

G

LADSTONE



AND HIS
CONTEMPORARIES.



FIFTY YEARS OF SOCIAL

AND POLITICAL PROGRESS



GLADSTONE

AND HIS CONTEMPORARIES.

FIFTY YEARS
OF SOCIAL AND POLITICAL PROGRESS.

By THOMAS ARCHER, F.R.H.S.

OPINIONS OF THE PRESS.

DAILY NEWS, London.

"William Ewart Gladstone and his Contemporaries" is not so much a biography of Mr. Gladstone as a political history of England during his lifetime. It is a book which has evidently been compiled with no ordinary pains and care, and with a praiseworthy desire to be impartial. . . . In this volume the leading politicians from the days of Castlereagh and Canning again appear before us, and we have at least a well-considered statement of what we may call the judgment of the educated world on the men who influenced the destinies of the nation.

STANDARD, London.

It is probably true that the biographical form of history is the best in dealing with times within the memory of men yet living. The life of a man prominent in affairs during a particular period may be taken as a central point round which matters of more general history group themselves. Such is the idea of the volume before us—the first of four which are to cover the fifty years of social and political progress since 1830.

THE ACADEMY, London.

Instead of being another example of that mania for vivisectioning contemporaries which has somewhat displaced the older fashion of *post-mortem* biographies, this work more fitly fulfils the promise of its sub-title, and is a record of the last "Fifty Years of Social and Political Progress." With the exception of the opening chapter, it can scarcely be claimed that the words and deeds of the Premier receive more space than do those of several of his political contemporaries. . . . Mr. Archer appears to resort to original authorities for information, and by so doing is creating a work of real utility and permanent value. He has evidently discovered many sources unknown, or little known, to the general student, and which none but one who has lived in the times to which they refer could have unearthed.

THE DAILY REVIEW, Edinburgh.

The first volume now before us is a splendid specimen of the material part of the art of bookmaking. It is handsomely bound and admirably printed; but with all its ornamentation it presents an appearance of durability, and proclaims that it is not merely a show-book. It is a book intended for use—a reference book, but likewise a historical book, doubly attractive because dealing with the leading political and literary personages of the day, whose names have become household words in every British home, and describing their characters, as well as recalling what they said, wrote, and did. . . . We are satisfied that every young man of intelligence who reads the book will rise from the perusal with his resolution quickened to make politics a study, and with his mind cleared and strengthened for the apprehension and appreciation of the issues involved in the political struggles of the present day.

TRUTH, London.

It is a good book; careful, just, equal tempered, and clearly written. I have no doubt but it will achieve a great deal of success.

DAILY TELEGRAPH, London.

So large a space in the history of that long and eventful time has indeed been filled by the name of William Ewart Gladstone, that his biography alone would be a chronicle of the epoch which he himself has greatly helped to mould and fashion. . . . The historian may be well assured of a gratifying reception from a wide circle of readers.

SCHOOL BOARD CHRONICLE, London.

There is not a dull passage in this stout volume, and so interesting is the story made, in every chapter and every section, that the reader lays down the volume at last with a feeling of impatience that he must wait for the other three volumes in succession before he can follow up the attractive and almost absorbing story.

PUBLIC OPINION, London.

This is practically a history of England, and is devoted to the biography, not of Mr. Gladstone alone, but of the Duke of Wellington, Earl Grey, Lord Melbourne, Daniel O'Connell, Sir Robert Peel, and Mr. Disraeli. . . . The work—brought out as it is with all its costly and beautiful illustrations—will, without doubt, prove one of the most useful books to have as one of reference, dealing as it does with subjects that Miss Martineau only considered in part, and that the existing generation often rather learns from the verbal traditions of their parents than from historical documents. It is evidently the author's intention to be scrupulously fair, and this work will be found to be very useful to all persons who wish to read some of the past glories of the last generation.

LIVERPOOL MERCURY.

As there is no epoch in our history with which it is of greater importance that the younger men of the generation should be acquainted than that of the last fifty years, so there is probably no part of it with which, from the nature of the case, they are really less familiar. . . . The book is neither a dry record of events nor a mere picturesque description of the surface of our national life during the past half century. Mr. Archer is a thinker as well as an observer. He not only depicts historical phenomena with the hand of an artist, but he enters into underlying causes in the spirit of a philosopher. His men and women are no lay figures, but living beings; and he possesses the enviable gift of imparting to his narrative somewhat of the force and animation of dramatic action. . . . He has grouped his facts with an eye to artistic effect as well as logical and chronological sequence. . . . Comprehensive in grasp and broad in his popular sympathies, he neither overlooks detail nor mars his narrative by the distortions of the political partisan. He is both fair in his statements of fact and impartial in his judgments—qualities which are too often wanting in the historians of all epochs, and which are rarely found in those who deal exclusively with their own times. His style is lively and picturesque, neither too stately nor too flippant, pleasant to read, but not without a certain dignity which well befits the subject.

DAILY CHRONICLE, London.

Mr. Bright, in his sound, common-sense way, has again and again told young men that in order to understand what is best for the present they should study the past; and they will be able to do this in a very easy and entertaining manner in Mr. Archer's volumes. Readers are nowhere worried with long political speeches or discussions, but facts are crisply dealt with, and great power of condensation has been displayed in bringing the record of many complex events within the compass of a single page.

PALL MALL GAZETTE, London.

Mr. Archer has made the meshes of his net pretty small and has cast it widely. Of men and things that have been notable or even notorious during the last fifty years he leaves none unhandled. . . . Mr. Archer has in fact written, or rather set about writing, a history of England since the accession of William IV.

LEEDS EXPRESS.

The first of the four volumes of the work is now before us, and it certainly realizes the promise of the prospectus. . . . It would be a great mistake to suppose that because the prime minister's name constitutes part of the title of the work that its pages are mainly devoted to an outline of his public career. No man will occupy so conspicuous a place in its chapters as the premier, but all others who have filled foremost positions in the councils of the nation, or who have prominently assailed abuses and contended for reforms, are likewise put before the reader in such a way that it is impossible he should not hereafter know their main characteristics, aims, and achievements. The Duke of Wellington, Lord Brougham, Sir Robert Peel, Lord Melbourne, Cobbett, Lord Beaconsfield, and a host of other well-known public men receive every attention at the hands of Mr. Archer, who displays excellent judgment in the way in which he intersperses biographies with the recital of parliamentary events and social movements. . . . From beginning to end "Gladstone and his Contemporaries" is an eminently readable book. Dulness finds no place within the covers of the first volume, and we have no doubt, from the skill with which Mr. Archer has handled the materials with which he has already dealt, that the interest of the work will be fully sustained to the end. Such a budget of incidents, anecdotes, historical information of all kinds, and graphic portraiture of the leading spirits of the generation that has gone and of that which is passing away, cannot fail to win for itself a high place in contemporary literature.

NONCONFORMIST AND INDEPENDENT, London.

Like its predecessor (the first volume), it is eminently readable, amusing, and conversational. There is nothing dry or philosophical or speculative in it. It is the romance of history, told by a contemporary who has himself witnessed most of the stirring scenes recorded.

THE SCOTSMAN, Edinburgh.

It is a very well and spiritedly-written narration of events during the period to which it relates; and it will be found, for young readers, extremely valuable, not only because of the information which it contains, but because of its indications of other sources from whence fuller and more detailed information can be drawn. The portraits in the book are very well done.

SPECTATOR, London.

We have sketches of a great number of personages, more or less distinguished; sketches which Mr. Archer draws with vigour, and always contrives to make entertaining. . . . The great difficulty of fairness in political matters has been well surmounted.

WESTERN DAILY MERCURY.

Mr. Archer has placed before his readers a succinct narrative of this remarkable period, and his description of it is most agreeably written. All the eminent men who took part in the struggles of that time are passed in review before us. We see Sir Robert Peel, under the influence of Cobden and Bright, and the great League that they created, gradually brought round to the candid adoption of their views. Other passages introduce us to the entrance into the political arena of Benjamin Disraeli, and the appearance of a new force in English politics—a force that continued down to a very recent period.

BIRMINGHAM DAILY MAIL.

The writer has included literary, artistic, and social episode, and anecdote, as well as the record of political facts. The style of the work is popular, its information is accurate and full, its criticisms are just, and its tone is impartial.

SUNDERLAND ECHO.

Throughout the volume the narrative of historical events is interspersed with biographical sketches of famous men, statesmen, soldiers, judges, philosophers, philanthropists, men of literature and science, written so vividly and with such intimate knowledge of their individual characteristics as to merit the name of word-portraits.

DUNDEE ADVERTISER.

This volume is full of well arranged information. To the youthful student especially it is valuable. It gives in small compass the leading outlines and facts of the period. It is precisely the book for a busy man who wishes to get at a glance a bird's-eye view of the past fifty years.

BRADFORD OBSERVER.

No reader of intelligence is likely to put this book down hastily. The sketches in it of the past generation of public men are full of life and vigour, and are embellished with a minuteness of detail which invest them with a strong human interest.

N. B. DAILY MAIL, Glasgow.

The graphic yet condensed power of narration so noticeable in this first volume gives fair promise of a work at once readable and yet invaluable as a work of reference.

BELFAST NORTHERN WHIG.

It is paying Mr. Archer a high compliment to say that he has not distorted to any extent the facts of which he treats, and that he has succeeded in presenting to his readers as fair and impartial a view of the events and personages with which he deals as it is possible for a man of decided opinions to do. His sympathy with progress and reform has not led him to question the motives of the opponents of popular tendencies in politics, nor has his admiration for genius induced him to palliate the faults of great men.

PEOPLE'S JOURNAL.

The work, in short, is highly creditable to Mr. Archer, showing, as it does, that he has brought to his task a commendable amount both of judgment and industry. It is a book which everyone who wishes properly to understand and judge of the political events that have occurred during the last fifty years should carefully read and digest.

STIRLING OBSERVER.

There is no political bias shown by the writer, who simply records events and takes no side, but the earnest and sympathetic tone of the work shows how much Mr. Archer appreciates and understands the great men whom he sketches, and the mighty movements whose inception and development he describes. The style of writing is clear and simple, without being bald, and carries the reader on from point to point with a perfect remembrance of what has preceded, and a keen appetite for what is to come.

LEEDS MERCURY.

The author has faithfully fulfilled his promise, that whilst endeavouring to be true, earnest, and sympathetic, he will guard himself against party bias. . . . Truly the story which the political historian has to record is not less marvellous than that unfolded by Sir John Lubbock, at York, when he sketched his Half-century of Science. . . . The volume, which is the first of a series of four, has been beautifully printed and bound, and is illustrated with lithographic portraits of the leading men of the time. Indeed, the publishers have done everything to make it worthy of public acceptance.

EASTERN DAILY EXPRESS, Norwich.

As a history of the period under discussion, with all its notabilities, its agitations, and its legislative enactments, this book is very valuable, while it is written in an eloquent and attractive style which makes it pleasant to every class of readers. Mr. Archer has been careful not to sink the historian in the partisan, and has sought to produce a faithful record of national progress rather than of party triumph.

LONDONDERRY STANDARD.

The essence of ten thousand newspapers is condensed into each of these volumes. In many instances the best and most telling parts of the speeches of the great orators are introduced. The great changes going forward in the nation are described at length. We have but to look through the table of contents in order to see at a glance the vast collection of multifarious information regarding our own times here provided to our hand. . . . It is a real "History of our own Times," not a series of sketchy superficial chapters touching only main points, but bringing out the full particulars, not in a prosy, but in a most attractive manner. We recommend the work, of which this is the second volume, as the best historical account which we know of the Victorian age.

YORK HERALD.

Taking no side, he is just to all who have contributed, by criticism or practical help, to the political, social and religious development of the period. . . . Mr. Archer has laid down for himself the broadest lines, and he works upon them with good taste, impartiality, and thoroughness, omitting nothing, and recounting events with skill and judgment. His style is clear and bright, and though he uses authorities freely, he does not encumber his work with footnotes and extraneous matter.

CARDIFF TIMES AND SOUTH WALES WEEKLY NEWS.

Messrs. Blackie & Son have rendered a great service to their countrymen by publishing a most interesting, we may say, fascinating work. . . . The book is one which we can most heartily recommend to all those who wish to become all but spectators of the stirring times which its author faithfully and graphically depicts.

EAST ANGLIAN DAILY TIMES.

As a concise narration of the arguments and aims of men—of whom now only a very few survive—whose thoughts and deeds have left a deep impress upon our national institutions as they exist at the present day, the work possesses a lasting value, and will, we doubt not, form an exceedingly popular contribution to the libraries of the ever-increasing number of workingmen students of our national history.

NEW YORK TIMES.

This work is to be in four volumes, not the kind of volumes that are produced for the subscription libraries, but tomes of solid type, adorned by numerous authentic portraits. Fifty years of personal history in connection with the public life of England, dating from the school days of the premier to the present time, covers a period of exciting interest, and the publishers have selected an author of rare capacity for the task.

WESTERN MORNING NEWS, Plymouth.

In the legislative events of the time "Gladstone and his Contemporaries" played more or less conspicuous parts. What those parts were and how they were performed are matters which are graphically and powerfully narrated in this splendid history of the times we live in. The sketches of statesmen are life-like, vigorous, and accurate; neither apologetic nor unduly laudatory, but very fair and kindly. . . . We are reluctant to close these pleasing pages, and shall eagerly await the continuation of the well-told tale of fifty years' social and political progress.

CHESTER CHRONICLE.

This is a work which is written in a charmingly lucid style, in no party spirit, and as far as it goes certainly fulfils what the author promises to make it—a book true, earnest and sympathetic in tone—and one appealing to the best sentiments of citizens of all ranks and of all classes.

AYR ADVERTISER.

The work is a happy interweaving of biography and history, and it goes far to prove that the most interesting way of teaching history is through a record of the lives of the men who have been the prominent actors in their time. . . . The last half century is the most remarkable period through which our country has passed, and yet to the rising generation it is probably the period which is least known. Young people of the present day probably know more about the time of Wallace and Bruce, of Queen Mary and Queen Elizabeth, than about the memorable events which happened in the times of their own fathers and grandfathers. . . . Altogether the work is one of the most useful that has of late been issued from the press; and should be in every house where the young people are expected to grow up intelligently acquainted with the recent history of their own country.



H. R. H. ALBERT EDWARD. PRINCE OF WALES.
FROM A PHOTOGRAPH

WILLIAM EWART
GLADSTONE

AND HIS
CONTEMPORARIES:

FIFTY YEARS
OF
SOCIAL AND POLITICAL PROGRESS.

BY
THOMAS ARCHER, F.R.H.S.,

AUTHOR OF "PICTURES AND ROYAL PORTRAITS," "DECISIVE EVENTS OF HISTORY,"
"THE TERRIBLE SIGHTS OF LONDON," ETC.

VOL. III.
1852 TO 1860.



BLACKIE & SON:
LONDON, EDINBURGH, GLASGOW, AND DUBLIN.
1882.

GLASGOW:
W. G. BLACKIE AND CO., PRINTERS,
VILLAFIELD.

DA
550
A7
v. 3

CONTENTS OF VOL. III.

	PAGE
Portrait—PRINCE OF WALES—From a photograph,.....	<i>frontispiece.</i>
„ LORD BROUGHAM—From a photograph,.....	<i>to face</i> 12
„ JOHN BRIGHT—From a photograph,.....	„ 62
„ LORD CLYDE—From the portrait by Sir Francis Grant, P.R.A.,.....	„ 96
„ EARL CLARENDON—From a photograph,.....	„ 150
„ EARL GRANVILLE—From a photograph,.....	„ 162
„ ROBERT LOWE—From a photograph,.....	„ 304
„ SIR WILLIAM THOMSON—From a photograph,.....	„ 330

CHAPTER VIII.

WAR-FEVER—THE YEARS MILITANT.

	PAGE		PAGE
Opening of Session of 1853—Material Prosperity—Statistics of Railways—Progress of Manufactures,	1	Father Newman's Attacks on Protestantism—Affair of Giovanni G. Achilli—Case of "The Queen <i>versus</i> J. H. Newman,"	8
Agricultural Improvement—Mr. Mechi's Experiments at Liptree Hall—The Water Supply of London—Mr. F. O. Ward's Sanitary Efforts,	2	HOME AFFAIRS IN 1852—Mr. Walpole's new Militia Bill—Mr. Macaulay again returned for Edinburgh—His enthusiastic Reception in the Music Hall—Macaulay's Speech against the Franchise Clauses of the Militia Bill,	9
Discussions regarding the final Disposal of the Great Exhibition Building—Erection of Art Galleries and Museums with surplus Funds of the Exhibition,	2	Commissioners' Report on the Oxford Colleges—Parliamentary Oaths Question and Mr. Alderman Salomons—Lord Lyndhurst's Law Reforms—Lord Brougham's proceedings in France,	12
Death of Pugin the Architect and of Turner the Painter—Turner's munificent Bequests,	3	The Frome-Bennett Case—Mr. Horsman's Charges against Mr. Bennett and the Bishop of Bath and Wells—Mr. Gladstone defends them—Revival of Convocation,	13
Death of Count d'Orsay—His relations with the Countess of Blessington—Byron's Sketch of D'Orsay,	4	THE EASTERN QUESTION—Visit of the Czar Nicholas to England in 1844—His Position and Temper—He communicates his Views on Turkey to Sir Hamilton Seymour in 1853,	14
"Emperor-making" in Hayti—Solemn Installation of Soulouque as Faustin the First,	4	Studies and Pursuits of the Emperor Nicholas—His Love of Pomp and Display—His untiring Activity—Character of his Government—Dr. Mandt's Story,	16
Arctic Discovery—Public Excitement about Sir John Franklin and his Crews—Reported Sighting of Franklin's Ships,	5	Russian Dislike of Lord Stratford de Redcliffe—The Czar's Hope of Prussian Support—Attitude of the French People,	20
Evils of Betting Offices,	6	Marriage of Napoleon III.,	20
Home-Secretary Walpole attempts to stop Open-air Sunday Meetings in the East-end of London—Increase of Secularism—Mr. Holyoake's Position in relation to it—His Appearance in a Court—Mr. Holyoake and Mr. Commissioner Phillips,	6	Napoleon's Letter to the Emperor of Russia—Nicholas's Reply—Nature of the Russian Demands—Insolence of Prince Menschikoff—Conduct of the Sultan,	21
Affairs in Australia—Escape of "Meagher of the Sword"—His Reception in New York—O'Brien and Meagher as Ticket-of-leave Men,	7	The Russians enter the Principalities—Rejection of the Vienna Note—Public Feeling in England—The Queen's Letter,	23

	PAGE		PAGE
The French and British Fleets sent to the Dardanelles—Lord Palmerston's Influence in the Cabinet—Position of the Emperor Nicholas—War declared by Turkey—Omar Pacha takes the Field,	25	tional Disarmament and Foreign War Loans—Difference between Cobden and Palmerston's Policy—Popular Feeling against "Cobden, Bright, & Co.,"	61
Prince Albert and Lord Palmerston on the Situation—Lord Aberdeen's Contention—Manifesto by the Emperor Nicholas—His Letter to Queen Victoria—The Queen's Reply—Commencement of Hostilities,	27	Mr. Gladstone's recent Views on the Causes of the Crimean War,	68
Lord John Russell on Coalition Ministries,	32	Departure of the Baltic Fleet—Banquet to Admiral Sir Charles Napier,	70
The Russians destroy the Turkish Fleet at Sinope—The Combined Fleets ordered to the Black Sea—Napoleon's Remonstrance with Nicholas—Attitude of Austria and Prussia—War-feeling in France and England—Prince Albert's Letter to King Leopold—The English Ultimatum rejected by Russia,	33	Speech of Mr. Bright at Edinburgh on War and Foreign Intervention,	73
The Crimea,	37	Return of the Baltic Fleet—Recriminatory Correspondence between Admiral Napier and Sir James Graham,	77
The "Poetic English Party"—Military Review at Chobham—Naval Review at Spithead,	38	Mr. Bright denounces the War in Parliament—His Opinion of the Condition of Turkey—His Views of the Vienna Note and of Count Nesselrode's Interpretation—He ridicules the "Balance of Power" and "British Interests" Ideas,	79
Positions occupied by the allied Fleets and Armies,	40	Mr. Gladstone on the Design of the Crimean War,	87
Lord Palmerston as Home Secretary—His Advice to the Presbytery of Edinburgh,	42	A "Day of Prayer and Supplication" appointed—The Queen's Letters to Lord Aberdeen,	88
Case of the Rev. Mr. Maurice—Dr. Colenso consecrated Bishop of Natal,	43	Invasion of the Crimea proposed—Austria's shabby Policy,	89
Popularity of Lord Palmerston—His threatened Resignation—Charges against Prince Albert—Palmerston suspected of encouraging them—His Denial—Prince Albert's Letter to Baron Stockmar—The Prince's Position in the State,	44	Siege and gallant Defence of Silistria—The Russians defeated and the Siege raised,	89
Lord Palmerston remains in the Cabinet—The Provisions of Lord John's Reform Bill—It is withdrawn,	49	Lord Lyndhurst on Russian Policy and the Object of the War—Attacks on Lord Aberdeen—His Defence,	91
Financial Prospects—Mr. Gladstone's expected War Budget,	52	Proposed Plan for the Attack on Sebastopol—The <i>Times</i> on the Situation,	92
Character of Frederick William of Prussia—His Letter to Queen Victoria in favour of Russia—The Queen's Reply—Duplicity of the Russian Court,	53	Ravages of Cholera among the Allied Troops—Great Fire at Varna,	93
The War Budget of 1854—Mr. Kinglake's Criticism of Mr. Gladstone,	56	The Allied Armies leave Varna for the Crimea—Eupatoria taken,	94
Mr. Gladstone's additional Proposals for meeting Expenditure—Details of the Supplementary Budget,	59	Battle of the Alma,	95
Mr. Gladstone's Views regarding Turkey in 1854 and 1877, and the Proposals for the Occupation of Egypt,	60	Prince Albert's Visit to the Emperor of the French,	97
Messrs. Cobden and Bright oppose the War—Characteristics of their Oratory—Mr. Cobden on the Duke of Wellington—His new Home at Dunford—His Sketch of a "People's Budget"—His Views on Na-		Proposal of the Emperor to go personally to the Crimea—He and the Empress visit England—Return Visit of the Queen and Prince Albert,	99
		Effect of the News of the Alma on the Czar,	103
		General Canrobert succeeds Marshal St. Arnaud—Sketch of the General,	104
		The Defences of Sebastopol—Ignorance concerning its actual Strength and Resources—It is invested by the French and English Armies,	105
		Battle of Balaklava,	106
		The "Charge of the Light Brigade,"	108
		Distinguished Services of Sir de Lacy Evans,	110
		Battle of Inkerman—Incidents of the Struggle—Savage Behaviour of the Russians—Prince Menschikoff's Explanation,	110
		Despatch of Reinforcements to the Crimea—	

	PAGE
Inefficiency of the Commissariat and Transport Services—Great Storm and Loss of Valuable Stores—Gross official Blundering,	115
The <i>Times</i> Crimean Fund—The "Patriotic Fund"—Opposition of the Peace Party—Mr. Bright on Popularity—He refuses to contribute to the Fund—Feeling against the "Pitiless Quakers,"	118
The Newspaper Press and the War—Importance of the "Special Correspondent,"	120
Florence Nightingale goes to the Crimea with a staff of voluntary Nurses—Their invaluable Services—Miss Stanley and a second Band of Ladies proceed to the Crimea,	121
Privations of the British Army—Private Efforts to relieve the Suffering—Mr. Theodore Martin on the State of the Camp—The Scene between the Harbour of Balaklava and the Camp,	122
Condition of the French Army,	123
Plan to obtain Official Intelligence from the Camp,	125
Formation of a Military Reserve Force at Malta,	126
An English Christmas before Sebastopol,	126
Construction of a Railway between Balaklava and the Camp—Telegraphic Communication with England established,	126
Balaklava in February 1856—Destruction and Rebuilding of the Town—Damage done to Sebastopol,	128
A Visit to the Camp in March—Details of a Dinner-party there—M. Soyer's important Culinary Improvements,	129
Positions of the Allied Armies before Sebastopol,	131
Home Recruiting and the Foreign Enlistment Act,	132
Sketch of Count Cavour—Mazzini's Teaching—Proposal to organize a Sardinian Contingent—The Sardinian Army lands in the Crimea,	132
General Pelissier succeeds General Canrobert—Death of Lord Raglan,	135
Lord John Russell urges the Appointment of Lord Palmerston as War Secretary—Lord and Lady Palmerston's Visit to the French Emperor,	136
Treaty between England, France, and Austria,	138
Meeting of Parliament in December 1854—The Conduct of the War condemned by Lord Derby and Mr. Layard—Sketch of Mr. Layard—Opposition to the Foreign Enlistment Bill,	138
Meeting of Parliament in January 1855—Mr. Roebuck's notice of motion for a Com-	

	PAGE
mittee of Inquiry—Resignation of Lord John Russell,	140
Messrs. Cobden and Bright opposed to their Constituents—Mr. Cobden's Speech at Leeds,	141
Debate on Mr. Roebuck's Motion for Inquiry—The Aberdeen Ministry defeated and resign—The Duke of Newcastle's defence,	143
Failure of Lord Derby to form a Ministry—Serious Aspect of Public Affairs,	148
Lord John Russell fails to form a Ministry—The Palmerston Coalition Cabinet formed—Mr. Gladstone appointed Chancellor of Exchequer and Lord Panmure War Secretary,	149
Sketch of Lord Panmure (Mr. Fox Maule),	151
Lord Palmerston announces the Policy of his Government—Opposition of Mr. Layard—Mr. Roebuck presses his Resolution—The new Ministry threatened with Dissolution—Mr. Bright's impassioned Appeal to stay the War—A Committee of Inquiry appointed,	152
Death of the Czar Nicholas, and Accession of Alexander II.—Resolution of British Government to prosecute the War,	155
Arrival of Wounded Soldiers in England—Organization of the Corps of Commissioners,	158
Congress at Vienna—Proposals rejected by Russia—Her Endeavours to separate England and France—Breaking up of the Conference,	158
Administrative Reform Association established—Lord Ellenborough proposes an Address to Her Majesty—Lord Granville defends the Government—Lord Palmerston's Speech,	161
Sketch of Sir Thomas Frankland Lewis and of his Son Sir George Cornwall Lewis—Sir George's Budget for 1856,	163
Progress of the War—Marshals Pelissier and Canrobert—Distribution of Crimean Medals by the Queen,	164
Expedition to Kerch—Destruction of Russian Stores,	165
Bombardment of Sebastopol—Capture of the Mamelon—Death of Lord Raglan,	166
Debate on the Continuation of the War—Mr. Gladstone advocates Negotiations for Peace—Mr. Bright on the Losses of the War—Prince Albert's Letter to Lord Aberdeen,	168
Mr. Gladstone's Review in 1877 of the Political Situation in 1855,	175
Sir Edward Bulwer Lytton's Appeal for continuing the War,	176
Renewed Negotiations at Vienna,	177

	PAGE		PAGE
Report of the Crimean Committee of Inquiry—Censure upon the Government—Prince Albert's Speech at the Trinity House,	177	Mr. Gladstone's Mission to the Ionian Islands, 209	
Discussion on Administrative Reform,	179	Changes in the Government of India,	209
Lord John Russell is denounced by Cobden, Roebuck, and Disraeli—Lord Palmerston attempts to defend his Colleague—Lord John's Resignation,	180	CHAPTER IX.	
Comments on the Political Situation—Mr. Disraeli on the "Candid Friend"—He attacks Lord Palmerston,	181	REVOLT AND CHANGE—THE YEARS OF NEW DEVELOPMENTS.	
Mr. Gladstone <i>versus</i> Lord Palmerston,	183	Condition of the Country—Sufferings of the Labouring Classes—Mr. Cobden's Indictment against War—Bread Riots,	210
Bombardment of Sveaborg—Condition of the Russians—Their Attack upon the Allied Forces at Tchernaya repulsed,	184	Success of the Ragged School Union—Mr. Gladstone lays the Foundation Stone of a School in Golden Lane,	212
Combined Attack upon Sebastopol—The Malakhoff captured—The Russians evacuate the Town—Its Appearance, and Dreadful State of the Hospital,	185	Prince Albert's Efforts to improve the Condition of the People—His Views on Popular Recreation and Education—He presides over an Educational Conference,	216
End of the Siege—Our Losses during its Continuance,	187	Debate on Sir G. C. Lewis' Budget,	219
Gallant Defence of Kars by General Williams,	187	Commercial Depression and Failures in 1857, 220	
Peace Negotiations renewed—Palmerston's Lesson to Austria—Conference of the Powers at Paris—Terms of the Treaty of Peace,	189	Christian Socialism and Young Englandism,	221
The Tidings of Peace received in the Crimea—Sebastopol given up to the Russians—Its Appearance described by an Eye-witness,	192	Demonstrations against Lord R. Grosvenor's Sunday Bill—The <i>Times</i> upholds the Opposition—Conduct of the Police—Trial of the Rioters—Palmerston and Brougham mobbed—Mr. Dundas' foolish Speech,	222
Changes in Maritime International Law,	192	Condition of the Dwellings of the Poor in London and other Large Towns—Revelations by Dr. Letheby—Main Drainage Act for London,	226
Peace Rejoicings at Home—Naval Review at Spithead,	193	Working of the Compulsory Vaccination Act, 228	
Relations with the United States,	193	The Adulteration of Food—"Analytic Sanitary Commission" of the <i>Lancet</i> —Startling Disclosures by Dr. Hassall—Sale of Diseased Meat,	229
Mr. Gladstone on the Terms of the Treaty of Peace,	194	Efforts for Extension of Education—Improvement in Popular Literature—Abolition of the Newspaper Stamp Duty—Cheap Newspapers,	231
The Difficulty of the Principalities,	194	Embezzlements by Sir John Dean Paul, Strahan, and Bates, and by John Sadleir—Failure of the Royal British Bank—Increase in Crimes of Violence—Treatment of Garrotters—Trial of Palmer the Poisoner—The Redpath Frauds—The "Waterloo Bridge Mystery,"	232
Mr. Gladstone's View of the American Difficulty,	195	End of the Transportation System—Penal Servitude—Sir George Grey's Changes in 1857—The Ticket-of-leave in Ireland and in England—Punishment of Prisoners—Case of Edward Andrews,	237
Mr. Cobden's Motion against the Foreign Policy of the Government—Difficulties with China—The Burmese War—Fighting in Persia,	196	THE INDIAN MUTINY—Feeling of the native Princes—Condition of India—Notions of the ordinary British Officer—Warnings by Colonel Hodgson and General Sir Charles Napier—Lord Macaulay supports Sir Charles Wood's India Bill—Annexation of Territory under Lord Dalhousie—The	
War with China—Affair of the <i>Arrow</i> —Sketch of Sir John Bowring—His Demands upon the Chinese—The British Fleet bombards Canton—Proclamation of Governor Yeh, 198			
Mr. Cobden on the Chinese Question—His Motion for a Select Committee—The Ministry outvoted and Parliament dissolved,	201		
Lord Palmerston's Triumph in the new Election—Messrs. Cobden, Bright, and other leading Opponents unseated—Mr. Bright's parting Address to his former Constituents,	204		
The Divorce Act—Mr. Gladstone's Opposition, 205			

	PAGE		PAGE
Annexation of Oudh—Nana Sahib of Bithoor and his Agent Azimoolah Khan—Number and Character of the Native Army,	240	The Queen's Sympathy with Lord Canning—His Return to England, and Death,	271
Origin of the Mutiny—Outbreak at Lucknow—Atrocities perpetrated there and at Delhi—The Magazine blown up by Lieutenant Willoughby,	246	The Government of India—Lord Palmerston's Bill for transferring the Government to the Crown—Absurdities of Lord Ellenborough's "India Bill No. 2"—A Government Measure finally passed—Its Provisions—Extinction of the East India Company,	273
News of the Mutiny reaches Lahore—The Native Troops in the Punjaub are disarmed—Lord Canning intercepts British Troops on their way to China,	249	Lord Elgin sent to China,	275
The Mutiny at Lucknow—The Sepoys besiege the British—Death of Sir Henry Lawrence,	250	Birth of the Princess Beatrice—Louis Napoleon's congratulatory Letter—The Anglo-French Alliance—Prince Albert's Reply,	275
Condition of Cawnpore—Sir Hugh Wheeler's desperate Position—He seeks aid from Nana Sahib, who attacks the British—Gallant Defence of the Garrison—Nana Sahib's Treacherous Offer—Heshoots down the Men and hacks to pieces the Women and Children—The fearful Slaughterhouse described,	251	The Allied French and English Forces take Canton—Commissioner Yeh captured and sent to Calcutta,	276
The Avenger of Blood at hand—General Henry Havelock—His rapid Advance upon Cawnpore—Flight of Nana Sahib—The Soldiers' dreadful Vow,	255	Difficulties of the Emperor Napoleon—Attempts on his Life—His supposed Secret Game with Russia and Austria,	277
Havelock and Outram march to Lucknow—The besieged Garrison relieved—Death of General Neill,	257	Betrothal of the Princess Royal—Christening of the Princess Beatrice,	278
Reinforcements arrive from England—March of Sir Colin Campbell to Lucknow—The Place stormed and the Garrison finally relieved—Death of Sir Henry Havelock,	258	Visit of the Emperor and Empress of the French to England—Its semi-political Character—The Queen and Prince Albert's Visit to Cherbourg—The Emperor's Congratulations on the approaching Marriage of the Princess Royal,	279
Desperate Fighting at Delhi—The British enter the City—State of the Palace,	260	Felice Orsini's Attempt to assassinate Louis Napoleon—Sketch of Orsini—Count Walewski's Despatch concerning English Protection of political Criminals—M. Persigny adds his Remonstrance—Fury of certain French Colonels— <i>Punch's</i> Gallic Cock—The <i>entente cordiale</i> in danger,	280
Lieutenant Hodson captures the King of Delhi and his two Sons—The Sons are shot,	263	Lord Palmerston's Conspiracy Bill introduced—Public Indignation aroused—The Bill rejected—Resignation of the Palmerston Cabinet,	283
Effect of the Indian Atrocities on the Public Mind—General Neill's treatment of the rebel Sepoys—The "Large Grave" at Cawnpore,	264	Lord Derby forms a Cabinet—Mr. Disraeli Chancellor of the Exchequer—Lord Cowley retained at Paris—Differences with France about the Conspiracy Bill,	287
Debate on Indian Affairs—Mr. Disraeli foreshadows his "Imperial Policy"—Mr. Cobden's Views—General Klapka deprecates wholesale Executions of the Sepoys,	265	Mr. Disraeli's Budget of 1858,	288
Suppression of the Mutiny—Escape of Nana Sahib—Doom of the King of Delhi and of Tantia Topee—The Rhanee of Jhansi—General Sir H. Rose's General Order,	268	Agitation for Reform—Debate on the Government Measure—Lord John Russell's Amendment—The Oratory of Sir Edward Bulwer Lytton and Sir Hugh Cairns—The Measure defeated—Dissolution of Parliament,	289
Career of Sir John Lawrence—His Management of the Punjaub,	269	Lord Palmerston again Prime Minister and Mr. Gladstone Chancellor of the Exchequer,	292
Honours to General Havelock's Family—General Neill, Captain Sir William Peel, and Colonel Inglis,	270	Mr. Cobden on the Derby Administration—He is returned for Rochdale—Lord Palmerston and Lord John Russell urge him to enter the Cabinet—Cobden's Arrival from America—His Interview with Palmerston—His Refusal to join the Cabinet,	292
Attacks upon Lord Canning—His Defence of his Policy—Discussion on his Proclamation—Lord Ellenborough's Proceedings—			

	PAGE		PAGE
Mr. Bright's Address on Parliamentary Reform at Glasgow in 1858,	296	—Mr. Bright on the Income-tax and our Financial Policy—He urges increased Commercial Relations with France,	316
Commercial Treaty with France—Mr. Cobden's Visit to Paris,	297	Mr. Cobden at Paris—His interview with the Emperor on the subject of English and French Tariffs—Cobden's Impressions of the Emperor—M. de Persigny's Representations—The Emperor assents to a Commercial Treaty,	318
Mr. Gladstone's <i>Studies of Homer</i> —His Address to the University of Edinburgh in 1865—His Mission to the Ionian Islands—Criticisms of his Opponents—Final Cession of the Islands to Greece,	298	M. Rouher's Plan of the Treaty—Cobden's Interview with Count Walewski—His Second Interview with the Emperor—His Letter to Mr. Bright describing the Interview,	320
Sketch of Sir Edward Bulwer Lytton—His Style of Oratory— <i>Punch</i> and Thackeray on Sir Edward—His Novels and Dramas—His Political Creed—His unhappy Domestic Relations—Sergeant Ballantine's Anecdote of Lord Lytton—His Interest in Criminal Investigations,	300	The Commercial Treaty with France officially recognized—Cobden's Opinion of Prince Napoleon,	322
Sir Hugh M'Calmont Cairns,	303	Close of the Franco-Austrian War—Dissatisfaction of Sardinia—Hostility of Germany towards France—Neutrality of England—Growth of our Volunteer Force,	322
Sketch of Mr. Robert Lowe,	303	Prince Albert and the Royal Family—Popularity of the Prince of Wales—His Education,	324
The Duke of Argyll,	304	Prince Albert's Efforts to promote Art and Industrial Exhibitions—His Interest in the Volunteer Movement—Presides at the Meeting of the British Association in Aberdeen—His Inaugural Address,	325
Lord Chief-justice Campbell,	304	Improvements in Rifles and Artillery—The Armstrong Gun—Armour-plated Warships—The Cigar-shaped Steamship,	326
Sketch of Sir Colin Campbell (Lord Clyde),	305	The <i>Great Britain</i> Atlantic Steamer—Construction of the <i>Great Eastern</i> —Her Cost and Details of her Fittings—Her unfortunate Career,	327
Lord Lyndhurst—His Speech in favour of Strengthening the National Defences,	305	Progress of Electric Telegraphy—First Atlantic Cable laid,	328
Mr. Gladstone's Position in the House and in the Palmerston Cabinet,	306	Sketch of Sir William Thomson,	329
Austrian Rule in Italy—Policy of Cavour and of Mazzini—Mazzini and Garibaldi—Character of Cavour,	306	Condition of the Country in 1859—Financial Association formed—Excessive Cost of Collecting the Revenue—Mr. Bright's Scheme for Financial Reform,	330
The Emperor Napoleon's Designs against Austria—Victor Emmanuel's Declaration—Feeling in England—Napoleon's Letter to Queen Victoria—Unpopularity of the War in France—The Emperor's false Position—Negotiations with Lord Cowley—A Congress proposed—M. Thiers on the Emperor—Proposal for a General Disarmament,	308	Mr. Gladstone's great Budget of 1860—He unfolds its provisions in a Speech of four hours—His Views on the Commercial Treaty with France—His Tribute to the Emperor and to Mr. Cobden—His Supplemental Measure of Customs Reform—Abolition of the Duty on Paper—Mr. Gladstone's concluding Remarks on his Financial Proposals,	331
Austria prepares for War—Her Summons to Sardinia—Victor Emmanuel's Declaration to his Soldiers—Commencement of Hostilities,	312		
The Emperor takes Command of the French Army—Movements of the Belligerents—The Austrians defeated at Palestro and at Magenta—Milan evacuated—Retreat of the Austrians—Their Defeat at Solferino,	313		
An Armistice signed—Conditions of the Treaty of Villafranca—Return of the Emperor to Paris,	316		
Mr. Gladstone's Budget of 1859—Increase of the Income-tax—Mr. Disraeli's Criticisms			

GLADSTONE

AND HIS CONTEMPORARIES.

