

## “Give Me the Man Who Thinks Cooley”: Masculine Care, Paternalism, and Reform in Britain and India, 1770-1835

BRENDAN GILLIS

In a 1779 letter to the lord lieutenant of Cambridgeshire, Dr. William Howell Ewin described the qualities of a “Truely Paternal” magistrate. “[How] ever Popular some Characters may be for a Noise & a bluster,” the academic and justice of the peace explained, “Give me the man who thinks Cooley & Judges from Reason & a Good heart.” For Ewin, the practice of paternalism involved both thought and affect, but the balance tipped decidedly in favor of calm detachment and rational reserve.<sup>1</sup>

This paper reconsiders the entangled histories of domestic and imperial governance, as well as those of affective sensibility, masculinity, and authority. Drawing evidence from a range of manuscript and printed sources, I trace changes to the emotional milieu of local government in England, before examining the influence of these new understandings of magisterial care for imperial rule. In Britain and its empire, magistrates often used the language of “care” to describe the work associated with the office of justice of the peace (JP). At times, this could signify close attention to law and legal mandates, but for much of the eighteenth century an emotional discourse of magistracy also emphasized paternal affection, religious feeling, mercy, and love of justice. After 1770, however, discussions of ideal magistracy (such as Ewin’s) began to privilege an ability to overcome emotional engagement and think rationally. Rather than evidence of disengagement, I argue, the rhetoric of reason and cool stood for a new approach to magisterial practice. In his body, a magistrate performed judicial power, administrative responsibility, and an attitude of reasoned governance. With this in mind, reformers worried that overarching reasons of state could be overruled by the passions of the men that governed.

Language of affect and care suffused eighteenth-century British social relations. In existing studies of this period, the class politics of paternalism frequently stands in for the conservatism of the *ancien regime*.<sup>2</sup> According to many interpretations, the aristocracy abandoned paternalistic values and assumptions as the propertied elite forged an alliance with middling professionals, adapted to public service, and embraced a national culture.<sup>3</sup> But paternalism did not just signify unequal class relations.<sup>4</sup> Fundamentally, it presumed a reciprocal relationship of authority met

---

<sup>1</sup> Dr. William Howell Ewin to Philip Yorke, earl of Hardwicke, December 29, 1779, f. 104, Add. MS 35626, Hardwicke Papers, BL.

<sup>2</sup> Eric Stokes, *The English Utilitarians and India* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959); Harold James Perkin, *The Origins of Modern English Society, 1780-1880* (London: Routledge, 1969); Leonore Davidoff and Catherine Hall, *Family Fortunes: Men and Women of the English Middle Class, 1780-1850* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991), 20–1.

<sup>3</sup> Landau, *The Justices of the Peace, 1670-1760*; Linda Colley, *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707-1837* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992), chap. 4; Langford, *Public Life and the Propertied Englishman, 1689-1798*; Douglas Hay, “Patronage, Paternalism, and Welfare: Masters, Workers, and Magistrates in Eighteenth-Century England”; David Lemmings, *Law and Government in England During the Long Eighteenth Century: From Consent to Command* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), chap. 2.

<sup>4</sup> Norma Landau, *The Justices of the Peace, 1670-1760*, 1984; Paul Langford, *Public Life and the Propertied Englishman, 1689-1798* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991), chap. 6; Douglas Hay, “Patronage, Paternalism, and Welfare: Masters, Workers, and Magistrates in Eighteenth-Century England,” *International Labor and Working-Class History* 53 (1998): 27–47; Peter King, *Crime, Justice, and Discretion in England: 1740 - 1820* (New

with respect along axes of age and gender. Often applied to early modern practices of local government, the term “paternalism” did not have contemporary purchase. Instead, many observers discussed the paternal qualities of both fathers and rulers, taking for granted the analogy between paternity and government.<sup>5</sup> Women, the young, and those with less property should obey father figures who, in turn, would repay this obedience with paternal affection.

