WILLIAM MCDOUGALL

THE GROUP MIND

William McDougall

The Group Mind

Enriched edition.

Introduction, Studies and Commentaries by Darren Fox

Table of Contents

Introduction

How can many minds become one without erasing the individual, and what happens to judgment, morality, and power when the crowd acquires a will of its own, organizing sentiments, loyalties, and impulses that exceed any person yet depend on each, shaping decisions in assemblies and churches, in armies and workplaces, in neighborhoods and nations, and doing so through mechanisms that feel at once spontaneous and disciplined, rational and passionate, binding and liberating, so that we both fear and seek the collective, suspecting it of credulity while trusting it for courage, and alternately blaming and praising it for deeds no single member would claim?

William McDougall's The Group Mind is a landmark work of social psychology from the early twentieth century, written by a British psychologist best known for exploring instinct and emotion. First appearing soon after the First World War, it reflects an intellectual climate urgently concerned with crowds, nationalism, and the stability of democratic institutions. As a theoretical treatise rather than a narrative, the book proposes a systematic account of how collective life forms, persists, and exerts influence. It stands at the intersection of psychology, sociology, and moral philosophy, sketching principles of collective mentality and their relevance to the conduct and character of nations.

Readers encounter a careful, methodical voice that moves from definitions to propositions, assembling its case through patient distinctions and cumulative reasoning. McDougall examines the psychological conditions under which groups become more than mere aggregates, discussing processes like imitation, suggestion, leadership, discipline, and the organization of shared sentiments. The

tone is confident, analytic, and occasionally exhortative, reflecting a belief that clear concepts can illuminate messy public life. The prose is formal and dense but accessible when approached deliberately, and the experience resembles a guided seminar in which terms are clarified, assumptions tested, and implications drawn for institutions ranging from clubs to nations.

Among its central themes is the tension between individual personality and collective structure: how personal motives are harnessed by custom, how loyalty shapes judgment, and how moral standards both arise from and constrain group action. The book investigates cohesion—what knits members together—and differentiates types of organization, from loosely assembled crowds to enduring communities with traditions and shared purposes. It explores the role of leaders and norms in stabilizing common life, while warning that the same forces enabling cooperation can amplify prejudice or folly. Throughout, the argument asks what makes a group responsible, creative, and durable without becoming oppressive, brittle, or credulous.

Rather than offering dramatic case studies, McDougall sketches general principles and uses illustrative examples sparingly to show how size, communication, and division of labor alter a group's mental life. He considers how habits and institutions embody collective memory, how discipline channels energy into sustained projects, and how public opinion forms and shifts. The discussion differentiates temporary assemblies from corporate bodies with defined functions, emphasizing that stability depends on shared sentiments and rules cultivated over time. By mapping these gradations, the book invites readers to analyze any association—committee, movement, or nation—by asking what binds it, who coordinates it, and how it learns.

The Group Mind remains pertinent because its core questions—about coordination, identity, and responsibility in

collective life—persist across new media and institutions. Today's networks, organizations, and polarized publics still wrestle with contagion, conformity, leadership, and moral purpose. While some terminology and assumptions reflect its era and demand critical distance, the conceptual tools remain useful for probing how norms emerge, how authority legitimizes itself, and how groups think, act, and change. Readers can mine the book for frameworks that complement later social identity theory and organizational research, gaining vocabulary to evaluate collaboration, governance, and civic life without reducing politics or culture to individual psychology alone.

Approached as a rigorous map rather than a final verdict, this work offers a disciplined way to ask better questions about collective behavior. It equips readers to examine when group decisions are wiser than individual ones, how shared ideals crystallize, and why some associations grow resilient while others fracture. Its value lies in sharpening attention to structure, sentiment, and purpose, encouraging civic imagination alongside sober caution. As contemporary life oscillates between decentralization and mass coordination, McDougall's analysis invites us to cultivate groups capable of judgment and care, where the many can act as one without losing the dignity and insight of each.