CHAPTER VIII.

WAR-FEVER—THE YEARS MILITANT.

Illustrative Events of the preceding Sessions 1852-3—Signs of Prosperity—Agriculture—Science—Art—Pugin—Turner—d'Orsay—Social Topics—"Secularism"—Mr. Holyoake—The "Achilli" Scandal—Mr. Walpole's Militia Bill—Macaulay at Edinburgh—Gladstone and Oxford University—The Oaths Question—Brougham—Gladstone and the Frome-Bennett Case—Drifting into War—The Czar Nicholas—The Crimea—Commissariat Muddle—Florence Nightingale—Our Allies—The Sardinians—Russell and the Shifting Government—The Great Struggle—Death of Nicholas—Parliament—Divorce Bill—Government of India—Gladstone and the Ionian Islands.

SIGNS of advances in material prosperity and of a great increase in the means of social progress had not been wanting during the period which we have been considering; and the session of 1853 opened with excellent prospects for the country. Telegraphic communications were being adopted, not only between distant parts of Great Britain, but between England and other nations. A submarine electric telegraph already united us with France, and a system of international copyright had been arranged between the two countries. The construction of railways in the United Kingdom had been going on at an enormous rate, with the result that the receipts at the end of 1851 had diminished in proportion to the increased length of the lines opened, as compared with the years from 1842 to 1846. At the end of the year 1845 the length of railway opened in the United Kingdom was 2023 miles. The total expenditure on railways at that date was £71,647,000—about £35,070 per mile; and the gross traffic receipts from the railways for that year were £6,669,230—about £3469 per mile per annum. At the end of the year 1851 the length of railway opened in the United Kingdom had increased to 6928 miles. The total expenditure on railways had swelled to £236,841,420—about £35,058 per mile; and the gross

receipts of the year were £14,987,310—not more than £2281 per mile per annum. In 1842 the average cost per mile of the railways in existence had been £34,690; in 1845 it had been £35,070; in 1848 it had been £34,234; and in 1851 it was again £35,058. So that the practical cost per mile had increased instead of diminishing with a reduced cost of material and increase of skill. The gross traffic receipts per mile from 1842 had been—In 1842, £3113, or £8·29 per cent on the capital then expended; in 1843, £3083, or £8·82 per cent on the capital; in 1844, £3278, or £8·84 per cent; in 1845, £3469, or £9·30 per cent; in 1846, £3305, or £9·25 per cent; in 1847, £2870, or £8·20 per cent; in 1848, £2556, or £6·78 per cent; in 1849, £2302, or £6·13 per cent; in 1850, £2227, or £5·80 per cent; in 1851, £2281, or £6·35 per cent. Therefore the increased receipts fell behind their due proportion to the increased length opened every year between 1842 and 1850; but in the latter year, when the increased length opened, fell below the increased length opened in the preceding year by more than half (from about 590 additional miles to about 240 additional miles), there were signs of a healthy reaction. The over-construction on speculative railway enterprise had to a great extent ceased, and the lines which had been formed in many in-

stances were the cause of the development of fresh industrial centres, and of the opening up of new markets and increased productions. There was a general increase in activity in trade in Manchester, Birmingham, and the Irish linen factories, both in home and foreign orders and at good prices. Machinery had to a large extent superseded the former kind of hand labour in numerous manufactures; but it was shown that the effect had not been disastrous to the people who were employed. With respect to inventions, an instance may be taken from one by which the lower class of hosiery goods was produced, and in consequence of which it was stated that while the labour which formerly cost 1s. 6d. had been reduced to 2d., the output had enormously augmented and the average earnings of the operatives had greatly increased. Indeed, the condition of the working-classes was better than at any previous period. All the mills were working at full time, and many of them had more orders than could be completed. New manufactories were being rapidly built in various districts. Prices of raw material and of articles of consumption were rising in all our markets; and the shipping trade was active, because, although the carrying power of the railways had enormously increased, those railways brought goods regularly and rapidly from the interior, for conveyance from our ports.

Among the prominent topics of the year were those relating to agricultural improvements, and they were closely associated with the name of Mr. Mechi, a London cutler and dressing-case maker, whose cheap razors and "magic strop" were advertised all over the kingdom. Mr. Mechi—who became a prosperous tradesman, and was afterwards alderman and Lord Mayor of London—bought an estate at Tiptree in Essex, and there carried out very costly and interesting experiments in drainage, and the application of sewage matter as manure to the land. His guests at the annual meetings and harvest-homes at Tiptree Hall usually included many of the nobility and gentry who were interested in agricultural improvements. Mr. Mechi said that "if far-

mers followed his plans the ox which went up to market on Monday would be back with them again in manure before Friday." His plan was to form reservoirs of liquid manure from animal and vegetable refuse and land drainage, and to distribute it over the poor land by means of iron pipes. His experiments were able and interesting, and he brought very poor, cold, and wet land to a high state of cultivation; but the experimental farms at Tiptree did not pay, and eventually Mr. Mechi, having spent a large sum of money, died poor, assisted however for a very short time by the contributions of his friends.

The name of Mr. Mechi could not very well be omitted when questions like these are before us; his ingenious and persevering experiments had an important bearing, not only on agriculture, but on "sanitation." Meanwhile the Sanitary Association was doing its best to arouse public attention upon the subject of the water supply of London, and the defects of a bill introduced by Lord John Manners for regulating that supply in some particulars. At this time the proposal was openly made that the government should "buy up" the water companies, and consolidate the whole machinery of the supply under an authority directly responsible to parliament.

Sanitary topics spread themselves over large areas of time—and space—and they are worked by large numbers of hands; but a word is also due to Mr. F. O. Ward's labours in the cause of pure water for London from the chalk hills, and the devotion of the refuse of towns to its natural use in fertilizing ground set apart for the growth of grain, fruits, and flowers. The open-air and other *reunions* of Mr. F. O. Ward for tasting hill-top water and fruit grown on ground fertilized in a manner which was then rather new to the minds of the multitude, were among the most brilliant and agreeable of the year 1852-3, including some of the foremost names in "society," literature, and art.

The building of Sir Joseph Paxton and Messrs. Fox and Henderson in Hyde Park, which was the admired scene of the Great

Exhibition of 1851, became, when that exhibition of "peace" was over, a sad bone of contention. Lord John Manners peremptorily closed the building at the end of the term, and the plan of making it a winter-garden for London did not excite any very great interest in the mind of the general public. Many of the trades-people in Piccadilly and the neighbourhood strongly opposed the idea of retaining the building on its original site, saying that the concourse of visitors blocked the streets and spoiled their trade. Others urged that, as the building covered nearly twenty acres of grass ground and necessitated the trampling down of about as much more, with a disagreeable pollution of the Serpentine (from which the effluvia was said to be very bad), it was very undesirable on sanitary grounds to keep the edifice where it was. In fact this crystal palace of peace was the subject of more warfare than any human being would have thought possible. It must not be supposed that London alone took part in the fray. The provinces joined in it, almost every town having a pet scheme of its own—one of these being that the building should remain where it was and be made a "centre" for the granting of diplomas in art and technical knowledge. At public meetings the Duke of Argyll, Lord Shaftesbury, Lord Harrowby, Lord Palmerston, Baron Meyer de Rothschild, and other distinguished public men, came forward to support the proposal for keeping the palace in Hyde Park. A working-man sent £20 to Lord Shaftesbury in aid of the movement; but the general public after all were apathetic, and Lord John Manners and his colleagues held that the government were pledged to its removal. There was at first a chance of its being laid down in Battersea Fields, which might have been a good conclusion; but the subsequent history of the palace is well known. The noticeable point is that in these discussions the idea of technical education on a large and dignified scale, and as a national matter, followed so easily in the wake of ideas which belonged strictly to the original Exhibition itself.

The royal commissioners had been constituted a permanent body by a charter granted

by her majesty, and were empowered to devote the surplus derived from the Great Exhibition to the erection of galleries and museums for the promotion of arts, manufactures, and commerce. The money was therefore expended in the purchase of land at South Kensington for the new national Science and Art Galleries.

Early in 1852 a name great in art, and of even more than national interest, had come prominently before the public. The death of Pugin, the centre, or more than the centre of the great Gothic revival, was interesting as well as mournful in various ways which need not be dwelt upon now; but Turner, who was in a more direct manner a national benefactor, claims distinct and extended notice. He was, in several respects, a very remarkable man; perhaps, like Pugin, not altogether sane. He was born in Maiden Lane, Covent Garden, in 1775, was the son of a barber, and received a very poor education. His extraordinary natural gift with the pencil made him noticed by kind and discerning friends, and it befell that at twelve years of age he was exhibiting two drawings at the Royal Academy. When he was only twenty-four years of age he was elected an associate, and three years afterwards he received the full honours of an academician. In 1807 he was elected professor of perspective, but as he was vulgarly illiterate and quite incapable of communicating knowledge this came to nothing. When he died, in a small house at Chelsea looking on the river, it was found that he had bequeathed to the nation the magnificent collection of pictures now to be seen in the National Gallery, and a fortune of about £200,000 for founding an asylum for decayed artists: a scheme which was frustrated owing to some legal technicality.

Turner left more—and more splendid—work in landscape than any artist that ever lived. He travelled much, but used to say that the finest sunsets he ever saw were in the Isle of Thanet. During the season he might be seen on board the Margate boat, eating a coarse dinner out of a cotton handkerchief, and quite ready to "spell for" a glass of wine of any

fellow-passenger. The back-grounds of his life are not agreeable to contemplate. It is bewildering to think of the painter of those rainbow dreams of pictures engaged in coarse, and worse than coarse, orgies at Wapping. Turner's coffin lies in the crypt of St. Paul's Cathedral, close to that of Sir Joshua Reynolds. What Mr. Ruskin did and has done for his fame is well known, and also Turner's gruff astonishment at "the young man's" discoveries of his meanings. He was sordidly careful of money, but that he was capable of kind and even generous actions is certain.

In this first year of the French empire, too, died Count d'Orsay, who was something of an artist, and held some sort of office under the prince-president, Louis Napoleon, in that capacity. He was the Count Mirabel of Disraeli's love-story of *Henrietta Temple*; not a coxcomb in the vulgar sense, but an artistically finished man of the world, elegantly epicurean, very clever, and somewhat fascinating. His relations with the Countess of Blessington started from a very high-flavoured piece of "scandal" which was never forgotten. At Gore House, where they presided over the hospitalities together, no *lady* who was in society was ever seen then, but there were plenty of brilliant men, including Disraeli (as has been mentioned), and some who were only notorious, including Louis Napoleon, then an exile.

D'Orsay spent his last years in erecting, on a green eminence in the village of Chambourey beyond St. Germain-en-Laye, where the rustic churchyard joins the estate of the Grammont family, a marble pyramid. In the sepulchral chamber there is a stone sarcophagus on either side, each surmounted by a white marble tablet; that to the left incloses the remains of Lady Blessington, that to the right contains the coffin of d'Orsay himself.

It was known that Count d'Orsay was bitterly disgusted with the state of French politics after the *coup d'état* of December, 1851, and disappointed with his old friend's treatment of him. It was said in addition that he died (aged about 53) of chagrin, while the Countess of Blessington broke her heart

over Louis Napoleon's ingratitude. d'Orsay had been a lieutenant in the French army, and notwithstanding the great flaw in his life, had, like the countess, fine qualities. He is very amusingly sketched in Lord Byron's diary at Genoa. "Milord Blessington (Mountjoy) and *épouse*, travelling with a very handsome companion in the shape of a French count, who has all the air of a *Cupidon déchainé*, and one of the few ideal specimens I have seen of a Frenchman before the revolution. Mountjoy (for the Gardiners are the lineal race of the famous Irish viceroy of that ilk) seems very good-natured, but is much tamed since I recollect him in all the glory of gems, and snuff-boxes, and uniforms, and theatricals, sitting to Strolling, the painter, to be depicted as one of the heroes of Agincourt."

It was arranged that d'Orsay was to be a fixture in the Mountjoy family by becoming the husband of the honourable Harriet Gardiner, his lordship's daughter by his first wife. This young person was summoned accordingly from school and married at her father's bidding to the *Cupidon déchainé*. The great scandal ensued. Lord Blessington died at Paris in 1827, and the title became extinct. His countess became a fashionable star in the literary firmament of England, and Count d'Orsay resumed in London the career of sportsman, exquisite, artist, and general *arbitrarius elegantiarum*. Lady Blessington's literary success was nothing more than *succès de salon*. The disappearance of these two figures may be said to mark the close of the whole business of literary dandyism.

While various small pageantries were going on in Paris by way of preparing for the actual assumption of the purple by Louis Napoleon, a ludicrous performance in the empire way was taking place in Hayti, a place which is memorable in connection with Toussaint L'Ouverture even if Wordsworth had not commemorated him in one of his greatest sonnets. Soulouque was to be crowned emperor. For months, troops, such as they were, had been pouring into "the capital" from every quarter of the country. In they came, helter-skelter, some with sticks, guns, a great number of the latter without locks; some

with coats only, many without either coats or breeches. The soldiers that had been lucky enough to procure shoes were more fortunate than their officers. There was a large tent erected on the “Champ de Mars” capable of containing from ten thousand to twelve thousand people. At a distance of four hundred yards there was another, erected immediately behind the government palace, which served as a robing-chamber for the imperial family. On the east-end stood a platform on which there was a Catholic altar; the rest of the tent was partitioned off for the deputies, nobles, ladies of honour (black), consuls, and foreign merchants; the troops assembled and formed into a square, and a double line was stationed along the route leading to the palace, in order to protect their majesties from violence. Then came the senators and deputies, dukes, earls, and ladies of honour, who were led to the place assigned to them by the master of the ceremonies. Their majesties were to make their appearance at six o'clock a.m., but with true negro punctuality they did not arrive till nine. They were announced by the discharge of artillery, music, and loud and long *vivus* from the spectators, and none shouted more lustily than the foreign merchants, while at the same time they inwardly cursed Soulouque and his government for ruining the commerce of the country. Their majesties were preceded by the vicar-general. Her majesty first made her appearance, attended by her ladies of honour, under a canopy like that which is seen at Roman Catholic ceremonies on the occasion of the procession of the holy sacrament. She wore on her head a tiara, and was robed in the most costly apparel. Before her husband was elected president she had been a vender of fish. Soulouque himself then followed, accompanied by all the distinguished nobility, under a similar canopy, wearing a crown that, it is said, cost thirty dollars, and having in his hand two sceptres. Their majesties were led to the *prie-dieu*, where they first said their prayers, and they were then conducted to the throne. The ceremonies then commenced by the vicar pronouncing a solemn benediction on the crown, sword, sword of justice, sceptre, cloak, ring,

collar, and imperial cloak of the emperor, after which were blessed the crown, cloak, and ring of the empress. Then came the president of the court of cassation (the supreme court of Hayti) accompanied by the deputies, and presented to Soulouque the constitution of Hayti, demanding of him to swear not to violate it; upon which he placed the crown on his head, and placed the Bible on the pages of the constitution, and said, “I swear to abide by the constitution, and to maintain the integrity and independence of the empire of Hayti.” Then the master of the ceremonies cried aloud, “Long live the great, glorious, and august Emperor Faustin the First.” So ended the pomp and pageantry of crowning this “nigger” emperor. The accounts of it caused much amusement in England, and when Louis Napoleon was crowned the occasion was not forgotten by caricaturists and jokers. But there was more than joking on the subject of the French emperor, for it must be remembered that while Louis Napoleon was challenging the admiration of most of us by his release of the grand old Algerian chief Abd-el-Kader on parole, he was endeavouring to spread his nets all over Europe with an eye to political conspirators. Lord Malmesbury, our foreign minister, nicknamed M. le Comte de Malmesbury and much laughed at about “my French cook,” introduced into the Upper House an alarming bill for the extradition of “offenders,” including Englishmen, in favour of France. It is enough to say that his lordship had to withdraw the measure, but it looked at one time very near to getting passed.

At the time of which we are now speaking there was considerable excitement in relation to Arctic enterprise, more particularly as to the fate of Sir John Franklin and the crews of the *Erebus* and *Terror*, which had sailed in search of the north-west passage in 1845 and had not since been heard of. From 1847 onwards, expeditions, both by land and sea, had been despatched in search of the missing ships, at a cost of about a million sterling to the country. In the spring of 1852 the brig *Renovation*, of North Shields, came home with a report that the captain and men had

seen two ships embedded in ice somewhere off Newfoundland. This brig was herself in danger at the moment, and the captain so ill that he could hardly do more than "groan;" but the tidings naturally caused much discussion in England. The general conclusion, after this discussion and comparing of notes, was that the whole story was the result of an illusion not unfrequently occurring to nautical observers of distant icebergs or masses of ice. A high authority expressed this opinion:—"I think," he wrote, "they were 'country ships,' as we whalers call them—formations upon an iceberg which deceive even practised eyes. To place ships in such a position by the process of freezing into an iceberg would require thirty to forty years, and floe ice would have been broken up with the western ocean swell before it had even reached Cape Farewell. Not a piece of sufficient size would be found to contain even one ship, much less two. No iceberg of one-fourth of a mile would reach such a position; it must have been two pieces of icebergs, and the vessel being five miles distant could not observe the water over the detached ice. We have the experience of the eleven whalers wintered on the ice; they all broke from their icebergs long before they reached Cape Farewell."

Sir Edward Belcher expressed his belief that two ships *had* been seen, not on, but beyond the iceberg, and that they were not the *Erebus* and *Terror*. No reliance, he said, could be placed on the position or correctness of the objects seen over a field of ice. He instanced a case which occurred to Captain Sir Edward Parry, who, with a shooting party in the Arctic regions, saw what every one of the party would have taken his oath was a herd of moose deer, until they came up to them, after nearly a whole day's exertion, and found they were a flock of ptarmigan. All this, however, while it added to what some people might call "the poetry of the case," kept the subject alive in the mind of friends at home, and it never died out till the expedition in the *Fox* under Captain M'Clintock.

One of the "social" topics which in 1852 began to attract serious attention was that of

betting and "betting-offices." It was not yet the hour for the legislature to interfere with these precious institutions, and it is not yet a settled thing in all minds that it had any business to interfere, or that it has done any good by meddling. But there never was any doubt that the results of the "betting-office" system were shocking. The thing began, probably, in a cigar-shop, with some such words in the window as "The Races! A List Kept Here." But after a time these places of resort were openly styled betting-offices, and a horrible "roaring trade" was done. Servant-girls, shop-boys, clerks, all and sundry, went and betted, large numbers of the wretched adventurers stealing the money of their employers in order to "speculate." Courts of justice all over the country had a dreary tale to tell. In one town in the north of England as much as £50,000 was lost on one horse; and it was found that very poor people had pawned blankets and children's clothing to procure money for this kind of gambling! Meanwhile the honest friends of the "turf," as it is called, were concerned in helping to expose this nuisance, for jockeys and stable-boys were frequently bribed by the proprietors of these dreadful dens, to betray the secrets of their masters with regard to particular horses. The cry, once taken up, did not cease for long until something was done.

It has already been hinted that the accession of the Tory party to power was followed by one or two signs of a return to what were regarded as repressive measures by the Radical side. There has always been a tendency among high-and-dry politicians of the church-and-king school to limit that right of public meeting and discussion which is so dear to Englishmen. Now Mr. Home-Secretary Walpole was one of the best men that ever lived, and a sound constitutional lawyer, a Christian gentleman who would not for his life do a thing that he believed to be unjust. But he was not a man of robust feeling and intelligence, and had somewhat feminine views on points of order. Unfortunately he had excuse, or what looked like excuse, for interfering with certain meetings in the open air at the East-End of

London, and he directed the police to check or stop them. These were largely Sunday meetings of artisans to discuss politics and religion, and were almost entirely "officered," so to speak, by republicans and atheists. But whatever power the law gives its administrators in such cases, it would have been wiser for the new Tory government to "let things slide," than to interfere in a way which they were not prepared to follow up, and which was sure to provoke an outcry. Practically, their interference did only harm, and had to be given up; though the police retreated in due order; and the Sunday "orating" in Bonner's Fields, beyond Bethnal Green, went on again finely.

In this connection may be noticed the rapid increase among the working-classes of the party now known as Secularists. For some time previously Mr. Holyoake, who had led the anti-Christian and anti-theistic party, had felt that it was a bad thing for them to be called "atheists," and he succeeded in organizing the party of Secularism, and in establishing that as the current name of the anti-religious body whose chief apostle he was. The point of the change of style lay in this, that a man might adopt the formula of secularism without being an atheist, though, we may add, it was exceedingly improbable that he should, and secularism utterly *ignores* all questions of God and a future life.

Just at this time it happened that Mr. Holyoake appeared as the "bail" in a bankruptcy case before Mr. Commissioner Phillips—of Courvoisier celebrity—and declined to take the usual oath. Being asked if he did not believe in a God, he replied that he was "not prepared to answer the question with the brevity the court would require." To the question what he called himself he answered that if he must take a name he should call himself a Secularist. After a little more twaddle on both sides Mr. Commissioner Phillips dismissed him with ungrammatical abuse: "Go and attend to your secularism, sir."

Now Mr. Holyoake was an able man and a journalist, and had friends and allies, so the case made a great noise. An immoral and irreligious novel of the worst French-revolu-

tion type had been written by Mr. Phillips when young, and this unsavoury work—*The Loves of Celestine and St. Aubert*—was dug up and brought into public notice for the purpose of showing the inconsistency of the author; while his defence of Courvoisier was made the most of against him. Those personalities are, however, a trifle. The important fact is, that the Liberal papers all over England, including some religious papers like the *Nonconformist* of Mr. Edward Miall, took up the case, and made it the text of an argument for permitting others than Quakers and Separatists to "affirm." From this time forward the subject assumed a prominence that it never lost.

The gold discoveries in Australia were having many startling effects both at home and in the colonies, the derangement of the currency and a rise in prices being among them. This was expected; but no human being was prepared for the escape of "Meagher of the Sword," one of the Irish patriots whom we had sent to Australia for his share in the rising of 1848. Mr. Meagher had the partial liberty of a ticket-of-leave at the time of his escape, but did not violate its literal conditions. It ran as follows:—"I undertake not to escape from the colony so long as I hold this ticket-of-leave." Having made previous preparations for his flight, with a horse saddled in his stable, and being armed with pistols, he addressed a letter to the magistrate of Ross, about twenty miles distant, and a township of the district out of which he was not permitted to go. The place in which he resided was the wild bush. In his letter he returned his ticket-of-leave and said he would remain at his house that day till twelve o'clock, when the leave expired, in order to give the authorities an opportunity of arresting him if they could. When the magistrate read the letter he was astounded, and he immediately ordered the chief of police, who happened to be present, to proceed at once to arrest Meagher. The chief of police replied he would not do any such thing, as he was an Irishman, and that young gentleman was an Irishman. "But you must do it," retorted the magistrate. "Faith, I will not," replied the Irishman; "I will resign

first." "But I will not accept your resignation." "Then if you do not you may let it alone, but I will not arrest young Meagher." The magistrate gave it up as a bad case, and rode immediately to another station in search of police. Meantime the Irish chief of police set out for the mines, as he thought he could make more money in digging gold than in arresting his Irish friends. Meagher waited for six hours after the time, in order not to give the British authorities any excuse for saying he had violated his pledge. He was accompanied and assisted by three young English settlers, who supplied him with horses and had horses themselves. They proposed to wait till the police came and to kill them. Meagher thought it unnecessary to shed blood, but stayed till the police came, and kept his friends waiting at a short distance. The moment the police entered the house he passed out at another door, and, mounting his horse, came round to the front of the building within pistol-shot of them, and told them to arrest him if they could. In the next moment he put spurs to his horse, and with his friends was soon out of sight. They travelled over 180 miles without halt, having relays of horses on the way. They at length reached unmolested a lonely spot upon the sea-coast, where, according to previous arrangements, a whale-boat was in waiting, and bore Meagher off in safety. He of course fled to America. When it became known in New York that he was there, detachments of the Irish militia regiments, accompanied by their bands, marched up to his residence in succession and serenaded him. But this was only a part of the "demonstrations" that ensued. The event is particularly interesting at the present time because it is certain that the presence of Meagher and Mitchell had much influence in the formation of the anti-English party among the Irish in America.

A very short time before the escape of Meagher, one of the exiles of the year of insurgence had written to a friend in Galway an amusing account of the then condition of "Smith O'Brine, of royal line," and "Meagher of the Sword." "Smith O'Brien, since his acceptance of a ticket-of-leave, has lived in

great privacy and retirement in the vale of Avoca, having, in order to employ his highly cultivated mind, condescended to become tutor to the young sons of an eminent Irish physician who resides in that retired locality. His constant and dignified demeanour has procured him the respect of all, even of those most opposed to him in principles and politics. He is now, I am informed, in very bad health, so much that he has been obliged to give up the employment he had accepted, and has got permission to reside in a different locality. Mitchell has been joined by his wife and family; and with such a family, and with the society of his old and excellent friend Mr. John Martin, he must be as happy as it is possible for an exiled rebel to be. O'Meagher still resides in his solitary domicile at Lake Sorell, save that the solitude is now somewhat disturbed by the presence of his amiable and beautiful bride."

For some years the influence of Dr. J. H. Newman had been increasingly felt in religious circles, and from the Oratory at Birmingham and otherwise he made damaging attacks on what may be called *show or shop* Protestantism. This led at last to the long-drawn Achilli business, which ended in one of the most memorable trials of the century, that of "The Queen *versus* J. H. Newman, in the matter of Giovanni Giacinti Achilli." It took place in the Court of Queen's Bench before Lord Campbell and a special jury, Sir Alexander Cockburn leading the case for the defence. The court was crowded, and the scenes which occurred when the women, some of them Italians, were in the box, as witnesses against Achilli, were most dramatic. Achilli himself was a very dark, firmly-built Italian, with deep-set brown eyes, great self-possession, and large mouth and jaw. He wore a short-haired black wig, and in dress and bearing looked a curious mixture of Romanist and Protestant Evangelical.

This Dr. Achilli is almost forgotten now by the general public, but he was then a great celebrity as a "converted Catholic" lecturer, making capital out of what he had seen, or said he had seen, in the Roman

Church. Father Newman, now Cardinal Newman, was then lecturing at the Oratory, Birmingham, and delivered an impassioned and bitterly ironical attack on the character and career of Achilli, which was included in a pamphlet on the "Logical Inconsistency of the Protestant Point of View." This attack contained the libel for which Father Newman was now indicted. It charged Achilli openly with the very worst offences that could be alleged against a minister of religion; with deliberate atheistic treachery and hypocrisy, and with the grossest immorality. The libel alleged—and this was proved at the trial—that he had been deprived of his office as a priest by his clerical superiors, and it was stated that he had then lived almost publicly in Italy with the wife of a chorus-singer. But publicity or privacy was—according to the libel—all one to Achilli, and the sacristy of a church was mentioned as the scene of some of the evil acts of which he was accused.

Two of his wife's English servant-girls, one of them little more than a child, came forward to give evidence against him. Protestants found it difficult to believe that a man making the most solemn professions of piety and purity could be guilty of the iniquities with which he was charged; but a very black story was brought out by Sir A. Cockburn for the defence. An account of Achilli's career, true or false, was published in the great Roman Catholic organ the *Dublin Review*, and was left unnoticed for fifteen months. A few passages, much condensed, from Dr. Newman's terrible indictment may be placed on record here.

"You speak truly, O Achilli, and we cannot answer you a word. You are a priest; you have been a friar; you are, it is undeniable, the scandal of Catholicism and the palmary argument of Protestants, by your extraordinary depravity. You have been, it is true, a profligate, an unbeliever, and a hypocrite. Not many years passed of your conventual life, and you were never in choir, always in private houses, so that the laity observed you. You were deprived of your professorship, we own it; you were prohibited from preaching and hearing confessions; you

were obliged to give hush-money to the father of one of your victims, as we learn from the official report of the police of Viterbo. You are reported in an official document of the Neapolitan police to be 'known for habitual incontinency;' your name came before the civil tribunal at Corfu for the crime of adultery. You have put the crown on your offences by, as long as you could, denying them all; you have professed to seek after truth when you were ravening after sin. Yes, you are an incontrovertible proof that priests may fall and friars break their vows. You are your own witness; but while you *need* not go out of yourself for your argument, neither are you *able*. With you the argument begins; with you, too, it ends; the beginning and the end you are both. When you have shown yourself you have done your worst, and your all; you are your best arguments, and your sole. Your witness against others is utterly invalidated by your witness against yourself."

It would be impossible to quote any of the evidence, except that which related to Dr. Achilli's being deprived of all ecclesiastical functions for ever, and some of the less important testimony of Lord Shaftesbury and other Englishmen. The trial lasted three days. Lord Campbell summed up by merely reading his notes with a few connecting remarks, and the jury found a verdict for the crown. This was received with repeated cheers, which, it was noted, Lord Campbell did not attempt to stop. The *Times* wrote an indignant article, maintaining that the administration of justice in England had received a terrible blow in a trial the like of which had not been seen since the first triumphs of Titus Oates. At the same time Achilli's residence was besieged by congratulating visitors.

To return for a moment to some of the movements which distinguished the portentous session of 1852, it may be mentioned that the Militia Bill, introduced by Mr. Walpole and warmly supported by the Duke of Wellington, was generally held to be an improvement on that of Lord John Russell, and was at the time largely accredited to Lord

Hardinge. Suppressing details, it may be stated briefly that the number of men to be raised was to be 80,000; the cost after the first year, £250,000 a year; the age from 18 to 35; and the height 5 feet 2 inches, the army standard being 5 feet 6. Lord Palmerston supported the measure. Mr. Hume and the Manchester party opposed it. Certain "fancy franchises" had to be withdrawn, but the best account of them will be found in Mr. Macaulay's great speech in Edinburgh, to which we will now refer.

A constitution for New Zealand was part of the work of the year. It was introduced by Sir John Pakington, and supported by the Duke of Newcastle and Mr. Gladstone. Mr. Berkeley's annual motion for the ballot was defeated of course; and Mr. Spooner was unsuccessful in his assault upon the Maynooth grant. Mr. Macaulay peremptorily refused to answer any of the questions about it that reached him from Edinburgh.

The narrative of Mr. Macaulay's rejection by his old Edinburgh constituents, his proud withdrawal from parliamentary life, his long-continued sufferings from chronic bronchitis, and his determination never again to take office, need not here be repeated. But it is within our province to notice his return, without solicitation on his part, for Edinburgh in 1852, upon the dissolution of parliament under Lord Derby's government. In November of that year the great Whig historian again addressed his old friends in the Music Hall of Edinburgh as their representative, amid tumultuous excitement. In the last speech he had delivered to an Edinburgh public there had been bitter things, and a little contempt, perhaps more than a little. The less intelligent portion of his audience had resented what they took for the undue self-assertion of the scholar and philosopher, and no doubt Macaulay—though he wished well to all men, and would have sacrificed something to serve them—had at bottom a real dislike of "the masses." There was something of Coriolanus in him, and of all the things which he despised none stood lower in his mind than religious bigotry, or

what he took for it. "We're as good as *you* are!" shouted one of the mob at Edinburgh at that bitter parting. After a few years, however, the "better sort" remembered that very few of them were "as good" as Macaulay in the sense in which those words had been used. It was openly proposed that he should again stand for the city; but the proud scholar would not stir in the matter himself. Edinburgh had cast him out; she must now fetch him with open arms and without trouble to himself, if he was to represent her again. To her honour and his she did so, and there never was a more affecting political reconciliation. When the orator first showed himself in the Music Hall—crowded to suffocation, and adorned not only by the presence of the leading men of the city, with some outsiders, and hundreds of ladies—the wan, thin face and pain-stricken air of the man sent a momentary pang through the assembly. There was a stirring pause. But then the cheers burst forth, and Macaulay faltered a little from the shock of sound. Mr. Adam Black, who was moved into the chair, made a very short speech, and simply called upon Mr. Macaulay to "address his constituents." Then the immense multitude rose and again broke out into cheering. When the applause had entirely ceased there was, for some moments, utter silence, and evident emotion on Macaulay's part; but at last he recovered himself, and the old voice was once more heard by the old friends and acquaintances.

The name of John Wilson—Christopher North—cannot be omitted in connection with this event. The professor, it is well known, was a high Tory; but for all that Lord John Russell had advised the queen to grant him a pension of £300 a year, accompanying the notice of the grant with a letter as tender and friendly as if Wilson had been a blue-blood Whig. It was now Wilson's own turn to show that he could forget the politics of party in those higher politics in which all men of good brain and heart are much closer than whips and partisans pretend.

The Edinburgh election came off in the summer. One very hot day Wilson, who was living at Woodburn, Dalkeith, and who had

been unusually ill (he was within two years of his death), exhibited a restless desire to be driven to Edinburgh. His own carriage had already been driven out by some members of his family, so his daughter thought he would give up his scheme. Not at all; he sent for a carriage from Dalkeith, and made his man drive him to Edinburgh. There he paused to rest at Mr. Blackwood's in George Street. Great was the surprise of the Edinburgh folk to see the worn old lion about their streets, and not a hint of his errand had he vouchsafed to any living soul. But when, leaning on his man, he entered Macaulay's committee-room in St. Vincent Street to record his vote for an old (political) foe, the secret was out, and he was greeted with a passionate burst of cheering.

Space will not permit us to quote Mr. Macaulay's admirably graphic and humorous account of the elections; but his treatment of the franchise clauses of Mr. Walpole's Militia Bill (which were withdrawn) we have promised to reproduce in brief as part of the story, and as a *reductio ad absurdum* of the kind in which the speaker excelled. "At the end of a sitting, in the easiest possible manner, as a mere clause at the tail of a Militia Bill, it was proposed that every man who served two years in the militia should have a vote for the county. What would be the number of these votes? The militia is to consist of 80,000 men; the term of their service is to be five years. In ten years we should have 160,000 voters, in twenty years 320,000, in twenty-five years 400,000. Some, no doubt, would by that time have died off; though the lives are all picked lives, remarkably good lives—still some would have died off. How many there may be I have not calculated. Any actuary would give you the actual numbers; but I have no doubt that when the system came into full operation you would have some 300,000 added from the militia to the county constituency, which, on an average, would be 6000 added to every county in England and Wales. This would be an immense addition to the county constituency. What are to be their qualifications? The first is youth; for they are not to be above a certain age; the nearer eighteen the better. The

second is poverty;—all persons to whom a shilling a day is an object. The third is ignorance—for if you ever take the trouble to observe in your streets what is the appearance of the young fellows who follow the recruiting sergeant, you will say that at least they are not the most educated of the labouring classes. Brave, stout young fellows no doubt they are. Lord Hardinge tells me that he never saw a finer set of young men; and I have no doubt that after a few years' training they will be ready to stand up for our firesides against the best disciplined soldiers that the Continent can produce. But these men, taken for the most part from the plough-tail, are not the class best qualified to choose our legislators—there is rather in the habits of the young men that enter the army a disposition to idleness. Oh, but there is another qualification which I almost forgot—they must be five feet two.


"There is a qualification for a county voter! Only think of measuring a man for the franchise! And this comes from a Conservative government—a measure that would swamp all the county constituencies in England with people possessed of the Derby-Walpole qualifications—that is to say, youth, poverty, ignorance, a roving disposition, and *five feet two*. Why, gentlemen, what have the people who brought in such a measure—what have they to say—I do not say against Lord John Russell's imprudence—but what right have they to talk of the imprudence of Ernest Jones? The people who advocate universal suffrage, at all events, gave us wealth along with poverty, knowledge along with ignorance, and mature age along with youth; but a qualification compounded of all disqualifications is a thing that was never heard of except in the case of this Conservative reform. It is the most ridiculous proposition that was ever made. It was made, I believe, at first in a thin house, but the next house was full enough; for people came down with all sorts of questions. Are the regular troops to have a vote? Are the police—are the sailors? indeed, who should not? for if you take lads of one-and-twenty from the plough-tail and give them votes, what possible class of honest Englishmen and Scotchmen can you exclude if

they are admitted? But before these questions could be asked, up gets the home secretary, and tells us that the thing has not been sufficiently considered—that some of his colleagues do not approve of it—that the thing is withdrawn—he will not press it. I must say, if it had happened to me to propose such a Reform Bill on one night, and on the next sitting of the house to withdraw it, because it had not been sufficiently considered, I think that to the end of my life I should never have talked of the exceeding evil of reopening of the question of reform;—to the end of my life I should never have read any man a lecture on the extreme prudence and caution with which he should approach questions of organic change.”

Murmurs were already beginning to be heard, near and far, that Mr. Gladstone was not the most “fit and proper man” to represent Oxford. But it is of more consequence to note that the blue-book report of the Oxford University Commission, a slight work of 900 folio pages, made it very plain that the new broom so long needed at that ancient centre of learning was ready for sweeping purposes, and would not be kept out much longer. “If,” said the commission, “we look only to their statutes, the colleges of Oxford are now what they were in the times of the Plantagenets and Tudors, and if the Laudian code be binding, the University of Oxford is now what it was in the time of King Charles I.; *but in fact, almost every distinct purpose and every particular object of the founders, almost every detail of government and administration has been neglected or superseded.*” This was, of course, an inevitable result of the lapse of time. How agreeable this association with the memory of the stupid and blood-thirsty bigot who treated the author of *Zion's Plea against Prelatry* (the father of Archbishop Leighton) with a life-long cruelty, the details of which will now hardly bear reading. It was part of the plan of the commissioners that past alterations of the Laudian code should be indemnified, and full power given for all future alterations or abrogations of statutes, some few fundamental reservations excepted.