Contemporary ideals for magistracy emphasized the embodied nature of delegated authority. Neither in theory nor in practice did the separation of powers apply to the justice of the peace. Similarly, those who wielded magisterial power struggled to balance identities as men subject to emotion, as caring heads of household, and as careful, dispassionate judges. These qualities are clearest in the moral and religious strands of magisterial expression that crystallized in reaction to professional legalism.<sup>6</sup> Advocates of moral reform through local government urged magistrates to love, care, and feel the disruptive consequences of vice.<sup>7</sup> Rhetorical commonplaces, views such as these ordered many discussions of public service. In the words of magistrate Nathaniel Blackerby in 1738, it was the task of JPs to mimic the “paternal Affection” of the king. To enforce laws controlling the distribution of alcohol, the JP asserted, would oblige royal subjects to obey the monarch and his magistrates as dutiful children.<sup>8</sup> Overwhelmingly, discussions of paternal care in the execution of justice understood it to include affection, feeling, and mercy.

Understandings of emotional experience, of course, were neither straightforward nor static. During the second half of the eighteenth century, changing medical understandings of mind and body, rooted in the nervous system, promoted an increasing interest in sensibility and sentiment. These ideas focused on the fusion of reason and emotion in the minds and bodies of individuals as they engaged with their societies.<sup>9</sup> But could a man of feeling, many concerned magistrates began to ponder, put aside his emotions in order to channel justice?<sup>10</sup>

After midcentury, printed discourse—both religious and secular—began to associate the pull of paternal affection with emotional vulnerability, a deviation from earlier usage. Samuel Foote (1753) and Elizabeth Inchbald (1785) both plotted satirical plays that turned on the “paternal weakness” of central characters, who struggled to act “with manly firmness, [and] resist every

York: Oxford University Press, 2000); Peter King, “The Summary Courts and Social Relations in Eighteenth-Century England,” *Past & Present* 183, no. 1 (2004): 125–72.

<sup>5</sup> The first use of paternalism recorded in the OED is dated 1876. The dictionary does not distinguish between government of household and family. “paternalism, *n.*” and “paternal, *adj.*” *The Oxford English Dictionary*, 3d ed. 2005. OED Online (<http://dictionary.oed.com/>). Accessed 19 January 2015.

<sup>6</sup> Sharing many inspirations and outcomes, magisterial feeling predated and was far more widespread, at least at first, than a Methodist emphasis on effusive male feeling. See, Phyllis Mack, *Heart Religion in the British Enlightenment: Gender and Emotion in Early Methodism* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008), chap. 3.

<sup>7</sup> Benjamin Hoadly, *The Measures of Submission to the Civil Magistrate Consider'd in a Defense of the Doctrine Deliver'd in a Sermon Preach'd before the Rt. Hon. the Lord Mayor, Aldermen, and Citizens of London*, 2d ed. (London: T. Childe, 1708), 12–3.

<sup>8</sup> Nathaniel Blackerby, *The Speech of Nathaniel Blackerby Esq; At a General Meeting of His Majesty's Justices of the Peace For... Westminster* (London: J. and J. Fox, 1738), 2, 7, 10, 12, 18–9.

<sup>9</sup> G. J. Barker-Benfield, *The Culture of Sensibility: Sex and Society in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992). For the broader Atlantic context of sensibility, see Sarah Knott, *Sensibility and the American Revolution* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2009); G. J. Barker-Benfield, *Abigail and John Adams: The Americanization of Sensibility* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2010).

<sup>10</sup> For discussions of the manliness of sentimental feeling and the “man of feeling” as an ideal of polite masculinity, Philip Carter, *Men and the Emergence of Polite Society, Britain, 1660–1800*, *Women and Men in History* (New York: Pearson Education, 2001), chap. 3; Michèle Cohen, “‘Manners’ Make the Man: Politeness, Chivalry, and the Construction of Masculinity, 1750–1830,” *Journal of British Studies* 44, no. 2 (2005): 312–29.

innate pleading” to support “ungrateful” children.<sup>11</sup> In contrast, others imagined forms of “paternal justice” stripped of emotion.<sup>12</sup> These changes injected new urgency into discussions of manly magistracy. In defense of a system that invested propertied men with administrative and judicial authority, handbooks for magistrates identified the characteristics of a gentleman that qualified him for office.<sup>13</sup>

In addition, a rationalist impulse that motivated campaigns for law reform exposed a potential disconnect between magistracy and paternal love. From the 1770s, the pamphlet literature addressing the duties of English justices of the peace increasingly focused on a tension between sentimental engagement with the world and a posture of resistance to human passions.<sup>14</sup> Addressing the Dublin Quarter Sessions in 1796, Chairman Robert Day described “Jurisprudence” as “a Science founded on solid and fixed principles,” a purely reasoned and rational endeavor.<sup>15</sup> This discourse of magisterial care had more to do with fulfilling obligation than with feeling. In fact, an emphasis on duty suggested that systemic coherence entailed suppressing emotion and disregarding inclination.

