moribund economy, further reduced by famine and sectarian disputes, for a rapidly growing economy, financed by Ballarat and Bendigo gold. In this sense they were simply a part of the great drain of scholarly talent from Ireland in the 1850s (which is strangely less commented upon compared to the cottier migration). The upper end of town almost became a TCD colony. They certainly dominated the Victorian legal profession (Serle 1963 p 44).<sup>14</sup>

Hearn arrived in Melbourne shortly after the Christmas of 1854, the year in which a small-business tax revolt now known as the Eureka Stockade took place and the year in which all of Melbourne was waiting anxiously for news about the Crimean War. Hearn was 28, learned, bespectacled, bearded and portly. He also sported an ill-fitting wig through which he cleverly weaved more and more grey hairs as the years passed

---

<sup>14</sup> Hearn would have found himself in familiar company. Graduates of TCD who were prominent in the Victorian legal profession included: Sir William Stowell, George Higinbotham, Sir Robert Molesworthy, Sir Redmond Barry, Bindoon, Macoboy, H. J. Wrixen and R. Walsh. Other TCD men prominent in Victoria included: J. F. L. Foster, H. B. McCartney and Sir Francis Murphy. It is not surprising that so many of the Irish migrants to Victoria were of this class, as the majority of the destitute cottiers took the cheaper and shorter route to the United States (see Serle 1963 p 49; Dixon 1902 pp 261-3). George Higinbotham, who was eventually the Chief Justice, is a typical example. He was born in the same year as Hearn; he was a contemporary at TCD (Higinbotham graduated in 1848, Hearn in 1847); like Hearn he enrolled in Lincoln's Inn; and he migrated to Melbourne in 1853. He was also the editor of *The Argus* in 1855-9, to which Hearn occasionally contributed.

(see Blainey 1957 p 40). After residing temporarily in rented accommodation, he moved into the campus housing provided by the University of Melbourne, an institution that then amounted to a few buildings in a paddock along the dusty Sydney Road taken by the amateur miners on their way to the diggings. Hearn temporarily took on the additional duty of teaching classics when the professor responsible for this duty died following the arduous sea journey out to Melbourne—a duty to which he returned in 1871, again between the departure of one professor and the arrival of his replacement. Fortunately for Hearn, however, the duties associated with the Chair of Modern History and Literature, Political Economy and Logic were greatly reduced when, shortly after arriving, a reorganisation of professorial duties was effected. He thereafter largely taught political economy and history to the Arts students. Hearn's breadth of knowledge was ideally suited to the varied demands (even within the confines of the Arts Faculty) of the thinly-staffed University of Melbourne. The extremely broad curriculum then taught to the Melbourne undergraduates went beyond even the liberal curriculum taught at TCD. As already mentioned, at a time in which students at Cambridge and Oxford narrowed their energies to excel in either mathematics or the classics, this was a refreshing break from tradition. There was, unfortunately, a lack of students to take advantage of this curriculum. The university produced, on average, ten graduates per annum during its first twenty years of operation (Scott 1936 p 38). Critics of the university suggested that it would be cheaper to pay for all of the undergraduates to attend Cambridge or Oxford.

Hearn may not have commanded large classes, but one or two of the few students who he did teach were brilliant. Alexander Sutherland, Samuel Alexander, H. B. Higgins, Isaac Isacs and Alfred Deakin were just some of the later notable public figures who were his early charges. From all accounts, Hearn was an extremely popular teacher. His learned lectures were by no means models of method and consecutive summary, being discursive, diffuse and desultory. In the midst of a monologue on some aspect of the feudal system, for example, he would absent-mindedly divert the narrative of the lecture to a lengthy analysis of the etymology of some medieval word, before realising that only five minutes remained in the hour and that there was a need to rush through the subject matter set for that day (see Sutherland 1888). Hearn nonetheless won over his audience. His lectures were peppered with jokes, comic illustrations and humorous anecdotes (many of which he repeated endlessly). As an ardent reader of

poetry, he would also recite apposite lines at strategic points in the delivery. Most importantly, however, he inspired his students and nurtured their scholarly ambition. As Hearn's most loyal student, Sutherland, wisely pointed out, in the age of cheap textbooks, it is not important to plod through systematic lectures, rigid in division, that mirror the set reading that the students already have in their possession. It is more important to have a magnetic power and personal influence over the students. In this sense, Hearn was the ideal lecturer. His scholarly manner, moreover, did not prevent students from approaching him. He formed lasting friendships with many of them and, mimicking Whately and Longfield, helped establish the forum, the Eclectic Society, in which they first presented themselves in public. Like the Dublin Statistical Society and the Royal Galway Institution of Hearn's Irish years, this society was an arena in which young intellectuals debated the issues of the hour. Early members included H. G. Turner (the 'literary banker'), Charles Pearson, William Shield, Deakin and Sutherland (see Goodwin 1966 p 620)

Hearn's lectures were often the draft chapters for the books that he planned to publish. His contemporaries joked that every time he embarked upon a new lecture sequence—first in political economy, then in history and later in law—he effectively embarked upon a new book. Hearn's first publication, *Plutology* (1863), was therefore the product of the political economy lectures that he delivered in the late 1850s and early 1860s. The university syllabus printed in 1858 indicates that he delivered a lecture sequence in political economy in the third year of the B.A. degree and another sequence to students taking the M.A. Degree.<sup>15</sup> The amount of reading, and then literary polish, devoted to preparing these lectures-cum-chapters was impressive. Hearn was a classic workaholic. Students observed that his light burned in his campus study until one or two, sometimes three a.m. He would then wander in to the lecture room, which adjoined his private apartments on campus, still wearing slippers (Scott 1936 p 25). The reading list for the lecture sequences initially included Senior and Smith, but it was expanded over the years to include Bastiat, McCulloch, Jevons, Fawcett, and Spencer (see Groenewegen and McFarlane 1990 p 44). After 1863, of course, Hearn prescribed his own *Plutology* as the key text for students taking political economy. He annotated his own copy of this text with references to the latest

---

<sup>15</sup> Classes at the University of Melbourne began in 1855. Thus, since political economy was a third-year subject, I presume that it was first taught in 1857.

industrial techniques and innovations, in which he took a keen interest, but these observations were designed simply to provide further illustrations of the key themes developed at an earlier date and there is no evidence that he substantially altered the core of his lectures between 1863 and the mid 1870s, when he gave up lecturing political economy.<sup>16</sup> Charles Pearson took over Hearn's lecturing duties in political economy in 1876 so that Hearn could devote more time to his onerous lecturing duties in law, which he had taken on in 1873 (see section 9 below). Pearson, however, did not seek reappointment after one year, and hence Hearn was not permanently relieved of this task until J. S. Elkington was appointed Professor of Political Economy and History in 1878, a position he held for 35 years.