We can find room for only one clause more, but that is an important one:—“Of the proposals which affect the university, the most important are those which we (the commissioners) have made for remodelling the constitution and for *abolishing the existing monopoly of the colleges and halls, by allowing students to reside at Oxford without the expenses of connection with those bodies.* In regard to the colleges, we would especially urge the immediate necessity of *opening the fellowships and scholarships, of attaching professorships to certain colleges, of increasing the number and value of scholarships, of granting to the colleges the power of altering the statutes, and, above all, of prohibiting as unlawful the oaths to observe the statutes.*”

The Parliamentary Oaths question was kept alive during nearly the whole of the year 1852 by the case of Mr. Alderman Solomons, member for Greenwich, who had taken his seat, and the oath, omitting only that portion which pledged the member to “the true faith of a Christian.” The honourable gentleman's case came before the legal tribunals, and it was decided that he could not legally be permitted to omit the clause in question, which, as Mr. Solomons observed, was amusing, since the words were originally intended to exclude “Popish recreant convicts.” In an action for penalties to the extent of £1500, the lord chief-baron of the Court of Exchequer, Pollock, laid it down distinctly that only one penalty, £500, was recoverable, however frequently a member might vote in error or in defiance of the law. This action broke down upon a technical point. No penalty was inflicted, and in the meanwhile Lord Lyndhurst had introduced a bill to amend the law. It is a curious thing that to that great lawyer, who seemed in some respects to have taken up the mantle of Eldon, we should be indebted, in his old age, for so many just and useful initiatives in law reform. There is something ludicrous in the spectacle of the Tory Lord Lyndhurst, about whom so much scandal “in the matter of women” was at one time afloat, introducing a bill to better the position of married women as against their husbands, which the once-Radi-



HENRY BROUCHAM
FIRST BARON BROUGHAM AND VAUX
FROM A PHOTOGRAPH

cal Brougham jumps up and denounces as the first step towards the destruction of a great social edifice which will not bear the touch of a finger.

Lord Brougham had been quiet for some time in relation to English politics, and had devoted considerable attention to French affairs during his repeated sojourns at Cannes, where he had a small estate and a winter residence, but probably some readers may be surprised to hear that during the troublous times of 1848 he had contemplated gaining a seat in the French legislature and offering himself for election as president. He had applied to Lamartine for letters of naturalization, which had not been granted, or rather Brougham was informed that the granting them would deprive him of his English privileges, and so he abandoned the application. Little is known of the real intention of the restless ex-chancellor, who would still, as it was said of him in a much earlier period, have undertaken any position, even that of commanding the British fleet. It is on the authority of Lord Palmerston that the fact is stated, for in a letter to Lord Normanby in 1848 the humorous and acute foreign minister wrote:—"Lamartine is really a wonderful fellow, and is endowed with great qualities. It is much to be desired that he should swim through the breakers and carry his country safe into port. I conclude that he has escaped one danger by the refusal to naturalize Brougham; for it is evident that our ex-chancellor meant, if he had got himself elected, to have put up for president of the republic. It is woful to see a man who is so near being a great man make himself so small."

But Brougham too did good work in 1852 in company with other law lords.

It was remarked by a very acute young lady that Mr. Gladstone would never make a perfectly willing politician, except in connection with church matters. It was a little strange that the man should be criticised as unfit for the post of representative of Oxford University, who displayed so much eloquence and acumen—ecclesiastico-forensic acumen—as Mr. Gladstone showed in the celebrated

Frome-Bennett case. It may just be mentioned in passing that Mr. Gladstone's antagonist in parliament in this matter was Mr. Horsman (now dead). Mr. Horsman made no mark on any one subject, and he was usually, though a Liberal, a self-isolated politician like the present Earl Grey. He was, however, a brilliant debater, and was pretty sure to be listened to and to produce an effect. Those were days in which quasi-Romanist practices in the Church of England excited much stronger *general* antagonism than they do now, and there had already been a series of storms out of doors, and some interpellations in the House of Commons. Mr. Horsman recited all the charges against the bishop and Mr. Bennett, and moved for a committee to inquire into the circumstances. It was alleged against this clergyman that he had, while at Kissingen, attended mass, but had never attended the Protestant service at the embassy, while he had carried about with him a small altar for his own use. He was also accused of not holding the doctrine of the supremacy of the crown. He had resigned the incumbency of St. Paul's, Knightsbridge, upon a remonstrance from the Bishop of London (the "anti-popery" scenes which led to this are now but little remembered), and the point now was that the Bishop of Bath and Wells had admitted him from another diocese into his own without due care. It would be tedious to go into the legal niceties of the story; but Mr. Gladstone, in a masterly speech, maintaining incidentally that the people of Frome were satisfied with their vicar, argued that his bishop had acted in due course of law, and could not be brought before the house as a culprit. If any honourable member would move for a committee to inquire into the state of the law in these matters, "which seemed to have been studiously framed to discourage bishops," he would himself vote for such a committee. Mr. Horsman he indicated as a sort of professional "public accuser." In the debate which followed, Mr. Disraeli of course opposed the motion, and no less sturdily Protestant an authority than Sir W. Page Wood supported Mr. Gladstone's contention that the bishop

was within the law. Mr. Horsman carried his motion, however; but when the committee had been nominated, Mr. Gladstone, Sir W. Page Wood, and some others refused to serve, Mr. Gladstone declaring that nothing less than a peremptory order of the house should compel him to sit! This was a collapse indeed. The discouragement of bishops was not a subject which troubled the house much, but the revival of convocation this year was a sign of the times (pointing to ecclesiastical controversy) which is entitled to this brief mention.

The attitude of the Czar Nicholas of Russia towards England in regard to "the sick man," as he had long nicknamed Turkey, had been made clear enough during his visit to this country in 1844, and we have already had a glimpse of what manner of man he was and of his efforts to draw English statesmen into a confidential understanding which would enable him to claim them as allies without the formality of a treaty.¹ It may be doubted whether those confidential suggestions were treated by Lord Aberdeen with sufficient decision. That amiable nobleman, who sought peace, was naturally reluctant to speak with marked emphasis to a potentate who was a guest of the queen, and the czar appears to have come to the conclusion—or he pretended to have come to the conclusion—that his proposals were at least to be considered and were not unacceptable. Had it happened that Palmerston had been the recipient of the emperor's confidence (an unlikely supposition of course) there would probably have been no war in the Crimea, though Palmerston would have been ready (some people said willing) for war. As it was, the statesman who hated war and did not dislike the czar, found himself—perhaps in consequence of his pacific and conciliating reticence—at the head of an administration from which immediate hostilities were demanded.

It is very difficult to understand the position assumed by Nicholas except on the ground that he was a semi-barbarian with an almost

insane sense of his vast authority, who, seeking to assert his personal influence, chose to flatter English statesmen by a proposal for a tacit mutual understanding with which the rest of the world had no concern. His will was despotic at home, and he may have calculated that his concessions would be irresistible when he chose to come here as a visitor and to be familiar with the English aristocracy. He was intensely interesting to those who met him; but, as we have seen, the kind of interest he excited was often that which people take in the temporary docility of a magnificent tiger. He had the grand physique of a semi-savage despot;—the almost childish desire to attract regard and admiration, the sudden generosity, the capability for noble impulses, the anxiety to be accepted as the equal if not the superior of men of high intellectual culture and refined habits, and on the other hand he possessed the cunning of the savage not much tempered by the diplomatic wiles of which he was usually suspected. When he discovered that his appeals had been received only with polite attention, and that they were not regarded as sacred confidences which would bind the English government from interposing to prevent the dismemberment of Turkey, he was (or assumed to be) as indignant as though the obligations of a definite treaty had been abandoned and disclaimed. It is likely that he had really come to think the conversations in which he had made known his views would be accepted as the basis of tacit agreements. In his own country they would have been no less than absolute commands. He had laid aside his imperative character during his visit here and had professed to desire no other agreement than such as might be implied by an understanding "between English gentlemen." This may have been part of a secret design to obtain an assurance which could never have been made part of a regular treaty, but probably he imagined that the mere fact of his having imparted his views in friendly confidence would so touch English notions of honour that he might be able to count upon the neutrality if not the co-operation of our government. The conversations in which he endeavoured to press his policy on

¹ See vol. ii. p. 130.

Lord Aberdeen and Sir Robert Peel, only indicated the proportions to which his intentions grew nine years afterwards when in January, 1853, he met the English ambassador (Sir Hamilton Seymour) at the palace of the Archduchess Helen in St. Petersburg, and commenced another series of confidential communications which showed that according to the usual temper of his mind the former tentative propositions had relation to a fixed purpose which he would obstinately carry out even in spite of refusal. The affairs of Turkey, the czar intimated, were in a very disorganized condition, the country itself seeming to be falling to pieces. That fall would be a very great misfortune, and it was very important that England and Russia should come to a perfectly good understanding upon these affairs, and that neither should take any decisive step of which the other was not apprised. A month afterwards the emperor again met our ambassador and returned to the subject. "I tell you," he said, "that if your government has been led to believe that Turkey retains any element of existence, your government must have received incorrect information. I repeat to you that the sick man is dying, and we can never allow such an event to take us by surprise.¹ We must come to some understanding, and this we should do, I am convinced, if I could hold but ten minutes' conversation with your ministers—with Lord Aberdeen, for instance, who knows me so well, who has full confidence in me as I have in him. And remember, I do not ask for a treaty or a protocol; a general understanding is all I require—that between gentlemen is sufficient; and in this case I am certain that the confidence would be as great on the side of the queen's ministers as on mine." Pursuing the conversation on the following day, he said, "There are certain things which I will never tolerate. I will begin with ourselves. I will not tolerate the permanent occupation of Constantinople by the Russians. Having said this I will say that it never shall be occupied by the English or French or any other great

nation. Again, I never will permit an attempt at the reconstruction of a Byzantine empire, or such an extension of Greece as would render her a powerful state; still less will I permit the breaking up of Turkey into little republics—*asylums* for the Kossuths and Mazzinis, and other revolutionists of Europe. Rather than submit to any of these arrangements I would go to war, and as long as I had a man or a musket left I would carry it on." It was still left to the speculation of the listener what was to be the future of Constantinople and the Turkish Empire, but it was more than hinted that in the case of the dissolution of the latter there might be a satisfactory arrangement. "The principalities," said the czar, "are in fact an independent state under my protection. This might so continue. Servia might receive the same form of government. So again with Bulgaria. There seems to be no reason why this province should not form an independent state." Then came the temptation—or what he conceived to be the temptation to an alliance—"As to Egypt, I quite understand the importance to England of that territory. I can, then, only say that if, in the event of a distribution of the Ottoman succession upon the fall of the empire, you should take possession of Egypt, I shall have no objection to offer. I would say the same thing of Candia; that island might suit you, and I do not know why it should not become an English possession." The monstrous arrogance added to the unscrupulous assumption of these propositions would only have been possible to a sovereign, himself a semi-barbarian, ruling with a personal despotism not only millions of people but even the nobles and officials by whom he was surrounded. When we attentively consider the terms and meaning of his efforts to form a tacit alliance with England to dismember the Ottoman Empire, divide the territory, and defy the rest of Europe, it is difficult to see how war could have been avoided unless the Earl of Aberdeen and our government had spoken in unmistakable denunciation of the suggestions instead of listening and saying little or nothing. Had a rough-and-ready or an emphatic and decided negative been given at

¹ In 1844 the czar had said, "Il y a dans mon cabinet deux opinions sur la Turquie : l'une, qu'elle est mourante; l'autre, qu'elle est morte—la dernière est la mienne."

once, accompanied by an intimation that England would not stand by and see the mischief done, we might have been saved the Crimean war; but the answer was not given in time. When it was given, and given so late that it seemed as though we were half reluctant to refuse or were only endeavouring to save appearances, Nicholas would not believe that we were in earnest until we had proceeded to extremities, when he lied without hesitation, and as promptly flung himself into a war in which, as he probably knew, Prussia and Austria would render us no aid, while our alliance with France goaded him to a condition not far short of frenzy.

It must not be understood that the Emperor of Russia was destitute of intellectual attainments; on the contrary, he was in many respects accomplished. His favourite studies were military architecture, mathematics, and music. He was passionately fond of dramatic performances, and is said to have assisted the Russian poet Nestor Koukoluik in the composition of some of his pieces, and to have repeatedly aided in the construction of ballets. He was frequently behind the scenes at the theatre. It may be said indeed that he had a decided taste for theatrical display, and that although in private he lived plainly and simply, his vanity was strong enough to be pleased with the trappings and ornaments that belong to state occasions and set off the person. An amusing story is told by the Comte de Villemar illustrating the czar's consciousness of his own superb appearance.

At the Vaudeville at Paris, when it was in the Rue de Chartres, there was an actress remarkable for her copulency, her animation, and her piquancy—Madame Bras, who left Paris to seek her fortune in Russia, where she was well received, particularly by the royal family. The Emperor Nicholas was fond of visiting the actors in the green-room during the play, and used to *thee* and *thou* the women. On entering one evening the women's green-room, he found Madame Bras alone. A slight malicious smile, as he entered, played over her lips. The emperor remarked it, and said, "Bras, what made thee laugh on my coming in?" "A feminine folly, sire," she replied,

"which passed through my mind, and which I beseech your majesty to excuse me from communicating, though I protest there was nothing in it to offend your majesty, whom I respect as I ought." "I believe it," replied the emperor with his usual dignity, "which is the reason why I want to know the cause of your laugh." "Sire," answered Madame Bras, "since you order it I will confess that, as I saw your majesty come in, I could not help saying to myself that your person is devilishly well adapted to your line of characters" (*qu'elle a diablement le physique de son emploi*). Though the compliment savoured a little of the vulgar player, it infinitely flattered the emperor, who laughed at it with the affability which was habitual to him when conversing with the French actresses; and on the following day he sent a beautiful pair of diamond bracelets to the vivacious truant from the theatre of the Rue de Chartres.

His regard for pomp and display in public may be partly explained by his fine physical proportions and by the necessity for his always appearing with effect upon state occasions, and this may have been the reason why he constantly wore a military uniform; but he possessed a vast self-consciousness, and was continually anxious to know what was said of him. It was declared that he had formed a collection of all the books and pamphlets and even of the numberless newspaper articles published in various languages in every quarter of the globe, in which he was spoken of either favourably or the reverse, and that this curious collection consisted, at the time of his death, of several hundred volumes and portfolios.

Nicholas of Russia, it must be remembered, was not the heir of a long line of imperial culture. Until Peter the Great, who had no pretensions whatever to culture, opened up the empire, Russia was a barbarous state. Catherine II., who *did* pretend to all kinds of intellectual progress, was the sovereign who really developed and extended the national boundary and created for it a prestige which placed it on an equality with the older states of Europe, but this was done not by culture but by governing capacity, unsparing despotism, and ex-

traordinary ability aided by political intrigue. Nicholas himself when he succeeded to the throne of his brother Alexander I., became the sovereign of neither a completely civilized nor a free people. Half the nation was still in a condition of semi-barbarism; and it had been the policy of its rulers vigorously to suppress liberty of thought and speech. The government was Asiatic in its prevention of what we call freedom, and Nicholas entered upon his enormous responsibilities with an intention to make himself personally regarded not only as the head but as the sole authority of the state. The aggrandisement of Russia was the tradition which he followed, and to that everything must give way. His capacity for work, his great strength and stature, his power of directing state affairs and giving almost unremitting care to minor details of civil and military organization, were all remarkable. There never was a sovereign who was so constantly employed as the Czar Nicholas, and this may have prevented the development of that insanity which had more than once shown itself in the imperial family, and of which outbursts of violence and obduracy were perhaps the occasional symptoms in Nicholas himself. He made himself not only dictator but responsible agent, and so he was never at rest. He was constantly travelling to various parts of his vast dominion, and ordering military, naval, or public works. He prompted the codification of the laws, or to speak more correctly the institution of a regular code of laws instead of the few enactments promulgated by Catherine, who adopted a preamble with the aid of Voltaire, Diderot, and d'Alembert. In 1832 the code inaugurated by the czar was contained in fifteen quarto volumes, and in 1851 sixteen volumes were added as a supplement. Russia had become a great and threatening military power, and the necessity for conciliating or counteracting her policy had long been a prominent factor in European diplomacy; but she was also making vast strides in material progress, and here again the emperor was compelled to exert himself to the utmost to enlarge his fleets, increase the number of his ports and his mercantile marine, to establish railroads

and means of communication through the great territory over which he ruled, and to provide for the rapid transmission of intelligence, which he did so effectually that news from the Crimea came to England more quickly by way of St. Petersburg than by the direct route. The conclusion of commercial treaties with China, Asiatic states, Germany, and America, gave him occupation in another direction, and yet the man's activity was so untiring that he constantly attended reviews—was first on the spot where there was a fire, directing the men how to work the engines, and even superintended the breaking of the long icicles which in winter hung from the eaves and copings of public buildings to the danger of the passengers.

It will be seen that Nicholas was in a position where submissive adulation, or at the most a kind of deferential temerity on the part of those who surrounded him, inflated his already overweening pride, and the homage which he received, added to some genuine admiration for his person and the extraordinary energy of his character, gratified his vanity to an excess that injured the real strength of his character. But he was also credited with holding the traditional dream of becoming, if not the conqueror of the world for the Slavonic race, at least of preparing the way for the Muscovite rule in Asia. Whether he held this expectation or not, he was eminently unfitted for promoting it outside Russian dominion. He had, as we have said, many of the higher qualities that distinguish half-civilized rulers who are despotic because they know no other form of government which would be applicable to their people—but he had no high moral qualities. As a ruler he had inherited and held almost unchanged the policy of the more powerful of his predecessors. Without going so far as to endorse the saying that his was in its bare elementary principles a government of force and fraud, we may quote the words of a writer who in 1855, when reviewing his career, said:—

“As to the liberty and dignity of man, as to those elevated sentiments of heart and mind which ennoble human nature, he not

only neglected to cultivate them among his people, but opposed them throughout his life by the most violent and merciless means. Every religious denomination was proscribed except his own, and the Bible was rigorously banished his dominions. To close Russia against all liberal ideas, no matter how moderate, to prevent the faintest discussion and criticism of the acts of authority, to bear down all resistance, and subjugate and mould sixty millions of men until the harshest military despotism should appear a natural and almost an indispensable thing, to substitute his own will for right, and, as a necessary consequence, to think himself infallible—these were the principles which filled his mind as his blood did his veins, and made the very pulse of his life. By the exercise of a power so unlimited a man runs the risk of becoming mad with pride, but can never be great or good. His system resolves itself into a species of deification of himself, and of an insulting opinion of the rest of mankind. If the theory itself was flagrantly false, he who cherished and acted upon it could be little better than a huge delusion.”¹

Yet it is difficult to believe that any man would pursue such a course except under the spell of imperial fanaticism: a conviction that he was called upon to subdue everything to the one end of national aggrandisement under the personal direction of members of one family. The toil was exhausting, and would have killed almost any other man: the anxiety was so constant that everybody noted, not only the occasional wild and almost horrifying stare, but the heavy cloud of care that marred the lineaments of that proud, handsome face. Amidst all the exertion, the flattery, the constant work, and change, and wearing ambition—there was the constant suspicion, if not the dread of assassination or of poisoning. A story of a terribly suggestive kind as showing the violent and almost brutal temper of the czar, as well as the peril to which he thought he was liable, was told privately at Breslau by Dr. Mandt in 1852, when the emperor was fifty-six years old, and had therefore already

passed the usual number of years attained by the members of the imperial family.

“The constitution of the emperor is excellent, but as he treats it like an enemy, and in spite of his age does not deny himself any excess, he often shakes this magnificent edifice. At the period of which I am speaking he suffered from an obstinate indisposition, of which the cause remained unknown. My enemies, my friends, and, above all, my brother physicians, took advantage of this to charge me first with want of foresight, then with ignorance, and ultimately with poisoning. At that critical juncture I was summoned by the Grand-duchess Helen, who received me with a countenance at once cold and stern. She inquired how the emperor was, and without waiting for an answer, added that she was forewarned, and would abandon that august health neither to ignorance, if there were ignorance, nor to treason, if there were treason! She then motioned to me to retire. On reaching home I was summoned to wait upon her husband, the Grand-duke Michael; his agitation was extreme, and he rushed towards me. I remained motionless, and instead of strangling me as I expected, he contented himself with putting his fist in my face, exclaiming, ‘Traitor!’ I respectfully begged that he would give me the means of repelling an odious accusation by acquainting me with the error which had suggested it. ‘You act the virtuous man!’ he exclaimed; ‘you play the philosopher, the stoic; but I will not suffer myself to be deceived by this jugglery. The health of the emperor is in your hands; you are answerable to me for it with your life. On the day of that precious health being endangered your learned head would only adhere to your shoulders by a thread. Not a word, sir; understand, and go!’ and I withdrew, pursued by his threats. In my absence the emperor had sent for me. I found him alone, stretched upon an easy-chair, his lion-like head weighed down by suffering, his colour leaden, his air gloomy. He cast on me a penetrating glance, and after some minutes of a chilling silence, inquired how I found him. I felt his pulse, which was strong and agitated; his tongue was bad, his general state

¹ *Quarterly Review*, March, 1855.

alarming. 'Well, sir?' said the emperor; he always used to call me by my name, and this alteration boded no good. 'Sire, your majesty has oppression and fever; it will be necessary to take an emetic.' At the word emetic the emperor raised his head abruptly—'An emetic! you never prescribed one to me before.' I went into the laboratory adjoining his study, and soon after returned with the dose; it was not long before it acted, but I was not satisfied with the result. Another emetic appeared to me necessary, and after it had taken effect the emperor raised his pallid countenance and said to me, in a tone of suppressed wrath, 'Is that all?' 'No, sire, for I must have bile.' 'That is to say, you must have my bowels. Be it so; but remember this—I *will* have' (and he pronounced the word *will* in a manner to give it a threatening meaning), '*I will have this one produce an effect.*' Fully sensible of the danger and responsibility, I, at all risks, trebled the dose; the vomiting was instantaneous and complete. He inquired whether I was satisfied. 'Your majesty is completely out of danger,' answered I, and we parted. On the following day I found the emperor standing up and strong. 'Do you know, Mandt,' said he, 'that yesterday, while you were administering the medicine to me, I believed I was poisoned?' 'I knew it, sire!' 'You knew it—and you had the courage to advise me to take an emetic!' 'The state of your majesty required it.' 'But if it had operated ill, what would your enemies have said? for you have enemies, and they are numerous.' 'They would have asserted subsequently what they insinuated previously,—they would have called me Mandt the Poisoner.' 'And that thought did not stop you?' and here he held out his hand to me."

The suspicion of the czar on this occasion has been explained by the fact that when an emetic was proposed he was at once reminded that this was the very remedy which had been mentioned as an antidote in case of a suspicion of poisoning; and that, as he was probably aware of the interview between Mandt and the Grand-duke Michael, he immediately began to consider whether the doctor, to save himself, was about to give a remedy

which would counteract the effects of some noxious drug previously administered. The story was not made public till after the death of the emperor, on whom Dr. Mandt (who, by the by, was a homœopath) continued to attend.

It must not be supposed, however, that the outbursts of violence displayed by the czar were evidences of a brutal temper. They have been attributed as much to hereditary malady as to the conditions amidst which he was placed and the defects of his education. He was capable of great gentleness and of moods of deep sentiment, and those domestics who were in personal attendance on him were warmly attached to him as to a kind master. That he was an affectionate father and husband is well known, and indeed though his marked attentions to women and his gallantries—which were more commands than intrigues—were notorious, his deep regard and esteem for his wife remained unaltered to the day of his death. She was the daughter of Frederick William III. of Prussia, but according to the Russian usage changed her name on her marriage from Louise Charlotte to Alexandra Feodorowna. They were married in 1796 while Nicholas was grand-duke, and their eldest son was born in the following year, on which occasion Nicholas wrote to the metropolitan Bishop of Moscow a very touching letter mentioning his joy at the happy termination of his anxieties, and asking the bishop to be his guide and aid in accomplishing a vow to erect a chapel to the honour of Alexander Newski in the church of the New Jerusalem. In this letter he says, "It has pleased Divine Providence to make me taste the happiness of being a father. He has deigned to preserve both the mother and the son. The expression of gratitude, which is not necessary to Him who searches the heart, becomes indispensable for a heart which is penetrated with it." The deep affection and respect for his wife continued to the day of his death, and was manifested on many occasions and in characteristic ways. It is recorded that when the military insurrection broke out in St. Petersburg after the death of the emperor Alexander the First, the new czar repaired with his wife to the

chapel of the palace before putting himself at the head of the regiment of horse-guards to give battle to the insurgents in Isaac Square, and joined in prayer with her for the safety of the empire. While the engagement lasted, the empress, who could hear the incessant discharges of cannon, remained prostrate, imploring Heaven for the preservation of her husband, who, when victory had declared itself, returned to throw himself into her arms and offer up thanks with her on his knees for his complete success. This desire to be together in trying conjunctures was manifested anew during subsequent years. In spite of a disease of the lungs, which for several seasons forced her to exchange the rigorous winter of St. Petersburg for some milder climate, the empress would not leave her husband alone in his trials, and to this affectionate resolve he owed the consolation of having by his death-bed the companion of his life. In former days, when she was absent for her health, the emperor had posted through Europe to surprise her in her winter-quarters. In 1845 she had a country house at the gates of Palermo, and the door of her chamber being opened one morning with an unusual noise, the czar entered, having travelled incognito from Russia for the mere gratification of the interview.

It will be seen that as the Russian empress was sister to the King of Prussia, the czar may have had some reason to expect that whatever Austria might do in the way of "moral support" to the claims of France and England in favour of the Ottoman Empire, the Prussian government would follow her only for a short distance, and in this he was scarcely disappointed. It soon became evident that Nicholas had determined to accept no compromise which the sultan and his advisers would make. Though Lord Stratford de Redcliffe by his astuteness more than once prevented an excuse for proceeding to extremities by his sagacious advice to the Turkish government, the Russian emperor felt the appointment of Lord Stratford itself to be an additional cause for irritation, since the designs of Russia had previously been checked by the prompt and decisive diplomacy of the British plenipotentiary, who had been ill received, if not refused, when

he was sent on a mission to Russia. It became evident, not only, as Lord Aberdeen piteously exclaimed, that we were drifting into war, but that the burden would have to be sustained by England and France alone. It was afterwards declared, and not without reason, that the French people were not altogether favourable to the war, which they regarded as affecting English interests more than their own, but they were not averse to the alliance with England, and Napoleon III. was ready to represent a principle which France was willing to endorse, in checking those overweening assumptions of the czar which had led him to ignore the existence of French interests in his suggestions to the English government. The Emperor of the French too, though he was willing to accept the name of a new-comer, owed little to the courtesy of the high-handed Nicholas. It cannot be supposed that he went into a tremendous conflict for the purpose of resenting any supposed slight, but there appears to be a tone in the letter he addressed to the Emperor of Russia inviting a pacific settlement, which is precisely that of the new-comer, addressing an easy and rather familiar remonstrance to the haughty claimant of conservative rights which are put entirely out of the question.

It should be mentioned also that Napoleon III. had lost no time in forming a matrimonial alliance, and that he had made not the slightest attempt to seek it in any of the royal or imperial families of Europe.

The declaration of the empire had been almost immediately followed by the marriage. The French emperor had long before made choice of a lady distinguished for her beauty and for eminent social talents; Eugénie Marie de Montijo, second daughter of Count de Montijo, grandee of Spain, and of Marie Manuela Kirkpatrick de Closeburn, the descendant of a Scotch Roman Catholic family. Her education had been completed in France and in England, and during travels through Europe. She was twenty-seven years of age at the time of her marriage to the emperor, who on the 22d of January, 1853, announced his intention to the senate by saying:—

"The alliance which I contract is not in

accordance with the traditions of ancient policy, and therein is its advantage. France, by its successive revolutions, has separated from the rest of Europe. Every wise government ought to wish it to re-enter the pale of the old monarchies. But this result will be more surely attained by a straightforward and frank policy, by loyalty in conduct, than by royal alliances, which often create a false security, and substitute family interests for those of the nation. Moreover, the example of the past has left in the minds of the people certain superstitious feelings. They have not forgotten that for seventy years foreign princesses have mounted the throne only to behold their race dispossessed or proscribed by war or revolution.

“One woman alone seemed to bring happiness, and to live more than the others in the memory of the people. That woman, the modest and good wife of General Bonaparte, was not the issue of royal blood. It must, however, be admitted that in 1810 the marriage of Napoleon I. with Marie Louise was a great event. It was a pledge for the future, a real satisfaction, as the ancient and illustrious house of Austria, which had been so long at war with us, was seen to intrigue for the alliances of the elected chief of a new empire. Under the late reign, on the contrary, the patriotism of the nation suffered when the heir to the crown solicited fruitlessly, during several years, a princely alliance, to obtain it only in a secondary rank and a different religion.

“When, in the presence of Europe, a man is borne on by the force of a principle to the level of ancient dynasties, it is not by giving an ancient character to his escutcheon, and by seeking to introduce himself, at any cost, into a family, that he is accepted. It is rather, ever remembering his origin, by preserving his own character, and by adopting frankly in presence of Europe the position of *parvenu*—a glorious title when one obtains it by the voluntary suffrages of a great people. Thus departing from the precedents followed up to this time, my marriage became a private affair, and there remained only the choice of the person.

“She who has been the object of my preference is of princely descent. French in heart, by education, and by the recollection of the blood shed by her father in the cause of the empire, she has, as a Spaniard, the advantage of not having in France a family to whom it might be necessary to give honours and fortune. . . . Without despising any one, I yet yield to my inclinations, after having taken counsel with my reason and my convictions. In fine, by placing independence, the qualities of the heart, domestic happiness, above dynastic prejudices and the calculations of ambition, I shall not be less strong because I shall be more free.”

It was on the 29th of January, 1854, and of course after the destruction of the Turkish fleet by the Russians at Sinope, that Napoleon III. wrote to the Emperor of Russia:—

“Your majesty has given so many proofs of your solicitude for the tranquillity of Europe, and by your beneficent influence has so powerfully arrested the spirit of disorder, that I cannot doubt as to the course you will take in the alternative which presents itself to your choice. Should your majesty be as desirous as myself of a pacific conclusion, what would be more simple than to declare that an armistice shall now be signed, that all hostilities shall cease, and that the belligerent forces shall retire from the places to which motives of war have led them? Thus the Russian troops would abandon the Principalities, and our squadrons the Black Sea. Your majesty, preferring to treat directly with Turkey, might appoint an ambassador, who could negotiate with a plenipotentiary of the sultan a convention which might be submitted to a conference of the four powers. Let your majesty adopt this plan, upon which the Queen of England and myself are perfectly agreed, and tranquillity will be re-established and the world satisfied. There is nothing in the plan which is unworthy of your majesty, nothing which can wound your honour; but if, from a motive difficult to understand, your majesty should refuse this proposal, then France as well as England will be compelled to leave to the fate of arms and the chances

of war that which might now be decided by reason and justice."

The Emperor of Russia replied on the 9th of February:—"I have made, for the maintenance of peace, all the concessions, both of form and substance, compatible with my honour; and in claiming for my coreligionists in Turkey the confirmation of the rights and privileges which they have long acquired at the price of Russian blood I claimed nothing which was not confirmed by treaties. If the Porte had been left to herself the difference which has so long kept Europe in suspense would have been solved. A fatal influence has thrown everything into confusion. By provoking gratuitous suspicions, by exciting the fanaticism of the Turks, and by deceiving their government as to my intentions and the real scope of my demands, it has so exaggerated the extent of the questions that the probable result seems to be war. . . . My confidence is in God and in my right, and Russia, as I can guarantee, will prove herself in 1854 what she was in 1812. If, however, your majesty, less indifferent to my honour, should frankly return to our programme, if you should proffer me a cordial hand, as I now offer it to you at this last moment, I will willingly forget whatever has wounded my feelings in the past. Then, sire, but then only, we may discuss, and perhaps we may come to an understanding. Let your fleet limit itself to preventing the Turks from sending additional forces to the theatre of war: I willingly promise that they shall have nothing to fear from my attempts. Let them send a negotiator; I will receive him in a suitable manner. My conditions are known at Vienna. That is the only basis upon which I can allow discussion."

It was thought by Prince Albert and others who were thoroughly acquainted with the situation that the representations made by Napoleon III. to Russia, though they were little likely to find favour with the czar, were genuinely intended to avert if possible a war in which the French people were not at all desirous to engage; but the temper of the French people themselves underwent a change after the reply came, and the war being in-

evitable they were ready to engage in it with spirit and determination. It is said that the phrase of the czar, "Russia will prove herself in 1854 what she was in 1812," aroused the war fever in France. But we must briefly refer to the events which preceded this correspondence, and then as briefly indicate the progress of the struggle during 1854 and 1855.

We have already seen that the demands of Russia were founded on a clause in a treaty which, it was alleged, gave the czar a protectorate over the Greek subjects of the sultan. The treaty was that of Kutchuk-Kainardji, made in 1774 between the Ottoman Porte and Catherine II. of Russia, at a time when Turkey had been repeatedly defeated, and was reduced to such extremities that she was ready to concede almost anything, and did in fact relinquish Azof and Taganrog, at the same time making the Crimea independent, with the result of its being afterwards calmly appropriated as a possession of the Russian Empire. It seems scarcely likely, therefore, that in the same treaty which enforced these enormous concessions a clause should have been knowingly accepted, which, under colour of giving Russia a right to demand from the sultan due protection to members of the Greek Church in Turkey, might be at any time interpreted to mean such a claim of interposition on the part of Russia as would virtually make the Porte entirely subservient to the czar in respect to a large proportion of its subjects. All Europe may be said to have been engaged in disputing about the literal interpretation of the clause in the treaty of Kutchuk-Kainardji, on which Russia founded its arrogant and inordinate claims, and many, among whom was Mr. Gladstone, contended that the *wording* of the treaty involved the right of Russia to interpose if the sultan failed to extend to the Christian churches the protection which had been promised. Of course, accepting even to the full this interpretation, it was still open to argue what was the kind or degree of protection intended, and to what extent Russian interposition could be permitted in a case affecting not the Ottoman Porte only, but the European powers; or at all events, not only the integrity

but the existence of the Ottoman Empire. Now the seventh clause of the treaty, on which the whole controversy turned, recorded the agreement of the Sublime Porte "to protect constantly the Christian religion and its churches; and also to allow the minister of the imperial court of Russia to make, on all occasions, representations, as well in favour of the new church in Constantinople, of which mention will be made in the fourteenth article, as in favour of those who officiate therein, promising to take such representations into due consideration as being made by a confidential functionary of a neighbouring and sincerely friendly power." The "new church in Constantinople" evidently refers to some specific building; and in the "fourteenth article" this reference is explained to mean a permission to the Russian court to build in the Galata quarter of Constantinople a Greek church for public worship, in addition to the chapel built in the residence of the Russian minister; and it is further declared that this new church shall be always under the protection of the ministers of the Russian Empire, and shielded from all obstruction and all injury. The whole contention as to the logical claim of Russia turned on a distinction or a relation between the first line of the seventh clause and the entire clause along with the article relating to the new church, to which a reference is made by the clause itself.

There is no need, however, to dwell on these disputes, and practically they had no effect in averting the war, or in justifying the action which was taken by Russia to enforce claims which it was asserted were monstrous under any interpretation of the treaty, or, as many people would have said, in spite of the existence of any treaty whatever. In England the intentions rather than the claims of the Emperor Nicholas were estimated, and his attempts to make our government a party to his assumptions appeared to be resented more by the people of this country than they had been by the ministers to whom the sinister suggestions had been submitted.

It would have been comparatively easy to obtain from Turkey a reasonable recognition of the terms of the treaty. The sultan

was ready to admit the claims in respect to the holy places, and the protection to be afforded to Christian churches. But it soon became evident that the emperor had determined to make an end of "the sick man" and administer his estate; and the refusal of England to become an accomplice seemed to increase his obstinacy, or rather to change its character to that of dogged fury. Prince Menschikoff either had orders to behave more like a bully than an envoy, or he naturally adopted that tone and manner which turned diplomatic proposals into threatening demands, and made of a so-called "convention" an ultimatum, the manner of presenting which was an insult to which no nation would be likely to submit unless it were in such extremity that it dare not refuse. The sultan did not think that Turkey was in that extremity, and it may be noted that Lord Palmerston thought so too, since he afterwards said he was by no means certain that the Turks might not have held their own for a long time against the bullying of Russia even after actual hostilities had commenced. The sultan had already issued firmans by which the claims for the confirmation and protection of the privileges of the Christian church had been met, and under the advice of Lord Stratford de Redcliffe the whole attitude of the Porte was one of a desire for conciliatory measures; but the demanded convention was refused, as perhaps Menschikoff expected that it would be, and then (on the 3d of July 1853) two Russian divisions under the command of Prince Gortschakoff crossed the Pruth and took possession of the Danubian principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia. This the czar announced was not an act of war, but only the acquisition of material guarantees for the concession of the demands of Russia; but as these demands had already been emphatically refused as intolerable, war could not be very far off. Still, in accordance with the advice of the English representative and the concurrence of the other powers, the sultan refrained from a declaration of hostilities. The Vienna note, which was the result of the conference, was put forward as a charming example of diplo-

macy; and Russia was ready to accept it, for it left the points in dispute unsettled, and its language was so vague that it was even more liable to misinterpretation than the treaty of Kutchuk-Kainardji itself. Lord Stratford, however, was not deceived by it. He saw that it could be distorted into a concession of Russian demands, since it would be interpreted into an admission of her immediate protectorate over the Greek Christians in Turkey. Prince Albert was among those who were at first caught by its smooth conciliatory admissions, but he afterwards characterized it as a trap laid by Russia through Austria. As we have already indicated, the demands of Prince Menshikoff had gone far beyond the questions in dispute about the holy places, and the Porte had closed that dispute by the issue of firmans at the beginning of May. The "convention" afterwards proposed was really an ultimatum which Turkey could not for a moment admit. The crossing of the Pruth by Russian troops for the purpose of securing material guarantees was little less than a declaration of war: but Count Nesselrode's note declaring it to be only a measure of self-protection enabled the western powers again to endeavour to pacify the Porte while fresh negotiations were attempted. The temper of the Turkish government was such that it needed no more than a hint from Lord Stratford to lead it to reject the Vienna note unless considerable modifications were made in its terms. Not only the Moslem, but a large proportion of the Christian populations were averse to the domination of Russia, and the sultan felt that he had the moral support of the western powers against the outrageous demands of the czar. In rejecting the note it was necessary to guard against interpretations which might revive those demands, even if they were for the moment kept in abeyance, and the only direct way to do this was to alter the reference to the stipulations of the treaty of Kainardji so as to make it quite clear that there should be no direct protectorate by the Emperor of Russia over the Christian subjects of the czar. This alteration was just what the emperor did not want; the amendments were rejected, and though some

further attempts were made to patch up a diplomatic arrangement, war became inevitable, except from the point of view of the "Peace Party," who mostly thought that even the disappearance of the Turkish Empire from the map of the world would not be an overwhelming calamity.