Attending to the language with which magistrates discussed local government offers new perspectives on the changing natures of fatherhood, magistracy, and care in the decades before and after 1800. According to this emerging logic of government, a man should feel for those around him—but not in excess. The rhetoric of distance and cool, precursors to reasonable judgment, did not mean that magistrates no longer cared about local affairs. Instead, it stood for a new type of caring that owed as much to evolving notions of masculinity as it did to the shifting political realities of an era of reform.

By the end of the eighteenth century, new ideals of masculinity challenged the fundamental premises of the magisterial political imaginary. Leonore Davidoff and Catherine Hall have argued persuasively that a burgeoning middle-class sensibility endorsed and promoted a gendered distinction between public and private. Between 1780 and 1850, upper- and middle-class moralists increasingly distinguished between the household and what lay beyond, defining masculinity in terms suited for public engagement and femininity as a vehicle for familial domesticity. Above all, propertied men privileged a distinctly male reason and a particularly feminine capacity for emotion.<sup>16</sup> This prescriptive discourse of “separate spheres” offered neither a fully coher-

<sup>11</sup> Samuel Foote, *The Englishman in Paris. A Comedy in Two Acts. As It Is Performed at The Theatre-Royal in Covent-Garden*, 2d ed. (Dublin, 1753), 30; Elizabeth Inchbald, *I'll Tell You What. A Comedy, in Five Acts, as It Is Performed at The Theatre Royal, Haymarket* (London, 1786), 61. Quotation from Inchbald.

<sup>12</sup> John Hey, *The Substance of a Sermon Preached at His Majesty's Chapel at Whitehall, on Friday, the 27th of February, 1778*. (Cambridge, 1778), 10.

<sup>13</sup> Edward Barry, *The Present Practice of a Justice of the Peace; and a Complete Library of Parish Law* (London, 1790), v.

<sup>14</sup> Much of the literature on the growth of a middle class identity in late eighteenth-century England focuses on the policing of morality. This scholarship has suggested that, despite rhetorical posturing that focused on the criticism of trade, many in the traditional propertied elite came to tolerate and even embrace commercial sensibilities. Paul Langford, *A Polite and Commercial People: England 1727-1783* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989); Langford, *Public Life and the Propertied Englishman, 1689-1798*; Margaret R. Hunt, *The Middling Sort: Commerce, Gender, and the Family in England, 1680-1780* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996); Donna T. Andrew, *Aristocratic Vice: The Attack on Duelling, Suicide, Adultery, and Gambling in Eighteenth-Century England* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2013).

<sup>15</sup> Charge delivered 12 January 1796, 14; charge delivered 25 April 1797, 5, 22, Robert Day, *Seven Charges Delivered to the Grand Juries of the County of Dublin, by the Hon. Mr. Justice Day, While Chairman of the Said County* (Dublin: Bratsberry and Campbell, 1808).

<sup>16</sup> Davidoff and Hall, *Family Fortunes*.

ent ideology nor a realistic description of actual behavior.<sup>17</sup> Nonetheless, as affective (and often affected) orientations, nineteenth-century divisions between spaces of public, communal engagement and private, familial concern transformed understandings of human relationships with profound implications for the logic of local government. Over the same period, historians of masculinity have argued, physical strength and a chivalric archetype came to define new ideals of manliness less invested in outward displays of emotional sensitivity.<sup>18</sup> For a knightly gentleman, care should be confined to his castle and worn underneath the armor of a public persona. Anecdotal evidence suggests that this affect may have changed the ways in which JPs presented themselves and their decisions. Emotional care ought to be confined within the household, while a cool, rational paternalism should direct a magistrate's public affairs.