Hearn's contribution to the discipline of political economy effectively ended after this date. There is no evidence that he successfully imitated Longfield, the foundation Whately Professor, in creating a school of political economy. Elkington may have prescribed *Plutology* between 1878 and 1912 in the same way Lonfield's successors prescribed (and built upon) *Lectures in Political Economy* (1834)—and there is evidence that subsequent lecturers continued to prescribe *Plutology* until 1924—but there was not to be a Melbourne School to mirror the Dublin School. This could be attributed to Elkington's character. According to Groenewegen and McFarlane (1990 p 45), Elkington—a listless, ineffective teacher, who was a club-footed drunk and recidivist bankrupt—effectively killed political economy as a discipline at the University of Melbourne for several generations. The governing body of the University at one time censured him for punching a colleague. Blainey (1957 p 100) reports that when he resigned in 1912 “the bottle dealer must have made a small fortune when he called at the vacated house in the university grounds”. At most it could be said that Hearn (and Elkington) established a free-trade outpost at the University of Melbourne at a time when the region was dominated by protectionists (see Goodwin 1966 p 620; Groenewegen and McFarlane 1990 p 56). It seems that Hearn's key contribution was, through his lectures and publications, to inspire students to pursue their own scholarly activities in whatever field they found interesting. *Plutology* was, at the closing of the day, simply an aid to achieve this end.

---

<sup>16</sup> The book-seller's catalogue for the auction of Hearn's extensive library, which was held shortly after Hearn's death, indicates that Hearn at least continued to receive the latest economic publications after 1863. Jevons's *Theory of Political Economy*, for example, was listed in the catalogue (see McCarron, Bird & Co 1888).

### 7. *The Publication of Plutology (1863-4).*

Hearn published *Plutology* in Melbourne in 1863 through the publishing house of George Robertson and in 1864 through the publishing house of Macmillan and Co.<sup>17</sup> This publication has merit because of the novel vision it presented of what the science of political economy should entail rather than because of the novelty of any specific theoretical idea. Hearn's reorientation of the science of political economy is implicit in the structure of the book. Orthodox texts at this time invariably launched straight into the analysis of the various factors of production, namely, labour, land and capital. Hearn's approach, by contrast, began with consumer wants and then analysed, in turn, the different factors of production or what he referred to as the aids or tools of production (including the then under-analysed aids, such as invention) that are used to satisfy those wants. It is now accepted that Hearn's unusual arrangement of his subject matter was to some extent derived from a number of French economists, Coquelin et Guillaumin, J. G Courcelle-Seneuille and J. B. Bastiat. The second chapter of Bastiat's *Harmonies* (1850), for example, is entitled "Wants, Efforts and Satisfaction" (see La Nauze 1949 p 58; Groenewegen and McFarlane 1990 p 63). It was nonetheless an unusual narrative order at this time for a reader who was raised in the English tradition of political economy. It was also, more importantly, a narrative structure that allowed Hearn to emphasise the fresh notion that the science of political economy entails the scientific study of the way in which the scarce aids of production may be more efficiently harnessed to service the unlimited wants of the consumer. Hearn presented this wants-tools vision with such a confident tone and in such an elegant hand that it caught the eye of more than one political economist struggling towards the neoclassical framework at this time. Jevons, Marshall and Edgeworth were amongst the neoclassical scholars who praised *Plutology* in the succeeding decades. The book was, with its focus on scarcity and wants, effectively a halfway house between the cost-of-production value theories of the earlier classical period and the scarcity-cum-subjectivist value theories of the coming neoclassical period.

---

<sup>17</sup> Robertson was yet another Dubliner (although he had been born in Scotland). He had been an apprentice to the book dealer-cum-publisher who handled the *Dublin University Magazine*, the famous organ of the Anglo-Irish intellectual elite, before migrating to Melbourne in 1852.

Hearn's wants-tools vision should, of course, not be interpreted as amounting to a one-to-one correspondence with the ends-means vision that was eventually finalised and popularised by Lionel Robbins in the 1930s. Firstly, although Hearn believed that the aids or tools of industry are ultimately directed to their most productive ends via adjustments in final consumer demand, and although (as in his *On Cottier Rents*) the incomes earned by these tools are set simultaneously via their opportunity costs, this adjustment process is not completed via the sophisticated "marginalist" mechanisms developed by the neoclassical economists.<sup>18</sup> Hearn failed to provide a marginal product theory of distribution and, even though an account of the idea of diminishing marginal utility is presented, he does not use it in any meaningful way to construct a theory of consumption. If anything, Hearn deliberately shirks the difficulties associated with these complex theoretical issues, partly from a want of ability (he was not a creative genius like Jevons) and partly to maintain the required narrative rhythm to deliver his overriding wants-tools research programme. Secondly, Hearn's wants-tools vision is placed within an organic evolutionary framework (and in this sense he anticipated, if not influenced, Marshall) rather than the static framework that most neoclassical economists eventually adopted. Indeed, Hearn was one of the first political economists, if not the first, to draw upon Charles Darwin's *Origin of Species* (1859) and the (dynamic-) sociological writings of Herbert Spencer. Hearn became pre-occupied with the way in which wants are more readily satisfied through time due to the increasing inter-dependence and co-operation of those parties who adopted ever more specialised roles in a society that was in the process of evolving towards a "fee" market economy. Hearn, in other words, viewed society in Spencerian terms as growing from a simple organism (i.e. subsistence economy) to a complex organism (i.e. a market-exchange economy). It is, of course, not a surprising preoccupation for an individual who had just migrated from a moribund, famine-stricken and pestilent-prone society to a growing, confident, increasingly prosperous colony. In many ways Hearn should be interpreted as a development economist who was trying to discover the cocktail of ingredients that induces Rostovian "take off" growth.

Hearn drew the details presented in this grand narrative from a number of sources. He was extremely well read in works published in North America and France—which

---

<sup>18</sup> The opportunity cost element is captured in statements such as: "the determining principle of value [is] the cost of procuring a similar service" (1863 p 322).

was unusual at that time for political economists from the British Isles—as well as in the less commonly read British publications from previous decades. The way in which Hearn trawled these publications for ideas induced La Nauze (1949) to charge Hearn with plagiarism: “The manner in which he uses his sources, however, is in some respects peculiar, and it gives rise to an appearance of something approaching plagiarism” (1949 p 55). Since this charge has become ingrained in the collective conscious of Australian historians of economic thought—and because it even questions whether historians should bother to analyse his work—it deserves further comment. La Nauze’s chief argument is that although Hearn cites his authorities when he deploys a specific quotation, he fails to acknowledge them when he re-drafts entire passages for large sections of his text. La Nauze adds that Hearn makes use of those passages that agree with his line of argument and ignores those extensions and qualifications with which he disagrees. This, La Nauze argues, amounts to both misrepresentation and superficial renderings of the complex ideas of more competent authors (La Nauze 1949 p 55). La Nauze’s jaundiced reading of Hearn is then littered with punishing put downs, such as “it ranges somewhat superficially over a wide range of ideas”; it is of “questionable intellectual honesty”, it is “little more than a collection of extracts”; he “plagiaries from John Rae [on capital] to an extent even remarkable for him”; and the “superficial lucidity” [of his work] (1949 pp 53, 57, 65, 76). More recent historians have correctly softened these claims either by providing qualifications (Wakatabe 2000) or toning them down within more sympathetic narratives (Groenewegen and McFarlane 1990). La Nauze’s initial critique of Hearn nonetheless still rings clear today.