The situation was the more critical because the subjects of the Porte were already in a state of great excitement, and were crying loudly against the demands of the Russian government; and indeed, public feeling in England was being aroused to a pitch which would soon have made a pacific government unpopular. England could not advise the ministry of the sultan to accept the Vienna note, the Russian interpretation of which had been distinctly declared to be at variance with the intention of the powers who drew up its provisions. One of two courses seemed to be unavoidable—either to induce the Turkish government to accept it by giving a guarantee to support them in any future attempt of Russia to act on its misinterpretation, or to prepare in conjunction with France to go to their aid to repel the Russian aggression.

To his great grief Lord Aberdeen saw that he was unable to stem the tide, and his difficulties were not diminished because he was already being "advised" by Palmerston, whose robust pugnacity would have taken decisive and emphatic measures to show Russia that he was not to be trifled with. The state of Constantinople had become very alarming. Lord Aberdeen wrote to the queen on the 23d of September, 1853, "The war frenzy and fanaticism of the Turks have passed all bounds, and threaten the safety of the sultan and of the Christian inhabitants of the capital. Under these circumstances authority has been given to call up the English and French fleets for their protection. The ambassadors have already agreed, each of them to summon two war steamers for this purpose. Unwilling as Lord Aberdeen has always been to agree to the gratuitous violation of the treaty of 1841, he could not hesitate a moment when British life and property were at stake, as well as the personal security of the sovereign."

The Queen and Prince Albert had by that

time, however, begun pretty well to understand the true position of affairs, and her majesty was prompt and definite enough in her reply in a letter from Balmoral dated September 25th.

“Lord Aberdeen’s explanation of the present state of affairs throws an entirely new light upon the position of the question in dispute. The queen has also just seen Count Nesselrode’s despatch, stating his reasons for the objections to the modifications made in Vienna note. Hitherto Russia has generally objected to any modification of what had been already accepted by the emperor as an *ultimatum*.

“But since it appears, as Lord Aberdeen says, ‘that the Russian interpretation of the Vienna note was directly at variance with that of the four powers, and in a great measure confirmed the Turkish objections,’ Lord Aberdeen is perfectly right in calling it ‘an act scarcely honest upon the part of England and France to ask the Porte to sign a note upon the strength of their interpretation, while they knew perfectly well that this interpretation was entirely different from that put upon it by the power to whom the note was to be addressed.’

“From this moment, however, it becomes also obvious that it will be fruitless further to attempt to settle the dispute by the ‘*rédaction*’ (compilation) of notes to be exchanged between Turkey and Russia, or the choice of particular words and expressions in public documents having for their object to avoid naming the real objects in dispute.

“It is evident that Russia has hitherto attempted to deceive us in pretending that she did not aim at the acquisition of any *new* right, but required only a satisfaction of honour and a reacknowledgment of the rights she already possessed by treaty; and that she does intend, and for the first time lays bare that intention, to acquire new rights of interference which the Porte does not wish to concede, and cannot concede, and which the European powers have repeatedly declared she *ought not* to concede.

“Ought not the points of difference to be now prominently laid before our allies, and in

conjunction with such as have either the honesty or the courage to avow the same opinion with ourselves ought we not to point this out to Russia, with a declaration that such demands are unsupported by existing treaties, inadmissible by Turkey if she has any regard for her independence, and inadmissible by the powers who have an interest and a duty to guard this independence, and that the continuance of the occupation of the principalities in order to extort these demands constitutes an unwarrantable aggression upon Turkey, and infraction of the public law of Europe?

“If the views of Russia, for instance, with regard to ‘Modification III. of the Note’ were to prevail, the extension of the advantages and privileges enjoyed by Christian communities, in their capacity as foreigners, to the Greeks generally, with the right granted to Russia to intercede for them to this effect, would simply make foreigners of ten millions of the subjects of the Porte, or depose the sultan as their sovereign, putting the Emperor of Russia in his place.”

It is not difficult to trace in this plain declaration the hand of Prince Albert, but at the time or soon afterwards he was accused and suspected of being in effect adverse to England and of acting inimically to the national honour by his foreign sympathies. The “dead-set” made on the prince by a large part of the newspaper press was inexcusable, and for a time he was again the centre of abuse from all quarters, until a short declaration in parliament utterly exploded these scandalous accusations. Of this we shall have a word to say in another page. The line of argument indicated in the queen’s reply to the Earl of Aberdeen was adopted and made the substance of a despatch by Lord Clarendon to Sir G. Hamilton Seymour at St. Petersburg, and then followed another move on the part of the Emperor Nicholas.

The French and British fleets had been sent to the Dardanelles for the protection of Turkey as soon as it was known that preparations were being made for the Russian occupation of the principalities. Lord Palmerston had strongly advised that when the occupation did take place the fleets should at once be sent up

to the Bosphorus, and that they should also be at liberty to go into the Black Sea if necessary or useful for the protection of Turkish territory. This he believed would be an encouragement to Turkey, a direct check to Russia, and a stimulus to Austria and Prussia to make increased exertions to bring the Russian government to reason, and that it would also "relieve England and France from the disagreeable and not very creditable position of waiting without venturing to enter the back door as friends while the Russians have taken possession of the front hall as enemies." Palmerston was then convinced that this country expected some such decisive course to be taken, and that it would meet with support from the opposition in parliament; but the Earl of Aberdeen persisted, as Prince Albert wrote in a letter to Stockmar, not only in treating our enemies as if they were honourable men, but in maintaining it was right to think that they were so in fact.

It must have been difficult to support this high opinion after the Emperor of Russia had declared that the occupation of the provinces was to be explained by the presence of the fleets in the Dardanelles, and would only cease when they retired. "It is the robber who declares that he will not leave the house until the policeman shall have first retired from the courtyard," said Palmerston in a memorandum sent round to the members of the cabinet. "The position of England and France was already sufficiently humiliating; but this insolent pretension, published to all Europe even before it was communicated to us, seems to me to make that position no longer tenable consistently with a due regard to the honour and character of this country." He still advised the despatch of the fleets to the Bosphorus, with an intimation that Count Nesselrode's note, dictating to us where we should send our fleet, left us no alternative but to station that fleet at the very heart of that empire whose integrity and independence had been unwarrantably threatened by a Russian invasion of its territory.

It will be seen that Palmerston was already playing a very prominent part as adviser in foreign affairs in addition to his duties as

home secretary, and it cannot be doubted that he was interpreting the feeling of the country; but he must seriously have embarrassed the patient and, as most people thought, the timid and hesitating policy of the Earl of Aberdeen, who clung to the opinion that negotiations for peace might be successful after all if we could only go on acting as though we gave Russia credit for honesty and good faith. But the Russian people as well as the Turkish people were regarding the impending struggle from a fanatical point of view; and though the emperor sometimes seemed ready to make another effort to set himself right with England, it was evidently only for the purpose of gaining his end, and without regard to the truth of his statements. He had declared at Olmutz that he sought no new right, privilege, or advantage, but solely the confirmation of the legal *status quo*. If he had been sincere in this there ought to have been no difficulty in concluding a peace. He was reported to be depressed and out of spirits at the position in which he found himself. The four great powers had declared him in the wrong; they all felt sore that the rash and unjustifiable invasion of the principalities had brought them to the verge of an European war. Prussia and Austria, moreover, had reason to dread a power so arbitrary in its demands and its manner of enforcing them by seizing what territory it pleased. If Moldavia, why not any other province under the pretext of some equally unfounded claim? Seeing the attitude adopted by England and France, the emperor had tried to engage Austria and Prussia in a league, offensive and defensive, against them. Austria would have yielded had Prussia done so; but Prussia, under the firm guidance of Baron Manteuffel, refused. Thus the emperor stood alone, with the public opinion of Europe arrayed against him, and two of its greatest powers virtually pledged to support the sultan by their whole combined strength. The prospect might well have made him pause; but by this time the religious fervour of the Russians was roused in favour of what they deemed a crusade in support of the true faith, and this element, with others, more than

outweighed the suggestions of policy and prudence.¹

The Emperor of Russia felt himself impelled to a difficult war in which he would have to stand alone, and at the last moment he was still plotting and contriving how he might secure some kind of support. There are even evidences that he would have receded if he could have done so with substantial advantage in the direction of a protectorate which would make it appear that he was, as he professed to be, acting only in the interests of national honour. But the time had passed. He had gained nothing by his efforts to hoodwink Europe, and though he made overtures for a triple alliance with Austria and Prussia, the governments of these countries could neither of them venture to go to that extent of perfidy after they had ever so faintly protested against the assumptions of the czar. Either they had promoted a treaty by the clauses of which they had been deceived, or they were playing into the hands of Russia.

The old Asiatic party in Turkey, led by Redschid Pacha, who held by a prophecy that the Turks were to be driven out of Constantinople and would be confined to a territory in Asia, were anxious to secure peace by almost any concessions; but they were no longer tolerated when Russia commenced hostilities by crossing the Pruth, and the war party were called to power with Omar Pacha as commander-in-chief of the Turkish armies for the Danubian Principalities. Omar Pacha was an Austrian subject, a Croatian, who had entered the Turkish service in 1830 when he was twenty-nine years old, and whose reputation had been sustained by his great military ability and some brilliant exploits in Syria, Albania, Koordistan, and Bosnia. He had professedly embraced the Mohammedan tenets, but it needed all his great talents and repeated successes to enable him to hold his own against the jealousy of the Turkish officers, who looked upon him for some years with dislike and suspicion. The war on which he was about to enter gave him another opportunity of asserting his superiority as a general. As

soon as the Russian troops entered the principalities Turkey issued a manifesto, and on the 5th of October declared war. The four western powers, desiring still to avert decided hostilities if possible, sent to the Turkish general desiring him not to cross the Danube or to commence an appeal to arms; but Omar Pacha was already in action:—his army had crossed the river and taken a firm position in spite of the resistance of the Russians.

At this time Prince Albert had sent a circular, or what may be called a series of notes on the situation, to the Earl of Aberdeen, in which he represented as his opinion that though we were most anxious for the preservation of the peace of Europe, which could not fail to be endangered by open hostilities between Turkey and Russia, by the order to our fleet to protect the Turkish territory, and by the declaration of war issued by the Turks, this the perhaps most important object of our policy had been decidedly placed in jeopardy. In acting as auxiliaries to the Turks we ought to be quite sure that *they* had no object in view *foreign* to our duty and interests; that they did not drive at war whilst we aimed at peace; that they did not, instead of merely resisting the attempt of Russia to obtain a protectorate over the Greek population incompatible with their own independence, seek to obtain themselves the power of imposing a more oppressive rule of two millions of fanatic Mussulmans over twelve millions of Christians; that they did not try to turn the tables upon the weaker power, now that, backed by England and France, they had themselves become the stronger.

If our forces were to be employed for any purpose, however defensive, as an auxiliary to Turkey, we *must insist* upon keeping not only the conduct of the negotiation, but also the power of peace and war, in our own hands, and that, Turkey refusing this, we could no longer take part *for her*.

It would be said that England and Europe had a strong interest, setting all Turkish considerations aside, that Constantinople and the Turkish territory should not fall into the hands of Russia, and that they should in the last extremity even go to war to prevent such an over-

¹ Sir Theodore Martin, *Life of the Prince Consort*.

throw of the balance of power. This must be admitted, and such a war might be right and wise. But this would be a war, not for the maintenance of the *integrity of the Ottoman Empire*, but merely for the interests of the European powers of civilization. It ought to be carried on unshackled by obligations to the Porte, and would probably lead, in the peace, which must be the object of that war, to the obtaining of arrangements more consonant with the well-understood interests of Europe, of Christianity, liberty, and civilization, than the reimposition of the ignorant barbarian and despotic yoke of the Mussulman over the most fertile and favoured portion of Europe.

This memorandum from the prince was approved by the foreign minister Lord Clarendon, and by Sir James Graham, while Lord John Russell said he "agreed very much with it;" but Lord Palmerston differed considerably from its conclusions, and his reply is worth attention, because it may be said to have relation to a dispute which has been renewed at a comparatively recent date and is by no means settled. He said: "According to my view of the matters in question the case is simple and our course is clear. The five great powers have in a formal document recorded their opinion that it is for the general interest of Europe that the integrity and independence of the Ottoman Empire should be maintained; and it would be easy to show that strong reasons, political and commercial, make it especially the interest of England that this integrity and independence should be maintained. But Russia has attacked the independence and violated the integrity of the Ottoman Empire; and Russia must, by fair means or foul, be brought to give up her pretensions and withdraw her aggression. England and France, urged by common interests to defend Turkey against Russia, have given Turkey physical assistance and political and diplomatic support. They undertook to obtain for Turkey, by negotiation, a satisfactory and honourable settlement of her difficulties with Russia, and failing that, to support Turkey in her defensive war. Hitherto our efforts at negotiation have failed, because the arrangement which we proposed was declared both by Turkey

and by Russia to be such as Turkey could not honourably nor safely adopt. The Turkish government, seeing no apparent prospect of better results from negotiation, and aware that lapse of time was running to the disadvantage of Turkey, at length, after having for some considerable time yielded to our advice to remain passive, came to a determination not unnatural and not unwise, and issued that declaration of war which we had officially and publicly said that the sultan would have been justified in issuing the moment the Russians invaded his territory.

"This declaration of war makes no change in the position of England and France in relation to Turkey. We may still try to persuade Russia to do what she ought to do, but we are still bound, by a regard for our own interests, to defend Turkey. Peace is an excellent thing, and war is a great misfortune; but there are many things more valuable than peace, and many things much worse than war. We passed the Rubicon when we first took part with Turkey and sent our squadrons to support her; and when England and France have once taken a third power by the hand, that third power *must* be carried in safety through the difficulties in which it may be involved. England and France cannot afford to be baffled, and whatever measures may be necessary on their part to baffle their opponent, those measures must be adopted; and the governments of the two most powerful countries on the face of the earth must not be frightened either by words or things, either by the name or by the reality of war. No doubt when we put forth our whole strength in defence of Turkey we shall be entitled to direct in a great measure the course and character of the war, and to exercise a deciding influence on the negotiations which may afterwards lead to peace. And it was with that view that some time ago I proposed to the cabinet that, negotiation failing, England and France should conclude a convention with Turkey, by which, on the one hand, the two powers should engage to afford Turkey naval assistance, and to permit their respective subjects to enter the sultan's service, naval and military; and by which the sultan, on the

other hand, should engage to consult with the two powers as to the terms and conditions of peace. But the only grounds on which we can claim influence in these matters is our determination to give hearty and effectual support. We support Turkey for our own sake and for our own interests, and to withdraw our support or to cripple it so as to render it ineffectual, merely because the Turkish government did not show as much deference to our advice as our advice deserved, would be to place our national interests at the mercy of other persons. . . . But it is said the Turks seem to wish for war while we wish for peace. I apprehend that both parties wish for one and the same thing, namely the relinquishment by Russia of inadmissible pretensions, and her retirement from the Turkish territory; both parties would rather gain these ends by the pen than by the sword. We only differ in our belief as to the efficiency of these two methods. It is indeed possible that the Turks may think that a successful conflict would enable them to make a treaty of peace which should free them from the thralldom of some of their old engagements; and if this were possible it would certainly place future peace on a firmer foundation. It is said also that the Turks are reawakening the dormant fanaticism of the Mussulman race, and that we ought not to be the helping instruments to gratify such bad passions. I believe these stories about awakened fanaticism to be fables invented at Vienna and St. Petersburg; we have had no facts stated in support of them. I take the fanaticism which has been thus aroused to be the fanaticism which consists in burning indignation at a national insult, and a daring impatience to endeavour to expel an invading enemy. This spirit may be reviled by the Russians, whose schemes it disconcerts, and may be cried down by the Austrians, who had hoped to settle matters by persuading the Turks to yield; but it will not diminish the good-will of the people of England, and it is a good foundation on which to build our hopes of success. The concluding part of the memorandum points to the expulsion of the Turks from Europe, and the establishment of a Greek Empire in European Turkey. But

such a scheme would be diametrically opposed to the principles of the policy on which we have hitherto acted. To carry such a system into execution we ought to join the Russians against the Turks, instead of helping the Turks against the Russians; for how could such a reconstruction of Turkey become the result of a successful contest by England and France in defence of Turkey? I have no partiality for the Turks as Mohammedans, and should be very glad if they could be turned into Christians. I am well convinced that there are a vast number of Christians under the governments of Russia, Austria, Rome, and Naples who would rejoice to enjoy as much security for person and property as the Christian subjects of the sultan. To expel from Europe the sultan and his two million of Mussulman subjects, including the army and the bulk of the landowners, might not be an easy task; still the five powers might effect it, and play the Polish drama over again. But they would find the building up still more difficult than the pulling down. There are no sufficient Christian elements as yet for a Christian state in European Turkey capable of performing its functions as a component part of the European system. The Greeks are a small minority, and could not be the governing race. The Slavonians, who are the majority, do not possess the conditions necessary for becoming the bones and sinews of a new state. A reconstruction of Turkey means neither more nor less than its subjection to Russia, direct or indirect, immediate or for a time delayed. It seems to me then that our course is plain, simple, and straight. That we must help Turkey out of her difficulties by negotiation if possible; and that if negotiation fails, we must, by force of arms, carry her safely through her dangers."

Nothing could more plainly indicate Palmerston's policy than this statement. It was not, it did not pretend to be, based on very exalted theoretical principles, and it is not difficult in reading it to understand the dislike, one might almost say the abhorrence, with which his declarations and the action which they involved were likely to excite, and did excite in the minds of men who

regarded war not only as a misfortune, but as an evil, to avoid which almost any sacrifice should be made. Such men held that war, either for the sake of British interests or for glory, was a crime,—would not admit that it was necessary for us to resort to arms when negotiations had failed for the purpose of supporting one barbarous and tyrannical power against another because it suited our purpose; nor would they agree that having once engaged in an enterprise which was in itself an evil one, we were bound to prosecute it to its evil end. That was the extreme view taken by those people who were regarded as the fanatics of peace, and it must be admitted that they were numerically weak. There was enough in Palmerston's appeal to the English sense of honour (which made it incumbent on a strong protective ally to stick to a threatened comrade through thick and thin), to hit the popular sentiment; and Palmerston himself was doubtless sincere in putting it forward as the highest motive which was practicable—looking to what he conceived to be the necessary outcome of an alliance that would achieve the humiliation of Russia, promote the power and influence of England, and teach unconstitutional autocrats that they could not break into their neighbours' houses without having to confront "the policeman." More than that, it had long been a personal policy. It was Palmerstonian as well as English, and Palmerston was waiting on events, shrewdly guessing that before long he would be recalled by the public voice to take the direction of the war office.

Lord Aberdeen did not let the whole statement go without a reply, and on the subject of Turkish fanaticism and cruelty he said: "Notwithstanding the favourable opinion entertained by many, it is difficult to believe in the improvement of the Turks. It is true that under the pressure of the moment benevolent decrees may be issued, but these, except under the eye of some foreign minister, are entirely neglected. Their whole system is radically vicious and inhuman. I do not refer to fables which may be invented at St. Petersburg or at Vienna, but to numerous despatches of Lord Stratford himself and of our own consuls,

who describe a frightful picture of lawless oppression and cruelty. This is so true that if the war should continue, and the Turkish armies meet with disaster, we may expect to see the Christian populations of the empire rise against their oppressors; and in such a case it could scarcely be proposed to employ the British force in the Levant to assist in compelling their return under a Mohammedan yoke."

He contended that in any case, though we had sent our fleet to the Bosphorus, we had done so reserving to ourselves complete freedom for further negotiation with a view to peace. If, while we were labouring for this, the Turks should be obstinately bent on war, "then," he added, "I confess I am not disposed to sacrifice our freedom of action, and to permit ourselves to be dragged into war by a government which has not the requisite control over its own subjects, and is obliged to act under the pressure of popular dictation." The Ottoman government had declared war in opposition to the remonstrances of our ambassador; and if we were now to go into war along with them we must see that we did so for ends which we could justify to ourselves and in the face of Europe.

"I should be perfectly prepared," he said, "to oppose, even to the extremity of war, the possession by Russia of Constantinople and the Dardanelles with the approaches to the Mediterranean; and I think that this decision would be justified by English and by European interests. It is true that the Emperor of Russia has invariably declared that he entertains no such projects, and that he would regret any such proposition; but if a contest should arise on this ground, it would probably embrace other objects than the security of Turkish dominion. It is difficult to say into whose hands these territories would ultimately fall; but whoever might profit by the result, it is to be expected that the Turks would disappear, never more to return to a soil upon which, in the face of Christendom, they have been so long established."

But the prospects of negotiation became more distant. The Emperor of Russia himself destroyed the restraints which might for

a time have influenced our government even against the clamour which was raised in the country. On the 1st of November the Emperor Nicholas issued a manifesto declaring war against Turkey, and referring to his former manifesto by which he had made known to his faithful and dearly beloved subjects the motives which had placed him under the obligation of demanding from the Ottoman Porte inviolable guarantees in favour of the sacred rights of the orthodox church. "We also," he went on to declare, "announced to them that all our efforts to recall the Porte by means of amicable persuasion to sentiments of equity and to the faithful observance of treaties had remained unfruitful, and that we had consequently deemed it indispensable to cause our troops to advance into the Danubian Principalities; but in taking this step we still entertained the hope that the Porte would acknowledge its wrong-doings and would decide on acceding to our just demands. Our expectation has been deceived. Even the chief powers of Europe have in vain sought by their exhortations to shake the blind obstinacy of the Ottoman government. It is by a declaration of war, by a proclamation filled with lying accusations against Russia, that it has responded to the pacific efforts of Europe as well as to our spirit of long-suffering. At last, enrolling in the ranks of its army revolutionary exiles from all countries, the Porte has just commenced hostilities on the Danube. Russia is challenged to the combat, and she has no other course left her than, putting her trust in God, to have recourse to force of arms, and so compel the Ottoman government to respect treaties and obtain reparation for the insults with which it has responded to our most moderate demands and to our most legitimate solicitude for the defence of the orthodox faith in the East, professed also by the people of Russia."

There is no need to quote more or to point out the monstrous falsehoods of this declaration which was distributed to the colonels of the Russian army. It was of course designed to stimulate the Russians themselves to a prosecution of the war, but to publish it to the world was little less than an insane defiance of the opinion of Europe. If anything had been

wanting to rouse the war fever in France and England this manifesto would have answered the purpose, and yet the czar seemed to imagine that he might still influence the English government, whose hesitation and reluctance to abandon the attempt to find a basis of agreement, he attributed either to timidity or to a lingering desire to support his claims. No other assumption seems capable of explaining an autograph letter which he at the same time addressed to the queen, expressing surprise that there should be any misunderstanding between her majesty's government and his own as to the affairs of Turkey, and appealing to her majesty's "good faith" and "wisdom" to decide between them. This letter was at once submitted by the queen to Lord Clarendon for his and Lord Aberdeen's perusal and opinion as to the answer to be returned. Her majesty replied on the 14th of November, and her letter, which was written in French, contained a direct and unmistakable answer, though it preserves the style of a formal private letter, and therefore gives the emperor rather more credit for good intentions than might be permissible if the language were to be judged otherwise than as that of the reserve which is understood to be ordained by etiquette.

"Being heartily anxious, sire, to discover what could have produced this painful misunderstanding, my attention has been naturally drawn to article 7 of the treaty of Kainardji; and I am bound to state to your majesty, that having consulted the persons here best qualified to form a judgment upon the meaning to be attached to this article, and after having read and re-read it myself, with the most sincere desire to be impartial, I have arrived at the conviction that this article is not susceptible of the extended meaning which it has been sought to attach to it. All your majesty's friends, like myself, feel assured that you would not have abused the power which would on such a construction have been accorded to you; but a demand of this kind could hardly be conceded by a sovereign who valued his own independence.

"Moreover, I will not conceal from your majesty the painful impression produced upon

me by the occupation of the principalities. For the last four months this has caused a general commotion in Europe, and is calculated to lead to ulterior events, which I should deplore in common with your majesty. But as I know that your majesty's intentions towards the Porte are friendly and disinterested, I have every confidence that you will find means to give expression and effect to them, so as to avert those grave dangers which, I assure you, all my efforts will be directed to prevent. The impartial attention with which I have followed the causes that up to this time have led to the failure of all attempts at conciliation, leaves me with the firm conviction that there exists no real obstacle which cannot be removed or promptly surmounted with your majesty's assistance."

Before her majesty's letter was despatched it was of course submitted to Lords Aberdeen and Clarendon, and was much commended by them; so that it is after all to be regarded as a semi-diplomatic as well as a formally courteous communication. It was known in St. Petersburg that a letter had been written to the Queen of England, and our ambassador there soon heard how much the emperor had been mortified by the tenor of the reply, which he could easily interpret from the language of etiquette. He regretted "that he had not followed Nesselrode's advice and kept clear of politics in his letter, for the queen had in fact gone heart and soul with her ministry." Count Nesselrode was very anxious to learn from our ambassador if he knew the contents of the queen's reply. To him as well as to his other informant Sir Hamilton Seymour could only answer that he did not. "These correspondences," he added, "between sovereigns are not regular according to our constitutional notions; but all I can say is that if her majesty were called upon to write upon the Eastern affair she would not require her ministers' assistance. The queen understands all these questions as well as they do."

Hostilities, as we have seen, had actually commenced between the invading force of the Russians in the principalities. At Oltenitza 9000 Turks had taken up a position on a triangular space formed by the village, the

Argis, and the Danube; and though the Russian troops endeavoured repeatedly to dislodge them the attempts were unsuccessful. On the last occasion the Turks repulsed the attack with such spirit, that 1200 of the enemy were killed or wounded. At Kalafat also the Turkish soldiers made good their position; but Omar Pacha did not intend to keep his whole army for the purpose of holding the left bank of the Danube, and he therefore retained Kalafat only as a position from which he could command that side of the river, blew up the works he had constructed at Oltenitza, and recrossed the stream.

It is easy to understand that after these events, the manifesto of the emperor and the reply to the letter which he sent to the queen, further efforts to avert war were not very promising, amidst growing excitement against Russia, and an impatient defiance and denunciation of the emperor's assumptions. After the defeat of Lord Derby's government the Aberdeen ministry had had enough to do to defend itself, not only for being a "coalition," which was a title that had been converted into a term of reproach, but against being denominated a "factious combination," which was a still more formidable charge. Lord John Russell as secretary for foreign affairs had said one or two smart things, but one of the best was to a meeting of his constituents, the electors of the city of London,—“If an omnibus with some dozen passengers were seen going down Ludgate Hill at a furious pace, and breaking into the shop windows and injuring everybody that was going by, why, every man would concur,—the men that were going eastward and the men that were going westward—all would concur in stopping that omnibus and telling the coachman to get off his box. And how much surprised would all those passengers with the policeman at their head be, if the coachman were to say, ‘Why, this is a factious combination. You gentlemen are going, some of you one way and some another, and yet you have all combined to prevent me driving my omnibus into the shops.’”

It may be mentioned, also, that on the first intimation of probable war with Russia, Lord

John Russell made use of a phrase which has since been heard a good deal of in its more recent form of "Peace with honour." In reply to a taunt from Mr. Disraeli of having joined the Aberdeen ministry "without a department," and of "condescending to accept subordinate office under an ancient and inveterate political opponent," he said, "Unless I were convinced that the present government was more likely than any government which could be formed to carry on the war successfully, and to conclude it by an honourable peace, I should cease to be one of its members." It was pretty evident, however, that the war fever was reaching to a height which would defy the placid palliatives of Aberdeen, and would not be allayed by the declarations of the foreign secretary. The Russian attack upon the Turkish fleet at Sinope turned the scale, and pacification seemed to have become impossible, for there could no longer be any pretence that the movements of the czar were only defensive. The Turks had been sending reinforcements to the Asiatic coast of the Black Sea; and in the harbour of Sinope, about halfway between Trebizonde and Constantinople, they had anchored a fleet of seven frigates, three corvettes, and two smaller vessels. On the 30th of November a Russian fleet of six sail of the line, two frigates and three steamers, appeared suddenly in the harbour and immediately commenced action. The Turks were in an ill-chosen position, they handled their ships badly, and were far inferior in the number of guns and men; but they fought for two hours and a half, during which 4000 were killed, and all their ships were destroyed or crippled, except one steamer which escaped the Russian broadsides and carried the news to Constantinople. It has been contended that Russia had a right to give battle to the Turks when and how she pleased; but that certainly was not the opinion in England at the time. The destruction of the Turkish vessels while in anchor in a Turkish harbour, and almost during the time that the emperor was proclaiming his intention to be defensive and not aggressive, was held to be a fresh proof of the unscrupulous character of his claims. Lord

Clarendon wrote to the British minister at St. Petersburg:—"The object with which the combined fleets were sent to Constantinople was not to attack Russia but to defend Turkey; and the English and French ambassadors were informed that the fleets were not to assume an aggressive position, but that they were to protect the Turkish territory from attack;"—but the sultan's squadron was destroyed, where the English and French fleets, if they had been present, would have protected it, and would have repelled the attack; and on receiving intelligence of the engagement the allied fleet sent two frigates to watch the movements of the enemy. By that time the Russian vessels had hastily sheered off and taken shelter in Sebastopol. Few politicians had much expectation of war being averted after this. The immediate results were that the combined fleets were ordered to the Black Sea by the Earl of Clarendon, who had succeeded Lord John Russell in the Foreign Office, and that thus the opinions of Lord Palmerston were being justified. The queen was acute enough to see that though Palmerston's mode of proceeding was often objectionable, it might, if it had been adopted earlier, have prevented the outrageous conduct of Russia and so have led to a treaty of peace. Writing to Lord Clarendon on the 20th of December, 1853, she said, "Lord Palmerston's mode of proceeding always had that advantage that it threatened steps which it was hoped would not become necessary, whilst those hitherto taken, started on the principle of not needlessly offending Russia by threats, obliging us at the same time to take the very steps which we refused to threaten."

It has already been noticed that after the destruction of the Turkish fleet at Sinope, Napoleon III. addressed the Emperor of Russia in terms which, while they strongly urged the conclusion of negotiations which might secure peace, were little calculated to appease the rage of the czar when he heard that the allied fleet was ordered to the Black Sea. Yet the language he used was guarded and moderate. "The two maritime powers had sent their squadrons to the Bosphorus because Turkey, threatened in her indepen-

dence, her provinces seized as a material guarantee for the fulfilment of a treaty which she had not broken, had claimed a support to which, by the justice of her cause, affirmed by the combined voice of Austria, Prussia, England, and France, she was entitled. The western powers had maintained a passive attitude up to the day when the Turkish fleet, riding quietly at anchor in a Turkish port, had been destroyed in spite of the assurance that there was no wish to commence an aggressive war. After that event it was no longer the policy of the allied powers which received a check, it was their military honour. The sound of the cannon-shot at Sinope reverberated painfully in the hearts of all those who in England and in France respected national dignity. All shared in the sentiment that wherever our cannon could reach our allies ought to be respected. Out of this feeling arose the order given to our squadrons to enter the Black Sea, and to prevent by force, if necessary, the recurrence of a similar event." Probably the most distasteful part of the letter was its concluding representation that the allies also could secure "material guarantees" by prohibiting the navigation of the Black Sea by the Russian fleet, since it was "important during the war to preserve a guarantee equivalent in force to the occupation of the Turkish territory, and thus facilitate the conclusion of peace by having the power of making a desirable exchange."

"I return with refusal," were the words telegraphed to Paris by the French representative at St. Petersburg. From the moment that the combined fleets of France and England entered the Black Sea with the avowed purpose of shutting up the Russian fleet in Sebastopol the hope of a peaceful adjustment was at an end. Count Nesselrode wrote to Baron Brunnow that it was "an act of flagrant hostility." It can scarcely be doubted that Lord Aberdeen and the ministry, with the exception of Lord Palmerston, were desirous to use every effort to convince the czar that they desired peace. One reason for this was, perhaps, that they knew we were not ready for war, but unfortunately that may have been regarded by the czar as their *chief* reason,

when he had reluctantly discovered that a desire covertly to support his claims had no influence in their decisions. He applied to Prussia and to Austria to obtain a promise of strict neutrality, but there also he was disappointed. Encouraged, perhaps, by the fact that they could safely assert their independence while France and England were immediately interested in maintaining it, they both objected to be dictated to. In answer to Count Orloff, who was at Vienna on this mission, the young Emperor of Austria asked whether the count could promise that the czar would not cross the Danube, would seek no acquisition of territory, and would evacuate the principalities when the war was over. The haughty reply was that the czar could come under no such engagement, and Count Orloff was then informed that Austria must be equally free to act as her interests and dignity might direct. Baron de Budberg had little more success in Prussia. The king was anxious enough to conciliate his brother-in-law the czar, and there was a strong Russian party at the court, but there was also a firm minister—Manteuffel—who for the moment influenced the king to refuse to commit himself to any course inconsistent with the principles he had maintained at the Vienna conference. Neither Austria nor Prussia would give any pledge of active interference, but Austria supported the ultimatum which was soon afterwards addressed to the czar by France and England. "It is impossible to make these people (Prussia) understand the duties and responsibilities of a great power," wrote our ambassador at Berlin; "their chief thought in this question appears to be the chance of playing a great card hereafter in Germany when the war shall have lasted a few years."

The Emperor of Russia had issued a ukase for a military levy of nine men in every thousand of the adult male population throughout his dominions, and this order was followed by a proclamation in which the blame for any future hostilities was thrown upon "those who were opposing the moderation and justice of demands in which Turkey, if left to herself, would have acquiesced." The manifesto having commenced with this declaration, which

was so worded as to appear to have been written more in sorrow than in anger, went on to say that the appearance of the English and French fleets at Constantinople had served as a further incentive to the obstinacy of the Porte, and that the two powers had now sent their fleets to the Black Sea, proclaiming their intention to protect the Turks, and to impede the free navigation of Russian vessels of war employed for the protection of the Russian coast. After a course of proceedings unheard of among civilized nations, the czar declared that he had recalled his embassies for England and France, and had broken off all political intercourse with these powers. The proclamation ended by appealing to the fanaticism of the people against those who had sided with the enemies of Christianity.

It may be easily understood that this manifesto increased the war feeling in France and England to a pitch which would have made the tenure of any government uncertain unless it was prepared to take immediate action. At the end of 1853 the *Times* upheld the general demand for hostilities by reminders that the suspicion that our fighting days were over was a mistake, whether it was held in Russia or in England:—

"The combined governments of England and France have exhausted their diplomacy, their remonstrances, and their patience, and they now see themselves apparently reduced to the alternative of quitting for ever their high station among the nations of the earth, forfeiting their promises, and abandoning their allies, or having recourse to war,—the sport of barbarous sovereigns, but the dread of free and progressive governments. This is no alternative—it is a decision. With whatever reluctance, the western powers must accept the challenge so insultingly flung to them. It has been greatly to the credit of our people that, under circumstances of no small irritation, they have forborne from embarrassing the course of negotiation by an indiscreet exercise of their right of public meeting, and have thus left diplomacy every opportunity for averting the scourge with which we are threatened. Equally meritorious has been their forbearance from expressing a natural

anxiety for peace, and an impatience of further taxation, at a time when such sentiments could only weaken the effect of our remonstrances and impair the confidence of our allies. The people of England have shown that they are not only temperate, but magnanimous, and capable of adopting in their collective capacity, when required by circumstances, the same prudent reserve and wise forbearance which are continually required from individual statesmen. We trust that in the coming struggle, which all our efforts seem powerless to avert, and which, though begun on the banks of the Danube, may spread from the Baltic to the Caspian, from the Caspian to the Ganges, and from the Ganges to the shores of the North Pacific, they may show a like firmness and constancy. We have not sought war, we have done all in our power to avoid it; but, if it must come, we trust its evils and sacrifices will be cheerfully borne, as we are sure its perils will be manfully confronted. We have enjoyed peace long enough to value it above all things except our honour, but not long enough to enervate our energies, or chill the courage which has carried us through so many unequal conflicts. The dawn of 1854 lowers dark with the passage of impending battle."

Prince Albert afterwards in a letter to King Leopold said:—"Another mistake which people abroad make, is to ascribe to England a policy based upon material interests and cold calculation. Her policy is one of pure feeling, and therefore often illogical. The government is a popular government, and the masses upon whom it rests only feel and do not think. In the present instance their feeling is something of this sort. The Emperor of Russia is a tyrant, the enemy of all liberty on the Continent, the oppressor of Poland. He wanted to coerce the poor Turk. The Turk is a fine fellow; he has braved the rascal, let us rush to his assistance. The emperor is no gentleman, as he has spoken a lie to our queen. Down with the Emperor of Russia! Napoleon for ever! He is the nephew of his uncle, whom we defeated at Waterloo. We were afraid of his invading us? Quite the contrary. He has forgotten all that is past,

and is ready to fight with us in the glorious cause against the oppressor of liberty. He may have played the French some tricks, but they are an unruly set, and don't deserve any better. D—— all the German princes who won't go with us against the Russian, because they think they want him to keep down their own people. The worst of them is the King of Prussia, who ought to know better."

There is a good deal of truth, and the evidence of keen perception in this, but it strikes one as peculiarly quaint, and there is a foreign air about it, though the prince was as English in his sympathies as it was afterwards shown he was faithful to the high position that he held in the country.

The war fever was reaching its height when, on the 27th of February, 1854, Lord Clarendon wrote to Count Nesselrode the ultimatum of England to Russia in the following terms:—"The British government having exhausted all the efforts of negotiation, is compelled to declare to the cabinet of St. Petersburg that, if Russia should decline to restrict within purely diplomatic limits the discussion in which she has for some time past been engaged with the Sublime Porte, and does not, by return of the messenger who is the bearer of my present letter, announce her intention of causing the Russian troops under the orders of Prince Gortschakoff to commence their march with a view to recross the Pruth, so that the provinces of Moldavia and Wallachia shall be completely evacuated on the 30th of April next, the British government must consider the refusal or the silence of the cabinet of St. Petersburg as equivalent to a declaration of war, and will take its measures accordingly. The messenger who is the bearer of this letter to your excellency is directed not to wait more than six days at St. Petersburg for your reply." On the fifth day from the messenger's arrival Count Nesselrode verbally informed the English consul that "his majesty does not think it becoming in him to give any reply to Lord Clarendon's letter." In the course of the same interview, the British agent asked the count what the intentions of his government were with reference to the consular arrangements between

the two countries, in the event of a declaration of war. Count Nesselrode replied:—"That will entirely depend upon the course her Britannic majesty's government may adopt. We shall not declare war." The messenger (Captain Blackwood) returned to England on the 25th March.