Synopsis

William McDougall's The Group Mind (1920) sets out to establish a coherent psychology of collective life. Writing in the aftermath of the First World War, he asks how enduring associations—especially nations—come to think, feel, and will as wholes. The book advances a program: first, to ground collective phenomena in individual psychology; then, to specify the conditions under which a true group mind exists; finally, to apply these principles to national life and character. McDougall differentiates his inquiry from mere crowd psychology, aiming to explain organized, continuous groups whose traditions, institutions, and purposes outlast any particular gathering of individuals.

The theoretical foundation is his account of the individual mind, organized by instincts, sentiments, habits, and will. McDougall argues that social behavior is driven by innate tendencies shaped through experience into stable dispositions, which supply the motives for cooperation, obedience, rivalry, and loyalty. Collective life never floats free of individuals, yet the coordination of many minds can yield properties not reducible to momentary aggregation. He rejects treating the group as a mysterious entity, insisting instead on mechanisms that align individual motives, structure mutual expectations, and channel emotion toward shared ends within a durable social framework.

From this base he surveys types of human aggregates, distinguishing the transient crowd from the public and from fully organized groups. A true group mind, he contends, requires stable membership, persistent interaction, a recognized structure of roles, and a fund of traditions and standards. Language, symbols, and ritual supply continuity

and enable complex coordination. The group's history is stored in custom and law, binding generations into a single stream of experience. In such conditions, collective thought and will emerge as regular, predictable patterns that can be studied without invoking anything beyond psychological principles.

McDougall then analyzes the processes by which groups achieve unity of feeling and purpose. Suggestion, imitation, and the authority of prestige knit individuals together, but he stresses disciplined organization over mere contagion. Institutions act as memory and guidance systems, transmitting knowledge and stabilizing norms. Public discussion and channels of communication allow common opinions to form; leadership articulates and directs them. He treats morale as a psychological resource, built by common symbols and shared trials. The result is a picture of collective life as a network of influences that consolidate experience into policy, custom, and coordinated action.

Attention turns to the internal conflicts that any group must manage. The claims of individuality press against demands for conformity; authority must be balanced with consent; zeal must be tempered by justice. McDougall describes how sanctions, education, and ceremony mold character to the group's standards while leaving room for initiative and criticism. He examines recruitment and socialization, maintenance of discipline, and mechanisms for resolving disputes. Functionally differentiated roles and representative procedures are shown to support coherence, allowing complex undertakings while preserving a sense of common responsibility and shared identity across diverse members.

In applying his framework to national life, McDougall considers how a people acquires collective will and character through institutions, education, and continuous common enterprises in peace and war. He discusses the conditions that strengthen or weaken cohesion and

efficiency, including the quality of leadership, the clarity of aims, and the adaptability of traditions. He evaluates how constitutional arrangements channel collective opinion into action, contrasting more centralized with more participatory forms. Throughout, he maintains that national character is shaped by long experience rather than momentary fervor, and that durable organization is essential for sustained collective achievement.

The book's lasting importance lies in its systematic attempt to relate individual psychology to the organized realities of collective existence. Without relying on mysticism or reducing everything to crowds, McDougall proposes criteria and mechanisms for understanding how groups think and act. While some formulations reflect its era, the work poses enduring questions about the sources of cohesion, the formation of public opinion, and the psychology of institutions and nations. It offers a framework for analyzing collective agency that remains relevant wherever people seek to align personal motives with common purposes while preserving responsible freedom.

Historical Context

The Group Mind appeared in 1920, amid the immediate aftermath of the First World War. Its author, the British psychologist William McDougall, had long taught at Oxford, serving as Reader in Mental Philosophy, and in that same year departed to take a chair at Harvard. The setting was Britain's universities and learned societies, where psychology was consolidating as an experimental and social science. Institutions such as Oxford and Cambridge hosted vigorous debate about how nations, crowds, and organizations behaved under stress. McDougall's book addressed this context directly, proposing principles for understanding collective life at a moment when Europe was rebuilding political and moral order.

Late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century writings on crowd and collective behavior framed McDougall's project. Gustave Le Bon's The Crowd (1895) popularized the idea that individuals submerged in crowds adopt new, volatile psychologies. Gabriel Tarde and Scipio Sighele added criminological and imitation-based accounts. In parallel, Émile Durkheim's work, including The Elementary Forms of Religious Life (1912), advanced concepts of collective representations and social cohesion. In Britain, the British Psychological Society (founded 1901) and university laboratories expanded experimental work while debating social applications. The Group Mind entered this conversation, seeking to reconcile individual psychology with the observed stability and action of organized groups and nations.