There is an element of truth in La Nauze’s claims and it is left to the reader to consult this author’s 1949 essay for the actual passages Hearn reputedly pilfered from Rae, Bastiat, Senior and others. It is nonetheless an over-stated, if not unnecessarily vicious, attack and simply will not do. Historians of thought invariably err when they present excessively panegyric or pejorative readings of well-known texts. La Nauze has failed in the latter sense. To be sure, Hearn is far less original in the details than on first reading; his narrative admittedly is sometimes no more than a brilliant tapestry of inadequately acknowledged sources; he obviously baulks at tackling theoretical difficulties; and he treats innumerable issues that have taxed the great minds of the discipline in a superficial manner. I am also willing to admit that, even

given the less strict rules on citing sources in the nineteenth century, Hearn was possibly a plagiarist of sorts. But these admissions should be couched within a kinder, more sympathetic, account than the one presented by La Nauze's essay. Hearn's contribution to the discipline of economics is in the presentation (or perhaps the popularisation) of a new vision, not in original analysis and the resolution of well-known theoretical conundrums that occupied the great minds of his day. A shift in vision, such as the movement towards the wants-tools framework, is just as important as the discovery of the law of diminishing marginal product or comparative advantage or the division of labour. La Nauze's pathological search for unacknowledged sources prevents him from emphasising this point. He grudgingly accepts Hearn's novel treatment of want satisfaction and organic evolution, but even then he deems the associated analysis to be either superficial or novel only amongst the English, not the French (1949 pp 57-9). His admission that Hearn made a contribution in these areas is certainly lost amongst the general argument that Hearn was a fraud.

It also must be emphasised that La Nauze (1949 pp 20, 49) is incorrect to argue that the other publications to emerge from Hearn's lecture sequences were not relevant to his research in political economy (see Groenewegen and McFarlane 1990 p 60 on this point). Hearn published *Of the Government of England* and *The Aryan Household* to great acclaim in 1867 and 1878 respectively. The former work traces the evolution of English constitutional law and conventions, while the latter work entails an analysis of the customs and institutions of the communal village societies that, in the Victorian era at least, were presumed to exist in Western Europe before the advance of Rome. The links between these texts and *Plutology* are sufficiently complex to warrant a full-length study. One common theme, however, is evident from the research presented in this paper. These three books were guided by Hearn's over-riding objective of demonstrating that a society (which, remember, always reflects the design of a magnanimous God) becomes increasingly prosperous (in the sense that wants are increasingly satisfied) as it evolves towards the 'English' market economy. The leading men of Australia, Ireland and other less developed societies merely needed to adopt, or in some cases to protect, the prevailing English institutions and to ensure that a suitable legal framework was in place. Individuals pursuing their own interests within free markets would achieve the rest. Hearn was willing to accept some exceptions to this rule, but these were always the exceptions that proved the rule

(some of them are discussed in subsequent sections). Hearn's trilogy, in other words, was a more sophisticated justification of the intellectual position that he had developed in Ireland. His experiences and observations in Australia (which he liberally drew upon to illustrate key ideas in *Plutology*) had merely reinforced the ideas formed in his Anglo-Irish youth. Hearn's contemporaries, however, initially snubbed his research program. *Plutology* was not a commercial success and it certainly did not bring him immediate international fame.

#### **8. The Failure of *Plutology* in the Market Place (1863-4).**

Hearn's *Plutology* was initially a dismal failure in the market place.<sup>19</sup> This was especially the case in the British Isles, which was the more important marketplace due to the previously mentioned inadequate number of students studying political economy at the University of Melbourne. Alexander Macmillan printed 500 copies of the book in 1864 and after two years only 87 had been sold and 37 had been given away (*Hearn Correspondence* Macmillan to G. Robertson cJuly 1866). The sales were sufficiently bad that Macmillan delayed conveying the market intelligence to Hearn for as long as possible: "The real state of the case has been that its success has been so slight that I have felt reluctance in conveying to you the intelligence that can hardly do otherwise than disappoint you" (*Hearn Correspondence* 31 October 1866). This failure to sell the book transpired in spite of Macmillan's Herculean efforts to puff the book in the market place. As was the custom at this time, Macmillan had sent complementary copies to prominent political economists, such as J. S. Mill, as well as to scholars of note who were known to Hearn. The latter strategy explains the number of recipients who were near contemporaries of Hearn at TCD, such as Ingram, Leslie, Hancock and Moffat. Macmillan had also encouraged the publication of sympathetic reviews in the more notable literary magazines of the day. Four anonymous reviews subsequently appeared. The reviewer for *The Spectator* (5 March 1864), now known to be Jevons, emphasised Hearn's innovative focus on the way in which the aids of production are harnessed to satisfy human wants. The reviewer for *The Reader* (19 March 1864), recently identified as Leslie Stephen, congratulated Hearn for dressing up what he called "pure" political economy with interesting illustrations, especially

---

<sup>19</sup> This section builds upon Moore (2002, 2006), where the failure of Hearn's *Plutology* is discussed at length.

when describing the evolution of the social organism through time (see Moore 2006). The unidentified reviewer for *The Saturday Review* (14 May 1864), a magazine known as the “Saturday Reviler” for its punishing reviews, stated that it was a good book but that it did not add much to a science that was largely settled. The anonymous reviewer for the *Athenaeum* (4 June 1864) recognised the novelty of its emphasis on consumer preferences but did not think that such an approach had a future.<sup>20</sup>

The first two of these reviews are the most interesting. The respective authors have been identified; they subsequently gained fame as scholars of the first rank; and they both gave glowing reviews of *Plutology*. Jevons’s positive response to Hearn’s work is not difficult to understand, as he glimpsed the makings of the neoclassical framework, which he himself was then striving to build, in Hearn’s wants-tools approach. Jevons praised *Plutology* again a year later in the best-selling *The Coal Question* for its soundness and originality ([1865] 1906 p 168). Macmillan (who was a friend of Jevons) subsequently appended this passage to advertisements in the more important newspapers and in Macmillan’s own magazine. He conveyed to Hearn, however, that the effect of Jevons’s panegyric “has been slight indeed, almost nothing, and this though Mr Jevons was in the meantime elected to the chair of Political Economy at Owens College, Manchester, which ought to have added weight to his very favourable judgement” (31 October 1866). Stephen’s authorship and positive response is, by contrast, a little more difficult to explain. He was at that time a fellow of Trinity Hall, Cambridge, and a member of a set of recent graduates of the Mathematical Tripos—including Henry Fawcett and Charles Baron Clarke—who championed Mill’s holy trilogy of *Logic*, *Political Economy* and *Liberty*. Stephen’s authorship may be attributed to his (and Fawcett’s) friendship with Macmillan, which was the product of the ‘Tobacco Parliaments’ held at the Macmillan bookshop-cum-establishment in Cambridge prior to its relocation to London in 1863. Macmillan knew of Stephen’s interest in political economy and no doubt asked him to review *Plutology*. The reason for Stephen’s praise of this work, by contrast, must remain speculative, but it was probably the product of his appreciation of Hearn’s literary