On the 28th the following declaration of the causes of war was published in the *London Gazette*:—"It is with deep regret that her majesty announces the failure of her anxious and protracted endeavours to preserve for her people and for Europe the blessings of peace. The unprovoked aggression of the Emperor of Russia against the Sublime Porte has been persisted in with such disregard of consequences, that, after the rejection by the Emperor of Russia of terms which the Emperor of Austria, the Emperor of the French, and the King of Prussia, as well as her majesty, considered just and equitable, her majesty is compelled by a sense of what is due to the honour of her crown, to the interests of her people, and to the independence of the states of Europe, to come forward in defence of an ally whose territory is invaded, and whose dignity and independence are assailed. . . . The Emperor of Russia had some cause of complaint against the sultan with reference to the settlement which his highness had sanctioned, of the conflicting claims of the Greek and Latin churches to a portion of the Holy Places of Jerusalem and its neighbourhood. To the complaint of the Emperor of Russia on this head justice was done; and her majesty's ambassador at Constantinople had the satisfaction of promoting an arrangement to which no exception was taken by the Russian government. But while the Russian government repeatedly assured the queen's government that the mission of Prince Menschikoff to Constantinople was exclusively directed to the settlement of the question of the Holy Place at Jerusalem, Prince Menschikoff himself pressed upon the Porte other demands of a far more serious and important character, the nature of which he in the first instance endeavoured as far as possible to conceal from her majesty's ambassador. And those demands thus studiously concealed affected not the pri-

vileges of the Greek Church at Jerusalem, but the position of many millions of Turkish subjects in their relations to their sovereign the sultan. These demands were rejected by the spontaneous decision of the Sublime Porte. Two assurances had been given to her majesty: one, that the mission of Prince Menschikoff only regarded the Holy Places; the other, that his mission would be of a conciliatory character. In both respects her just expectations were disappointed. . . . Her majesty, in conjunction with the sovereigns of Austria, France, and Prussia, has made various attempts to meet any just demands of the Emperor of Russia without affecting the dignity and independence of the sultan; and had it been the sole object of Russia to obtain the security for the enjoyment by the Christian subjects of the Porte of their privileges and immunities she would have found it in the offers that have been made by the sultan, but as that security was not offered in the shape of a special and separate stipulation with Russia it was rejected. Twice has this offer been made by the sultan, and recommended by the four powers; once by a note originally prepared at Vienna and subsequently modified by the Porte; once by the proposal of bases of negotiation agreed upon at Constantinople on the 31st of December and approved at Vienna on the 13th of January, as offering to the two parties the means of arriving at an understanding in a becoming and honourable manner. It is thus manifest that a right for Russia to interfere in the ordinary relations of Turkish subjects to their sovereign, and not the happiness of Christian communities in Turkey, was the object sought for by the Russian government; to such a demand the sultan would not submit, and his highness, in self-defence, declared war upon Russia; but her majesty, nevertheless, in conjunction with her allies, has not ceased her endeavours to restore peace between the contending parties. The time has, however, now arrived when the advice and remonstrances of the four powers have proved wholly ineffectual, and the military preparations of Russia becoming daily more extended, it is but too obvious that the Emperor of Russia has entered upon a course

of policy which, if unchecked, must lead to the destruction of the Ottoman Empire. In this conjuncture her majesty feels called upon, by regard for an ally, the integrity and independence of whose empire have been recognized as essential to the peace of Europe, by the sympathies of her people with right against wrong, by a desire to avert from her dominions most injurious consequences, and to save Europe from the preponderance of a power which has violated the faith of treaties and defies the opinion of the civilized world, to take up arms in conjunction with the Emperor of the French for the defence of the sultan. Her majesty is persuaded that in so acting she will have the cordial support of her people, and that the pretext of zeal for the Christian religion will be used in vain to cover an aggression undertaken in disregard of its holy precepts, and of its true and beneficent spirit. Her majesty humbly trusts that her efforts may be successful, and that by the blessing of Providence peace may be re-established on safe and solid foundations."

We now find that the ears and eyes of our countrymen have become familiar with names of places afar off that had hitherto been scarcely noticed by schoolboys in their books of geography. Some of these knew what the Bosphorus was, and remembered something about the Chersonese, but to the great majority of Englishmen the very word Crimea was strange, and certainly Kertch, and Sebastopol, and Scutari had a very foreign sound with them. Sidney Herbert, as has been said in these pages, had beautiful estates in the very peninsula—nearly an island—which the British and French were now to invade; but it certainly was not generally known that the southern part of this country was not only rich in natural beauty, but contained some of the finest parks and gardens in the world. Here the Tartar and the Russian, the Mohammedan mosque and the convent of the Greek Church are mingled together among the rocky hills and the forests, while here and there a mouldering fortress suggests to the instructed eye some incident in the long and varied history of the country. Here grow the olive,

the grape, and even the orange, while good wines are yielded by some of the vineyards. Horses, sheep, oxen, honey, and silk are among the products of the southern portion of this interesting land, which was once Crim Tartary. The population is about a fifth of a million, and is very mixed, the greater portion being Tartars. This was the country in which the little river Alma was soon to give a name to one of the most important battles in history.

Something has already been said concerning the existence of what may be called the poetic English party, whose voices were for war at this time. The feeling with these politicians had something romantic and even ethereal about it. They seemed to think that England was reading the whole world a lesson by standing forward in defence of the weak, *i.e.* Turkey. Was "the sick man" (as Turkey was by that time currently called) to be quietly smothered by the "Colossus of the North?" No; we had neglected our duty with regard to Italy, Hungary, and Poland—it was now time to make what amends we could to our consciences. Such was the argument of this party. They also laid great stress upon the question of the education of the nation in manliness, upon what Florence Nightingale called the "re-tempering of peoples." The half-mad lover in Mr. Tennyson's "Maud" very nearly advocated war as a cure for social ills. Here, said he, we have been having for many years "the blessings of peace," but "we have made them a curse." Women poison their babies for the sake of the insurance money. Men, having lost the sense of brotherhood, for want of social strain (such as war creates) have made life rotten from end to end with fraud and selfishness. "Peace in her vineyard? Yes! But a company forges the wine." The inner heart of the nation is being eaten out by commercial fraud. Is not this war? It *is* war, "the viler, as underhand, not openly bearing the sword." Far better open conflict with a strong foe. Let us get rid of "the long, long canker of peace," and welcome "the blood-red blossom of war, with a heart of fire." Mr. Bright, Mr. Cobden, and a good many more were opposed to

the war, but those who did not perceive that what England wanted was a bout of bloodshed, were "hucksters:"—

"Last week came one to the county town,
To preach our poor little army down,
And play the game of the despot kings,
Tho' the state has done it and thrice as well.
This broad-brimmed hawker of holy things,
Whose ear is stuf with his cotton, and rings
Even in dreams to the chink of his pence,
This huckster put down war! can he tell
Whether war be a cause or a consequence?"

There was of course no lack of *popular* outcry for war—the mob are always for fighting. Those who dreaded and hated the idea of a French alliance were not numerous enough or well-informed enough to outvote the rest; the newspapers cried "War, war!" Lord Palmerston was devoted not only to the old idea of the balance of power, but to the old policy of keeping Russia not only away from Constantinople, but right away, as far as possible, from access to the Mediterranean; and everybody hated the Emperor Nicholas—everybody out of courtly or high-commercial circles. The newspapers made ludicrous capital out of the "movements" of our fleet in the Mediterranean under Admiral Dundas. Day after day the "bills" displayed such lines as, "The fleet preparing to advance!" and "The fleet in the Dardanelles!" until at last, after long waiting, came the announcement, "The fleet has passed the Bosphorus!" The street songs that celebrated this event were endless, and were in this style (we quote from an original):—

"Old Nick will soon be made to quake,
His troops will wade in gore;
Prince Menschikoff and the Russian Bear
In misery do deplore.
"The fortress of Sebastopol'
Will soon come down, alas!
Surrounder'd both by sea and land
By Raglan and Dundas."

Nicholas, Emperor of Russia, was vulgarly called "Old Nick" of course.

Manifestations of an intention to prepare for a probable war had not been wanting on our part, although the opportunities for negotiation had avowedly been kept open as long as possible. The camp at Chobham

Common could scarcely be deemed a hostile movement, as it had been proposed early in the year, and was part of a scheme for increasing the general efficiency of the army by training the troops to field operations in accordance with modern manœuvres; but when the various brigades were assembled the spectacle presented was not without significance. A party of sappers and miners went down to prepare the camping-ground, dig wells, clear away obstructions, and erect the more important stores and buildings; and on the 14th there arrived from various quarters four regiments of cavalry, three battalions of guards, two brigades of infantry each comprising three regiments, a troop of royal horse-artillery, and three batteries of horse-artillery. A company of sappers was there, and a pontoon train formed part of the equipment. Prince Albert went with the Duke of Cambridge to visit the camp on the arrival of the men, and remained there for two or three days in command of the brigade of guards. He took deep interest in the operations, and would have continued actively employed, but on his return to town with a severe cold was seized with an attack of measles, from which the royal children (except the two youngest), and finally the queen herself, afterwards suffered. The infection also reached the guests at Buckingham Palace, the young Crown-prince of Hanover and the Duke and Duchess of Coburg, who had left England before they discovered that they had incurred the disorder, which they in turn had carried to the Duke of Brabant and the Count of Flanders, whom they met on their homeward journey. This, however, was after the review and the trial of field operations which took place before the queen at Chobham on the 21st of June. The queen had been staying at Osborne, whither she had gone a fortnight after the birth of her fourth son (Prince Leopold) on the 7th of April, and had returned on the 27th of May, so that this was her first appearance on any special public occasion after the event; but early in the morning her majesty and the prince, with the King of Hanover and the Duke of Coburg, were on the ground; the queen, on horseback in a military riding-habit,

rode with the prince and her guests down the lines, and afterwards witnessed the manœuvres from a neighbouring height. The spectacle was realistic—for the country was open, but broken by hollows, woods or thickets, streams and marshes—and a hundred thousand spectators had assembled to witness it. The real value of the camp was to be found in the daily exercises, and though the weather for a great part of the two months during which the troops were under canvas was exceptionally rainy and tempestuous, the men showed themselves to be remarkably efficient and enduring.

More suggestive than the manœuvres at Chobham, however, was the naval review held at Spithead on the 8th of August. By that time the common impression was that war must soon become imminent, and the display of a naval force was regarded not only as a determined manifestation, but as an exhibition of the enormous development, or rather the vast reconstruction, of our maritime armaments. There were altogether forty vessels of war, of which twenty-five were of chief importance. Thirteen of these were screw and nine were paddle-wheel steamers, while three were sailing ships of the line. The steam-vessels possessed a nominal total of nearly 10,000 horse-power, and an actual total of about 18,000 and of 44,146 tons, the number of hands being about 10,000. There were 1087 guns, of which 68-pounders were the chief feature, the smallest of the guns being 32-pounders and the largest throwing 84-pound shells. At forty-five minutes past ten the royal yacht, the *Victoria and Albert*, entered between the leeward ships of the fleet, passing the *Vesuvius* and the *Terrible*, and then proceeding straight down the line towards the *Duke of Wellington*, gave an opportunity to the vast number of persons congregated on the decks of the steamers, which brought passengers to the spectacle, to welcome her majesty with bursts of enthusiastic cheering. After the queen and the royal party had inspected the *Duke of Wellington*, the signal was given to weigh, and her majesty led the fleet out to sea, the royal yacht occupying a central position between "the *Duke*" on the starboard and

the *Agamemnon* on the port side, but slightly in advance of both. A few miles below the mole the signal was given to form line abreast, and at cable length from each other the line from end to end extended for more than three miles. At 2:40 the signal was given to "chase," and later in the afternoon the review ended with a mock engagement between the principal vessels. The weather was fine, and the spectacle from the point of view of those who regarded it as a great warlike demonstration was magnificent. Most of the members of the House of Commons with the speaker went to see the great show by special steamers provided for their accommodation. It was said that a hundred steam-boats carried spectators, and the royal circle included the three grand-duchesses, the Crown-prince of Wurtemberg, the Duke of Mecklenburg, and the Prince of Prussia, so there were plenty of witnesses to report the proceedings not only to the two neutral powers, but to the Emperor of Russia himself. Prince Albert afterwards wrote to Stockmar: "The great naval review has come off, and surpassed all that could have been anticipated. The gigantic ships of war, among them the *Duke of Wellington* with 131 guns (a greater number than was ever before assembled in one vessel), went, without sails, and propelled only by the screw, *eleven miles an hour*, and this against wind and tide! This is the greatest revolution effected in the conduct of naval warfare which has yet been known. Steam as well as sailing vessels will of necessity be cast aside as useless, and men-of-war with the auxiliary screw will take their place. This will cost a great deal of money till the change is effected, and render many fleets, like the present Russian one, useless. We have already sixteen at sea and ten in an advanced state. France has no more than two, and the other powers none. On Thursday 300 ships and 100,000 men must have been assembled on one spot. The fleet carried 1100 guns and 10,000 men. The weather, moreover, was magnificent, and the impression which the spectacle presented sublime."

Those people in London who had not been to the naval review were soon to witness what to them came nearer in significance—the de-

parture of troops by railway or by transport ships, the marching of well-known regiments through the streets, the clang and fanfare of military bands, the tramp of men, and the "shrill squeaking of the wry-necked fife" or the drone of the bagpipe. They were to have part too in leave-takings, that were sad enough, and were remembered afterwards when, during the terrible winter, there came home tidings from the British camp which made men and women wail, and utter complaints that were little short of imprecations against a government which had prepared so ill for war that while men were upon the field to fight the foe, they had to fight cold and hunger and disease also, because food and drink, shelter and clothing, and medicine, and even mules and horses, had either not arrived or were beating about on shipboard at some port where they were useless, or were landed where there were no means of conveying them to the soldiers who starved and froze and sickened, but would not yield till death itself vanquished them.

Before war had been formally declared both France and Russia had sent considerable forces to the East for the protection of Turkey, and to act as might be required for that object. The British army consisted of four divisions commanded by Lieutenant General Sir George Brown, and Major-Generals the Duke of Cambridge, Sir de Lacy Evans, and Sir Richard England, and a division of cavalry under the Earl of Lucan. Altogether 10,000 of our troops left England at the end of February, 1854, and landed at Malta, where they remained till the 31st of March, when they proceeded to Gallipoli, in European Turkey, where the French were already arriving in detachments, Marshal St. Arnaud, former minister of war, being in command, and under him General Canrobert and General Bosquet; a brigade of cavalry under General d'Allonville, and reserves under Prince Napoleon, General Forey, and General Cassagnalles. The number of the French troops was at that time 20,000, or twice as many as our own. The choice of Gallipoli as a basis of operations was that of the Emperor of the French, who had

determined that to fortify that place would be to prevent the Russians from crossing the Balkan; but as a basis of operations it was too far from the Turkish armies and from Constantinople. The emperor had, however, instructed General St. Arnaud that though Gallipoli should be the strategical point and the place of *dépôt* for arms, ambulances, and provisions, that need not prevent the troops from marching forward or lodging one or two divisions at the barracks at the west of Constantinople or at Scutari; while, if, after having advanced towards the Balkans, a movement in retreat should become necessary they would regain the coast of Gallipoli instead of that of Constantinople, because the Russians would never venture from Adrianople to Constantinople with an army of 60,000 good troops on their right flank. These instructions and the attitude afterwards assumed by the French general looked a little too much like taking the initiative of command of the entire allied army for the taste of some people here, but matters soon assumed a regular course. Lord Raglan did not arrive at Gallipoli till May, when more active measures than merely protective dispositions had to be adopted. The war may, in fact, be said to have begun much as it continued. The results were attributable more to the soldiers than to the generals. The French and English worked together harmoniously in a cheerful hearty spirit of emulation in making the seven miles of line of entrenchments on the crest of the ridge from the Gulf of Saros to the Sea of Marmora, just as they afterwards fought like brave comrades whenever there was fighting to be done, and they were allowed to support or relieve each other amidst the tempest of shot and fire. When the works were finished the forces moved to the Bosphorus, the French occupying the European side near Constantinople, and our men landing on the eastern side of the narrow Strait of Scutari.

The positions taken by the allied fleets and the allied armies can only be estimated by reference to the map of Europe, and an acquaintance with the conformation of the territory where hostilities were likely to be commenced. The northern shores of the Black

Sea and also a part of the eastern shore belonged to Russia; the southern, the Asia Minor, and the greater part of the western shore was the territory of Turkey. The Black Sea itself was therefore little other than a lake, but it was the only outlet for Russia on the south, its own sole escape being the deep and narrow channel of the Bosphorus, seventeen miles long and repeatedly contracted to not more than half a mile in breadth, but deep enough to carry large ships of war close to the shore throughout its entire course. This channel passes between Constantinople and Scutari, and, flowing into the Sea of Marmora, may be said to reappear as a westward waterway under the name of the Dardanelles, which flow for forty miles till they reach the Mediterranean. It is little to be wondered at that the sultans of Turkey had always claimed the right to exclude foreign ships of war from both these channels,—a right which was confirmed by the five great powers of Europe in the treaty of 1841, which was the latest of several treaties having the same object. By its provisions the sultan had power to close the straits against all foreign vessels of war, and at the same time was bound to exclude any such force in time of peace. In time of war, however, he might admit a foreign fleet; and this proviso enabled him, in such a contingency, to shut up the western outlet of Russia, and actually to confine the Russian fleet to the Black Sea. No other equitable arrangement would have been possible except that of leaving the straits entirely open to the navies of the world, and that would have ill-suited Russia, since it would have abolished the exclusive policy which left her influence foremost in Eastern Europe, and enabled her eagerly to watch for an opportunity of absorbing not only the straits, but Constantinople itself, or at all events of holding both in subjection by her influence on the Ottoman government.

We have already tried to show that it is no part of the purpose of these pages to give prominence to deeds of war, or to show to each reader the soldier standing in front and becoming the figure

“That hides the march of men from us.”

And yet such was the position which the nation chose to take during the earlier part of the Crimean war, that comparatively little attention was paid even to some important measures brought before parliament, and other equally important occurrences in society.

Our soldiers and sailors deserved all the honour that they received, for they were actuated by a simple desire bravely to do their duty, and they did it nobly; but the war fever had hold of the body of the nation. People suffering from its delirium, would talk of little else than the Crimea and Sebastopol. Lord Palmerston had, as he was sure to do, made a distinct reputation as home secretary. He gave his mind to the work with his usual originality and blunt determined common sense, and he was as indifferent as ever to opinions with which he had no sympathy. Yet by his never-failing *bonhomie* and shrewd wit he contrived to avoid making enemies. Only very earnest and deeply serious people, who would not accept his worldly philosophy for true wisdom, were long at variance with him, and even these could scarcely be proof against his inveterate good humour. Between him and Cobden and Bright, and men of their school, there could be no real agreement, and Palmerston himself did not pretend that any such agreement was possible. He seems almost to have gone out of his way to make himself appear as flip-pant and irreverent as he was accused of being, for the purpose of showing how little he cared for the remonstrances and the opposition of Mr. Bright; and though during his home secretaryship he said and did things which were afterwards incontrovertible, he contrived to say them in such a way as to appear to carry a contemptuous expression to strait-laced and orthodox persons who (as he clearly saw) regarded him with suspicion, while they sought to influence his proceedings. In cases where most other ministers would have thought it prudent merely to make a brief statement or to give a simple reply, Palmerston could not refrain from giving his reasons, for the sake, as it would seem, of challenging an adverse opinion. There was an Irish side of his character which constantly

came uppermost; and his humour, the quality which made him popular, and often not only saved him from defeat but secured his success, had in it much of the Irish quality. It was amusing, although it is somewhat painful, to note the thrill of aversion with which people holding certain dogmatic opinions were affected by some of Lord Palmerston's sayings, that were uttered in perfect good faith as maxims of practical experience and without any reference whatever to so-called religious doctrines. This of course does not wholly apply to his answer to the Presbytery of Edinburgh, who had written to be informed whether it was proposed, on account of the epidemic of cholera, to appoint a day of national fast and humiliation. His reply gave great offence at first, and it was probably designed as a smart rebuke. "There can be no doubt," it said, "that manifestations of humble resignation to the Divine will and sincere acknowledgments of human unworthiness are never more appropriate than when it has pleased Providence to afflict mankind with some severe visitation; but it does not appear to Lord Palmerston that a national fast would be suitable to the circumstances of the present moment. The Maker of the universe has established certain laws of nature for the planet on which we live, and the weal or woe of mankind depends upon the observance or the neglect of these laws. One of these laws connects health with the absence of those gaseous exhalations which proceed from overcrowded human beings, or from decomposing substances whether animal or vegetable; and these same laws render sickness the almost inevitable consequence of exposure to these noxious influences. But it has at the same time pleased Providence to place it within the power of man to make such arrangements as will prevent or disperse such exhalations so as to render them harmless, and it is the duty of man to attend to these laws of nature and to exert the faculties which Providence has thus given to man for his own welfare. The recent visitation of cholera, which has for the moment been mercifully checked, is an awful warning given to the people of this realm that they have too much neglected their duty in this respect,

and that those persons with whom it rested to purify towns and cities, and to prevent or remove the causes of disease, have not been sufficiently active in regard to such matters. Lord Palmerston would therefore suggest that the best course which the people of this country can pursue to deserve that the further progress of the cholera should be stayed, will be to employ the interval that will elapse between the present time and the beginning of next spring in planning and executing measures by which those portions of their towns and cities which are inhabited by the poorest classes, and which, from the nature of things, most need purification and improvement, may be freed from those causes and sources of contagion which, if allowed to remain, will infallibly breed pestilence and be fruitful in death in spite of all the prayers and fastings of a united but inactive nation. When man has done his utmost for his own safety then is the time to invoke the blessing of Heaven to give effect to his exertions."

Of course this was not an exhaustive answer, and a good deal might reasonably have been said against so rough and ready a way of reply; but it was not an irreverent one, and there were but too many obvious proofs in the streets that the Scottish as well as the English municipal authorities had not faithfully attended to their immediate duties. There was an outcry against the letter, of course, and while some of the religious sections of the community denounced it from their point of view, it was made use of by unscrupulous satirists as the foundation for a jest to the effect that the ex-foreign minister treated Heaven itself as a "foreign power;" but the jest was a very poor one—so poor that its want of reverence was not to be excused for its wit.

This was in the autumn of 1853, and there were at that time other symptoms of orthodox significance, one of them being the dismissal of the Rev. Frederic Denison Maurice from the professorships of ecclesiastical history and of English literature in King's College. Mr. Maurice had long been as remarkable for his piety and simplicity of character as for his attainments. He was perhaps not so much

the head of what was known as the Broad Church, as the leader of those young and generous enthusiasts who desired to make their religion a living power, and who therefore advocated what has been called Christian socialism. We have already glanced at the position taken by Charles Kingsley and others in relation to the often painful and always solemn social problems of the time. It is enough here to say that Mr. Maurice was the master to whose pure and unselfish teaching they had listened, and by whom their religious opinions had been greatly influenced. Mr. Maurice made no secret of his views on the subject of the professed doctrine of eternal punishment, and it was to a correspondence on this subject, as it was treated in his *Theological Essays*, that the attention of the council of the college was directed by Principal Jelf. The council came to the conclusion that the opinions set forth and the doubts expressed in the essay were of a dangerous tendency, and likely to unsettle the minds of theological students; and that the continuance of Mr. Maurice's connection with the college would be seriously detrimental to its usefulness. It was in vain for him to remonstrate, calling upon the council to state which of the articles of faith condemned his teaching. "I cannot, my lords and gentlemen," he said, "believe that, great as are the privileges which the right reverend bench has conceded to the principal of the King's College, their lordships, the bishops, ever intended to give him an authority superior to their own, superior to that of the articles by which they are bound. I cannot think that they wish to constitute him and the council, arbiters of the theology of the English Church. Such a claim would be as alarming, I apprehend, to the public as to our ecclesiastical rulers. If some parents have been suspicious of the influence I might exercise over their sons, I believe that there are few parents in England who will not complain that the college has departed from its original principle when it gives such a scope to the private judgment of its chief officer, or even to the judgment of the body which manages its affairs. . . . If I have violated any law of the church, that law can be at once

pointed out; the nature of the transgression can be defined without any reference to possible tendencies and results."

These representations were of no avail; the council "did not think it necessary to enter further into the subject." The two chairs held by Mr. Maurice were declared vacant, and were filled respectively by Dr. A. M'Caul and Mr. G. W. Dasent, whose orthodoxy was presumably unquestioned, or who at all events may be supposed to have said nothing to lead to its being suspected. But the dismissal of Mr. Maurice from the professorships made him none the less a professor. The men who had been his pupils remained his friends, and he remained, until his too early death, the recognized leader and teacher of a "school" of religious thought which included many of the best and noblest of the large number of those who have since, without rebuke, openly avowed opinions for holding which he was deemed unworthy to be recognized as a Christian teacher.

It may be worth while here to note that only a month after Mr. Maurice had been discharged from his appointments at King's College Dr. Colenso was consecrated Bishop of Natal by the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishop of London, and the Bishop of Lincoln. At the same time Dr. Armstrong was appointed to the other new see of Grahams-town, and the Bishop of Oxford preached the consecration sermon, taking for his text the words, "Separate me Barnabas and Saul." He spoke with such positive intensity of the certainty of the call to the sacred office to which both the new bishops had been appointed that the sermon on this occasion, the demands of a declaration of orthodoxy, and the limits of the articles of profession of faith with regard to certain supposed dogmas, all became significantly prominent topics of discussion when, nine years afterwards, Bishop Colenso, the heterodox, was prohibited from preaching in the churches of most English dioceses.

It might have been thought that Palmerston had enough to occupy even his untiring industry in carrying out the sanitary measures which he was determined should be no dead

letter under his administration of the home-office. He had spoken pretty plainly to the Edinburgh corporation, and in London the provisions of the public health acts were being enforced in a very practical fashion. Foul neighbourhoods were being destroyed or disinfected; the smoke of factory chimneys was abated, churchyards were being closed and sealed with cement, and he declined even to exercise the right of making privileged exceptions to the law against intramural interments. In answer to Lord Stanley of Aldersley, who had written for special permission for the interment of the remains of a church dignitary beneath the sacred edifice, he said: "The practice of burying dead bodies under buildings in which living people assemble in large numbers is a barbarous one, and ought to be at once and for ever put an end to. . . . And why, pray, should archbishops and bishops, and deans and canons, be buried under churches if other people are not to be so? What special connection is there between church dignities and the privilege of being decomposed under the feet of survivors? . . . As to what you say about pain to feelings by shutting up of burial-grounds, that is perfectly true. I am quite aware that the measure is necessarily attended with pain to feelings which excite respect, as well as to pressure upon pecuniary interests which are not undeserving of consideration. But no great measure of social improvement can be effected without some temporary inconvenience to individuals, and the necessity of the case justifies the demand for such sacrifices. To have attempted to make the application of the new system gradual would have reduced it to a nullity. England is, I believe, the only country in which in these days people accumulate putrefying dead bodies amid the dwellings of the living; and as to burying bodies under thronged churches, you might as well put them under libraries, drawing-rooms, and dining-rooms."

Such language as this would have been cynical if employed by most men; but it was a part of Palmerston's "common sense" relieved by a jaunty expression. It is astonishing how few people were offended by plain utterances which, though they read somewhat

coarsely, lost much of their offensiveness because of the peculiar humour which gave them a different effect; and even the reader of a letter like this would recall the familiar manner of the writer. Palmerston as the "judicious bottle-holder"—Palmerston as the keen-faced, wide-awake sporting man, biting a straw or a flower stem, as he appeared in the caricatures of *Punch*—was the popular favourite, and hundreds who were not among the populace believed implicitly in the ready wit and consummate tact, which, combined with the practical straightforward temper that is prompt to act and refuses to acknowledge the probability of failure, was regarded as peculiarly "English." But it was doubted by people of greater penetration whether the noble lord was quite so straightforward as he pretended to be. He had given his advice to the prime-minister, he was hankering after the power if not the place of minister of war or of foreign minister, and was urging that the allied fleets should be sent at once to the scene of conflict. The cabinet hesitated to accept his dicta, enforced though they were by letters and circulars, and it was suddenly announced that Lord Palmerston had resigned. It will be remembered that on a former occasion (in 1851), when he had relinquished office, his resignation had been preceded and accompanied by a number of rumours almost amounting to deliberate accusations against Prince Albert, charging him with using his influence to control the government and to turn its policy towards the advantage of foreign interests. The position of the prince consort was assailed, and it was insinuated that he used it for the purpose of sending despatches and tampering with foreign affairs to the detriment of British independence. It was an unfortunate circumstance that the same or similar insinuations reappeared at this juncture, and it is scarcely to be wondered at that Palmerston was suspected of having some hand in them either directly, or by recklessly giving expression to his opinion that the opposition with which his proposals were received by the cabinet was to be attributed to the influence of the prince, and through him of the queen. It is plain

enough from his letters and speeches that Palmerston had very little of the reticence supposed to be essential to a responsible minister, and that he was in the habit, to use a common expression, of "letting his tongue run" when it would have been more discreet if he had been silent. Whether he was responsible for it or not, no sooner had his resignation been rumoured than those newspapers which supported his foreign policy recommenced their scarcely veiled attacks upon the prince. He was represented to be the chief agent of "the Austro-Belgian-Coburg-Orleans clique, the avowed enemies of England and the subservient tools of Russia, he was present at the conferences between the queen and her ministers, the queen herself discussed with him the foreign as well as the domestic policy of the country, and her opinions were perpetually subject to his influence,—was that influence not exercised to defeat a foreign policy which would be national and patriotic, for the purpose of advancing that of foreign rulers with whom he was in constant correspondence, to whom he could reveal the secrets of her majesty's council? Of course these insinuations—and they sometimes grew to the proportions of direct allegations—need now only to be examined for their absurdity to be discovered. It would have been little to the advantage of the prince to diminish the prestige of the British government and to injure the interests of the queen for the sake of foreign rulers or distant family relations, with whose opinions he had over and over again emphatically shown that he was at variance. Amidst all the imputations that were made not a single fact was adduced that had the least weight; nor did any of the political leaders on either side pay any serious regard to such charges, though they must have known, and some of them would surely have represented any such actions as were made the subject of these scandalous suggestions. There is no need at the present day to enter into any vindication of the prince; his letters, speeches, conversations of that time have been published, and the refutation of the calumnies to which he was subject has long been completed in the story of his life and of the true rela-

tions which he sustained to the country to which he was never weary of giving his best and worthiest efforts. But there was no real need of vindication even at the time. Singularly enough, directly it was known that Lord Palmerston had withdrawn his resignation, many of those papers which had been foremost in their imputations withdrew them with the utmost facility. Whether Palmerston had or had not anything to do with the storm of invective that had been raised, it abated directly it was discovered that he had no need of that mode of accounting for his supposed retirement from the councils of the state. But the accusations had the effect of raising a violent uproar in the country. As the *Spectator* said, a whisper which was first insinuated for party purposes had grown into a roar, and a constructive hint had swelled into a positive and monstrous fiction. The story, not only told in all parts of England, but by some believed, was, that Prince Albert was a traitor to his queen, that he had been impeached for high treason, and finally that on a charge of high treason he had been arrested and committed to the Tower. Nay, the public appetite having grown by what it fed on went beyond this, and there was a report that the queen herself had been arrested.

"You will scarcely credit," wrote the prince to Stockmar, "that my being committed to the Tower was believed all over the country—nay, even that the queen had been arrested! People surrounded the Tower in thousands to see us brought to it! On the other hand, I hear from Manchester, where Bright, Cobden, Gibson, Wilson, &c., held their annual meeting, that they made very light of it, and laughed at all the accusations."

They were just the men who were likely to treat such rumours with a kind of humorous contempt, for they knew well enough what were the means likely to be taken by a certain class of political opponents to foment popular prejudice. It is only fair to admit, however, that the same sort of disdain may have prevented Palmerston from contradicting the declaration that he was responsible for the growth of the scandals with which Prince Albert was assailed. That he had on

the former occasion originated expressions of antagonism to the court there was no denying, and it, therefore, did not seem improbable that such expressions had been repeated, or that he had imputed to the prince influences which were opposed to him and to his policy, and were therefore, in his opinion, antagonistic to English interests, for Palmerston had a very sincere belief that the two things were inseparable if not identical.

Once during the contention Palmerston did give a denial, but it was not a very conclusive one. A long time previously a pamphlet had, it appears, been prepared, setting forth the inimical and adverse position of the prince in relation to the state, and this was now referred to by the newspapers, with an insinuation, not only that Lord Palmerston had handed to the writer of the pamphlet, proofs of the prince's misdoings and copies of his alleged secret correspondence, but that the prince had bought up the copies of the work, suppressed its publication, and made friends with Palmerston in order to screen himself. At the same time it was intimated that there were still some copies in existence, and republication was threatened. Palmerston thereupon wrote to the *Morning Post*, declaring that he neither got the pamphlet written nor gave up any documents whatever, but that he had, on the contrary, entreated that the pamphlet might not appear. This was evidently saying too much or not enough, and it was followed by the publication of the pamphlet in the columns of another paper; not, probably, by any connivance of Palmerston, for, as Prince Albert afterwards remarked, it was a miserable performance, which could really hurt no one but Lord Palmerston himself, as it accused the court and Lord John Russell of having intrigued to subject Lord Palmerston *falsely* to the stigma of having cried up the *coup d'état*, with the conviction that a false belief on this head was calculated to do him serious injury! As, however, it had already been proved in parliament that Palmerston *had* supported the *coup d'état*, it seemed scarcely likely that he would have wished this representation to be revived or to be made public. There had been a very decided antagonism between the prince

and the ex-foreign secretary ever since the queen's remonstrances on the subject of the despatches, which led to Palmerston's dismissal from the Russell administration, but there was a tendency to make Palmerston responsible for more than really belonged to him, and it was one of his characteristics to let things alone when they only involved his personal claims. He would not take the trouble to defend himself apart from his official position, and, strange as it may seem, he claimed the right to abstain from personally defending himself against the complaints of the queen, on the ground that it would ill become him to have any altercation with the sovereign. The same feeling *might* have prevented what could only have been an indignant denial of having been responsible for the imputations made against the prince consort, and though there can be little doubt that he had given rather too free expression to the suspicion that the dislike of the court had influenced the attitude of the cabinet towards his policy, it appears to have been admitted by Prince Albert himself that the slanders which were levelled at the throne during the Aberdeen ministry were not wholly attributable to this source.

"One main element," he wrote to Stockmar, "is the hostility and settled bitterness of the old high Tory or Protectionist party against me on account of my friendship with the late Sir Robert Peel, and of my success with the Exhibition. . . . Their fury knew no bounds, when by Palmerston's return to the ministry that party (which is now at variance with Disraeli) lost the chance of securing a leader in the Lower House, who would have overthrown the ministry with the cry for English honour and independence, and against parliamentary reform, which is by no means popular. Hatred of the Peelites is stronger in the old party than ever, and Aberdeen is regarded as his representative. To discredit him would have this further advantage, that, if he could be upset, the keystone of the arch of coalition would be smashed, and it must fall to pieces; then Palmerston and John Russell would have to separate, and the former would take the place he has long coveted of leader to the Conservatives and Radicals. For the same

reason, however, it must be our interest to support Aberdeen, in order to keep the structure standing. Fresh reason for the animosity towards us. So the old game was renewed which was played against Melbourne after the queen's accession, of attacking the court, so as to make it clear, both to it and to the public, that a continuance of Aberdeen in office must endanger the popularity of the crown."

Another element of opposition, the prince declared, was the appointment of Lord Hardinge as commander-in-chief instead of Fitzroy Somerset (Lord Raglan), who had for thirty years been military secretary under the Duke of Wellington. It was assumed that the appointment of Lord Hardinge was due to the prince, who had since the death of the Duke of Wellington been in constant confidential communication with him on military matters relating chiefly to arms and equipments. But the matter really at issue was the actual position which the prince was entitled to assume as one of the council, and as the husband and therefore the adviser of the queen, and on this subject he knew well public opinion must pronounce in spite of calumnies which, it could be shown, were without the slightest foundation, and of misrepresentations which could be refuted directly they were plainly met. He knew, and it was, he believed, time the nation knew, he had long outgrown his first neutral position, and that, after constant study and unremitting attention to public matters, he could not, and should not, remain unconcerned with political affairs—or rather with those affairs of state in which, as the natural counsellor as well as the private secretary of the queen, he had a legitimate interest deepened by observation and experience.

"A very considerable section of the nation," he wrote to his old friend and counsellor, "had never given itself the trouble to consider what really is the position of the husband of a queen regnant. When I first came over here I was met by this want of knowledge and unwillingness to give a thought to the position of this luckless personage. Peel cut down my income, Wellington refused me my rank, the royal

family cried out against the foreign interloper, the Whigs in office were only inclined to concede to me just as much space as I could stand upon. The constitution is silent as to the consort of the queen; even Blackstone ignores him, and yet there he was, and not to be done without. As I have kept quiet and caused no scandal, and all went well, no one has troubled himself about me and my doings; and any one who wished to pay me a compliment at a public dinner or meeting, extolled my 'wise abstinence from interfering in political matters.' Now, when the present journalistic controversies have brought to light the fact, that I have for years taken an active interest in all political matters, the public, instead of feeling surprise at my reserve, and the tact with which I have avoided thrusting myself forward, fancied itself betrayed, because it felt it had been self-deceived. It has also rushed all at once into a belief in secret correspondence with foreign courts, intrigues, &c.; for all this is much more probable than that thirty millions of men in the course of fourteen years should not have discovered, that an important personage had during all that time taken a part in their government. If *that* could be concealed, then all kinds of secret conspiracy are possible, and the Coburg conspiracy is proved to demonstration.

"Beyond this stage of knowledge, which was certain sooner or later to be reached, we shall, however, soon have passed; and even now there is a swarm of letters, articles, and pamphlets to prove that the husband of the queen, as such, and as privy-councillor, not only may, but in the general interest must be, an active and responsible adviser of the crown; and I hope the debate in parliament will confirm this view, and settle it at once and for ever.

"The recognition of this fact will be of importance, and is alone worth all the hubbub and abuse. I think I may venture to assume that the nation is ashamed of its past thoughtlessness, and has already arrived at a just understanding of my position. . . .

"As for the calumnies themselves, I look upon them as a fiery ordeal that will serve to purge away impurities. All the gossip and

idle talk of the last fourteen years have been swept away by what has occurred. Every one who has been able to say or surmise any ill of me has conscientiously contributed his faggot to the burning of the heretic, and I may say with pride, that not the veriest tittle of a reproach can be brought against me *with truth*. I have myself sometimes felt uneasy, under attacks prompted by fiendish wickedness, that I might here or there have unconsciously made mistakes. But nothing has been brought against me which is not absolutely *untrue*. This may have been mere good luck, for I can scarcely suppose that I have not in some things laid myself open to censure."