McDougall's earlier An Introduction to Social Psychology (1908) had argued that human conduct rests on innate instincts and organized sentiments, shaping attention,

emotion, and will. That framework, influential in Britain and beyond, positioned him against reductionist trends that treated behavior as mere reflex or conditioning. In the 1910s, American behaviorism gathered force after John B. Watson's 1913 manifesto, promising a strictly objective account of behavior. Conditioning research by Ivan Pavlov also gained prominence. The Group Mind extended McDougall's purposive, volitional approach to collective life, insisting that enduring group organization and shared ends could not be explained solely by imitation, suggestion, or habit.

The Great War profoundly shaped the book's concerns. From 1914 to 1918, European states mobilized millions, introduced conscription, and coordinated economies and morale on unprecedented scales. Britain created official propaganda bodies, including the War Propaganda Bureau in 1914 and later the Ministry of Information, to influence opinion at home and abroad. Mass obedience, endurance under bombardment, and the management of rumor and panic became practical problems for administrators and scholars. McDougall wrote into this landscape, asking how disciplined armies, bureaucracies, and publics achieve coherent action, and how leadership, tradition, and shared purpose sustain collective will in times of crisis.

In Britain, the political order was shifting quickly. The Representation of the People Act 1918 vastly expanded the electorate, while returning soldiers and workers pressed claims through unions and new parties. The 1919 Paris Peace Conference and the Treaty of Versailles redrew borders and established the League of Nations. Nearby, the Russian Revolution of 1917 signaled a rival model of mass mobilization and ideology. Ireland entered a war of independence from 1919 to 1921. Against this backdrop of nationalism, democratization, and industrial unrest, The Group Mind examined how nations, classes, and institutions

hold together or fracture, and how collective purpose might be cultivated.

Scientific debates about heredity, intelligence, and social improvement strongly colored the period. Francis Galton had coined eugenics in 1883, and by 1907 the Eugenics Education Society in London promoted hereditarian policies. Karl Pearson's biometry and, in 1918, R. A. Fisher's work on the genetic basis of correlation shaped arguments about inheritance. Psychologists advanced mental testing; Charles Spearman proposed a general factor of intelligence in 1904, and wartime testing in the United States brought large-scale data. McDougall engaged these currents, discussing national character and the transmission of dispositions, while also emphasizing institutions, tradition, and leadership as mechanisms that organize otherwise volatile collective impulses.

The book also sits at a transatlantic juncture in academic psychology. In 1920 McDougall left Oxford for Harvard, entering an American discipline increasingly defined by laboratory methods and behaviorist doctrine. He continued to defend purposive psychology publicly, most famously in a 1924 debate with John B. Watson. After 1927 he moved to Duke University, where psychology expanded in new directions under his chairmanship. The Group Mind, though centered on British and European examples, addressed audiences on both sides of the Atlantic who were grappling with mass education, industrial organization, and the governance of diverse, rapidly changing populations.

Published at a moment of reconstruction and anxiety, The Group Mind reflects early twentieth-century efforts to theorize mass society without surrendering agency to irrational crowds. It integrates debates on instinct, leadership, tradition, and national character with observations from wartime mobilization and postwar politics. The work often adopts categories and assumptions that were common in its era yet later contested, especially

concerning heredity and nationhood. As a result, it stands both as a major statement in the formation of social psychology and as a document that reveals how interwar scholars sought normative guidance for democratic governance, education, and institutional cohesion amid sweeping change.

The Group Mind

Main Table of Contents

"Une nation est une âme, un principe spirituel. Deux choses qui, à vrai dire, n'en font qu'une constituent cette âme, ce principe spirituel. L'une est dans le passé, l'autre dans le présent. L'une est la possession en commun d'un riche legs de souvenirs; l'autre est le consentement actuel, le désir de vivre ensemble, la volonté de continuer à faire valoir l'héritage qu'on a reçu indivis."

Ernest Renan.