---

<sup>20</sup> The accounts of *Plutology* in the Australian press amounted to extracts of the more glowing passages from these London reviews. *The Argus*, for example, replicated passages from the *Spectator* (see 17/05/1864), *Reader* (see 28/05/1864) and the *Saturday Review* (see 17/07/1864).

style, a skill for which Stephen himself became famous, and his then preoccupation with the new evolutionary theory that Hearn had harnessed (see Moore 2006).

Any praise from Jevons and Stephen was unfortunately checked by the “noxious influence” of Hearn’s contemporary from TCD, John Elliot Cairnes, whose influence as a political economist in London at this time was second only to that of his close friend, John Stuart Mill. Cairnes’s hostility to Hearn was pathological and cannot solely be explained by his well-documented hostility to the emerging science of the consumer (see De Marchi 1972 for his views on this science). His inability to get along with his temporaries from TCD, whom he looked down upon as intellectual pretenders in the field of political economy, must also be partly responsible. The mutual hostility between Cairnes and Leslie is certainly now well documented (see Boylan and Foley 2000; Moore 2001). The fierce nature of the extant correspondence between these two equally peculiar characters would be amusing if it were not for the serious implications it had for the career of the less capable Leslie. Take the following passage from a letter written by Leslie: “My Dear Cairnes, I feel that it is not of character with our bad relations to address you with such familiarity, & I only do so because of the last seriously offensive letter from you being in that form” (*Cairnes Papers* 1 June 1863; see also Boylan and Foley 2000). Cairnes displayed the same imperious contempt for Hearn that he displayed for Leslie. He conveyed his views of *Plutology* to Leonard Courtney, then a fellow at Cambridge and leader writer for *The Times*: “I have looked through the book pretty carefully, and find its staple consists of the tested economic platitudes expanded indefinitely by the easy process of multiplying second hand illustrations for most part dreary and unelucidatively. From the beginning to end there is not one serious attempt to grapple with real economic problems—indeed not an indication that the writer is aware that Political Economy or, I should say, ‘Plutology’, contains any problem for solution. As to the book being ‘interesting’, I am unable to conceive the mental condition of the man who could read ten pages of it consecutively” (*Courtney Papers* 22 March 1864 Letter 15).

Cairnes is here touching on the issue later taken up by La Nauze, namely, Hearn’s tendency to balk at tackling theoretical difficulties and to treat complex issues in a superficial manner. Although these are valid criticisms, the excess in his critical tone betrays a personal animosity to Hearn. The demented way in which he subsequently

used his influence in London intellectual circles to turn opinion against Hearn is astonishing. He asked Courtney whether the initials L. S. at the bottom of review in *The Reader* were those of his friend, Leslie Stephen, and declared his bemusement that someone who could be so sound in his assessment of H. D. Macleod (whom Stephen had demolished in an earlier review) could be so unsound in his assessment of Hearn: “Why will he cancel the obligation [of criticising Macleod] by letting up [on] Hearn?—in my opinion a far less respectable character; the difference between the two being the difference between fanaticism and -+imposture; for this ‘Plutology’, unless I am grossly mistaken in my estimate of it, it is not too harsh to say, is simply an imposition on the public” (*Courtney Papers* 22 March 1864, Letter 15). Courtney replied: “I saw the reviews of Hearn’s *Plutology* in the *Reader* and the *Spectator*, but the book itself I have not seen and after your emphatic condemnation I will not go out of my way to get it” (*Cairnes Papers* 19 April 1864, Letter 13). Cairnes, however, was not sufficiently content with this reply. In a letter dated three months later he reminds Courtney to cross-examine Stephen about the Hearn review, to make him justify his positive comments about Hearn, and then to convey his findings to him by the next post (*Courtney Papers* 13 June 1864, Letter 26). Cairnes also expressed similar views to Mill, who, as a result, did not bother to read his complimentary copy of *Plutology* and concluded that the reviewers, Jevons and Stephen, were probably incompetent: “‘Plutology’ has been sent to me, but I have not yet had time to look at it, and shall now think many other duties more urgent than that of reading into it. I should ascribe the opinion given of it by the *Spectator* and *Reader* not to defects of honesty, but to sheer ignorance and incompetence on the subject” (*Mill’s Collected Work* 28 March 1864, Letter 684). Mill subsequently conveyed to Cairnes that he speculated that the reviewer of *The Reader* article was Stephen, who was no doubt ignorant of the subject: “I also suspect that L. S. is Leslie Stephen, but as I have no proof of his knowledge of the subject, and great proof of yours, I have little doubt that he has in this case shewn ignorance of it” (2 April 1864 Letter 685)

Hearn’s *Plutology* did not stand a chance with such powerful forces arrayed against it. Macmillan conveyed this state of affairs to Hearn. He stated that the leading authorities other than Jevons, who was then really still making his way in the world of economics, had failed not only to review *Plutology*, but also failed to respond to his personal appeals to provide recommendations suitable for advertisements and what

are now called dust-jacket 'blurbs'. In Macmillan's words: "I have endeavoured to elicit opinions from such of the leading Political Economists to whom I sent copies, and whom I knew personally. The only definite one I got was verbally from a man of considerable weight in the current opinion on such subjects in this country that he did not agree in [with] Professor Jevons[']s estimate" (*Hearn Correspondence* Macmillan to Hearn 31 October 1866). This authority was probably Cairnes, although there is no direct evidence of this. Macmillan, not surprisingly, attributed this state of affairs to Hearn's status as an outsider from the Antipodes, and vainly inquires if he knew any reputable political economists whom he could ask to promote the book on his behalf.<sup>21</sup> The news of *Plutology's* failure in the market place must have been keenly felt by Hearn and may, in part, explain why he shifted away from political economy to law in the 1870s. A more immediate negative consequence was that Macmillan declined to handle Hearn's proposed book on the English constitution, which was eventually published as *The Government of England* (1867) by George Robertson in Melbourne and Longmans, Green, Reader and Dyer in London.