The queen had suffered no less than the prince from a sense of the wrong which had been inflicted on them by their detractors, and as they feared by the nation, which, under the fickle excitement of a great slander, had been willing to cancel those sentiments of simple loyalty and affection without which the throne itself would have been worthless. But they yet trusted to the honest instincts of the people, and looked forward to the meeting of parliament for a refutation of calumnies which might, after all, as the prince had said, have the effect of bringing before the country his just claims, a recognition of which would at once give him his true position, and would leave no room for further misrepresentation of his relations to the throne and to the government. On the 31st of January her majesty went to open parliament, and she was accompanied by the prince. Lord Aberdeen and the other ministers had seriously advised that the subject of the attacks on the prince and his true claims should be brought before the house, and had assured her that the slanders would then be effectually demolished, and that general satisfaction and enthusiasm would be the result; that the reaction would be greater than any attack could be, and that the country was as loyal as ever, only a little mad.

"The prince has now been so long before the eyes of the whole country," wrote the premier, "his conduct is so invariably devoted to the public good, and his life so perfectly

unattackable, that Lord Aberdeen has not the slightest apprehension of any serious consequences arising from these contemptible exhibitions of malevolence and faction."

And he was right. It was expected that some adverse demonstrations might be made against the prince, and the precaution was taken of calling out the whole of the Horse Guards instead of a small escort only, while the route of the procession was lined with policemen. These arrangements might have been necessary if the Russian ambassador, who had not then left London, had chosen to attend, but he prudently absented himself. At a few points, hisses were heard when Prince Albert passed, but they were drowned in a tempest of cheering; and it was soon evident that the people had not been very ready to accept in earnest the scandalous rumours that had been so widely circulated. The Turkish ambassador was, of course, received with uproarious acclamations when he was seen in the procession, and there was no lack of the usual loyal demonstrations. So far as the queen and her consort were concerned, there was no need for further anxiety.

The distinct and warmly emphatic denial which was given by Lord John Russell to the charges of improper interference by the prince in the Eastern question was endorsed by Lord Aberdeen. Lord Derby in the House of Lords and Mr. Walpole in the Lower House spoke with equal decision and earnestness in contradiction of the imputations which had been made, and in vindication of the constitutional right of the prince to support the sovereign by his advice in matters of state.

Lord Campbell, also, representing the highest legal authority, gave unhesitating testimony to this view, and indeed the leaders of all political parties concurred in a declaration which many of them had already endorsed, by an expression of personal regard and esteem for the prince. "The impression has been excellent," he wrote to his former correspondent, "and my political status and activity, which up to this time have been silently assumed, have now been asserted in parliament without a dissentient voice."

Lord Palmerston had resumed office before the meeting of parliament. His resignation had not been accepted, and though he waited for some time he consented to withdraw it. What would have been the consequence to the government if he had persisted in retiring need not be discussed. People were asking another question—Had he resigned because he could not agree with the other members of the cabinet on the Eastern question and the steps to be taken with regard to the approaching war? The opposition declared that he had, the government affirmed that he had not. No explanation was given. He had reconsidered the matter, and there he was. He was himself more than usually reticent, but he had written to his brother-in-law—the Right Hon. Laurence Sullivan—that the cause of his resignation was his inability to agree with a scheme of parliamentary reform which was to be introduced by Lord John Russell.

He had been placed on the committee of the cabinet to prepare the plan, but he had insurmountable objections to the scheme, and stated them both to Lord John and to Lord Aberdeen, who said he would communicate with the queen and his colleagues; but instead of this consulted Russell and Graham, who said that Palmerston's objections were inadmissible, with which he (Aberdeen) agreed. There was nothing left for Palmerston but to resign. "I could not," he says, "take up a bill which contained material things of which I disapproved, and assist to fight it through the House of Commons, to force it on the Lords, and to stand upon it at the hustings." The letter had the following postscript:—"The *Times* says there has been no difference in the cabinet about Eastern affairs. This is an untruth, but I felt it would have been silly to have gone out because I could not have my own way about Turkish affairs, seeing that my presence in the cabinet did good by modifying the views of those whose policy I thought bad."

These reasons for not retiring were potent—for in less than a week he wrote again to his brother-in-law, to say that he should remain in the government. "I was much and strongly pressed to do so for several days by many of

the members of the government, who declared that they were no parties to Aberdeen's answer to me, and that they considered all the details of the intended reform measure as still open to discussion."

Had the members of the cabinet already foreseen that Lord John Russell's scheme would not pass—that it was not only defective in itself, but that the temper of the country would not brook so inopportune a moment for introducing a measure which would interfere with the one absorbing topic, the prosecution of a war that would defer political if not social progress? One can partly understand the attitude of men like Bright and Cobden if they looked at the relative situation of the government and the country by this light.

But Lord Palmerston had yet a few lines to write. "Their (the members of the government) earnest representations, and the knowledge that the cabinet had on Thursday taken a decision on Turkish affairs in entire accordance with opinions which I had long unsuccessfully pressed upon them, decided me to withdraw my resignation, which I did yesterday. Of course what I say to you about the cabinet decision on Turkish affairs is entirely for yourself and not to be mentioned to anybody. But it is very important, and will give the allied squadrons the command of the Black Sea."

These are suggestive lines. They were written on Christmas-day, 1853. Almost immediately afterwards the French ambassador, on hearing that Palmerston's resignation was withdrawn, wrote to him: "Au début de la campagne que nous allons faire ensemble, c'est un grand confort pour moi et une grande garantie pour l'Empereur que de vous savoir l'âme des conseils de notre allié. Votre concours d'ailleurs pèse d'un poids très-réel dans la balance, et on sait à Paris en apprécier toute le valeur."

The period of which we are writing was one of so much excitement that it is not surprising to find the reputations, or rather the popularity, of public men undergoing a considerable change. The position of the ministry was precarious, and its character for inde-

cision was not improved by the threatened defection of Lord Palmerston, and the suspicion that he had resigned in consequence of what were called "timid counsels." But more damaging still was the indecision of Lord John Russell, who seemed to have a chronic tendency towards resignation, and who, while exhibiting before the country as an uncertain figure with undefined outline, came forward with a new proposition for parliamentary reform. During the whole session he only succeeded in obtaining distinction as an example of how a high reputation may be obscured by vacillation followed by untimely action. The country was perhaps not absolutely indifferent to a new measure of parliamentary reform, but it could not entertain two great and absorbing topics at the same time. Even people who had been waiting and clamouring for another reform bill did not want it then, nor did they want a measure which, though it was elaborate, was evidently, and perhaps in consequence, imperfect.

The proposed bill, though not complete, was too wide to be hastily accepted, and the pressure and excitement of the coming war forbade due consideration being given to a scheme which involved changes in the system of representation, several of which resembled those subsequently adopted, when the country was in a temper to entertain a still larger project. Briefly stated, this bill proposed that both in counties and boroughs votes should be given to persons in receipt of salaries of not less than £100 a year, payable quarterly or half-yearly; persons in receipt of £10 a year from government, bank, or India stock; persons paying forty shillings per annum of income or assessed taxes; graduates of any university in the United Kingdom; and persons who had for three years possessed a deposit of £50 in a savings-bank.

In the counties votes were to be given also to all occupiers rated at £10 per annum residing elsewhere than in represented towns, and in the boroughs to all occupiers rated at £6 who had been resident within the borough for two years and a half.

Boroughs having fewer than 300 electors or

than 5000 inhabitants were to be disfranchised, and of these there were 19 boroughs returning 29 members.

Boroughs having fewer than 500 electors or than 10,000 inhabitants, and returning two members, were in future to return one member only, and these amounted to thirty-three; but on the other hand, counties and divisions of counties containing a population of more than 100,000 each, and returning two members, were in future to return three members. Of these there were thirty-eight; while two divisions of counties (South Lancashire and the West Riding of York) were to be subdivided and each subdivision was to return three members.

Cities and boroughs were also to return additional members. Those containing more than 100,000 inhabitants, and returning only two members, were in future to return three; and boroughs returning only one member were to return two. Thus ten additional members would be returned, and six additional members were to be secured by giving representation by one member to Birkenhead, Burnley, Staleybridge, by two members to the Inns of Court, and one to the London University.

One clause deserves particular attention. The city of London was to continue to return four members, but each elector was to have only three votes—the effect being to give an opportunity for that representation of minorities which has been more fully recognized in recent changes in the system of parliamentary representation.

It will be seen that this scheme admitted the £10 householder to the county franchise, and at the first glance it would have seemed to make the manufacture or purchase of the right to vote both cheap and easy; but to prevent this, the building was to be rated at £5 a year unless the voter was actually resident. Lord John expressly stated that the borough franchise was made to follow a £6 municipal rating for the purpose of admitting a larger number of the working-classes of the country, for whom the Reform Act had not made sufficient provision. There would have been sixty-six vacancies under his scheme; sixty-three of these were to be apportioned as we have

seen, and the other three were to be given to populous towns, and to one university in Scotland.

It soon became evident that the temper neither of the house nor of the country was in favour of passing the bill. On the 13th of February, in bringing it forward, amidst strong expressions of dissent, Lord John Russell had said: "I cannot think that there is any danger in discussing the question of reform during the excitement of a foreign war. The time that is really dangerous for such a discussion is the time of great popular excitement and dissension at home. It is said that there is no feeling on the subject; that there is a complete apathy about reform. If that really is the case, is it not the proper time to discuss questions of reform, lest in the course of the war there should be times of distress when the people should become excited, and large meetings should be assembled in every town, partly crying out for more wages and cheaper food, and partly crying out for an increase of political power? Supposing we should have the calamity of war, and with it the necessity for increasing the public burdens, is it not a fitting time to enlarge the privileges of the people when parliament is imposing fresh taxes, that in imposing them we may as far as possible impose them on those who have elected us?" There was much serious truth in this, and the fact that the bill was rejected by the house and by the country because of the war fever, no other measure being brought forward in its place, doubtless afforded a new argument for those very few persons who, at the time, were utterly opposed to fighting; but rejected it was, and what was more, the people immediately submitted to an enormous additional imposition of taxes for the purpose of carrying on the conflict which was now imminent.

On the 10th of April the proposed measure was withdrawn. The government to whom it belonged gave it but a half-hearted support, and it was evident that there was little chance of its being carried. It had been carefully prepared, and Lord John Russell had apparently intended to stake his reputation upon it, but neither the time of its presentation nor the temper of the house was favour-

able to its reception. Probably Lord John alone felt deeply the necessity for withdrawing it, but he was much overcome, and towards the close of his remarks, in referring to the existence of some suspicion of his motives, his voice was stifled and he spoke through tears; but a simultaneous burst of cheering broke forth from all parts of the house, and was again and again repeated. "If I have done anything in the cause of reform," continued his lordship with emotion, "I trust that I have deserved some degree of confidence; but at all events, I feel if I do not possess that confidence I shall be of no use to the crown or to the country, and I can no longer hold the position I now occupy. These are times of no ordinary importance, and questions arise of the utmost difficulty. I shall endeavour to arrive at those conclusions which will be for the best interests of the crown and the country, and I trust that I may meet with support." The whole attitude of Lord John Russell at this time, conveys an impression of feebleness and uncertainty; and he may be said to have commenced the series of resignations by which this coalition ministry became distinguished; but he had done too good work for the country and was too able and gifted a statesman to be treated otherwise than with sympathy and respect. When he sat down, expressions of admiration for his character and esteem for his consistency, were numerous and genuine, and among the more prominent speakers, Mr. Disraeli, while utterly opposing many of the details of the measure which had been withdrawn, professed his cordial respect for Lord John, and declared "his character and career" to be "precious possessions of the House of Commons."

While scarcely anybody could be found in a humour for considering questions of parliamentary reform, or any other measures demanding long and careful debate, everybody was anxiously waiting for the more immediately essential statement of the chancellor of the exchequer. The question was being asked everywhere, "What will Gladstone do?" and the answer mostly was, "Oh, depend upon it, he has some original plan for raising the revenue to carry on the war."

There could scarcely have been a more anxious trial for a financial reformer than that which demanded, if not a reversal, a complete change of a budget intended to relieve the country from pressing burdens, and made it necessary to impose new taxes for the purpose of meeting sudden and almost alarming expenditure; but Mr. Gladstone was already equal to the occasion, and the country had sufficient confidence in his ability and his honesty to accept his statements and to submit without much flinching to the burdens which he reluctantly but decisively laid upon it. Indeed, his former budget, even for the short time that it had been in operation, was well calculated to inspire that confidence. He had estimated the revenue of the country for the year 1853-54, after all the reductions which had been effected, at £52,990,000, and it had reached £54,025,000, while the expenditure had been a million less than the sum at which it had been computed, so that he had two millions in hand; an amount which, small as it was, in view of the enormous estimates to be provided for, would have encouraged many ministers to devise a scheme for bringing forward a contingent budget postponing the means of payment, for what might or might not be a long-continued war, to some future period, when it would be met only by an increment of taxation, or by a permanent burden on succeeding generations. Mr. Gladstone at once emphatically repudiated any such intention, and practically announced his determination as far as possible to raise during the year the funds that would be required to meet, not only the ordinary, but the extraordinary expenses. Thoughtful and sagacious politicians truly characterized this determination as honest and courageous, and the opinion was endorsed by the nation even when, as a necessary provision for carrying that policy into effect, it was proposed to double the income-tax, to increase the duty on Scotch and Irish spirits, and to raise the malt-tax. The expenses of the war were to be paid out of current revenue, provided they did not amount to more than ten millions sterling beyond the ordinary expenditure, and £1,250,000 was to be at once voted for the expenses of

the army of the East, a sum which was calculated to represent £50 a head for 25,000 men.

It may be very well understood that to make these large demands on the country at a time when, but for the growing demands of army and navy, he would have been looking forward to further important reductions of taxation was a deep disappointment to a statesman who shared the reluctance of Lord Aberdeen and others to enter into hostilities at all. There was, however, as he believed, no other course to adopt, as war was inevitable, than so to provide for it as to make it effectual towards the speedy settlement of a lasting peace. Probably Mr. Gladstone differed from Mr. Cobden and Mr. Bright only inasmuch as he could not admit that the utmost moral interposition might be used and yet that material interference as a resort to physical force could seldom or never be justified. With regard to the approaching war with Russia for the defence of the Ottoman Porte he may reasonably have considered that whatever might have been the circumstances in the past which had led to the existing situation, the demands of Russia were such as menaced not only Turkey but the integrity of European States, and that the cause of justice as well as the observance of international obligations, made it the duty of England to oppose by strong diplomatic representations, if such might be successful, but in the last resort by determined material opposition to a gigantic physical power, the unwarrantable attempts of the czar practically to add the Turkish possessions to his empire. This perhaps would be the outline of the argument held by the large moderate section of people who deplored and would have made great sacrifices to prevent rather than to maintain the conflict. This was the position taken during negotiations which had failed one after another, and the continuance of which even after the repeated evasions and attempted overbearing of the Emperor of Russia, was now recommended by the King of Prussia in a letter to the queen, in terms which may have been intended to be pious but were singularly inappropriate.

In England the character ascribed to the King of Prussia was that of a weak and self-

indulgent sovereign, with just enough culture to be *dilettante*, and with a decided liking for the pleasures of the table. He was nicknamed "Clicquot" because he was supposed to be fond of champagne, and the common caricatures represented him dividing his attention between that exhilarating beverage and Strasbourg pie or German sausage. There was no sufficient reason for this estimate of his habits, and it is pretty certain that he really possessed considerable culture and liked intellectual pursuits; but he was weak in more than one respect, and his subsequent mental disorder in 1858 was perhaps not very surprising. Had his brother William been on the throne in 1853 instead of becoming his regent in 1858 and afterwards succeeding him, there is no telling what might have happened. Probably there would have been no Crimean war, but as it was, Prussia occupied the unenviable position of alternately crouching before Russia, and endeavouring to justify the attitude by asserting a right to sustain a moral and political neutrality. After having, by his anxiety not to offend his brother-in-law, reduced Prussian influence to a mere feeble coincidence with our remonstrance against the misinterpretation of the Vienna note, Frederick William appeared to be alarmed lest the czar should suspect him of being too decidedly opposed to him. The feeling against him in England was unmistakable. "The irritation here against the Prussian court," said Prince Albert, "is very great, and not undeserved. After it had caused intimation to be made of its dread of France, and we had procured a declaration for them that no territorial aggrandizement of any kind would be accepted by that nation, they now affect a fear of Russia, as though Prussia must be swallowed up in a moment." But it was at this juncture that the King of Prussia thought he might interpose by sending two letters, one of a private and one of an official character, to the Queen of England. These were specially despatched by a cavalry officer almost immediately after the czar's proposals had been negatived at Vienna, and their avowed intention was to induce the queen to reconsider those proposals, as though she could in any sense act independently of the decisions

of her ministers. It seemed that the King of Prussia was prepared to act outside the conference of ambassadors and of ministers of state, and he pretended to think, or was ignorant enough to think, that the English sovereign might do the same, "in a spirit of conciliation and a love of peace." He was—he said—eager to co-operate with her majesty in every effort for the preservation of peace, and though he could not hope that war would be averted, its sphere might be restricted, and the duration of the calamity averted, by the four powers continuing to be firmly united in their policy and course of action. This was the language of the sovereign whose policy had been feeble and pusillanimous, and whose untrustworthiness had encouraged Russia and embarrassed Austria.

The more official letter was long, elaborate, and tainted with obvious duplicity. "I am informed that the Russian emperor has sent proposals for preliminaries of peace to Vienna, and that these have been pronounced by the conference of ambassadors not to be in accordance with their programme. Just there where the vocation of diplomacy ceases does the special province of the sovereign begin." Was it not most strange, he asked, that England seemed for some time past to have been ashamed of what had been the special motive for the conflagration? The war would now be one for a distant and ulterior purpose. "The preponderance of Russia is to be broken down! Well! I, her neighbour, have never yet felt this preponderance and have never yielded to it. And England in effect has felt it less than I. The equilibrium of Europe will be menaced by this war, for the world's greatest powers will be weakened by it. But above all suffer me to ask, 'Does God's law justify a war for an idea?'" The letter goes on to implore her majesty for the sake of the Prince of Peace not to reject the Russian proposals. "Order them to be probed to the bottom, and see that this is done in a desire for peace. Cause what may be accepted to be winnowed from what appears objectionable, and set negotiations on foot upon this basis! I know that the Russian emperor is ardently desirous of peace. Let your majesty build a bridge for the prin-

ciple of his life—the imperial honour! He will walk over it extolling God and praising him. For this I pledge myself.

"In conclusion, will your majesty allow me to say one word for Prussia and for myself? *I am resolved to maintain a position of complete neutrality*; and to this I add, with proud elation, *my people and myself are of one mind*. They require absolute neutrality from me. They say (and I say), 'What have we to do with the Turk? Whether he stand or fall in no way concerns the industrious Rhinelanders and the husbandmen of the Riesengebirg and Bernstein. Grant that the Russian tax-gatherers are an odious race, and that of late monstrous falsehoods have been told and outrages perpetrated in the imperial name. It was the Turk and not we who suffered, and the Turk has plenty of good friends, but the emperor is a noble gentleman, and has done us no harm. Your majesty will allow that this North German sound practical sense is difficult to gainsay. . . . Should Count Gröben come too late, should war have been declared, still I do not abandon hope. Many a war has been declared, and yet not come to actual blows. God the Lord's will decides.'

There is no need to analyse or to characterize this letter, but it is little to be wondered at if it was read with impatience and even with indignation. Even now, that large numbers of people are more and more convinced that the Russian war, if it were just, might have been prevented, the terms in which the letter is couched will be regarded as offensive to English notions when the words are accompanied with some knowledge of the position occupied by Prussia at that time. The very spirit of time-serving, and of a selfishness the more stupendous because it is half-unconscious, seems to pervade the language employed. There could be only one kind of reply to it. The queen wrote without delay.

"The recent Russian proposals came as an answer to the very last attempt at a compromise which the powers considered they could make with honour, and they have been rejected by the Vienna Conference, not because they were merely at variance with the language of the programme, but because they

were directly contrary to its meaning. Your majesty's envoy has taken part in this conference and its decision, and when your majesty says, 'Where the vocation of diplomacy ends, there that of the sovereign may with propriety begin,' I cannot concur in any such line of demarcation, for what my ambassador does he does in my name, and consequently I feel myself not only bound in honour, but also constrained by an imperative obligation to accept the consequences, whatever they may be, of the line which he has been directed to adopt.

"The consequences of a war, frightful and incalculable as they are, are as distressing to me to contemplate as they are to your majesty. I am also aware that the Emperor of Russia does not wish for war. But he makes demands upon the Porte which the united European powers, yourself included, have solemnly declared to be incompatible with the independence of the Porte and the equilibrium of Europe. In view of this declaration, and of the presence of the Russian army of invasion in the principalities, the powers must be prepared to support their words by acts. If the Turk now retires into the background, and the impending war appears to you to be a 'war for an idea,' the reason is simply this, that the very motives which urge on the emperor, in spite of the protest of all Europe, and at the risk of a war that may devastate the world, to persist in his demands, disclose a determination to realize a fixed idea, and that the grand ulterior consequences of the war must be regarded as far more important than its original ostensible cause, which in the beginning appeared to be neither more nor less than the key of the back-door of a mosque.

"Your majesty calls upon me 'to probe the question to the bottom in the spirit and love of peace, and to build a bridge for the imperial honour.' . . . All the devices and ingenuity of diplomacy and also of goodwill have been squandered during the last nine months in vain attempts to build up such a bridge! *Projets de notes*, conventions, protocols, &c. &c., by the dozen have emanated from the chanceries of the different powers,

and the ink that has gone to the penning of them might well be called a second Black Sea. But every one of them has been wrecked upon the self-will of your imperial brother-in-law.

"When your majesty tells me 'that you are now determined to assume an attitude of complete neutrality,' and that in this mind you appeal to your people, who exclaim with sound practical sense, 'It is to the Turk that violence has been done; the Turk has plenty of good friends, and the emperor has done us no harm,'—I do not understand you. Had such language fallen from the King of Hanover or of Saxony I could have understood it. But up to the present hour I have regarded Prussia as one of the five Great Powers, which since the peace of 1815 have been the guarantors of treaties, the guardians of civilization, the champions of right, and ultimate arbiters of the nations; and I have for my part felt the holy duty to which they were thus divinely called, being at the same time perfectly alive to the obligations, serious as these are and fraught with danger, which it imposes. Renounce these obligations, my dear brother, and in doing so you renounce for Prussia the *status* she has hitherto held. And if the example thus set should find imitators, European civilization is abandoned as a plaything for the winds; right will no longer find a champion, nor the oppressed an umpire to appeal to.

"Let not your majesty think that my object in what I have said is to persuade you to change your determination. . . . So little have I it in my purpose to seek to persuade you, that nothing has pained me more than the suspicion expressed through General von der Gröben in your name, that it was the wish of England to lead you into temptation by holding out the prospect of certain advantages. The groundlessness of such an assumption is apparent from the very terms of the treaty which was offered to you, the most important clause of which was that by which the contracting parties pledged themselves *under no circumstances to seek to obtain from the war any advantage to themselves*. Your majesty could not possibly have given any

stronger proof of your unselfishness than by your signature to this treaty.

“But now to conclude! You think that war might even be declared, yet you express the hope that, for all that, it might still not break out. I cannot, unfortunately, give countenance to the hope that the declaration will not be followed by immediate action. Shakspeare’s words:—

‘Beware
Of entrance to a quarrel; but, being in,
Bear it, that the opposer may beware of thee’—

have sunk deeply into every Englishman’s heart. Sad that they should find their application here, where, in other circumstances, personal friendship and liking would alone prevail! What must be your majesty’s state of mind at seeing them directed against a beloved brother-in-law, whom yet, much as you love him, your conscience cannot acquit of the crime of having, by his arbitrary and passionate bearing, brought such vast misery upon the world!”

This reply is a fair representation of the situation as it appeared, not only to English ministers, but to the majority of thoughtful Englishmen at the time; but there were other thoughtful Englishmen—beside Richard Cobden and John Bright—who, though they were not *on the side* of the czar, and would not have endorsed either the conduct or the mode of expression of the King of Prussia, would not accept these representations as sufficient reasons for a war which they believed was neither necessary, justifiable, nor even expedient for the country.

The attitude of the queen and of the ministry with regard to the Emperor of Russia may well be attributed to the knowledge, that while professing to be anxious to conclude a treaty with England after failing to induce its government to conspire with him against the existence of Turkey, he was using efforts with Austria, Prussia, and France, to prevent them from maintaining an alliance with us. Lord John Russell had spoken in parliament implying the bad faith of the Russian government, and this had led to an article in the *Journal de St. Pétersbourg*, which evidently came from the Russian chancery, repudiating the

implied charge of bad faith, and appealing to the confidential communications between the two governments to show how open and sincere were the intentions of the czar. This was too much. As the challenge was given it was accepted, and the memoranda were published. They led to other revelations, for directly the French government learned with surprise what had been the course Russia had pursued, they informed their representatives throughout Europe, that, from the moment Russia saw that England would not fall in with her views, she had tried to sow discord between England and France. Prince Gortschakoff had, in November, 1853, proposed to Count Béarn, the French minister at Stuttgart, a solution of the Eastern question by means of an understanding between Russia and France. In the course of what passed Prince Gortschakoff had declared, that he knew England would throw over the Eastern question as soon as she had got France fairly committed. “She will in fact have helped you to compromise yourselves, and will leave you all the embarrassment of a false and difficult position. We have all grievances of our own against this power. What a nice trick to play her would it be to come to an arrangement among ourselves without her! Trust me! Distrust perfidious Albion!” This language, and much more to the same effect, Prince Gortschakoff stated that he was officially authorized to hold. “I need not say,” M. Drouyn de Lhuys writes in the circular note from which these quotations are made. “that our loyalty towards England and towards Europe forbade us to lend an ear to these insinuations.”¹

But there was nearly an end to all thought of negotiations or of further parley when on the 6th of March, 1854, Mr. Gladstone rose to propose what was in reality a war budget. His position was in many respects a painful one, for both on financial and on much higher grounds he had a real objection to the war; but at the same time he could not take the view of Mr. Cobden or of Mr. Bright, nor, the grounds of England’s intervention being

¹ *Life of the Prince Consort*, by Sir Theodore Martin.

at the time what they were, could he dissociate himself from the government on account of it. Of course Mr. Kinglake, in his narrative of the exciting events connected with the invasion of the Crimea, has something to say about Mr. Gladstone's position, and the words are neither altogether true, nor, as they have been often quoted, are they any longer new. "He had once," says the pungent historian of the war, "imagined it to be his duty to quit a government and to burst through strong ties of friendship and gratitude by reason of a thin shade of difference on the subject of white or brown sugar. It was believed that if he were to commit even a little sin or to imagine an evil thought he would instantly arraign himself before the dread tribunal which awaited him within his own bosom, and that his intellect being subtle and microscopic, and delighting in casuistry and exaggeration, he would be very likely to give his soul a very harsh trial, and treat himself as a great criminal for faults too minute to be visible to the naked eyes of laymen. His friends lived in dread of his virtues as tending to make him whimsical and unstable, and the practical politicians perceiving that he was not to be depended upon for party purposes, and was bent upon none but lofty objects, used to look upon him as dangerous, used to call him behind his back a good man,—a good man in the worst sense of the term."

After all, this criticism, when analysed, amounts to little other than an admission that Mr. Gladstone was constantly influenced by conscientious motives, against which neither ambition, nor the desire for place, nor the supposed claims of party, had any abiding influence. There are readers who will see in the smart estimate of the satirist something which may remind them of the utterances of the prophet, who, going out to curse, used what was really the language of blessing. At all events when the chancellor of the exchequer rose to propose the new budget there was no paltering with the difficulties which were presented to him, though he had to abandon the hopes that he had entertained of a policy of retrenchment and the further

relief of the country from taxation. He utterly repudiated the "convenient, cowardly, and perhaps popular" course, as it was afterwards called, of making up for the coming extra expenditure by extensive borrowing.

It was impossible to say that the estimate for the war would suffice for the wants of the whole year. That was the reason for proposing to vote for extraordinary military expenditure a sum of £1,250,000. There was a deficiency of nearly three millions to provide for, and even this did not exhaust the whole cost of the war. But while he hoped that this sum might be raised without returning to the higher duties, which had recently been diminished on various articles, he urged strongly that it should not be raised by resorting to a loan, and so throwing the burden on posterity. Such a course was not required by the necessities of the country, and was therefore not worthy of its adoption. No country had played so much as England at this dangerous game of mortgaging the industry of future generations. It was right that those who make war should be prepared to make the sacrifices needed to carry it on; the necessity for so doing was a most useful check on mere lust of conquest, and would lead men to make war with the wish of realizing the earliest prospects of an honourable peace.

We had entered upon a great struggle, but we had entered upon it under favourable circumstances. "We have proposed to you to make great efforts, and you have nobly and cheerfully backed our proposals. You have already by your votes added nearly 40,000 men to the establishments of the country; and taking into account changes that have actually been carried into effect with regard to the return of soldiers from the colonies, and the arrangements which, in the present state of Ireland, might be made—but which are not made—with respect to the constabulary force, in order to render the military force disposable to the utmost possible extent, it is not too much to say that we have virtually an addition to the disposable forces of the country, by land and by sea, at the present moment, as compared with our position twelve months ago, to the extent of nearly 50,000 men. This looks like

an intention to carry on your war with vigour, and the wish and hope of her majesty's government is, that that may be truly said of the people of England, with regard to this war, which was, I am afraid, not so truly said of Charles II. by a courtly but great poet, Dryden—

'He without fear a dangerous war pursues,
Which without rashness he began before.'

That, we trust, will be the motto of the people of England; and you have this advantage, that the sentiment of Europe, and we trust the might of Europe, is with you. These circumstances—though we must not be sanguine, though it would be the wildest presumption for any man to say, when the ravages of European war had once begun, where and at what point it would be stayed—these circumstances justify us in cherishing the hope that possibly this may not be a long war."

The plan was, as we have seen, to increase the income-tax, levying the whole addition for and in respect of the first moiety of the year, which was in effect to double the tax for the half year. The amount of the tax for 1854-55 was calculated at £6,275,000, and a moiety of that sum was £3,137,500; but as the cost of collection diminished in proportion to the amount obtained the real moiety would be £3,307,000, so that the whole produce of the income-tax would be £9,582,000. The aggregate income for the year would be £56,656,000, and as the expenditure was estimated at £56,186,000 this would leave a small probable surplus of £470,000. There were other changes of commercial importance, one of which was to abolish the distinction between home and foreign drawn bills, which were thenceforward to pay the same rate of duty. As the additions to the revenue could not be realized before the end of the year, and a large sum was immediately required to meet the expenses of the war, he brought forward a resolution for a vote of £1,750,000 for an issue of exchequer bills. It was not expected that it would be necessary to exercise this permission to its full extent, but should the necessity arise the unfunded debt would only stand as it stood twelve months before, when its amount was

£17,750,000, as compared with £16,000,000, to which it had been reduced for the current period.

This financial scheme, bold, simple, and effectual, met with the support of men who were keen judges of finance, and among them was Joseph Hume, who accepted it on the ground that those who had urged the government to a war, the propriety of which could not yet be judged, should bear their share of its burdens. This was one of the latest votes of the veteran reformer, financier, and political economist. He was seventy-eight years old, and died in February of the following year (1855) after a parliamentary career of forty-four years, during which he did the country inestimable service in watching the national expenditure and pointing out the means of reducing taxation. The resolution for doubling the income-tax was passed without discussion or division, but on the following day an amendment was moved by Sir H. Willoughby to the effect that the collection of the additional moiety should extend over the whole year; and Mr. Disraeli, who had previously stated that he should not oppose the vote, as the house was bound to support her majesty in all just and necessary wars, came forward with a contention that the government was only justified in levying increased taxes if they could prove the war to be unavoidable. It was of course pointed out that this argument was equivalent to an expression of want of confidence and should have been followed by a proposed vote to that effect, but the leader of the opposition would not listen to this argument, urged that the government apparently had no confidence in the house or in themselves, quoted ministerial utterances to show what divergence of opinion had existed on the question whether there should be peace or war, and declared that these differences had in fact produced the present state of affairs. The war, he said, was "a coalition war;" and had the cabinet been united it would have been prevented altogether. Obviously if these arguments were potent against voting in favour of the budget they more than justified want of confidence, and Mr. Gladstone, in reply, challenged that issue, saying that Mr. Disraeli

defended his omission to propose a vote of want of confidence on the very grounds that should have prompted it, and that his argument had therefore reached an "illogical and recreant" conclusion. He concluded by defending the various provisions of his financial scheme, which was agreed to, the amendment being negatived.

But war had not yet been actually declared, and the caution which he had exercised in pointing out that the provisions might be only temporary was soon afterwards justified. On the 8th of May, almost directly after the rejection of Lord John Russell's Reform Bill, Mr. Gladstone had to bring forward additional proposals for meeting the enormous expenditure which it was seen would be necessary for equipping and maintaining our army in the Crimea. It had been known that the first demand made on the country would not be adequate, and now it was evident that there must be a further claim made in order to meet the daily increasing cost, if we were to carry on the struggle upon which the nation had entered with such unanimous determination. Again Mr. Disraeli opposed the means that were proposed to augment the revenue, and took the opportunity of defending the financial scheme of the former government when he was chancellor of the exchequer. With no little acerbity he attacked Mr. Gladstone with an accusation of having been mistaken in paying off the South Sea stock, and with having doubled the malt-tax to the detriment of those whose interests he had deserted; but these accusations were not altogether new, and some of them had been met already. That which it was necessary to consider was that a computed extra expenditure of £6,800,000 had to be provided for, of which £500,000 was for the militia. In a speech which lasted three hours, and aroused the ministry and the house to the fact that this was more than a mere supplementary budget, and that it rose to the height of a new masterly plan for meeting the extraordinary expenditure, the chancellor of the exchequer explained his scheme. He proposed to repeat the augmentation of the income-tax, which had already yielded from this

source £9,582,000, and the addition would give £3,250,000, amounting altogether to £12,832,000. This augmentation would last during the continuance of the war, and should the war terminate during the existence of the tax under the Act of 1853, the augmentation would cease. The difficulty was to raise the remainder without either proposing any other direct tax or reimposing taxes which had been removed. To meet this difficulty, and to go to the consumer in the least oppressive and injurious way, it was proposed to repeat the operation of the previous year on Scotch and Irish spirits, and to augment the duty in Scotland by 1s. per gallon, and in Ireland by 8d. This would be a gain to the exchequer of £450,000. By a readjustment of the sugar duties and a postponement of their reduction £700,000 would be raised. To the proposal to augment the duty on malt considerable antagonism was manifested by the opposition; but Mr. Gladstone went on to say that he considered we might fairly come upon the wealthy for the first charges of the war, but that a national war ought to be borne by all classes. This (ignoring the first part of the remark) Mr. Disraeli afterwards referred to as a kind of communism. The argument in favour of increasing the malt-tax, however, was that it pressed on all, and as it was easily collected, and required no increased staff for the purpose, it seemed to fulfil the conditions which should be sought for. The malt-tax stood, in round figures, at 2s. 9d. per bushel, and Mr. Gladstone proposed to raise it to 4s., which would still leave it lower than it was in 1810, and less than half what it was from 1804 to 1816, during the great war struggle. Taking the consumption at forty million bushels, this would give £2,450,000. The united amounts thus to be obtained by increased income-tax, spirit duty, sugar duty, and malt duty, would be £6,850,000, which was the required sum. Mr. Gladstone next stated that it was necessary to have a resource for extraordinary contingencies, and for a possible rapid increase in the rate of war expenditure. He explained and vindicated his policy with regard to the issue of exchequer bonds, and unfolded his plan for providing the further *interim* funds which would be

required. He would take authority to confirm the contracts for the exchequer bonds of the Class A, and power to issue a second series. He would also take power to issue two millions of exchequer bills, and so many more as should not be taken on the four millions of exchequer bonds. This would give a command of £5,500,000, and the total sum of £66,746,000 of revenue, set against £63,039,000 of expenditure, would show for the year a margin which he would for safety put at three millions and a half.

Among the charges brought against him by his rival was that of want of foresight in originally bringing forward a peace budget where many useful and perhaps necessary means of obtaining revenue were abandoned—when war was so near as to seem inevitable. To this it was replied that it was hardly necessary for the government to meet so absurd an accusation as that of the want of foresight, or to defend themselves for having believed that a sovereign of Europe was a man of honour. He met the charge of having abandoned public revenue, however, by asking in what state the government found the revenue when the income-tax itself was in peril because Mr. Disraeli had thought it consistent with his duty to his sovereign and his country to promise to remodel that tax without any plan for the purpose. The man who did that was the one who surrendered public revenue. In concluding his speech, he said that such was the vigour and elasticity of our trade, that even under the disadvantages of a bad harvest, and under the pressure of war, the imports from day to day and almost from hour to hour were increasing, and the very last papers laid on the table showed that within the closing three months of the year there were £250,000 increase in the exports. In the subsequent discussion Sir John Pakington, Sir E. Bulwer Lytton, and other speakers strongly opposed the government policy, and Lord John Russell rose to reply briefly, but effectively.

Mr. Disraeli again declared that he supported the policy of the war, but that he objected to the malt-tax, since it was not merely unjust and unnecessary, but hampered the industry, crippled the progress, and in

every way injured the agricultural interest of the country. The financial proposals were, however, carried by a large majority. There was yet another sharp discussion between Mr. Disraeli and the chancellor of the exchequer. A few days afterwards, on the subject of the resolution empowering the government to issue £2,000,000 of exchequer bonds, which was opposed by Mr. Baring, Mr. Disraeli charged the government with mismanagement, which had culminated in the necessity for a loan of six millions; and this war in its turn had been so mismanaged that the chancellor of the exchequer had offered four per cent. for the money and yet could not get it. "He had shown himself incompetent to deal with the *bulls* and *bears*, and had been forced to appeal to the *stags* of the Stock Exchange. And now came a last shift for raising a loan in masquerade." To this it was answered that the exchequer bonds were for repayment at a short period, and it had been the opposition who had really advocated the borrowing system and loans in masquerade.

The scheme proposed to the house was evidently too sound to be seriously affected by this kind of opposition. The government had a majority of 104, or 290 votes, while the opposition only gained 186; and though, on the 26th of July, when Lord John Russell moved a vote of credit for £3,000,000, Mr. Disraeli again attacked the government, declaring that there would have been no war if the former administration had remained in power, and again complaining that it was largely due to the evil of a coalition government; the question of a vote of credit had become identified with that of a vote of confidence, and no one ventured to take such decided steps as might lead to the defeat and resignation of the ministry at such a critical moment.