These changes to English understandings of ideal magistracy provide essential context for imperial administration, particularly law enforcement in India. The unusually prolific writings of Edward Strachey, a British magistrate in Bengal, provide insight into the emotional experience of magistracy during a period of political instability and institutional change. As judge and magistrate in Bengal, Strachey agonized over the emotional repercussions of his work. In a journal of his life in Midnapoor, where he served as magistrate from 1805 to 1806, Strachey repeatedly chastised himself for feeling and caring in excess, never quite able to feel magisterial even as he strove to act like a rational governor. His musings point to a powerful poetics of emotional distancing that set the terms for his work both in and beyond the courtroom. Strachey figured his judicial and administrative actions as a struggle to achieve cool, rational detachment in a world of manly feeling.<sup>19</sup>

In these private writings, Strachey is unusually forthright in the description of the emotional consequences of authority and governance. His attitudes, however, are suggestive of a long transitional moment in understandings of the aims, qualities, and outcomes associated with magistracy. In navigating the complicated and at times tortured relations of rational mind and emotional body, Strachey wrestled with issues that defined late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century discourses of gender, identity, and social interaction. A sensitive self trying to master the passions attendant to imperial governance, Strachey defined his identity in terms of sentiment and sensibility.<sup>20</sup>

Strachey diagnosed himself with melancholy. He did so as the logic of local authority was beginning to come apart at the seams. Emerging historiographical focuses on emotion and affect have begun to influence the ways in which imperial historians characterize regimes of inequali-

---

<sup>17</sup> For a classic critique that distinguishes between historical experience and prescriptive gender norms, see Vickery, "Golden Age to Separate Spheres?" Studies of behaviors that blurred distinctions between public and private abound, for example Amanda Vickery, *The Gentleman's Daughter: Women's Lives in Georgian England* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998); Amanda Vickery, *Behind Closed Doors: At Home in Georgian England* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009); John Tosh, "Domesticity and Manliness in the Victorian Middle Class: The Family of Edward White Benson," in *Manful Assertions: Masculinities in Britain Since 1800*, ed. Michael Roper and John Tosh (New York: Routledge, 1991); Michèle Cohen, "'Manners' Make the Man: Politeness, Chivalry, and the Construction of Masculinity, 1750–1830," *Journal of British Studies* 44, no. 2 (2005): 312–29; Judith R. Walkowitz, *Prostitution and Victorian Society: Women, Class, and the State* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1980).

<sup>18</sup> Thomas W. Laqueur, "The Queen Caroline Affair: Politics as Art in the Reign of George IV," *The Journal of Modern History* 54, no. 3 (1982): 417–66; Cohen, "'Manners' Make the Man"; Dodsworth, "Masculinity as Governance: Police, Public Service and the Embodiment of Authority, c. 1700–1850."

<sup>19</sup> Entry for 8 March 1806, Edward Strachey, Journal of Midnapoor, MSS Eur F128/206, f. 16, papers of Edward Strachey, Bengal Civil Service, 1793–1811, India Office, Private Papers, British Library.

<sup>20</sup> Barker-Benfield, *The Culture of Sensibility: Sex and Society in Eighteenth-Century Britain*.

ty.<sup>21</sup> Jon E. Wilson argues that anxiety about the apparent unknowability of India defined the affective environment of British governors in the colony during the period between 1780 and 1830.<sup>22</sup> Anxiety, however, is a quality often associated with the emotional experience of men of authority and status. Frequently used to characterize early modern England, the figure of the “anxious patriarch” appears wherever regimes of male privilege used differences in class, race, and gender to assert power.<sup>23</sup> Definitions of melancholy emphasized its associations with a particular set of masculine privileges; its symptoms exaggerated qualities of refinement, including reserve, thoughtfulness, and leisurely torpor.<sup>24</sup> For early modern physicians, melancholy signaled the peculiar discontents of modern civilization. As the English malady, it demonstrated the superiority of those sensible enough to experience it. Cultural and medical discourses of melancholy emerged in dialogue with imperial awareness and experiences. Since the publication of George Cheyne’s *The English Malady* (1733), melancholy, or melancholia, had acquired considerable cachet in British medical literature and even an element of fashion in polite circles.<sup>25</sup> For a magistrate, melancholy could be deeply troubling on a conceptual level, inhibiting the very qualities necessary for the office. Even worse, the cure for the most common variants of the disease would turn governor into governed, a state of affairs incompatible with the exercise of authority.