Hearn's reputation as a political economist only began to rise when more neoclassical economists began to make their way in the world. Jevons magnanimously spelt out its path-breaking qualities in the concluding chapter of the second edition of *Theory of Political Economy* ([1879] 1931 p 273 and various entries in Black 1973-81). Marshall advised the future Mrs Marshall and other students who attended his Cambridge lectures in the early-to-mid-1870s to read *Plutology* as an introductory text (Marshall 1947 p 20); he (with Mrs Marshall) made reference to Hearn in a footnote in *Economics and Industry* as one of a number of economists who adhered to the notion that wages were determined by demand and supply (1879 p 205n); and he argued in all of the many editions of the *Principles* that *Plutology* was "at once simple and profound" ([1890] 1920 p 91). Edgeworth echoed these views in his entry on Hearn for *Palgrave's Dictionary of Political Economy*, where he wrote that *Plutology* was a model of classical style and that like "Hermann or Ricardo, Hearn holds and

---

<sup>21</sup> The success of Cairnes's campaign against Hearn is even more impressive once one dwells upon the extent to which Macmillan puffed the titles taken on by his organisation. Courtney, for one, conveyed to Cairnes that the early positive reviews of *Plutology* were clearly Macmillan's handiwork: "I am surprised at nothing. Macmillan has such a command over newspaper agencies and works them in such indirect and wicked ways, that almost any book published by him is to be puffed by many voices" (*Cairnes Papers* 19 April 1864 Letter 13).

intermediate course between the highest abstraction and mere information, neither soaring to mathematical analysis nor creeping among historical details” (1896 p 295). All of these accolades, however, came too late for Hearn. He had been rebuffed and had moved on to other fields of intellectual endeavour.

### **9. Law and Politics (1859-88).**

Hearn channelled his energy away from political economy into two intimately intertwined endeavours that came to dominate his career in the 1870s: politics and law. Hearn’s quest to pursue politics predates the writing of *Plutology*. He put himself forward for the Legislative Assembly seat of the Murray District in the by-election of January 1859, but was unsuccessful. It was during this election that the hard men of *The Age*, a radical-cum-protectionist organ that would eventually make or break politicians in the Colony of Victoria, first displayed their ferocious animosity for Hearn. They portrayed Hearn, who had presented himself to the electorate as a mild conservative and unadulterated free trader, as a reactionary who was wedded to professorial ideas that were of no practical value. One leader in *The Age* proceeded thus: “His mind is essentially scholastic and pedantic, capable of dealing only with details and incapable of taking a broad view of human affairs. His mind is very sharp but very small. His career in the House will be an utter failure” (13 Jan 1859; see also Scott 1936 p 26). A leader published a few days later was entitled “The Professor of Political Dodgery” (15 Jan 1859). The viciousness of these attacks motivated the Chancellor of the University of Melbourne, Sir Redmond Barry (another TCD man), to take steps to prevent professors from entering politics. He believed that a professor in parliament would make the University a target in the party-based brawls that defined the early colonial parliaments. The University Council, under Barry’s careful eye, consequently passed a regulation preventing professors from seeking elected office or even being members of a political party. Hearn pointed out that he had initially accepted the position at the University under different terms and conditions, and that the administrative body could not change them at a whim, but his protests were to no avail. His political ambitions seemed to be checked as long as he remained a professor at the University of Melbourne (Scott 1936; Blainey 1957; Campbell 1977).

Hearn proceeded to take an active part in public affairs in other ways. The most important of these was the assistance he gave in drafting the Land Act of 1862. One of the most interesting aspects of this duty was that the politician overseeing the associated Bill was none other than Charles Gavin Duffy, the Irish nationalist and the editor of the Young Ireland organ, *The Nation*, when the revolution went off half-cocked in 1848. Duffy, broken from the trials for sedition and no doubt shamefaced from observing his fellow conspirators consigned to Van Dieman's land as convicts, had migrated to Victoria shortly after Hearn in 1856. Like many men of 1848, he subsequently contributed to the administration of the Empire, eventually becoming premier of Victoria. (He was not the first Repealer to receive a KCMG). In the early 1860s, however, Duffy was the minister in charge of the Lands Department in a cabinet led by another Papist Celt, John O'Shanassy. This cabinet is sometimes referred to as O'Shanassy-Duffy ministry due to the dominance of these two men, both of whom represented what was then called the Roman Catholic faction in Victorian politics. It was thought that this faction would finally give jobs to the Irish Catholics rather than the Anglo-Irish Protestants (the TCD men), but this did not stop Duffy from drawing upon Hearn's legal expertise.<sup>22</sup> The political imperative of the hour was to break the squatters' monopoly-like hold on land. Unfortunately, however, the Land Act of 1862 that Duffy and Hearn ushered through Parliament, which was eventually referred to as the Duffy Act, was fundamentally flawed and failed to achieve its objectives. The aim was to encourage the dispersal of large pastoral estates on which little improvement had been made—a goal for which Hearn, given his earlier pre-occupation with the idle wasteland in Ireland, could show some sympathy. The pastoralists regrettably overcame this new obstacle by deploying the simply strategy of hiring dummies to act on their behalf. The extent to which the faulty legislation was Hearn's fault has not been determined. Duffy, however, blamed Hearn, as did the gentlemen of the press (especially those from *The Age*) and H. G. Turner, the first historian of Victoria. So indignant was the population of Victoria that the O'Shanassy-Duffy Ministry had to resign in 1863. It was not an auspicious foray into public life for Hearn.<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>22</sup> This is not as surprising as it seems. Duffy often mixed with the Anglo-Irish intellectuals of Dublin in the 1840s and even drank with Sheridan Le Fanu, who, as we have already noted, was a relation of Hearn's wife.

<sup>23</sup> It has been speculated that Hearn and the Attorney General, R. D. Ireland,—both conservatively inclined—conspired against Duffy and O'Shanassy by deliberately including flaws in the Bill so as to

Hearn still harboured political ambitions in spite of this set back. The main obstacle that confronted him was still the 1859 Barry rule that prevented professors from joining the political fray. Hearn cleverly overcame this obstacle in 1873 by resigning from the Chair of Political Economy and History to take up the position of dean in the newly established Faculty of Law. Deans, as opposed to professors, were not prohibited from entering politics under the 1859 rule. It is even said that Hearn himself orchestrated the creation of this position (with its all-important title) rather than a combined professorial-dean position (Blainey 1957 p 56). This Machiavellian manoeuvring on the part of Hearn should not, of course, induce the reader to conclude that he did not deserve the senior position in the law faculty. Hearn was an eminently suitable candidate for the position. As mentioned section three of this paper, he had received his training in law under Longfield and at Lincoln's Inn, and had already published a major book, *The Government of England* (1867), in a related area. Indeed, Hearn soon thrived as a lecturer in law in the same way that he had thrived as a lecturer in political economy and history, namely, by delivering erudite narratives that inspired the students. He taught jurisprudence, Roman law, constitutional law and international law. As Blainey (1957 p 58) related, Hearn emphasised “fundamental principles rather than details, and intellectual depth rather than sharpness—the qualities of his own intellect”.<sup>24</sup> The law students received a liberal arts rather than a professional education. Still, it must be admitted that it was only through sharp practice that Hearn got his second chance to enter Parliament.