TO

Professor L. T. HOBHOUSE

in admiration of his work in philosophy, psychology, and sociology, and in the hope that he may discern in this book some traces of the spirit by which his own writings have been inspired.

Preface

In this book I have sketched the principles of the mental life of groups and have made a rough attempt to apply these principles to the understanding of the life of nations. I have had the substance of the book in the form of lecture notes for some years, but have long hesitated to publish it. I have been held back, partly by my sense of the magnitude and difficulty of the subject and the inadequacy of my own preparation for dealing with it, partly because I wished to build upon a firm foundation of generally accepted principles of human nature.

Some fifteen years ago I projected a complete treatise on Social Psychology which would have comprised the substance of the present volume. I was prevented from carrying out the ambitious scheme, partly by the difficulty of finding a publisher, partly by my increasing sense of the lack of any generally accepted or acceptable account of the constitution of human nature. I found it necessary to attempt to provide such a foundation, and in 1908 published my *Introduction to Social Psychology*. That book has enjoyed a certain popular success. But it was more novel, more revolutionary, than I had supposed when writing it; and my hope that it would rapidly be accepted by my colleagues as in the main a true account of the fundamentals of human nature has not been realised.

All this part of psychology labours under the great difficulty that the worker in it cannot, like other men of science, publish his conclusions as discoveries which will necessarily be accepted by any persons competent to judge. He can only state his conclusions and his reasonings and hope that they may gradually gain the general approval of his colleagues. For to the obscure questions of fact with

which he deals it is in the nature of things impossible to return answers supported by indisputable experimental proofs. In this field the evidence of an author's approximation towards truth can consist only in his success in gradually persuading competent opinion of the value of his views. My sketch of the fundamentals of human nature can hardly claim even that degree of success which would be constituted by an active criticism and discussion of it in competent quarters. Yet there are not wanting indications that opinion is turning slowly towards the acceptance of some such doctrine as I then outlined. Especially the development of psycho-pathology, stimulated so greatly by the esoteric dogmas of the Freudian school, points in this direction. The only test and verification to which any scheme of human nature can be submitted is the application of it to practice in the elucidation of the concrete phenomena of human life and in the control and direction of conduct, especially in the two great fields of medicine and education. And I have been much encouraged by finding that some workers in both of these fields have found my scheme of use in their practice and have even, in some few cases, given it a cordial general approval. But group psychology is itself one of the fields in which such testing and verification must be sought. And I have decided to delay no longer in attempting to bring my scheme to this test. I am also impelled to venture on what may appear to be premature publication by the fact that five of the best years of my life have been wholly given up to military service and the practical problems of psycho-therapy, and by the reflection that the years of a man's life are numbered and that, even though I should delay yet another fifteen years, I might find that I had made but little progress towards securing the firm foundation I desired.

It may seem to some minds astonishing that I should now admit that the substance of this book was committed to writing before the Great War[1]; for that war is supposed by

some to have revolutionised all our ideas of human nature and of national life. But the war has given me little reason to add to or to change what I had written. This may be either because I am too old to learn, or because what I had written was in the main true; and I am naturally disposed to accept the second explanation.

I wish to make it clear to any would-be reader of this volume that it is a sequel to my *Introduction to Social Psychology*, that it builds upon that book and assumes that the reader is acquainted with it. That former volume has been criticised as an attempted outline of *Social Psychology*. One critic remarks that it may be good psychology, but it is very little social; another wittily says "Mr McDougall, while giving a full account of the genesis of instincts that act in society, hardly shows how they issue into society. He seems to do a great deal of packing in preparation for a journey on which he never starts." The last sentence exactly describes the book. I found myself, like so many of my predecessors and contemporaries, about to start on a voyage of exploration of societies with an empty trunk, or at least with one very inadequately supplied with the things essential for successful travelling. I decided to avoid the usual practice of starting without impedimenta and of picking up or inventing bits of make-shift equipment as each emergency arose; I would pack my trunk carefully before starting. And now although my fellow travellers have not entirely approved my outfit, I have launched out to put it to the test; and I cannot hope that my readers will follow me if they have not at their command a similar outfit—namely, a similar view of the constitution of human nature.