As I argue in my larger project, the justice of the peace had emerged during the eighteenth century as the predominant form of local government across the British empire.<sup>26</sup> A worldview of cosmopolitan parochialism fostered expansive tendencies that pushed at the boundaries of established jurisdictions, as magistrates clamored for new powers to be executed in new ways. The sudden and rapid expansion of British magistracy in India coincided with an affective shift

---

<sup>21</sup> Much of the literature that has approached colonial or imperial histories of affect and emotion has focused on family or slavery, for example Bianca Premo, *Children of the Father King: Youth, Authority, and Legal Minority in Colonial Lima* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2005); Edlie L. Wong, *Neither Fugitive nor Free: Atlantic Slavery, Freedom Suits, and the Legal Culture of Travel* (New York: New York University Press, 2009); Margot Finn, “Anglo-Indian Lives in the Later Eighteenth and Early Nineteenth Centuries,” *Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies* 33, no. 1 (2010): 49–65; Erin Austin Dwyer, “Mastering Emotions: The Emotional Politics of Slavery” (Ph.D. Dissertation, Harvard University, 2012).

<sup>22</sup> Jon E. Wilson, *The Domination of Strangers: Modern Governance in Eastern India, 1780-1835*, Cambridge Imperial and Post-Colonial Studies Series (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008). This plays out in the official correspondence of Thomas Perry discussed in the previous chapter.

<sup>23</sup> Alexandra Shepard argues that the focus on anxiety in studies of early modern masculinity has more to do with the broader economic and social turmoil of the period than any qualitative difference between the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, Shepard, “From Anxious Patriarchs to Refined Gentlemen?” Anxious patriarchs populate studies of the propertied classes of early modern England, colonial Virginia, and eighteenth-century Jamaica, as well as the East India Company in the early nineteenth century. See, Anthony Fletcher, “Men’s Dilemma: The Future of Patriarchy in England 1560-1660,” *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, Sixth Series, 4 (1994): 61–81; Mark Breitenberg, *Anxious Masculinity in Early Modern England* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996); Kathleen M. Brown, *Good Wives, Nasty Wenches, and Anxious Patriarchs: Gender, Race, and Power in Colonial Virginia* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996); Trevor Burnard, *Mastery, Tyranny, and Desire: Thomas Thistlewood and His Slaves in the Anglo-Jamaican World* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004); Wilson, *The Domination of Strangers*, 66–7, 74.

<sup>24</sup> Michael MacDonald, *Mystical Bedlam: Madness, Anxiety, and Healing in Seventeenth-Century England* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1981), 150–160; Dana Y. Rabin, *Identity, Crime, and Legal Responsibility in Eighteenth-Century England* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004), 62.

<sup>25</sup> George Cheyne, *George Cheyne: The English Malady (1733)*, ed. Roy Porter (New York: Routledge, 1991), 10–1.

<sup>26</sup> In early modern parlance, the term magistrate could signify any agent of government with judicial powers, including the king and high court judges. By the eighteenth century, it was used almost exclusively to describe justices of the peace or equivalent officers with a combination of judicial and administrative authority.

throughout the empire. A reorientation of the types of care expected of elite men—from the community to the household, from public to private—destabilized the discourse of local government in India. Here, the emotional consequences of changing understandings of masculine self-control collided with a uniquely hierarchical system of judicial and administrative oversight within a context of profound awareness of cultural difference. Overdetermined by a number of factors, this shift drew from and contributed to the rise of liberalism in state and empire, evangelical religious discourse, and new understandings of credit and market behavior that heralded the rise of a capitalist economy.<sup>27</sup>