A sequence of humiliating rebuffs followed. Hearn unsuccessfully put himself forward for the Legislative Assembly seat of East Melbourne in 1874. He then tried to gain access to Parliament via the back door by pushing for the creation of a seat to represent the University of Melbourne (in the same way that the Universities of Cambridge and Oxford were represented in Westminster), but this was defeated in 1876. Hearn again put himself forward for the Legislative Assembly seat of Fitzroy in 1877, but he was again unsuccessful. Finally, and indeed mercifully, Hearn entered

---

protect the rights of the squatters, who then dominated the upper house (see Campbell 1977 p 61). There is, however, insufficient evidence for this conclusion and, as we have already seen, Hearn himself believed that large runs (especially if partly idle) should be broken up through time to encourage more intensive agricultural processes. He believed that this would be a “natural” process once the appropriate legal framework was in place.

<sup>24</sup> See also Campbell's (1977) history of the University of Melbourne's Law School.

Parliament when the Legislative Council seat of Central Province, held by T. T. a'Beckett, became vacant in 1878. He entered the Parliament when the Liberal-Radical ministry led by Graham Barry (not to be confused with the Chancellor of the University, Sir Redmond Barry) was striving to reform the Legislative Council, which was the 'unrepresentative' upper house in Colonial Victoria. This prolonged dispute caused a deadlock between the two houses, in which the annual appropriation bill was not passed. The only interesting role played by Hearn in this crisis was, in the 1879-80 session, to propose as a solution Hare's system of proportional representation, which had earlier caught the imagination of Mill, Fawcett and other political economists who sought solutions to the growing democratic tendencies of the age. Hearn was, however, insufficiently persuasive and, as was invariably the case during his political career, his colleagues did not follow him. The reform question was settled in 1881. Hearn was soon after appointed the unofficial leader of the Legislative Council, following the resignation of Sir C. Sladen in 1882. This was an unpaid post in which a member of the Legislative Council with suitable professional knowledge, who was neither leader of the government nor opposition, was given the task of critically dissecting the Bills presented before Parliament. Hearn, however, could not fulfil this function adequately due to diverse workloads, his own political programme and ill health, even though he continued to hold this position until 1888.

Hearn's main objective during his political career was to codify the laws of the Colony of Victoria along Austinian-Benthamite lines. He regarded the work he undertook in this regard as his *magnum opus* (*The Argus* 24 April 1888, p 8). This is a surprising statement coming from the author of *Plutology, Government of England* and *Aryan Household*. In 1879 he introduced the Duties of the People Bill, which had nearly 700 clauses and sought to bring the law relating to the duties of every individual, except so far as they related to property, into a systematic form. In 1881 he introduced the Law of Obligations Bill, which contained some 500 clauses and was the second instalment of his codification program. In 1884 he introduced the Substantive General Law Consolidation Bill, which contained an astonishing 1,300 clauses and systemised all of the criminal law, and a great proportion of the law of wrongs. These Bills were sent from the Legislative Council to the Legislative Assembly, where they were contested, debated and revised (see Campbell 1977 for an analysis of this program from a legal perspective). Hearn meanwhile provided the

philosophical justification for this codifying program in *The Theory of Legal Duties and Rights*, which was published in 1883 and clearly derived from his lectures on analytical jurisprudence within the Law Faculty. He never asked for any pecuniary reward for this Herculean effort and it is speculated that he gained silk in 1886, even though he rarely had time to practise at the bar, as a reward for his codifying labours. The whole exercise, however, was far too difficult, if not excessively abstract, for Members of Parliament who represented electorates with different priorities. The codifying bills were allowed to slip away quietly and unnoticed after Hearn's death in 1888.

It is apparent, then, that codifying laws rather than economic policy preoccupied Hearn during his many years in politics. Hearn, as one would expect, nonetheless expressed strong opinions on economic issues. G. Foster (1971) has already made the economic content of Hearn's political speeches and pamphlets the subject of an admirable study. Foster identifies three broad areas in which Hearn's political position was influenced by his economic beliefs. First, Hearn argued that taxation should be raised for the sole purpose of providing the state with the funds to defend the national borders, protect the liberties of its citizens and enforce contracts. It should take the form of a proportional income tax rather than an indirect tax, as the latter would most likely be employed selectively to achieve political objectives and give rise to a mis-allocation of resources.<sup>25</sup> Second, Hearn particularly opposed the use of an indirect tax (i.e a customs duty) for protectionist purposes. He repeatedly argued that protection prevented the "natural" evolution of industry and, instead, induced the creation of industries that would otherwise not come into being. The political nature of tariff policy would also make such duties self-perpetuating, thereby carrying them past the infancy stage of an industry's development. These free-trade views were expressed on the hustings, in Parliament and at the meetings of the Free Trade League of Victoria (of which Hearn was the Treasurer).<sup>26</sup> Third, Hearn objected to the 1870

---

<sup>25</sup> Hearn was, for example, opposed to the Victorian Land Tax Act of 1881, which, he argued, was not designed to raise revenue, but rather to achieve the political objective of breaking up the large pastoral estates. These estates should be broken up naturally over time within a suitable legal framework. Boylan and Foley (1990) trace Hearn's hostility to indirect taxation to the papers presented before the Dublin Statistical Society by Hancock and Lawson in 1849. Although this is plausible, it should not be overlooked that the opposition to indirect taxation "solely as a political tool" is a natural outcome of Hearn's laissez faire position, and could have been the product of any number of influences.

<sup>26</sup> The Free Trade League was founded in the 1870s. It published numerous anonymous pamphlets on commercial policy, but these pamphlets cannot be attributed to Hearn with certainty (see Goodwin

Education Bill, which called for compulsory free primary education and the merging of the state and religious schools. He objected on the grounds that diversity in education was essential and the iron mould of government in this arena would be injurious. He argued that teachers should, instead, be paid a sum commensurable with how well their students performed in an annual examination, and that parents rather than government should pay for the cost of the scheme. Hearn, however, was again unable to carry his colleagues with him and the Victorian Education Act of 1872 introduced compulsory “free” education.<sup>27</sup>

Hearn also occasionally departed from his extreme laissez-faire views when the peculiar environment of the Colony dictated that this was needed. He granted that the government could perform three additional functions in Victoria. First, as mentioned in relation to Hearn’s involvement in the Land Act of 1862, he argued that the government could play a role in disposing of idle or under-utilised land. This is related to the old crotchet from his Irish days, namely, the disposal of the waste lands that were currently in the hands of absentee landlords. He excused the intervention of government in this situation on the grounds that the normal market mechanism was not in place in the colonial environment, as there were no sellers, only buyers. Victoria was effectively in a pre-economic state and the land had to be disposed in a wise manner. Second, Hearn admitted that a vicious circle may unnecessarily delay the introduction of a suitable communications network in the colonial states. The current communication system may not be sufficient for social development and, in turn, capital and co-operation associated with the current state of social development may not be sufficient to bring the communication system forward. He therefore proposed that, in relation to the Tramways Bill (1882) and State Railways

---

1966 pp 46-55; Foster 1971 p 30). Hearn’s leading role in this society once again made him a target for abuse in the “protectionist” *Age*. The hostility of the *Age* towards Hearn is best seen in Hearn’s obituary in this paper (24 April 1888, *The Age*; Foster 1971 p 29).