Mr. Gladstone had been one of the foremost to advocate the maintenance of peace by means of negotiations, and unlike many who were of the same mind he had very little belief either in the soundness or the future progress and improvement of the Turkish institutions and government. His opinions on that subject in 1854 differed little (though they

were perhaps not fully developed), from those which he has expressed in later years. But, on the other hand, he could not consent that the ill condition of Turkey should be a reason for submitting to the treachery or the tyranny of Russia, directed to the acquisition of a complete control of the Ottoman Empire and the achievement of a colossal preponderance in Europe. He had already spoken of the almost hopeless expectation of the reform of Turkey and its development into a state which could demand the respect of Europe; and at a later period, when the war was nearly over and a treaty of peace was debated, he declared: "If I thought this treaty was an instrument which bound this country and our posterity to the maintenance of a set of institutions in Turkey which you are endeavouring to reform, if you can, but with respect to which endeavour few can be sanguine, I should look for the most emphatic word in which to express my condemnation of a peace which bound us to maintain the laws and institutions of Turkey as a Mohammedan state." Whilst regretting that more had not been done for the principalities, he defended the war which he and his colleagues of the Aberdeen cabinet had been accused of precipitating, on the grounds that the danger of the encroachment upon, and absorption of Turkey by Russia, was one calculated to bring upon Europe evils none the less formidable than those already existing, and which, as threatening the peace, liberties, and privileges of all, they were called upon to resist with all the means in their power.

In his attitude with regard to the relative claims of Russia and Turkey he was, and he continued to be, consistent, for we find him at a recent date comparing the conditions of the Crimean war with those of the Russo-Turkish contest of 1877, and saying:—

"There was in each case an offender against the law and peace of Europe; Turkey, by her distinct and obstinate breach of covenant, taking, on the latter occasion, the place which Russia had held in the earlier controversy. The difference was that, in 1854-55, two great powers, with the partial support of a third, prosecuted by military means the work they

had undertaken; in 1877 it was left to Russia alone to act as the hand and sword of Europe, with the natural consequence of weighting the scale with the question what compensation she might claim, or would claim, for her efforts and sacrifices."

Again in August, 1877, writing on the subject of various proposals for the occupation of Egypt, he says, "It is most singular that the propagandism of Egyptian occupation seems to proceed principally from those who were always thought to be the fastest friends to the formula of independence and integrity, and on whom the unhappy Turk was encouraged to place a blindfold reliance. I have heard of men on board ship thought to be moribund, whose clothes were sold by auction by their shipmates. And thus, in the hearing of the Turk we are now stimulated to divide his inheritance." Speaking of a proposition to purchase the Egyptian tribute, he says, "I admit that we thus provide the sultan with abundant funds for splendid obsequies. But none the less would this plan sever at a stroke all African territory from an empire likely enough to be also shorn of its provinces in Europe. It seems to me, I own, inequitable, whether in dealing with the Turk or with any one else, to go beyond the necessity of the case. I object to our making him or anybody else a victim to the insatiable maw of these stage-playing British interests. And I think we should decline to bid during his lifetime for this portion of his clothes. It is not sound doctrine that for our own purposes we are entitled to help him downwards to his doom."

We shall have again to refer to Mr. Gladstone's view of the conditions which, if they did not necessitate, completely justified the Crimean war, but it will be seen that he had no leanings towards Turkey, nor did he believe in its development into a healthy state. He could also sympathize with the deep and unalterable feelings which made both Mr. Cobden and Mr. Bright the conscientious opponents of a conflict which they believed to be entirely mischievous. But he could not join them. It may be said, indeed, that these two men at that time stood alone in England. They were not in reality (although they were com-

monly reported to be) identified with those members of the peace party among the Society of Friends who fancied that they might be able to beg a peace of Nicholas of Russia, and whose efforts did much to make war ultimately more certain by impressing the emperor with the notion that it was not desired by the majority of the English people. When in February, 1854, a deputation consisting of Mr. Sturge of Birmingham, Mr. Charlton of Bristol, and Mr. Pease of Darlington, waited on the emperor at St. Petersburg to present an address expressing the sorrow which filled their hearts at the approaching conflict, he was ready enough to reply that he also abhorred war and was ready to forget the past and forgive Turkey if only she would discharge the obligations imposed on her by treaties. Of course it was on the interpretation which Russia, as opposed to the other powers of Europe, placed upon those obligations that the war was about to turn, and did turn. Cobden and Bright contended that the war upon which England had entered was wholly unnecessary, as one with which she had no business, and that even the treaty might have reached a stage of interpretation reasonably acceptable if the country had not been misguided and had neither been hurried nor drifted into hostilities for which there was no justification even on the doubtful grounds of a probable future advantage either to this country or to Europe in general. It would perhaps have been impossible to give stronger proof of an earnest conviction of the truth of their opinions than by the firm attitude which they maintained. They had been the recognized leaders of a great and popular movement, they had achieved a high position and were regarded as the chiefs of a large and influential party, and Cobden at all events had been listened to with profound respect and admiration not only among large bodies of thoughtful politicians in England, but in other countries, where, in theory at least, his doctrines on commercial policy had been widely accepted. Now they saw the faces of these former friends and supporters averted. The public meetings which had formerly been the prompt and effectual means by which they moved the

opinion and raised the enthusiasm of the country, would no longer have responded to their summons, even if they had ventured to call them. Yet they stood, as it were, side by side, strong, dignified, and although they were sorrowful, not without the hope that sustains men who act on a deep and immovable principle, that the time will at last come when that principle will be recognized and their convictions and even their denunciations be endorsed by the national verdict. Alike in aim, swayed by the same powerful impulses, and using much the same arguments, they each appealed in a different and characteristic manner. Cobden was calm, logical, in a certain sense philosophical; Bright was logical, scarcely what would be called philosophical, and certainly not always calm. He was fervid, prone to the kind of oratorical intensity which when dealing with an object of aversion is apt to exaggerate its hateful qualities by admitting no extenuating circumstances. To him war, or in other words physical force as an outcome of moral force, was utterly repulsive, or at all events it is difficult to imagine that he would have endorsed any modern war as being either necessary or excusable. It would be a curious metaphysical inquiry how far a man, religious, thoughtful, humane, energetic, and with a sincere and unswerving love of liberty, could demand the right of opposing moral force and of uttering strong protest and fierce denunciation against evil and injustice, and yet deny that there are conditions where the only effectual demonstration of moral opposition would be physical antagonism. We need not enter into so difficult a question. It may suffice to say that Mr. Bright has been called, and not without truth as regards his public addresses and appeals, the most belligerent advocate of peace that ever lived. It has probably been often said that it was a very good thing that he obstinately held war to be almost always indefensible and unlawful, as otherwise his great ability might have gained him an influential position in the government, and his pugnacity in conjunction with that of Lord Palmerston would have left us few chances of maintaining peace. From their point of view, however, the arguments of both



JOHN BRIGHT

FROM A PHOTOGRAPH

Cobden and Bright were forcible and their reasoning cogent, while it is to be noted that they were often far-reaching and embraced many other matters of advanced political significance which have since that date come to the front not only in theoretical but in practical politics. It need scarcely be said that Cobden had been an advocate of peace as a necessary means of retrenchment and material and social progress before the topic became concreted by the outbreak of the Crimean war. It was remarkable that that war, which he thought, and justly thought, should emphasize all these utterances, was the occasion of the whole nation becoming deaf to his representations, and even retorting upon him with suspicion and with indignant accusations.

Cobden at that time may be said to have retired to his new home at Dunford, near Midhurst, where he spent all his time (and he had little leisure) which was not occupied in parliament, in attending meetings, or in making journeys to advocate or explain those principles in which he was constantly interested. His business had not been successful and had therefore been closed, a considerable proportion of the sum of money subscribed for him as a national testimonial having been devoted to the payment of outstanding claims. The house which he had purchased with part of the remaining amount was no mansion nor was the domain extensive. On one occasion, when addressing a meeting at Aylesbury on the relations of landlord and tenant, he illustrated some remark by referring to his own small property. A man in the crowd interrupted him by shouting the inquiry how he had got his property. The answer was unhesitating and simple enough:—"I am indebted for it to the bounty of my countrymen. It was the scene of my birth and infancy; it was the property of my ancestors; and it is by the munificence of my countrymen that this small estate, which had been alienated from my father by necessity, has again come into my hands and enabled me to light up afresh the hearth of my father, where I spent my own childhood. I say that no warrior-duke who owns a vast domain by the vote of the imperial parliament holds his property by a more honourable title than I possess mine."

This was, of course, before the death of the Duke of Wellington; and though his reference to the enormous rewards conferred on the great soldier may at first seem somewhat harsh, it was not intended to have a special personal application. In 1852, after the funeral of Wellington, he wrote to Mr. Sturge:—"The death of the duke would, one thinks, tend to weaken the military party. But if the spirit survive it will find its champions. After all, if the country will do such work as Wellington was called on to perform, I don't know that it could find a more honest instrument. He hated jobs and spoke the truth (the very opposite of Marlborough), and although he grew rich in the service it was by the voluntary contributions of the parliament and government. If he had been told to help himself at the exchequer his modesty and honesty would never have allowed him to take as much as was forced upon him. I who saw with what frenzy of admiration he was welcomed by all classes at the Exhibition can never honestly admit that, in what the legislature and government had done for him, they had exceeded the wishes of the nation."¹

These few words are singularly suggestive, and naturally lead to a deeper consideration of Cobden's political views than would be occasioned by many a longer but more superficial extract from his speeches. He also seems to have mellowed, and his views to have become wider if not clearer, amidst the rural pleasures and repose which he was able to enjoy at Dunford, before he was for a time almost prostrated by a great domestic calamity—the sudden death of his eldest son, and the painful condition to which the shock of that bereavement reduced Mrs. Cobden. It is worth while to pause for a moment to read his own description of the place which he had made his home during the summer months, for it shows not only the gentle nature of the man, but how simply and yet

¹ The reader who would learn more fully the character and opinions of the eminent free-trader and peace advocate will best find them displayed in Mr. John Morley's excellent work, *The Life of Richard Cobden*, where the biography of the man is furnished no less by selections from his speeches, letters, and conversation than by the careful comments which accompany them.

with what genuine graphic force he wrote even in ordinary correspondence. It occurs in a letter to Mr. Ashworth:—"I have been for some weeks in one of the most secluded corners of England. Although my letter is dated from the quiet little close borough of Midhurst, the house in which I am living is about one and a half mile distant, in the neighbouring rural parish of Heyshott. The roof which now shelters me is the one under which I was born, and the room where I now sleep is the one in which I first drew breath. It is an old farm-house, which had for many years been turned into labourers' cottages. With the aid of the whitewasher and carpenter we have made a comfortable, weather-proof retreat for summer; and we are surrounded with pleasant woods and within a couple of miles of the summit of the South Down Hills, where we have the finest air and some of the prettiest views in England. At some future day I shall be delighted to initiate you into rural life. A Sussex hill-side village will be an interesting field for an exploring excursion for you. We have a population under three hundred in our parish. The acreage is about 2000, of which one proprietor, Colonel Wyndham, owns 1200 acres. He is a non-resident, as indeed are all the other proprietors. The clergyman is also non-resident. He lives at the village of Sledham, about three miles distant, where he has another living and a parsonage-house. He comes over to our parish to perform service once on Sundays alternately in the morning and afternoon. The church is in a ruinous state, the tower having fallen down many years ago. The parson draws about £300 a year in tithes, besides the produce of a few acres of glebe-land. He is a decent man with a large family, spoken well of by everybody, and himself admits the evils of clerical absenteeism. We have no school and no schoolmaster, unless I give that title to a couple of cottages where illiterate old women collect a score or two of infants while their parents are in the fields. Thus 'our village' is without resident proprietors, or clergyman, or schoolmaster. Add to these disadvantages that the farmers are generally deficient of capital and do not

employ so many labourers as they might. The rates have been up to this time about six shillings in the pound. We are not under the new poor-law but in a Gilbert's Union, and almost all our expense is for outdoor relief. Here is a picture which will lead you to expect, when you visit us, a very ignorant and very poor population. There is no post-office in the village. Every morning an old man aged about seventy goes into Midhurst for the letters. He charges a penny for every despatch he carries, including such miscellaneous articles as horse-collars, legs of mutton, empty sacks, and wheel-barrows. His letter-bag for the whole village contains on an average from two to three letters daily, including newspapers. The only newspapers which enter the parish are two copies of *Bell's Weekly Messenger*, a sound old Tory Protectionist much patronized by drowsy farmers. The wages paid by the farmers are very low, not exceeding eight shillings a week. I am employing an old man nearly seventy, and his son about twenty-two, and his nephew about nineteen, at digging and removing some fences. I pay the two former nine shillings a week and the last eight shillings, and I am giving a shilling a week more than anybody else is paying. What surprises me is to observe how well the poor fellows work and how long they last. The South Down air, in the absence of South Down mutton, has something to do with the healthiness of these people, I dare say. The labourers have generally a garden and an allotment of a quarter of an acre; for the latter they pay 3s. 9d. a year rent. We are in the midst of woods and on the border of common land, so that fuel is cheap. All the poor have a right to cut turf on the common for their firing, which costs 2s. 3d. per thousand. The labourers who live in my cottages have pigs in their sties, but I believe it is not so universally. I have satisfied myself that however badly off the labourers may be at present, their condition was worse in the time of high-priced corn. In 1847, when bread was double its present price, the wages of the farm labourers were not raised more than two to three shillings a week. At that time a man with a family spent all that he

earned for bread, and still had not enough to sustain his household. I have it both from the labourers themselves and the millers from whom they buy their flour that they ran so deeply in debt for food during the high prices of 1847 that they have scarcely been able, in some cases up to the present, to pay off their score. The *class feeling* among the agricultural labourers is in favour of a cheap loaf. They dare not say much about it openly, but their instincts are serving them in the absence of economical knowledge, and they are unanimously against Chowler and the Protectionists. I can hardly pretend that in this world’s-end spot we can say that any impulse has been given to the demand for agricultural labourers by the free-trade policy. Ours is about the last place that will feel its good effects. But there is one good sign that augurs well for the future. Skilled labourers, such as masons, joiners, blacksmiths, painters, and so on, are in very great request, and it is difficult to get work of that kind done in moderate time. I am inclined to think that in more favourable situations an impulse has likewise been imparted to unskilled labour. It is certain that during the late harvest-time there was a great difficulty in obtaining hands on the south side of the Downs towards the sea-coast, where labour is in more demand than here under the north side of the hills. I long to live to see an agricultural labourer strike for wages!”

Without reference to the opinions expressed it will be seen how large a number of important topics is included in this extract from a simple friendly letter, and the ready ease with which each of those topics is in turn made strongly suggestive. The whole quotation may stand for an example of Cobden’s style and manner of writing and speaking—the only difference being the added strength of terse and often vivid illustration, and earnest though quiet emphasis when he was addressing an audience. But we must look at him for a moment in relation to the war.

Cobden had strong and mostly positive opinions on those subjects which were agitating political circles. For Irish difficulties he had but one plan, though he confessed he did not know how it could be enforced. He would

have cut up the land into small properties, leaving no estates so large as to favour absenteeism even from the parish. In order to provide the means of reducing taxation he would have proposed a “people’s budget,” an outline of which he sketched in a letter to Mr. Bright, and the provisions of which were doubtless in accord with the efforts of the Financial Reform Association. “I have been thinking and talking,” he said, “about concocting a national budget” to serve for an object for financial reformers to work up to and to prevent their losing their time upon vague generalities. The plan must be one to unite all classes and interests, and to bring into one agitation the counties and the towns. I propose to reduce the army, navy, and ordnance from £18,500,000 to £10,000,000, and thus save £8,500,000. Upon the civil expenditure in all its branches, including the cost of collecting revenue and the management of crown-lands, I propose to save £500,000. I propose to lay a probate and legacy duty on real property to affect both entailed and unentailed estates, by which would be got £1,500,000. Here is £11,500,000 to be used in reducing and abolishing duties, which I propose to dispose of as follows:—

“*Customs.*—Tea, reduce duty to 1s. per lb.; wood and timber, abolish duties; butter and cheese, abolish duties.

“Upwards of 100 smaller articles of the tariff to be abolished. (I would only leave about fifteen articles in the tariff paying customs duties.)

“*Excise.*—Malt, paper, soap, and hops, all duty abolished; window-tax and advertisement duty, all off.

“All these changes could be effected with £11,500,000. There are other duties which I should prefer to remove instead of one or two of them; but I have been guided materially by a desire to bring all interests to sympathize with the scheme. Thus the tea is to catch the merchants and all the old women in the country; the wood and timber, the shipbuilder; the malt and hops, the farmers; paper and soap, the Scotch anti-excise people; the window-tax, the shopocracy of London, Bath, &c.; the advertisements, the press.”

It is not to be supposed that Cobden had any strong expectations that his proposals to open negotiations with other countries for the reduction of armaments would be accepted. He firmly believed that the principles on which he had always opposed war were true, and he doubtless hoped that they would one day receive full recognition. He had persisted in advocating free-trade, and the corn-laws had been repealed, while there was a continued tendency to abolish or to diminish taxes on articles of necessary consumption. The same result might ultimately be achieved with regard to the mitigation of one of the chief causes of the burdens on the people of England and of other countries, and it was his duty not to let the subject rest whenever he had an opportunity of reviving it. When everybody was talking about the "Palace of Peace," and the results that might be expected from the Great International Exhibition, he estimated such probabilities at a lower value than many of those who two years afterwards were among the foremost advocates of war. What he did was to propose that the foreign minister should take advantage of the favourable opportunity to open negotiations with France for reducing the armed forces, and so setting an example to Europe. It was admitted that it would be a glorious consummation of the great peace congress, and one devoutly to be wished. Lord Palmerston and the majority of the government and the houses of parliament were ready to endorse the sentiment warmly enough, but to carry it into practice was quite another matter. The maxim that the best security for peace was to be always prepared for war had been too long accepted to be easily relinquished, although as a matter of fact England was not prepared for the war with Russia, and had to adopt a foreign enlistment bill in order to meet the sudden call for men to go to the Crimea. Cobden's complete doctrine condemned the recent subscription to foreign loans for military purposes. He had in 1848 declared that if Lord Palmerston had firmly protested against the Russian invasion of Hungary the czar would never have given his aid to Austria, and he denounced with all his energy the Austrian and

Russian loans, amounting respectively to seven and five and a half millions of exported capital to be lost in foreign wars. Such a course he contended was contrary not only to the principles of political economy but to the claims of morality. What paradox could be more flagrant than for a citizen to lend money to be the means of military preparations on the part of a foreign power when he knew, or ought to have known, that these very preparations for which he was providing would in their turn impose upon himself and the other taxpayers of his own country the burden of counter-preparations to meet them? What man with the most rudimentary sense of public duty could pretend that it was no affair of his to what use his money was put, so long as his interest was high and his security adequate? Austria with Russia had been engaged in a cruel and remorseless war, and then came stretching forth her blood-stained hand to honest Dutchmen and Englishmen, asking them to furnish the price of that hateful devastation. Not only was such a system a waste of national wealth, an anticipation of income, a destruction of capital, the imposition of a heavy and profitless burden on future generations; but it was a direct connivance at acts and a policy which the very men who were thus asked to lend their money to support it, professed to dislike and condemn, and had good reason for disliking and condemning. The system of foreign loans for warlike purposes by which England, Holland, Germany, and France were invited to pay for the arms, clothing, and food of the belligerents was a system calculated to perpetuate the horrors of war. Those who lent money for such purposes were destitute of any of those excuses by which men justify a resort to the sword. They could not plead patriotism, self-defence, or even anger, or the lust of military glory. They sat down coolly to calculate the chances to themselves of profit or loss in a game in which the lives of human beings were at stake. They had not even the savage and brutal gratification which the old pagans had, after they had paid for a seat in the amphitheatre, of witnessing the bloody combats of gladiators in the circus.

Such emphatic declarations were not likely to be palatable to city capitalists, nor to those who could not or would not go deeply enough into the question to prevent their asking why, if money was a commodity, they might not trade with it without asking the purpose for which it was to be used, looking only to the mercantile value to be placed upon it. This question, it will be seen, did not really touch Cobden's position, since he could have replied by denying the moral right so to deal with any commodity whatever; but there was a far different question which men who agreed with many of his political and most of his moral principles had to ask, What were the circumstances which justified interposition in foreign affairs, and what were the grounds for refusing material aid in money or in arms for the support of a just cause? Both Cobden and Bright would have answered this question by referring to those wars in which we had interposed for the alleged purpose of preventing the tyranny of a stronger over a weaker power, and by showing that in such cases prompt and decided expression of opinion would have prevented hostilities which mostly arose from the neglect of such an arrangement of just interests as could be effected by wise and truly moral arbitration. It may perhaps be said that supposing the *grounds* of interference had been the same, the difference between Cobden's and Palmerston's policy was that one would have been a serious and emphatic appeal to moral obligations, and the other a strong representation of the demands of international law with a threat of punishment for the breach of it. One represented the serious remonstrances of the onlooker ready to arbitrate; the other the sharp protest of the policeman with his hand on a truncheon.

Of course the inevitable inquiry was how would a ruler like the czar receive a moral remonstrance unaccompanied by the implied threat, that in case of refusal it might be followed by a resort to compulsion? Cobden himself gave some colour to this question by representing that had the proper steps been taken at first Russia would have receded, because she would not have dared to provoke hostilities. “I look back with regret,” he said

in 1855, “to the vote which changed Lord Derby's government. I regret the result of that motion, for it has cost the country a hundred millions of treasure, and between thirty and forty thousand good lives.” This was a strong declaration, but it has since been endorsed by a large number of thoughtful men who never acknowledged that the results of the Crimean campaign were other than extravagantly purchased. Cobden, however, was not of course opposed to a protective force, or as he said in a letter to Colonel Fitzmayer, “to the maintenance of a disciplined force to serve as a nucleus in case of war, around which the people might rally to defend their country. But there is,” he continued, “hardly a case to be imagined or assumed in which I would consent to send out a body of land forces to fight the battles of the Continent; and last of all would I agree to send such an expedition to the shores of Russia.”

Cobden, although he advocated peace, had a very shrewd notion of the way in which we might have commenced war. He was quite opposed to Palmerston's opinion that 60,000 French and English troops would, with the co-operation of the navy, take Sebastopol in six weeks, and he also stated, even if the fortress were to be taken and destroyed, it would neither give a disastrous blow to Russia nor prevent future attacks upon Turkey. He said truly enough that we knew nothing about the real strength or strategical importance of Sebastopol, and added that he thought he could have obtained full information on the subject at an earlier period of the war for the cost of a few thousand pounds. If we were to defend Turkey against Russia it should be by the use of the navy and not by sending a land force to the Crimea. It will be seen, therefore, that he was not only opposed to Lord Palmerston and those who supported his policy in believing that these hostilities might have been prevented, but in the opinion that they had been misconducted. This kind of opposition was irritating enough no doubt, and probably Palmerston felt it to be so. At any rate it seems to have given occasion for an exhibition of that “patrician bullying from the treasury bench” to which Disraeli

once alluded with telling sarcasm. Cobden during a debate had said that under certain conditions he would fight, or if he could not fight would work for the wounded in the hospitals. "Well," was Palmerston's retort, "there are many people in this country who think that the party to which he belongs should go immediately into a hospital of a different kind, and which I shall not mention."

This was no uncommon manner of treating the representations of Cobden among the war party outside the House of Commons. During the whole of the time during which the war was prosecuted with an enthusiasm that was afterwards followed by a demand for searching inquiry, he was spoken of with derision or dislike even among people who had once regarded him as their political leader. The newspapers were filled with abuse of "Cobden, Bright, & Co.," as Palmerston once designated them in a letter, and Mr. Bright was burned in effigy. At the best they were regarded as doctrinaires or fanatics. Neither of these men swerved from their first assertions, however. Cobden held precisely the same opinions when, four years later, Lord Palmerston invited him to become a member of the cabinet. His views on public questions had undergone little or no change. Both he and Mr. Bright had learned that though to offer what they deemed to be explanations, appeals, or exhortations during the time when the nation was urging or was urged in the direction of war might be followed by good results, such endeavours were useless amidst the tumult of the conflict. It increased their hatred of war to believe that it had the effect of making men reckless of such appeals. "It is no use to argue," said Cobden, when speaking some years afterwards of the war in America, "It is no use to argue as to what is the origin of the war, and no use whatever to advise the disputants. From the moment the first shot is fired or the first blow is struck in a dispute, then farewell to all reason and argument; you might as well reason with mad dogs as with men when they have begun to spill each other's blood in mortal combat. I was so convinced of the fact during the Crimean war, I was so convinced of the

utter uselessness of raising one's voice in opposition to war when it has once begun, that I made up my mind that so long as I was in political life, should a war again break out between England and a great power, I would never open my mouth upon the subject from the time the first gun was fired until the peace was made."

But by the time of the American war the principles which both Cobden and Bright had enunciated were much better understood. The peace party failed to make the Crimean invasion serve as an immediate illustration of their policy, but it is by no means certain that it did not assume to many minds the force of an example of the value of their principles. At any rate there began the development of a feeling that armed intervention, and even the threat of it, should no longer be regarded as the foremost British influence in relation to European quarrels and supposed "British interests."

The mention of "British interests" may well give us occasion to hear Mr. Gladstone on the subject of the origin and reasons of the Crimean war. His words are perhaps even more worthy of attention from the fact that they were written in 1878, twenty-four years after the period to which they relate. They occur in a review of that *Life of the Prince Consort* by Mr. (afterwards Sir) Theodore Martin, already quoted in these pages.

Mr. Gladstone says it would be curious to ascertain the precise date at which the idea was first broached that British interests required the maintenance of the Ottoman Empire, and states his belief that it is later than 1828, when we were engaged in a policy of coercion against Turkey, out of which, just before, had grown the battle of Navarino. In that debate Lord Holland delivered a speech which appeared to show that we had ancient alliances with Russia, that we had no treaty at all with Turkey before 1799, that the treaty concluded was only for seven years, that it was simply part and parcel of our military measures against France, and that it began with these words:—"His Britannic majesty, connected already with his majesty the Em-

peror of Russia by the ties of the strictest alliance, accedes by the present treaty to the defensive alliance which has just been concluded between his majesty the Ottoman emperor and the Emperor of Russia." The doctrine of upholding the Ottoman Empire for the sake of British interests was far from being generally recognized by statesmen of the last generation, and Mr. Gladstone distinctly says:—"It may be boldly affirmed that it was not the avowed doctrine of the British government in the proceedings immediately anterior to the Crimean war." He believes the idea "may probably be traced in the policy of 1840 and the armed assistance lent to the decrepit empire against its Egyptian vassal," and that it "grew with rapidity, fostered by the rather womanish suspicions and alarms on behalf of India of which Russia gradually became the object." It has, he says, "grown with greater rapidity since the Crimean war in proportion to the increased susceptibility of the country, which has almost learned to regard political alarm as standing in the first class of its luxuries—those, namely, which are daily and indispensable." Mr. Gladstone puts the case distinctly enough; and whatever may have been the necessity for actual hostilities, it is a vindication of the position assumed by England. At the outset the quarrel was one between Russia and France in regard to ecclesiastical privileges at the holy places. England was but an *amicus curiæ*, and in that capacity she thought Russia in the right. As, however, communications went on the czar unfortunately committed his case to a special envoy, Prince Menschikoff, whose demands upon the Porte appeared to the British government to render harmony in the Turkish Empire, if they should be accepted, thenceforth impossible. In the further stages of the correspondence, which had thus shifted its ground, we found ourselves in company with France, and not with France only but with Europe. At one particular point it must in fairness be allowed that Russia, with her single rapier, had all her antagonists at a disadvantage. They had collectively accepted, and they proposed to her a note known as the Vienna Note, which she also accepted; and

they afterward receded from it upon objection being taken by Turkey. Russia, however, covered the miscarriage of her opponents by sustaining the Turkish interpretation of the words, and thus sheltered their retreat from the support of the document they themselves had framed. But it was not upon this miscarriage that the dispute came to a final issue. The broken threads of the negotiation were pieced together, and about the time when the year expired a new instrument of a moderate and conciliatory character was framed at Constantinople and approved by the cabinets of the five powers still in unbroken union. It was the rejection of this plan by the Emperor Nicholas, when it was presented to him in January, 1854, and not his refusal of Turkish amendments of the Vienna Note, that brought about the war in the following March. This, Mr. Gladstone affirms, vindicates the British policy against the accusation of selfishness. As against the charge of Quixotry he says:—"If it is wholly unwise and unwarrantable for one power to constitute itself the judge and the avenger of European law, is it wholly wise and reasonable for two? So far as a question of this kind can be answered in the abstract, undoubtedly it is not. It is a precedent by no means free from danger: a couple of states cannot claim for themselves European authority. But this was not the enterprise on which France and England advisedly set out. They began their work say from the time of the Menschikoff mission in close association with Austria and with Prussia; and the four together were the only powers who, by established usage, could represent the concert of Europe in a case where the fifth, an only remaining power of the first order, was itself the panel in the dock. They pursued their work in harmony through the whole of the year 1853. With March, 1854, came the crisis. Austria urged the two leading states, England and France, to send in their *ultimatum* to Russia, and promised it her decided support. She redeemed the pledge, but only to the extent of a strong verbal advocacy. Without following out the subsequent detail of her proceedings, she rendered thereafter to the allies but equivocal and uncertain service; without,

however, disavowing their policy either in act or word. It was Prussia which, at the critical moment, to speak in homely language, bolted; the very policy which she had recommended, she declined unconditionally to sustain, from the first moment when it began to assume the character of a solid and stern reality. In fact, she broke up the European concert, by which it was that France and England had hoped, and had had a right to hope, to put down the stubbornness of the czar, and to repel his attack upon the public law of Europe. The question that these allies had now to determine was whether, armed as they had been all along with the panoply of moral authority, they would, upon this unfortunate and discreditable desertion, allow all their demands, their reasonings, their professions, to melt into thin air. . . . Would such a retreat by two such powers have been for the permanent advantage of European honour, or legality, or peace?"

We must now turn to the occurrences of which both parliamentary proceedings and expressions of public opinion were indications, and we shall have to look back a little in order to measure the progress of events. Probably the departure of our fleet for the Baltic was in the public eye the most significant of the preparations for an arduous struggle, and at the time it was made much of, although it was afterwards found to be of little practical importance so far as naval operations were concerned. There had already been a grand naval review at Spithead. The Grenadier and the Coldstream Guards had been cheered by an enthusiastic concourse as they departed from Waterloo Station for Southampton, the Fusiliers had marched from Wellington Barracks, and as they passed had been cheered by the queen and the royal family from a balcony at Buckingham Palace. On the 11th of March (1854) the Baltic fleet, under Admiral Sir Charles Napier, had left Spithead, having been visited by her majesty and (so to speak) led out to sea by the royal yacht, which kept its place at the head for some distance and then stopped till the great armada had swept by.

The sailing of the Baltic fleet had been heralded by a banquet given to its commander Admiral Sir Charles Napier at the Reform Club; Lord Palmerston presided and made an after-dinner speech, which has since been characterized as the kind of oration in which a jocular elderly gentleman would propose the bride and bridegroom at a wedding-breakfast. This is not an exact description of it; but it was not in the best of taste, considering that the occasion was one which was sufficiently serious to make grave statesmen anxious, and it came to be singularly out of tune with the results of Napier's expedition, about which the gallant admiral had six months afterwards a bitter dispute with Sir James Graham, who, as first lord of the admiralty, called his judgment and energy in question. The immediate result of Lord Palmerston's vivacity was a grave remonstrance by Mr. Bright in the House of Commons. It may be interesting to give a passage or two of what the home secretary really did say, or at all events of the portion which displeased others who were perhaps neither so earnest nor so serious as Mr. Bright. As an after-dinner speech it was doubtless amusing enough, and Lord Palmerston was perhaps not altogether inexcusable in resenting any public comment upon such a matter in the House of Commons; but his retort on Mr. Bright was even in worse form than the speech itself.

"There was," said his lordship when he rose to propose the toast of the evening, "a very remarkable entertainer of dinner company called Sir R. Preston, who lived in the city, and who, when he gave dinners at Greenwich, after gorging his guests with turtle, used to turn round to the waiters and say, 'Now bring dinner.' Gentlemen, we have had the toasts which correspond with the turtle, and now let's go to dinner. Now let us drink the toast which belongs to the real occasion of our assembling here. I give you 'The health of my gallant friend Sir Charles Napier,' who sits beside me. If, gentlemen, I were addressing a Hampshire audience consisting of country gentlemen residing in that county, to which my gallant friend and myself belong, I should introduce him to your notice as an eminent agri-

culturist. It has been my good fortune, when enjoying his hospitality at Merchistoun Hall, to receive most valuable instructions from him while walking over his farm about stall-feeding, growing turnips, wire-fencing, under-draining, and the like. My gallant friend is a match for everything, and whatever he turns his hand to he generally succeeds in it. However, gentlemen, he now, like Cincinnatus, leaves his plough, puts on his armour, and is prepared to do that good service to his country which he will always perform whenever an opportunity is afforded to him.

"I pass over those earlier exploits of his younger days which are well known to the members of his profession; but perhaps one of the most remarkable exploits of his life is that which he performed in the same cause of liberty and justice in which he is now about to be engaged. In the year 1833, when gallantly volunteering to serve the cause of the Queen of Portugal against the encroachments and the usurpations of Don Miguel—to defend constitutional rights and liberties against arbitrary power—he took command of a modest fleet of frigates and corvettes, and at the head of that little squadron he captured a squadron far superior in force, including two line-of-battle ships, one of which my gallant friend was the first to board. But on that occasion my gallant friend exhibited a characteristic trait. When he had scrambled on the deck of this great line-of-battle ship, and was clearing the deck of those who had possession of it, a Portuguese officer ran at him full dart with his drawn sword to run him through. My gallant friend quietly parried the thrust, and, not giving himself the trouble to deal in any other way with his Portuguese assailant, merely gave him a hearty kick and sent him down the hatchway. Well, gentlemen, that victory was a great event. I don't mean the victory over the officer who went down; but the victory over the fleet, which my gallant friend took into port; for that victory decided a great cause then pending. It decided the liberties of Portugal; it decided the question between constitutional and arbitrary power—a contest which began in Portugal, and which went on afterwards in Spain, when my gallant

friend Sir De Lacy Evans lent his powerful aid in the same cause, and with the same success. My gallant friend Sir Charles Napier, however, got the first turn of fortune, and it was mainly owing to that victory of his that the Queen of Portugal afterwards occupied the throne to which she was rightfully entitled, and the Portuguese nation obtained that constitution which they have ever since enjoyed. A noble friend of mine, now no more, whose loss I greatly lament, for he was equally distinguished as a man, as a soldier, and as a diplomatist, the late Lord William Russell—an honour to his country as to his family—told me that one day he heard that my gallant friend Sir Charles Napier was in the neighbourhood of the fortress of Valenza, a Portuguese fortress some considerable distance from the squadron which he commanded. Lord W. Russell and Colonel Hare went to see my gallant friend, and Lord W. Russell told me that they met a man dressed in a very easy way, followed by a fellow with two muskets on his shoulders. They took him at first for Robinson Crusoe; but who should these men prove to be but the gallant admiral on my right, and a marine behind him. 'Well, Napier,' said Lord W. Russell, 'what are you doing here?' 'Why,' said my gallant friend, 'I am waiting to take Valenza.' 'But,' said Lord William, 'Valenza is a fortified town, and you must know that we soldiers understand how fortified towns are taken. You must open trenches; you must make approaches; you must establish a battery in breach; and all this takes a good deal of time, and must be done according to rule.' 'Oh,' said my gallant friend, 'I have no time for all that. I have got some of my blue jackets up here and a few of my ship's guns, and I mean to take the town with a letter;' and so he did. He sent the governor a letter to tell him he had much better surrender at discretion. The governor was a very sensible man; and so surrender he did. So the trenches and the approaches, the battery, breach, and all that, were saved, and the town of Valenza was handed over to the Queen of Portugal. Well, the next great occasion in which my gallant friend took a prominent and distinguished

part—a part for which I can assure you that I personally in my official capacity, and the government to which I had the honour to belong, felt deeply indebted and obliged to him—was the occasion of the war in Syria. There my gallant friend distinguished himself as usual at sea and on shore. All was one to him, wherever an enemy was to be found; and I feel sure that when the enemy was found the enemy wished to Heaven he had not been found. Well, my gallant friend landed with his marines, headed a Turkish detachment, defeated the Egyptian troops, gained a very important victory, stormed the town of Sidon, captured three or four thousand Egyptian prisoners, and afterwards took a prominent part in the attack and capture of the important fortress of Acre. I am bound to say that the government to which I belonged in sending those instructions which led to the attack upon Acre were very much guided by the opinions which we had received of the practicability of that achievement in letters from my gallant friend.”

Whether the effects of the banquet still remained in a touch of gout which made him unusually irritable, or whether he felt it to be a monstrous proceeding to attack him for words uttered at “the social board,” and perhaps intended to infuse spirit and cheerfulness into an otherwise dull assembly, cannot be easily determined; but it is certain that Lord Palmerston resented with quite unwonted bitterness the reference made to the tone and temper of his remarks at the Napier banquet. Mr. Bright’s expressions were certainly strong; he had, he said, read the proceedings with pain and humiliation, the reckless levity displayed being in his opinion discreditable to the grave and responsible statesmen of a civilized and Christian nation. Palmerston rose to reply, and commenced in his jaunty manner, “Sir, the honourable and *reverend* gentleman”—upon which Cobden stood up to call the attention of the speaker to the phrase as flippant, undeserved, and not justified by the rules of the house. “I will not quarrel about the words,” retorted Palmerston; “but as the honourable gentleman has been pleased to advert to the circumstance of my being chairman at the

dinner to which allusion has been made, and as he has been kind enough to express an opinion as to my conduct on that occasion, I deem it right to inform the honourable gentleman that any opinion he may entertain either of me personally or of my conduct private or political is to me a matter of the most perfect indifference.” This was received with some laughter and a good deal of cheering, and Palmerston continued, “I am further convinced that the opinion of this country with regard to me and to my conduct will in no way be influenced by anything that the honourable gentleman may say; I therefore treat the censure of the honourable gentleman with the most perfect indifference and contempt.” The laughter and cheering were repeated at this; but they were mingled with cries of remonstrance. “Is that parliamentary or not?” said the veteran gladiator. “If it is not I do not insist on the expression.”