From the mid-1820s, reformers sought to reorganize and rationalize the institutions and practices of the English state and its colonial subsidiaries. Many interpretations of reform in Britain emphasize the limited intent for and extent of actual change, and scholars of India have argued that the authoritarian realignment of imperial rule during this period distinguishes the colonial experience from that of the metropole.<sup>28</sup> While the Reform Bill of 1832 accomplished only the most moderate electoral reform, the legislature systematically restructured English parish and county government with significant consequences for state and empire.<sup>29</sup> Similarly, reforms passed during the governor-generalship of William Bentinck in India (1828-1835) embraced rationalization and centralization, repudiating efforts to remodel the subcontinent through paternalist landownership. A series of measures culminating in the 1833 Charter Act created a supreme government with a uniform penal code, sweeping away the loose confederacy of presidencies that previously had accommodated regional difference. Reinforcing policies critical of discretion, these efforts worked to transform Indian magistrates into executive officers subject to considerable oversight and possessed of significantly circumscribed summary powers.<sup>30</sup> The legislation produced during this decade of reform systematically undercut local discretion and summary jurisdiction, disciplining the office of magistrate and transforming it into an arm of a reformed, bureaucratic state. Collectively, these measures implemented a more hierarchical pattern of government in which central institutions oversaw local decisions.<sup>31</sup> Addressing both Britain and India, Parliament disavowed the most fundamental principles of eighteenth-century magistracy.

<sup>27</sup> Boyd Hilton, *The Age of Atonement: The Influence of Evangelicalism on Social and Economic Thought, 1785-1865* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991); Jennifer Pitts, *A Turn to Empire: The Rise of Imperial Liberalism in Britain and France* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005); Sven Beckert, *Empire of Cotton: A Global History* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2014).

<sup>28</sup> Philip Harling and Peter Mandler, "From 'Fiscal-Military' State to Laissez-Faire State, 1760-1850," *Journal of British Studies* 32 (1993): 44-70; David Eastwood, *Governing Rural England: Tradition and Transformation in Local Government 1780-1840* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994); Philip Harling, *The Waning of "Old Corruption": The Politics of Economical Reform in Britain, 1779-1846* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996); Arthur Burns and Joanna Innes, *Rethinking the Age of Reform: Britain 1780-1850* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003). For India, see Wilson, *The Domination of Strangers*, 158-60.

<sup>29</sup> Many interpretations suggest that these reforms realigned the state with the ideals of the middle class, thus preserving the power and interest of the aristocratic elite. See, among many others, Harling and Mandler, "From 'Fiscal-Military' State to Laissez-Faire State, 1760-1850"; Gareth Stedman Jones, "Rethinking Chartism," in *Languages of Class: Studies in English Working Class History, 1832-1982* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 90-178; Dorothy Thompson, *The Chartists: Popular Politics in the Industrial Revolution* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1984); J. C. D. Clark, *English Society 1660-1832*, 2nd ed. (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000).

<sup>30</sup> Stokes, *The English Utilitarians and India*, 184-243; C. A. Bayly, *Imperial Meridian: The British Empire and the World, 1780-1830* (London: Longman, 1989), 244-5; Wilson, *The Domination of Strangers*, chap. 6.

<sup>31</sup> As David Eastwood has argued, the series of reforms culminating in a new poor law substantively altered structures of local government. David Eastwood, *Governing Rural England: Tradition and Transformation in Local Government 1780-1840* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994). Much of the legislation passed surrounding the Reform Act of 1832 worked to institutionalize processes of rule previously decentralized.

The reforms of the 1830s, I argue, cannot be understood fully without awareness of a broader affective history of masculine care.<sup>32</sup> Over the previous decades, an affective shift in understandings of paternal care undermined confidence in traditions of magistracy. Instead of suddenly and almost inexplicably letting their power slip away, as suggested in J. C. D. Clark's influential interpretation, entrenched elites came to question the cultural and normative underpinnings of a government predicated on their voluntary participation.<sup>33</sup> Earlier visions for rationalization gave way to a new logic that valued economic efficiency, uniformity, and consistency in legal application. Many magistrates appear to have accepted, or even encouraged, the very reforms that undercut their authority. The revolution in local government, then, owed at least as much to this shift in the political imaginary of British and imperial magistrates as to the ideas and proposals of liberal intellectuals and utilitarian philosophy. Before legislation accomplished structural and institutional reform, the nature of magistracy had changed.

---

<sup>32</sup> For influential works in the history of affect and emotions, see Carol Z. Stearns and Peter N. Stearns, eds., *Emotion and Social Change: Toward a New Psychohistory* (New York: Holmes & Meier, 1988); Barbara H. Rosenwein, ed., *Anger's Past: The Social Uses of an Emotion in the Middle Ages* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1998); William M. Reddy, *The Navigation of Feeling: A Framework for the History of Emotions* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001).

<sup>33</sup> Clark, *English Society 1660-1832*.