<sup>27</sup> Hearn’s views on education are far too complex to be analysed in the tight compass of this paper and should be seen in the context of the debates, which were invariably coloured by sectarian disputes, between Matthew Arnold, Robert Lowe and many others in England in the 1860s. Hearn had already demonstrated a certain commercial attitude to education, prior to arriving in Australia, in his inaugural address at Queen’s College, Galway (see Boylan and Foley 1990). As reported in the *Galway Vindicator* (5 Dec 1849), he argued that the institution would only prosper if it drew students in a competitive environment. In Melbourne he published two pamphlets on education reform, entitled *Some Observations on Primary Schools* (1856) and *Payments by Results in Primary Education* (1872). The second pamphlet, on payment by results, was obviously influenced by the arguments advanced by Robert Lowe (who, recall, was on the committee to select Hearn for the Melbourne chair) and was designed to support his opposition to the 1872 Act described in the text above.

Management Bill (1883), the government should build rail and tram lines and then lease them to private providers. Third, Hearn approved of government-assisted immigration. As he so elegantly articulated in *Plutology*, a larger population expands the market and allows a greater division of labour, exchange and co-operation. It is this Spencerian evolution from the simple organism to the complex organism that yields the greatest prosperity. The helping hand of government can, it seems, hasten the natural evolution of industry in certain situations.

## **11. Conclusion**

Many other dimensions of Hearn's very full life could be explored in a larger biography not primarily concerned with his views on political economy. It is well known, for example, that he played an important part in the administration of the University of Melbourne. He acted as Warden of the Senate from 1868 to 1875; he was a member of Council from 1881 to 1886; and he was briefly Chancellor from May to October of 1886, before Sir A. Mitchie pointed out that it was inappropriate for members of the teaching body to hold seats on the Council. Hearn was also an extremely happy family man. In 1878, following the death of his first wife, he married Isabel St Clair, who was the product of yet another Anglo-Irish military-cleric family. He thereafter divided his time between his university apartments and a summer home in Dromana, which was perched half-way up Arthur's Seat and provided splendid views of the bay. He especially took delight in watching his three daughters (two of whom attended university) and son from his first marriage grow and mature. Hearn was, moreover, highly active in the Church of England, acting as Chancellor of Diocese of Melbourne from 1877 to 1888. Finally, he was chairman of the Freehold Banking Corporation and connected with several other financial institutions. In many ways it was lucky that Hearn died shortly before the Melbourne financial system unravelled during the crises of 1888-93, as the dishonest land boomers who ran these institutions recruited establishment figures, like Hearn, to encourage Melbournians to bank with them. The Freehold institution was, in fact, part of the financial group run by the infamous land boomer, Matthew Davies, and failed in controversial circumstance in 1888-9. Hearn did not have to answer to the depositors and shareholders. He had been in poor health for some time, suffering from chronic cystitis. This led to a disease of the kidneys, which was eventually the cause of his

death. The excessive workload at the university and the long hours he was devoting to codifying the law, combined with a bout of bronchitis, caused his health to collapse. He was advised to take a trip abroad, but he refused to leave his codifying work. He instead visited his son, who was a surgeon, in Hamilton for five or six weeks. Hearn died on 23 April 1888 shortly after returning to Melbourne

## **12. Bibliography.**

### ***Unpublished Material.***

*The Hearn Correspondence, Australian National Archives.*

*The Hearn Papers, Melbourne University.*

*J. A. La Nauze Papers. Melbourne University.*

*Ingram Papers, Public Records Office of Northern Ireland*

*Cairnes Papers, National Library of Ireland*

*Courtney Papers, London School of Economics*

### ***Published Material.***

Anonymous. 1877. "Cavan" pp 263-5. *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. V.5 9<sup>th</sup> edition.

Bair, D. [1978] 1990. *Samuel Beckett. A Biography*. London. Vintage.

Black, R. D. C. 1945. "Trinity College, Dublin, and the Theory of Value". *Economica*. n.s. 12 (47) pp 140-8.

Black, R. D. C. 1947a. "Economic Studies at Trinity College, Dublin. Part 1". *Hermathena*. 70. pp 65-80.

Black, R. D. C. 1947b. "Economic Studies at Trinity College, Dublin. Part 2". *Hermathena*. 71. pp 52-63.

Black, R. D. C. (ed) 1973-81. *Works and Correspondence of William Stanley Jevons*. Macmillan. London.

Blainey, G. 1957. *A Centenary History of the University of Melbourne*. Melbourne. MUP.

Boylan, T. and T. Foley. 1990. "W. E. Hearn's Irish Writings. A Pattern Established". *Irish-Australian Studies. Papers Delivered at the Sixth Australian Conference*. July. Melbourne. La Trobe University Printery.

- Boylan, T. and T. Foley. 1992. *Political Economy and Colonial Ireland. The Propagation and Ideological Function of Economic Discourse in the Nineteenth Century*. London. Routledge.
- Boylan, T. and T. Foley. 2000. “‘Brotherhood at Arms’. The Cairnes-Leslie Controversy”. In A. E. Murphy and R. Prendergast (ed) *Contributions to the History of Economic Thought: Essays in Honour of R. D. C. Black*. London. Routledge.
- Burke, B. 1891. *A Genealogical and Heraldic History of the Colonial Gentry*. London. Harrison and Sons.
- Burtchaell, G. D. and T. U. Sadler (eds) 1924. *Alumni Dublineses. A Register of the Students, Graduates, Professors and Provosts of Trinity College, in the University of Dublin*.
- Campbell, R. 1977. *A History of the Melbourne Law School 1857-1973*. Melbourne. Published by the Faculty of Law.
- Carlyle, E. I. 1917. “Walsh, Richard Hussey (1825-1862)”. In L. Stephen and G. Smith (eds) *Dictionary of National Biography*. Vol 20. London. OUP. P 681
- Copland, D. B. 1935. *W. E. Hearn. The First Australian Economist*. Melbourne. MUP.
- Cornish, F. W. 1910. *The English Church in the Nineteenth Century*. 2 Vols. London. Macmillan.
- Daly, M. 1997. “The Society and its Contribution to Ireland: Past, Present and Future”. *Journal of the Statistical and Social Inquiry Society of Ireland*. 27 (5) pp 33-46.
- Dixon, W. M. 1902. *Trinity College, Dublin*. London. F. E. Robinson.
- Duffy, C. G. 1883. *Four Years of Irish History. 1845-1849*. Melbourne. George Robertson.
- Eagleton, T. 1999. *Scholars and Rebels in Nineteenth Century Ireland*. Oxford. Blackwell.
- Edgeworth, F. Y. 1896. “William Edward Hearn (1826-1888)”. In *Palgrave’s Dictionary of Political Economy*. Vol 2. London. Macmillan. P 295.
- Foster, G. 1971. “W.E. Hearn: A Laissez Faire Economist in Parliament”. *Australian Economic Papers*. 10 (16). June pp 25-39.
- Gordon, B. J. 1967. “W.E. Hearn on Rent: an Early Item”. *Australian Economic Papers*. 5. pp 103-112.
- Goodwin, C. D. 1964. “Evolution Theory in Australian Thought”. *Journal of History of Ideas*. 25 (3) pp 393-416.