I would gratefully confess that the resolve to go forward without a further long period of preparation has been made possible for me largely by the encouragement I have had from the recently published work of Dr James Drever, *Instinct in Man*. For the author of that work has carefully studied the most fundamental part of my *Social Psychology*,

in the light of his wide knowledge of the cognate literature, and has found it to be in the main acceptable.

The title and much of the substance of the present volume might lead a hasty reader to suppose that I am influenced by, or even in sympathy with, the political philosophy associated with German 'idealism.' I would, therefore, take this opportunity both to prevent any such erroneous inference and to indicate my attitude towards that system of thought in plainer language than it seemed possible to use before the war. I have argued that we may properly speak of a group mind, and that each of the most developed nations of the present time may be regarded as in process of developing a group mind. This must lay me open to the suspicion of favouring the political philosophy which makes of the state a super-individual and semi-divine person before whom all men must bow down, renouncing their claims to freedom of judgment and action; the political philosophy in short of German 'idealism,' which derives in the main from Hegel, which has been so ably represented in this country by Dr Bosanquet, which has exerted so great an influence at Oxford, and which in my opinion is as detrimental to honest and clear thinking as it has proved to be destructive of political morality in its native country. I am relieved of the necessity of attempting to justify these severe strictures by the recent publication of *The Metaphysical Theory of the State* by Prof. L. T. Hobhouse. In that volume Prof. Hobhouse has subjected the political philosophy of German 'idealism,' and especially Dr Bosanquet's presentation of it, to a criticism which, as it seems to me, should suffice to expose the hollowness of its claims to all men for all time; and I cannot better define my own attitude towards it than by expressing the completeness of my sympathy with the searching criticism of Mr Hobhouse's essay. In my youth I was misled into supposing that the Germans were the possessors of a peculiar wisdom; and I have spent a large part of my life in

discovering, in one field of science after another, that I was mistaken. I can always read the works of some German philosophers, especially those of Hermann Lotze, with admiration and profit; but I have no longer any desire to contend with the great systems of 'idealism,' and I think it a cruel waste that the best years of the lives of many young men should be spent struggling with the obscure phrases in which Kant sought to express his profound and subtle thought. My first scientific effort was to find evidence in support of a new hypothesis of muscular contraction; and, in working through the various German theories, I was dismayed by their lack of clear mechanical conceptions. My next venture was in the physiology of vision, a branch of science which had become almost exclusively German. Starting with a prepossession in favour of one of the dominant German theories, I soon reached the conclusion that the two German leaders in this field, Helmholtz and Hering, with their hosts of disciples, had, in spite of much admirable detailed work, added little of value and much confusion to the theory of vision left us by a great Englishman,—namely, Thomas Young; and in a long series of papers I endeavoured to restate and supplement Young's theory. Advancing into the field of physiological psychology, I attacked the ponderous volumes of Wundt with enthusiasm; only to find that his physiology of the nervous system was a tissue of unacceptable hypotheses and that he failed to connect it in any profitable manner with his questionable psychology. And, finding even less satisfaction in such works as Ziehen's *Physiologische Psychologie*, with its crude materialism and associationism, or in the dogmatic speculations of Verworn, I published my own small attempt to bring psychology into fruitful relations with the physiology of the nervous system. This brought me up against the great problem of the relations between mind and body; and, having found that, in this sphere, German 'idealism' was pragmatically indistinguishable from thorough-going

materialism, and that those Germans who claimed to reconcile the two did not really rise much above the level of Ernst Haeckel's wild flounderings, I published my *History and Defense of Animism*. And in this field, though I found much to admire in the writings of Lotze, I derived most encouragement and stimulus from Prof. Bergson. In working at the foundations of human nature, I found little help in German psychology, and more in French books, especially in those of Prof. Ribot. In psycho-pathology I seemed to find that the claims of the German and Austrian schools were far outweighed by those of the French writers, especially of Prof. Janet. So now, in attacking the problems of the mental life of societies, I have found little help from German psychology or sociology, from the elaborations of Wundt's *Völkerpsychologie* or the ponderosities of Schäffle, and still less from the 'idealist' philosophy of politics. In this field also it is French authors from whom I have learnt most and with whom I find myself most in sympathy, especially MM. Fouillée, Boutmy, Tarde, and Demolins; though I would not be thought to hold in low esteem the works of many English and American authors, notably those of Buckle, Bagehot, Maine, Lecky, Lowell, and of many others, to some of which I have made reference in the chapters of this book.