- Goodwin, C. D. 1966. *Economic Enquiry in Australia*. Durham. Duke University Press.
- Groenewegen, P. and B. McFarlane 1990. *A History of Australian Economic Thought*. London and New York. Routledge.
- Hearn, W. E. 1851. *The Cassell Prize Essay on the Condition of Ireland*. London. Cassell.
- Hearn, W. E. 1851. *On Cottier Rents*. Dublin. Hodges and Smith.
- Hearn, W. E. [1863] 1864. *Plutology*. Macmillan. London.
- Hearn, W. E. 1867. *The Government of England*. Melbourne. George Robertson.
- Hearne, W.T. 1907 (with 1912 Addendum). *Brief History and Genealogy of the Hearne Family*. This publication may now be found on the web.
- Howes, M. 1992. "Misalliance and Anglo-Irish Tradition in Le Fanu's Uncle Silas". *Nineteenth-Century Literature*. 47 (2). pp 164-
- Hyde, H. M. 1976. *Oscar Wilde*. New York. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Ingram, J. K. 1888. "Biographical Notice of the author". In Leslie, T. E.C. [1888] 1969. *Essays in Political Economy*. New York. A. M. Kelly.
- La Nauze, J. A. 1941. "Two Notes on Hearn". *Economic Record*. 17.
- La Nauze, J. A. 1949. *Political Economy in Australia*. Melbourne. Melbourne University Press.
- La Nauze, J. A. 1965. "Hearn on Natural Religion: An Unpublished Manuscript" *Historical Studies. Australia and New Zealand*. 12 (45). Pp 119-122.
- La Nauze, J. A. [1965] 1979. *Alfred Deakin. A Biography*. Melbourne. Angus and Robertson.
- La Nauze, J. A. 1972. "Hearn, William Edward". In D. Pike (ed) *Australian Dictionary of Biography. Volume 4 1851-1890*. pp 370-371.
- Le Fanu, T. P. 1924. *Memoir of the Le Fanu Family*. Privately Printed (150 copies).
- Le Fanu, W. R. 1896. *Seventy Years of Irish Life. Being Anecdotes and Reminiscences*. London. Edward Arnold.
- Lewis, S. 1837. *Topographical Dictionary of Ireland*. 2 vols. London. S. Lewis & Co.
- Lyster, T. W. 1909 "Bibliography of the Writings of John Kells Ingram with a Brief Chronology". *An Leabarlann. The Journal of Cumann Na Leabarlann*". June pp 5-46.

- McCarron, Bird & Co. 1888. *Catalogue of the Library of the Late Dr Hearn, M. L. C.: Comprising Valuable Works on Law and Jurisprudence & General Literature: To be Sold at Their Rooms, 49 Collins St West*. Melbourne. McCarron, Bird & Co.
- McCormack, W. J. 1980. *Sheridan Le Fanu and Victorian Ireland*. Oxford. Clarendon Press.
- McDowell, R. B. and D. A. Webb. 1982. *Trinity College Dublin*. London. Cambridge University Press.
- Mahaffy, J. P., J. W. Stubbs, R. Ball, T. K. Abbott, U. R. Burke, W. M. Dixon and E. P. Wright. 1892. *The Book of Trinity College Dublin*.
- Marshall, A [1890] 1920. *Principles of Economics*. London. Macmillan.
- Marshall, A and M. P. Marshall. 1879. *The Economics of Industry*. London. Macmillan.
- Marshall, M. P. 1947. *What I Can Remember*. Cambridge. At the University Press.
- Moody, T. W. and J. C. Beckett. 1959. *Queen's College, Belfast. 1845-1949*. 2 vols. London. Faber and Faber.
- Moore, G. C. G. 1995. "T. E. Cliffe Leslie and the English *Methodenstreit*". *Journal of the History of Economic Thought*. 17 (1) 57-77.
- Moore, G. C. G. 1996. "Robert Lowe and the Role of the Vulgar Economist in the English *Methodenstreit*". *Journal of Economic Methodology*. 3 (1) 69-70.
- Moore, G. C. G. 1999. "John Kells Ingram, the Comtean Movement, and the English *Methodenstreit*". *History of Political Economy*. 31 (1) pp 53-78
- Moore, G. C. G. 2000. "Ingram vs Nicholson on the History of Political Economy and a Charge of Plagiarism". *Journal of the History of Economic Thought*. 22 (Dec) pp 433-60.
- Moore, G. C. G. 2001. "An Irish Clerisy of Political Economists?: Friendships and Enmities Amongst the mid-Victorian Graduates of Trinity College, Dublin". *History of Economics Review*. 33 (Winter). pp 63-77.
- Moore, G. C. G. 2002. "Selling Plutology: Correspondence Relating to the Failure of Australia's First Economic Text". *History of Economics Review*. 35 (Winter)
- Moore, G.C.G. 2003. "John Neville Keynes and the English *Methodenstreit*". *Journal of the History of Economic Thought*. 25 (1) pp 5-38
- Moore, G. C. G. 2005. "An Evangelical Aesthete: The Political Economy of John Ruskin". *History of Political Economy*. Forthcoming.

**Moore, G. C. G. 2006. “The Cambridge Millites and the Early Economic Writings of Leslie Stephen”. *History of Political Economy. Forthcoming.***

Maxwell, C. 1946. *A History of Trinity College, Dublin, 1591-1892*. Dublin

Montgomery, H. 1976. *Oscar Wilde*. London. Eyre Methuen.

Serle, P. 1963. *The Golden Age. A History of the Colony of Victoria. 1851-1861*. Melbourne. MUP.

Stuart. I. 1937. *Rules and Existing Customs. A Brief History of the [Royal] School*. Privately Printed.

Scott, E. 1936. *A History of the University of Melbourne*. Melbourne. MUP.

Sutherland, A. 1888. “William Edward Hearn”. *The Argus*. April 28, p 5.

Trimble, C. W. c1916. *Enniskillen Royal School at Portora. Commonly Known as Portora Royal School. From it Foundation in 1618*. Fermagh Protestant Board of Education. .

White, M. 1987. “William Edward Hearn (1826-1888)”. In *New Palgrave. A Dictionary of Political Economy*. Vol 2. London. Macmillan. P 619.