I have striven to make this a strictly scientific work, rather than a philosophical one; that is to say, I have tried to ascertain and state the facts and principles of social life as it is and has been, without expressing my opinion as to what it should be. But, in order further to guard myself against the implications attached by German 'idealism' to the notion of a collective mind, I wish to state that politically my sympathies are with individualism and internationalism, although I have, I think, fully recognised the great and necessary part played in human life by the Group Spirit and by that special form of it which we now call 'Nationalism.'

I know well that those of my readers whose sympathies are with Collectivism, Syndicalism, or Socialism in any of its

various forms will detect in this book the cloven foot of individualism and leanings towards the aristocratic principle. I know also that many others will reproach me with giving countenance to communistic and ultra-democratic tendencies. I would, therefore, point out explicitly at the outset that, if this book affords justification for any normative doctrine or ideal, it is for one which would aim at a synthesis of the principles of individualism and communism, of aristocracy and democracy, of self-realization and of service to the community. I can best express this ideal in the wise words of Mr F. H. Bradley, which I extract from his famous essay on 'My Station and its Duties.' "The individual's consciousness of himself is inseparable from the knowing himself as an organ of the whole; ... for his nature now is not distinct from his 'artificial self.' He is related to the living moral system not as to a foreign body; his relation to it is 'too inward even for faith,' since faith implies a certain separation. It is no other-world that he can not see but must trust to; he feels himself in it, and it in him; ... the belief in this real moral organism is the one solution of ethical problems. It breaks down the antithesis of despotism and individualism; it denies them, while it preserves the truth of both. The truth of individualism is saved, because, unless we have intense life and self-consciousness in the members of the state, the whole state is ossified. The truth of despotism is saved, because, unless the member realizes the whole by and in himself, he fails to reach his own individuality. Considered in the main, the best communities are those which have the best men for their members, and the best men are the members of the best communities.... The two problems of the best man and best state are two sides, two distinguishable aspects of the one problem, how to realize in human nature the perfect unity of homogeneity and specification; and when we see that each of these without the other is unreal, then we see that (speaking in general)

the welfare of the state and the welfare of its individuals are questions which it is mistaken and ruinous to separate. Personal morality and political and social institutions can not exist apart, and (in general) the better the one the better the other. The community is moral, because it realizes personal morality; personal morality is moral, because and in so far as it realizes the moral whole."

Since correcting the proofs of this volume I have become acquainted with two recent books whose teaching is so closely in harmony with my own that I wish to direct my readers' attention to them. One is Sir Martin Conway's *The Crowd in Peace and War*, which contains many valuable illustrations of group life. The other is Miss M. P. Follett's *The New State; Group Organization the Solution of Popular Government*, which expounds the principles and advantages of collective deliberation with vigour and insight.

I am under much obligation to the general editor of this series, Prof. G. Dawes Hicks. He has read the proofs of my book, and has helped me greatly with many suggestions; but he has, of course, no responsibility for the views expressed in it.

W. M^cD.

Oxford,
March 1920.

Part I.

General Principles of Collective Psychology

43 George Frederic Watts (circa 1817–1904) was a prominent English Victorian painter and sculptor best known for large allegorical works and portraits that influenced public taste and moral sentiment in late 19th-century Britain.

44 This refers to A. Lawrence Lowell, the American academic who served as President of Harvard University in the early 20th century and wrote on civic topics such as Public Opinion and Popular Government (early 1900s); the text uses his views on public opinion.

45 The Russo–Japanese War was a military conflict between the Russian Empire and the Empire of Japan fought mainly in 1904–1905; the passage alludes to wartime incidents (such as reported attacks on British fishing vessels) that provoked public outrage in Britain at the time.

46 A 19th-century British journalist, economist and political writer (1816–1877) best known for works on government and society; his book Physics and Politics (published 1872) argued a division between a long prehistoric "race-making" period and a later "nation-making" period.

47 Names used in 19th-century physical anthropology to denote putative European subraces (roughly northern, Alpine and Mediterranean types); these typological labels come from historical racial classification and are now regarded as outdated and scientifically problematic.

48 Here denotes the late 19th/early 20th-century biological view that evolution is primarily driven by natural selection acting on spontaneous variation and that acquired characteristics are not directly inherited.

49 'M.' is the French honorific for 'Monsieur'; the citation refers to a French writer cited by McDougall who wrote on

the English people and argued that atmospheric and visual conditions influence national character (late 19th century).

50 Refers to Henry Thomas Buckle (1821–1862), an English historian best known for his work 'History of Civilization in England', who argued that large-scale physical environments shape national beliefs and institutions.

51 Meredith Townsend was a British journalist and editor active in the late 19th century, known for writing on international and Asian affairs and for his association with periodical journalism of that era (including The Spectator and other publications).

52 Lazzaroni (often spelled lazzaroni or lazzaroni di Napoli) was a historical term used by foreigners for the poor, often mobile street population of Naples and southern Italy, especially noted in 18th–19th century accounts. The word carried connotations of rough, unemployed urban lower classes in contemporary travel and political writing.

53 M. Thiers refers to Adolphe Thiers (1797–1877), a French historian and statesman who served in various ministerial roles and became the first President of the French Third Republic; he was also noted for writings on contemporary politics and administration.

54 A Latin legal term from Roman law referring to the wide authority the male head of a Roman family (paterfamilias) held over his children and household; it denotes legal power rather than the communal, clan-based 'patriarchal' systems described elsewhere and was central to Roman family law from the Republic into the Empire.

55 A Russian village commune or communal institution (mir) that historically allocated and managed land collectively among peasant households; it was a dominant form of rural

organisation in Imperial Russia from medieval times until major reforms in the late 19th and early 20th centuries.

56 The name of the Democratic Party political organisation that dominated New York City politics from the early 19th century into the early 20th century, known for providing immigrant social services and patronage while also being associated with corruption and machine-style politics.

57 An ancient name used by classical authors for pre-Greek inhabitants of parts of Greece and the Aegean; modern scholarship treats the term as a catch-all for diverse prehistoric populations whose exact origins and linguistic identity remain uncertain, with activity attested from the 3rd millennium BCE and later.

58 A prominent Athenian statesman and general who led Athens during its Golden Age in the mid-5th century BCE (roughly 461–429 BCE), associated with the expansion of Athenian democracy and the flourishing of arts and architecture.

59 A 1598 French royal decree that granted limited religious and civil rights to Huguenot (Protestant) communities; it was effectively revoked by King Louis XIV in 1685, triggering waves of Protestant emigration from France.

60 Hernán Cortés and Francisco Pizarro were Spanish conquistadors who led the military conquests of the Aztec Empire (Cortés, 1519–1521) and the Inca Empire (Pizarro, 1532–1533), actions that opened large parts of the Americas to Spanish colonial rule.

61 A set of institutions of the Catholic Church, most famously the Spanish Inquisition (formally established in 1478), tasked with identifying and punishing heresy; in

practice it involved trials, punishments, and in some cases executions or forced exile over several centuries.

62 Sir Henry Sumner Maine (1822–1888) was a British jurist and comparative legal historian whose work influenced 19th-century views of social and legal development.

63 Ancient Law (1861) is a book by H. S. Maine that compares legal institutions across societies and introduced the influential idea of social movement 'from status to contract.'

64 Walter Bagehot (1826–1877) was an English journalist and political writer (author of works like The English Constitution and Physics and Politics) who analysed how political institutions and customary authority affect social change.

65 The phrase refers to 19th-century literary and popular depictions of people of mixed Black and white ancestry; 'mulatto' is an historical term now considered outdated and often offensive, used in older writings to discuss racial mixing and its social consequences.

66 A variant/archaic spelling of Buddhism, the religion and philosophical tradition based on the teachings of Siddhārtha Gautama (the Buddha), which originated in South Asia around the 5th–4th centuries BCE.

67 An older Western term for Islam, the monotheistic religion founded by the Prophet Muhammad in the 7th century CE; the term is now often regarded as outdated and imprecise.

68 An older form of the word 'Renaissance,' referring to the European cultural and intellectual revival (roughly 14th–17th