Surely there must have been a kind of answering note of defiance or of pugnacity between Lord Palmerston and Mr. Bright, and this, the first unmodified expression of it, came from the elder antagonist. But Palmerston could scarcely have felt either the contempt or the indifference of which he almost boastfully protested. The opinions enforced by an orator of Mr. Bright’s power,—by the successful advocate of free-trade,—would not always fall on the ears of a community dull with the roar of war; and it is pretty certain that though they may not have affected the public estimate with regard to Lord Palmerston personally, they had much to do with the change which came over English policy after Palmerston’s death and with the impossibility of repeating a personal influence such as Palmerston’s, even had there been another statesman possessing his peculiar abilities and qualifications. But what were Mr. Bright’s opinions? The country was not altogether a stranger to them, and whatever they may have been, they were not, could not be, contemptible. Many of his declarations may have been founded on an erroneous impression of the facts of the case; his conclusions may have been drawn from imperfect information of diplomatic movements, exact knowledge of

which could scarcely be obtained outside the cabinet; he may entirely have mistaken the causes and the claims by which the attitude of England had been determined; but at least he had something to say worth listening to, and men had listened already. Far beyond the meeting of the Peace Society, at whose conference in Edinburgh he had spoken in October in the previous year, many of his words on the then impending struggle had been effectual in arousing serious attention to what war really meant for the people of a country. Perhaps nobody could venture to contradict that portion of his declarations; but his representations of the reasons for which wars were undertaken, and the principle on which they were maintained, at once challenged denial, and were of course utterly repudiated by his opponents.

“What is it,” he asked, “that we really want here? We wish to protest against the maintenance of great armaments in times of peace; we wish to protest against the spirit which is not only willing for war but eager for war; and we wish to protest, with all the emphasis of which we are capable, against the mischievous policy pursued so long by this country, of interfering with the internal affairs of other countries, and thereby leading to disputes, and often to disastrous wars.”

“I mentioned last night what it was we were annually spending on our armaments. Admiral Napier says that the hon. member for the West Riding, who can do everything, had persuaded a feeble government to reduce the armaments of this country to ‘nothing.’ What is ‘nothing’ in the admiral’s estimation? Fifteen millions a year! Was all that money thrown away? We have it in the estimates, we pay it out of the taxes; it is appropriated by parliament, it sustains your dockyards, pays the wages of your men, and maintains your ships. Fifteen millions sterling paid in the very year when the admiral says that my honourable friend reduced the armaments of the country to nothing! But take the sums which we spent for the past year in warlike preparation—seventeen millions, and the interest on debt caused by war—twenty-eight millions sterling, and it amounts to £45,000,000.

What are our whole exports? Even this year, far the largest year of exports we have ever known, they may amount to £80,000,000. Well, then, plant some one at the mouth of every harbour and port in the United Kingdom, and let him take every alternate ship that leaves your rivers and your harbours with all its valuable cargo on board, and let him carry it off as tribute, and it will not amount to the cost that you pay every year for a war, that fifty years ago was justified as much as it is attempted to justify this impending war, and for the preparations which you now make after a peace which has lasted for thirty-eight years.

“Every twenty years—in a nation’s life nothing, in a person’s life something—every twenty years a thousand millions sterling out of the industry of the hard-working people of this United Kingdom are extorted, appropriated, and expended to pay for that unnecessary and unjust war, and for the absurd and ruinous expenditure which you now incur. A thousand millions every twenty years! Apply a thousand millions, not every twenty years, but for one period of twenty years, to objects of good in this country, and it would be rendered more like a paradise than anything that history records of man’s condition, and would make so great a change in these islands that a man having seen them as they are now, and seeing them as they might then be, would not recognize them as the same country, nor our population as the same people. But what do we expend all this for? Bear in mind that admirals, and generals, and statesmen defended that great war; and that your newspapers, with scarcely an exception, were in favour of it, and denounced and ostracised hundreds of good men who dared, as we dare now, to denounce the spirit which would again lead this country into war. We went to war that France should not choose its own government; the grand conclusion was that no Bonaparte should sit on the throne of France; yet France has all along been changing its government from that time to this, and now we find ourselves with a Bonaparte on the throne of France, and, for anything I know to the contrary, likely to

remain there a good while. So far, therefore, for the calculations of our forefathers, and for the results of that enormous expenditure which they have saddled upon us.

“We object to these great armaments as provoking a war spirit. I should like to ask what was the object of the Chobham Exhibition? There were special trains at the disposal of members of parliament, to go down to Chobham the one day, and to Spithead the other. What was the use of our pointing to the President of the French Republic two years ago, who is the emperor now, and saying that he was spending his time at playing at soldiers in his great camp at Satory, and in making great circuses for the amusement of his soldiers? We, too, are getting into the way of playing at soldiers, and camps, and fleets, and the object of this is to raise up in the spirit of the people a feeling antagonistic to peace, and to render the people—the deluded, hard-working, toiling people—satisfied with the extortion of £17,000,000 annually, when, upon the very principles of the men who take it, it might be demonstrated that one-half of the money would be amply sufficient for the purposes to which it is devoted. What observation has been more common during the discussion upon Turkey than this—‘Why are we to keep up these great fleets if we are not to use them? Why have we our Mediterranean fleet lying at Besika Bay, when it might be earning glory and adding to the warlike renown of the country?’ This is just what comes from the maintenance of great fleets and armies. There grows up an *esprit de corps*—there grows a passion for these things, a powerful opinion in their favour, that smothers the immorality of the whole thing, and leads the people to tolerate, under those excited feelings, that which, under feelings of greater temperance and moderation, they would know was hostile to their country, as it is opposed to everything which we recognize as the spirit of the Christian religion.

“Then we are against intervention. Now this question of intervention is a most important one, for this reason, that it comes before us sometimes in a form so attractive that it

invites us to embrace it, and asks us by all our love of freedom, by all our respect for men struggling for their rights, to interfere in the affairs of some other country. And we find now in this country that a great number of those who are calling out loudest for interference are those who, being very liberal in their politics, are bitterly hostile to the despotism and exclusiveness of the Russian government. But I should like to ask this meeting what sort of intervention we are to have? There are three kinds—one for despotism, one for liberty; and you may have an intervention like that now proposed, from a vague sense of danger which cannot be accurately described.

“What have our interventions been up to this time? It is not long since we intervened in the case of Spain. The foreign enlistment laws were suspended; and English soldiers went to join the Spanish legion, and the government of Spain was fixed in the present queen of that country, and yet Spain has the most exclusive tariff against this country in the world, and a dead Englishman is there reckoned little better than a dead dog. Then take the case of Portugal. We interfered, and Admiral Napier was one of those employed in that interference to place the Queen of Portugal on the throne; and yet she has violated every clause of the charter which she had sworn to the people; and in 1849, under the government of Lord John Russell, and with Lord Palmerston in the foreign office, our fleet entered the Tagus and destroyed the Liberal party by allowing the queen to escape from their hands, when they would have driven her to give additional guarantees for liberty; and from that time to this she has still continued to violate every clause of the charter of the country. Now let us come to Syria; what, as Admiral Napier said, about the Syrian war? He told us that the English fleet was scattered all about the Mediterranean, and that if the French fleet had come to Cherbourg and had taken on board 50,000 men and landed them on our coasts, all sorts of things would have befallen us. But how happened it that Admiral Napier and his friends got up the quarrel with the French? Because we

interfered in the Syrian question when we had no business to interfere whatever. The Egyptian pasha, the vassal of the sultan, became more powerful than the sultan, and threatened to depose him and place himself as monarch upon the throne of Constantinople; and but for England he would assuredly have done it. Why did we interfere? What advantage was it to us to have a feeble monarch in Constantinople, when you might have an energetic and powerful one in Mehemet Ali? We interfered, however, and quarrelled with France, although she neither declared war nor landed men upon our coast. France is not a country of savages and banditti. The admiral's whole theory goes upon this, that there is a total want of public morality in France, and that something which no nation in Europe would dare to do or think of doing, which even Russia would scorn to do, would be done without any warning by the polished, civilized and intelligent nation across the Channel."

In reading this speech delivered six months before the Napier banquet, who can avoid the suspicion that Lord Palmerston had it in his memory when he eulogized the admiral, and that his resentment of Mr. Bright's remonstrances was sharpened by the recollection.

"But," Mr. Bright asked in continuation, "if they are the friends of freedom who think we ought to go to war with Russia because Russia is a despotic country, what do you say to the interference with the Roman Republic three or four years ago? What do you say to Lord John Russell's government, Lord Palmerston with his own hand writing the despatch, declaring that the government of her majesty the Queen of England entirely concurred with the government of the French Republic in believing that it was desirable and necessary to re-establish the pope upon his throne? The French army, with the full concurrence of the English government, crossed over to Italy, invaded Rome, destroyed the republic, banished its leading men, and restored the pope; and on that throne he sits still, maintained only by the army of France.

"My honourable friend has referred to the time when Russia crossed through the very principalities we hear so much about, and

entered Hungary. I myself heard Lord Palmerston in the House of Commons go out of his way needlessly, but intentionally, to express a sort of approbation of the intervention of Russia in the case of Hungary. I heard him say in a most unnecessary parenthesis, that it was not contrary to international law or to the law of Europe for Russia to send an army into Hungary to assist Austria in putting down the Hungarian insurrection. I should like to know whether Hungary had not constitutional rights as sacred as ever any country had—as sacred, surely, as the sovereign of Turkey can have upon his throne. If it were not contrary to international law and to the law of Europe for a Russian army to invade Hungary, to suppress there a struggle which called for, and obtained too, the sympathy of every man in favour of freedom in every part of the world,—I say, how can it be contrary to international law and the law of Europe for Russia to threaten the Sultan of Turkey, and to endeavour to annex Turkey to the Russian Empire?

"I want our policy to be consistent. Do not let us interfere now, or concur in or encourage the interference of anybody else, and then get up a hypocritical pretence on some other occasion that we are against interference. If you want war, let it be for something that has at least the features of grandeur and of nobility about it, but not for the miserable, decrepit, moribund government which is now enthroned, but which cannot last long, in the city of Constantinople.

"They tell us that if Russia gets to Constantinople Englishmen will not be able to get to India by the overland journey. Mehemet Ali, even when Admiral Napier was battering down his towns, did not interfere with the carriage of our mails through his territory. We bring our overland mails at present partly through Austria and partly through France, and the mails from Canada pass through the United States; and though I do not think there is the remotest possibility or probability of anything of the kind happening, yet I do not think that in the event of war with these countries we should have our mails stopped or our persons arrested in passing through these countries. At any rate it would be a much

more definite danger that would drive me to incur the ruin, guilt, and suffering of war.

“But they tell us further that the Emperor of Russia would get India. That is a still more remote contingency. If I were asked as to the probabilities of it, I should say that, judging from our past and present policy in Asia, we are more likely to invade Russia from India than Russia is to invade us in India. The policy we pursue in Asia is much more aggressive, aggrandizing, and warlike than any that Russia has pursued or threatened during our time. But it is just possible that Russia may be more powerful by acquiring Turkey. . . . But I should like to ask whether, even if that be true, it is a sufficient reason for our going to war, and entering on what perhaps may be a long, ruinous, and sanguinary struggle with a powerful empire like Russia?

“What is war? I believe that half the people that talk about war have not the slightest idea of what it is. In a short sentence it may be summed up to be the combination and concentration of all the horrors, atrocities, crimes, and sufferings of which human nature on this globe is capable. But what is even a rumour of war? Is there anybody here who has anything in the funds, or who is the owner of any railway stock, or anybody who has a large stock of raw material or manufactured goods? The funds have recently gone down 10 per cent. I do not say that the fall is all on account of this danger of war, but a great proportion of it undoubtedly is. A fall of 10 per cent. in the funds is nearly £80,000,000 sterling of value, and railway stock having gone down 20 per cent. makes a difference of £60,000,000 in the value of the railway property of this country. Add the two—£140,000,000—and take the diminished prosperity and value of manufactures of all kinds during the last few months, and you will understate the actual loss to the country now if you put it down at £200,000,000 sterling. But that is merely a rumour of war. That is war a long way off—the small cloud no bigger than a man’s hand; what will it be if it comes nearer and becomes a fact? And surely some men ought to consider whether the case is a good one, the ground fair, the necessity clear, before they drag a nation of

nearly 30,000,000 of people into a long and bloody struggle for a decrepit and tottering empire, which all the nations in Europe cannot long sustain. And mind, war now would take a different aspect from what it did formerly. It is not only that you send out men who submit to be slaughtered, and that you pay a large amount of taxes; the amount of taxes would be but a feeble indication of what you would suffer. Our trade is now much more extensive than it was, our commerce is more expanded, our undertakings are more vast, and war will find you all out at home by withering up the resources of the prosperity enjoyed by the middle and working classes of the country. You would find that war in 1853 would be infinitely more perilous and destructive to our country than it has ever yet been at any former period of our history. There is another question which comes home to my mind with a gravity and seriousness which I can scarcely hope to communicate to you. You who lived during the period of 1815 to 1822 may remember that this country was probably never in a more uneasy position. The sufferings of the working-classes were beyond description, and the difficulties, and struggles, and bankruptcies of the middle classes were such as few persons have a just idea of. There was scarcely a year in which there was not an incipient insurrection in some parts of the country, arising from the sufferings which the working-classes endured. You know very well that the government of the day employed spies to create plots, and to get ignorant men to combine to take unlawful oaths, and you know that in the town of Stirling two men, who but for this diabolical agency might have lived good and honest citizens, paid the penalty of their lives for their connection with unlawful combinations of this kind.

“Well, if you go into war now you will have more banners to decorate your cathedrals and churches. Englishmen will fight now as well as they ever did, and there is ample power to back them if the country can be but sufficiently excited and deluded. You may raise up great generals. You may have another Wellington and another Nelson too; for this

country can grow men capable for every enterprise. Then there may be titles, and pensions, and marble monuments to eternize the men who have thus become great; but what becomes of you and your country and your children? For there is more than this in store. That seven years to which I have referred was a period dangerous to the existence of government in this country, for the whole substratum, the whole foundations of society were discontented, suffering intolerable evils, and hostile in the bitterest degree to the institutions and the government of the country."

It is scarcely necessary to point out how illustrative this speech is of the difference between the manner of Mr. Bright and that of Mr. Cobden. Nor can we omit to notice that want of discrimination in the application of the statements brought forward to illustrate his argument which laid the speaker open to more than adverse criticism, and excited a feeling stronger than mere contradiction.

It was unfortunate that the laudations bestowed on Sir Charles Napier and the intended operations of the first division of the Baltic fleet should have been so overdone. The spectacle of the departure of that fleet had aroused a large amount of public enthusiasm, for it was the most important naval force which had ever gone forth from the chief maritime station of the kingdom, and a vast multitude of people had left London and various large towns and assembled at Portsmouth for the purpose of witnessing the warlike show—almost the last naval display before iron-clads and their successors, with rams and turrets, had superseded the old "wooden walls"—the first in which the principal vessels were propelled by steam-power. Three large ships remained behind to form the nucleus of a second division. The expectations of the nation ran high—so high that the admiral possibly foresaw the disappointment which must follow. If he did so, however, the address which he signalled to the fleet before commencing operations seems to have been rather impolitic:—"Lads! war is declared. We are to meet a bold and numerous enemy; should they offer us battle, you know how to dispose of them.

Should they remain in port, we must try to get at them. Success depends on the quickness and precision of your fire. Lads, sharpen your cutlasses and the day is your own." Now this was much in the vein of the oratory at the dinner at the Reform Club, and Sir James Graham began to fear that the ardour of the admiral might outrun his discretion, or that he might be tempted to make some sudden venture and endanger the fleet for the purpose of satisfying public expectation. He advised Sir Charles Napier in the first instance to feel his way and to make good his hold in the Gulf of Finland. "When I say this," he added, "I by no means contemplate an attack either on Sweaborg or on Cronstadt. I have a great respect for stone walls, and have no fancy for running even screw line-of-battle ships against them. Because the public here may be impatient, you must not be rash; because they, at a distance from danger, are foolhardy, you must not risk the loss of a fleet in an impossible enterprise." Sir James continued that he believed both Sweaborg and Cronstadt to be all but impregnable from the sea—Sweaborg more especially—and that none but a very large army could co-operate by land efficiently in the presence of such a force as Russia could readily concentrate for the immediate defence of the approaches to her capital. He advised the admiral, if he had none but naval means at his command, to pause long and consider well before he attempted any attack on the Russian squadrons in their strongholds, and he impressed these cautions upon him lest, "to satisfy the wild wishes of an impatient multitude," he should "yield to some rash impulse and fail in the discharge of one of the noblest duties, which is the moral courage to do what you know to be right at the risk of being accused of having done wrong."

There was much "mounting the high horse" in all this, and Sir James Graham either succeeded beyond his intention in impressing the ardent admiral with his own caution, or he was altogether mistaken in believing such solemn warnings to be necessary. The truth seems to have been, that Sir Charles Napier knew very well what he might be able to do

and what he would not be able to do with a fleet which was after all insufficient for any such attempts as were feared by the first lord of the admiralty and expected by the public. The operations began with the bombardment by two ships, the *Arrogant* and the *Hecla*, of a little fort called Eckness on the coast of Finland and the capture of a merchant vessel. Then followed the bombardment of Gustafsvaern and the blockade of the forts in the Gulf of Finland. On the 16th of August (1854) the fortress of Bomarsund, with its garrison of 2235 men, surrendered to the severe cannonade of the allied fleet; and as this was the first success in the war, the news was received with enormous enthusiasm, but that was nearly the last of it as regarded this fleet. The Russian ships had been kept in durance, but had not been injured or even attacked. What had been possible at Bomarsund had been unattainable at Sweaborg and Cronstadt. By the end of August a correspondence had begun between Sir Charles Napier and Sir James Graham, which was painfully recriminatory, and was not good for the reputation of the country. Sir James Graham had sent letters to the admiral which the latter interpreted to refer to a termination of active operations in the Baltic for the approaching winter; but Sir James refused to accept this responsibility, and replied by saying:—"I was not prepared even at that time for the immediate departure of the French army after the capture of Bomarsund, and I pointed out to you Abo, Sweaborg, and Revel as points which with military aid were open to attack. Much less was I prepared for the withdrawal of the French squadron from the combined naval operations almost instantaneously with the departure of the army so soon as Bomarsund had been destroyed." Evidently the first lord of the admiralty had begun to recede from his former advice, because he had made the mistake (a very common one at that time) of computing probable successes from data which were imperfect or which had been entirely falsified by events. The admiral had followed what he believed to be his instructions; the weather was bad even for that late season, and if he was to

take care of the fleet it would be of little use to make any attempts which even under more favourable conditions would have been open to the charge of undue temerity after he had been emphatically ordered by his superiors to exercise caution. Even this reason might have been sufficient defence for Sir Charles, but he declared that the whole matter was an attempt to prejudice him. The truth appears to be that there was a complete misunderstanding, and that the admiral, who had been made a hero, and was undoubtedly brave enough and perhaps rash enough to have justified Lord Palmerston's praise and Sir James Graham's advice, became angrily suspicious that his letters had been purposely misinterpreted because the admiralty needed "a scape-goat" on whom to turn the indignation which was succeeding the impatience of the public. "Had people considered one moment," he wrote, "they would have seen the impracticability of the attempt; but they thought Sebastopol was taken, and I must take Sweaborg, Revel, and Cronstadt." There had been "a great cry and little wool;" and the admiralty and the admiral were engaged in endeavouring to place on each other the responsibility of not having achieved what became impossible after the French troops and the French squadron parted company with the Baltic fleet. Sir James Graham declared that he was not aware of their departure, and that he understood Sir Charles to have asked for reinforcements. Sir Charles accused the first lord of expecting him to attack almost impregnable strongholds under conditions which would probably have been fatal to a small force making the attempt. The controversy was unpleasantly prolonged.

Speaking at a dinner at the Mansion House in February, 1855, the admiral made a vehement attack upon Sir James Graham, which he wound up by saying—"I state it to the public, and I wish them to know, that, had I followed the advice of Sir J. Graham, I should most inevitably have left the British fleet behind me in the Baltic." This he undertook to prove before all the world—a pledge which he was never allowed, and would probably have found it hard, to redeem. The attack was

made in terms so unseemly that the government were asked in the House of Commons a few nights afterwards (16th February) if they intended to take proceedings against the rebellious admiral. "He has proclaimed himself a hero," was Sir James Graham's answer; "but it is not my intention to allow the gallant officer to dub himself a martyr as well as a hero; and therefore it is not my intention to advise the crown to take any further notice of the matter." Replying to a taunt about his speech at the Reform Club Sir James Graham remarked on the same occasion, "I underwent due correction in this house on the subject of that speech; since that correction was made I hope I have improved in prudence." The honour of Grand Cross of the Bath was offered a few months afterwards to Sir Charles Napier; but he declined it, stating in a letter to Prince Albert (6th July, 1855) as his reason for doing so, that having demanded a court-martial from the admiralty to investigate his conduct, and this having been refused, "he did not feel he could accept an honour till his character was cleared."

Sir Charles had returned from the Baltic with his fleet, and though he received no warm welcome, he did not for any long time remain under the suspicion of not having done his duty. He had, as was written at the time by an admirer, caused the thirty sail composing the powerful Russian fleet to shrink like rats into their holes; he had taken Bomarsund, caused Hango to be blown up, interrupted the Russian commerce; and for six months had kept in a state of inaction certainly 80,000 or 90,000 good troops, namely, 20,000 at Helsingfors, 15,000 at Abo, and 40,000 at Cronstadt, besides smaller corps protecting Revel and other places. He had restored and enlarged the knowledge of the Finland Gulf to navigation; had ascertained what large vessels could do there and what they could not do, when they could act alone and when with troops, and when gun-boats could be used with effect. He had carried out an ill-manned and ill-disciplined fleet, and had brought back unharmed a well-organized, well-disciplined one, with crews exercised in gunnery and seamanship. These encomiums were not undeserved,

and the country afterwards acknowledged them and vindicated the veteran, who always had on his side a large number of people who knew and admired his courage, and many of whom looked not without distrust upon Sir James Graham in the still lingering recollection of the opened letters at the post-office, the remembrance of which stuck in the popular mind in spite of often repeated explanations.

But the country was in the midst of war by the time that Napier was disputing in London, and another Baltic fleet under Admiral Dundas, provided with the necessary gun-boats and mortars, went out and bombarded Sweaborg. Our troops were advancing towards Sebastopol. At home people were in a state of wild excitement about the want of preparation by the war-office and the alleged break-down of our commissariat and transport system.

The "peace at any price" party, as they had been dubbed, were unmoved. They abated nothing of their condemnation of the whole of the action, or rather the inaction, of the cabinet which had led to hostilities. What Mr. Bright had said at the meeting of the peace congress at Edinburgh he was ready to repeat, and to repeat with considerable additions, when he rose to speak in the House of Commons after the royal message announcing the declaration of war. Referring to one of the epigrammatic phrases used by Disraeli he said:—

"The right hon. gentleman the member for Buckinghamshire, on a recent occasion, made use of a term which differed considerably from what he said in a former debate; he spoke of this war as a 'just and unnecessary war.' I shall not discuss the justice of the war. It may be difficult to decide a point like this, seeing that every war undertaken since the days of Nimrod has been declared to be just by those in favour of it; but I may at least question whether any war that is unnecessary can be deemed to be just. I shall not discuss this question on the abstract principle of peace at any price, as it is termed, which is held by a small minority of persons in this country, founded on religious opinions which are not generally received, but I shall discuss it entirely on principles which are accepted by all the

members of this house. I shall maintain that when we are deliberating on the question of war, and endeavouring to prove its justice or necessity, it becomes us to show that the interests of the country are clearly involved; that the objects for which the war is undertaken are probable, or, at least, possible of attainment; and, further, that the end proposed to be accomplished is worth the cost and the sacrifices which we are about to incur.

“The house shall bear in mind that at this moment we are in intimate alliance with a neighbouring government, which was, at a recent period, the originator of the troubles which have arisen at Constantinople. I do not wish to blame the French government, because nothing could have been more proper than the manner in which it has retired from the difficulty it had created; but it is nevertheless quite true that France, having made certain demands upon Turkey with regard to concessions to the Latin Church, backed by a threat of the appearance of a French fleet in the Dardanelles, which demands Turkey had wholly or partially complied with; Russia, the powerful neighbour of Turkey, being on the watch, made certain other demands having reference to the Greek Church; and Russia at the same time required (and this I understand to be the real ground of the quarrel) that Turkey should define by treaty, or convention, or by a simple note or memorandum, what was conceded, and what were the rights of Russia, in order that the government of Russia might not suffer in future from the varying policy and the vacillation of the Ottoman government.

“Now it seems to me quite impossible to discuss this question without considering the actual condition of Turkey. The honourable member for Aylesbury (Mr. Layard) assumes that they who do not agree in the policy he advocates are necessarily hostile to the Turks and have no sympathy for Turkey. I repudiate such an assumption altogether. I can feel for a country like that if it be insulted or oppressed by a powerful neighbour; but all that sympathy may exist without my being able to convince myself that it is the duty of this country to enter into the serious obliga-

tion of a war in defence of the rights of that country. The noble lord the member for Tiverton is one of the very few men in this house, or out of it, who are bold enough to insist upon it that there is a growing strength in the Turkish Empire. There was a gentleman in this house sixty years ago, who in the debates in 1791 expressed the singular opinion which the noble lord now holds. There was a Mr. Stanley in the house at that period who insisted on the growing power of Turkey, and asserted that the Turks at that day ‘were more and more imitating our manners, and emerging from their inactivity and indolence; that improvements of every kind were being introduced among them, and that even printing-presses had been lately established in their capital.’ That was the opinion of a gentleman anxious to defend Turkey, and speaking in this house more than sixty years ago; we are now living sixty years later, and no one now but the noble lord seems to insist upon the fact of the great and growing power of the Turkish Empire.

“If any one thing is more apparent than another, on the face of all the documents furnished to the house by the government of which the noble lord is a member, it is this, that the Turkish Empire is falling, or has fallen, into a state of decay, and into anarchy so permanent as to have assumed a chronic character. The noble lord surely has not forgotten that Turkey has lost the Crimea and Bessarabia, and its control over the Danubian Principalities; that the Kingdom of Greece has been carved out of it; that it has lost its authority over Algiers, and has run great risk of being conquered by its own vassal the Pasha of Egypt; and from this he might have drawn the conclusion that the empire was gradually falling into decay, and that to pledge ourselves to effect its recovery and sustentation is to undertake what no human power will be able to accomplish. I only ask the house to turn to the statements which will be found nearly at the end of the first of the blue books recently placed on the table of the house, and they will find that there is scarcely any calamity which can be described as afflicting any country which is not there

proved to be present and actively at work in almost every province of the Turkish Empire. And the house should bear in mind when reading these despatches from the English consuls in Turkey to the English ambassador at Constantinople, that they give a very faint picture of what really exists, because what are submitted to us are but extracts of more extended and important communications. It may fairly be assumed that the parts which are not published are those which described the state of things to be so bad that the government has been unwilling to lay before the house and the country and the world, that which would be so offensive and so injurious to its ally the Sultan of Turkey.

“But if other evidence be wanting, is it not a fact that Constantinople is the seat of intrigues and factions to a degree not known in any other country or capital in the world? France demands one thing, Russia another, England a third, and Austria something else. For many years past our ambassador at Constantinople has been partly carrying on the government of that country and influencing its policy, and it is the city in which are fought the diplomatic contests of the great powers of Europe. And if I have accurately described the state of Turkey, what is the position of Russia? It is a powerful country under a strong executive government, it is adjacent to a weak and falling nation, it has in its history the evidences of a succession of triumphs over Turkey, it has religious affinities with a majority of the population of European Turkey which make it absolutely impossible that its government should not, more or less, interfere, or have a strong interest in the internal policy of the Ottoman Empire. Now if we were Russian—and I put the case to the members of this house—is it not likely, according to all the theories I have heard explained when we have been concerned in similar cases, that a large majority of the house and the country would be strongly in favour of such intervention as Russia has attempted? and if I opposed it, as I certainly should oppose it, I should be in a minority on that question more insignificant than that in which I have now the misfortune to find myself with regard to

the policy of the government on the grave question now before us.”

Mr. Bright boldly asserted that if Russia made certain demands on Turkey this country insisted that Turkey should not consent to them; and defied any one to read the despatches of Lord Stratford de Redcliffe without coming to the conclusion that, from the beginning to the end of the negotiations the English ambassador had insisted in the strongest manner that Turkey should refuse to make the slightest concession on the real point at issue in the demands of the Russian government. In proof of that statement he referred to the account given by Lord Stratford de Redcliffe in his despatch of the 5th May, 1853, of the private interview he had with the sultan, the minister of the sultan having left him at the door that the interview might be strictly private. In describing that interview Lord Stratford had said, “I then endeavoured to give him a just idea of the degree of danger to which his empire was exposed.” This Mr. Bright interpreted to mean, “The sultan was not sufficiently aware of his danger, and the English ambassador ‘endeavoured to give him a just idea of it;’ and it was by means such as this that he urged upon the Turkish government the necessity of resistance to any of the demands of Russia, promising the armed assistance of England whatever consequences might ensue. From the moment that promise was made, or from the moment it was sanctioned by the cabinet at home, war was all but inevitable; they had entered into a partnership with the Turkish government (which, indeed, could scarcely be called a government at all) to assist it by military force; and Turkey, having old quarrels to settle with Russia, and old wrongs to avenge, was not slow to plunge into the war, having secured the co-operation of two powerful nations, England and France, in her quarrel.”

Speaking of the celebrated “Vienna note” Mr. Bright said, “I am bound here to say that nobody has yet been able clearly to explain the difference between the various notes Turkey has been advised to reject, and this and other notes she has been urged to accept. With respect to this particular note, nobody seems

to have understood it. There were four ambassadors at Vienna, representing England, France, Austria, and Prussia; and these four gentlemen drew up the Vienna note, and recommended it to the Porte as one which she might accept without injury to her independence or her honour. Louis Napoleon is a man knowing the use of language, and able to comprehend the meaning of a document of this nature, and his minister of foreign affairs is a man of eminent ability; and Louis Napoleon and his minister agree with the ambassadors at Vienna as to the character of the Vienna note. We have a cabinet composed of men of great individual capacity; a cabinet, too, including no less than five gentlemen who have filled the office of secretary for foreign affairs, and who may therefore be presumed to understand even the sometimes concealed meaning of diplomatic phraseology. These five foreign secretaries, backed by the whole cabinet, concurred with the ambassadors at Vienna and with the Emperor of the French and his foreign secretary in recommending the Vienna note to the sultan as a document which he might accept consistently with his honour and with that integrity and that independence which our government is so anxious to secure for him. What was done with this note? Passing by the marvellous stupidity, or something worse, which caused that note not to be submitted to Turkey before it was sent to St. Petersburg, I would merely state that it was sent to St. Petersburg, and was accepted in its integrity by the Emperor of Russia in the most frank and unreserved manner. We were then told—I was told by members of the government—that the moment the note was accepted by Russia we might consider the affair to be settled, and that the dispute would never be heard of again. When, however, the note was sent to Constantinople after its acceptance by Russia, Turkey discovered, or thought or said she discovered, that it was as bad as the original or modified proposition of Prince Menschikoff, and she refused the note as it was, and proposed certain modifications. And what are we to think of these arbitrators or mediators—the four ambassadors at Vienna, and the governments of France and England—who,

after discussing the matter in three different cities and at three distinct and different periods, and after agreeing that the proposition was one which Turkey could assent to without detriment to her honour and independence, immediately afterwards turned round and declared that the note was one which Turkey could not be asked to accede to, and repudiated in the most formal and express manner that which they themselves had drawn up, and which only a few days before they had approved of as a combination of wisdom and diplomatic dexterity which had never been excelled?"

It might be said that in making these statements Mr. Bright either knew too much or not enough of the actual conditions which were influencing the cabinet, and there is no need to comment on them, as they are quoted to show what was his expressed opinion at that time—an opinion, as we have seen, which differed essentially from that of many others who yet deplored the war and the occasion of it, and would have made any sacrifice for the sake of restoring peace, except that which they deemed would involve the national honour and lead to a tacit abandonment of international obligations undertaken apart from any selfish motive or for the maintenance of "British interests" in any material sense. But Mr. Bright had at least "the courage of his convictions" when he went on to say he very much doubted whether Count Nesselrode placed any meaning upon the note which it did not fairly warrant, and that it was impossible to say whether he really differed at all from the actual intentions of the four ambassadors at Vienna. Mr. Bright's explanation of the course taken by the Russian minister was this:—"Seeing the note was rejected by the Turk, and considering that its previous acceptance by Russia was some concession from the original demand, he issued a circular, giving such an explanation or interpretation of the Vienna note as might enable him to get back to his original position, and might save Russia from being committed and damaged by the concession, which, for the sake of peace, she had made. This circular, however, could make no real difference in the note itself; and

notwithstanding this circular, whatever the note really meant, it would have been just as binding upon Russia as any other note will be that may be drawn up and agreed to at the end of the war. Although, however, this note was considered inadmissible, negotiations were continued; and at the conference at Olmutz, at which the Earl of Westmoreland was present, the Emperor of Russia himself expressed his willingness to accept the Vienna note—not in the sense that Count Nesselrode had placed upon it, but in that which the ambassadors at Vienna declared to be its real meaning, and with such a clause as they should attach to it, defining its real meaning."

It will of course be seen that this explanation is founded on assumptions directly contrary to the declarations then and subsequently made by ministers who, like Mr. Gladstone, were in a position to know what had actually transpired, but Mr. Bright had come to entirely different conclusions, and having made up his mind that his interpretation of Count Nesselrode's intentions was the right one, went on to argue:—"It is impossible from this fairly to doubt the sincerity of the desire for peace manifested by the Emperor of Russia. He would accept the note prepared by the conference at Vienna, sanctioned by the cabinets in London and Paris and according to the interpretation put upon it by those by whom it had been prepared—such interpretation to be defined in a clause to be by them attached to the original note. But in the precise week in which these negotiations were proceeding apparently to a favourable conclusion, the Turkish council, consisting of a large number of dignitaries of the Turkish Empire—not one of whom, however, represented the Christian majority of the population of Turkey, but inspired by the fanaticism and desperation of the old Mohammedan party—assembled; and, fearful that peace would be established, and that they would lose the great opportunity of dragging England and France into a war with their ancient enemy the Emperor of Russia, they came to a sudden resolution in favour of war; and in the very week in which Russia agreed to the Vienna note in the sense of the Vienna

conference the Turks declared war against Russia, the Turkish forces crossed the Danube and began the war, involving England in an inglorious and costly struggle, from which this government and a succeeding government may fail to extricate us.

"The course taken by Turkey in beginning the war was against the strong advice of her allies; but notwithstanding this, the moment the step was taken they turned round again, as in the case of the Vienna note, and justified and defended her in the course she had adopted in defiance of the remonstrances they had urged against it." Lord John Russell had contended that Turkey was fully justified in declaring war. Mr. Bright declared, "I should say nothing against that view if Turkey were fighting on her own resources; but that if she was in alliance with England and France the opinions of those powers should at least have been heard, and that in case of her refusal to listen to their counsel they would have been justified in saying to her, 'If you persist in taking your own course we cannot be involved in the difficulties to which it may give rise, but must leave you to take the consequences of your own acts.' But this was not said, and the result was that we were dragged into a war by the madness of the Turk, which, but for the fatal blunders we have committed, we might have avoided."

"This 'balance of power' is in reality the hinge on which the whole question turns. But if that is so important as to be worth a sanguinary war, why did you not go to war with France when she seized upon Algiers? That was a portion of Turkey not quite so distinct, it is true, as are the Danubian principalities; but still Turkey had sovereign rights over Algiers. When, therefore, France seized on a large portion of the northern coast of Africa, might it not have been said that such an act tended to convert the Mediterranean into a French lake—that Algiers lay next to Tunis, and that, having conquered Tunis, there would remain only Tripoli between France and Alexandria, and that the 'balance of power' was being destroyed by the aggrandizement of France? All this might have been said, and the government might easily have

plunged the country into war on that question. But happily the government of that day had the good sense not to resist, and the result had not been disadvantageous to Europe; this country had not suffered from the seizure of Algiers, and England and France had continued at peace.

“Take another case—the case of the United States. The United States waged war with Mexico—a war with a weaker state—in my opinion an unjust and unnecessary war. If I had been a citizen of the American Republic I should have condemned that war; but might it not have been as justly argued that, if we allowed the aggressive attacks of the United States upon Mexico, her insatiable appetite would soon be turned towards the north—towards the dependencies of this empire—and that the magnificent colonies of the Canadas would soon fall a prey to the assaults of their rapacious neighbour? But such arguments were not used, and it was not thought necessary to involve this country in a war for the support of Mexico, although the power that was attacking that country lay adjacent to our own dominions.

“If this phrase of the ‘balance of power’ is to be always an argument for war, the pretence for war will never be wanting, and peace can never be secure. Let any one compare the power of this country with that of Austria now and forty years ago. Will any one say that England, compared with Austria, is not now three times as powerful as she was thirty or forty years ago? Austria has a divided people, bankrupt finances, and her credit is so low that she cannot borrow a shilling out of her own territories; England has a united people, national wealth rapidly increasing, and a mechanical and productive power to which that of Austria is as nothing. Might not Austria complain that we have disturbed the ‘balance of power,’ because we are growing so much stronger from better government, from the greater union of our people, from the wealth that is created by the hard labour and skill of our population, and from the wonderful development of the mechanical resources of the kingdom which is seen on every side? If this phrase of the

‘balance of power,’ the meaning of which nobody can exactly make out, is to be brought in on every occasion to stimulate this country to war, there is an end to all hope of permanent peace.

“There is, indeed, a question of a ‘balance of power’ which this country might regard, if our statesmen had a little less of those narrow views which they sometimes arrogantly impute to me and to those who think with me. If they could get beyond those old notions which belong to the traditions of Europe, and cast their eyes as far westward as they are now looking eastward, they might see a power growing up in its gigantic proportions which will teach us before very long where the true ‘balance of power’ is to be found. This struggle may indeed begin with Russia, but it may end with half the states of Europe; for Austria and Prussia are just as likely to join with Russia as with England and France, and probably much more so; and we know not how long alliances which now appear very secure may remain so; for the circumstances in which the government has involved us are of the most critical character, and we stand upon a mine which may explode any day. Give us seven years of this infatuated struggle upon which we are now entering, and let the United States remain at peace during that period, and who shall say what will then be the relative positions of the two nations? Have you read the reports of your own commissioners to the New York Exhibition? Do you comprehend what is the progress of that country as exhibited in its tonnage, and exports, and imports, and manufactures, and in the development of all its resources and the means of transit? There has been nothing like it hitherto under the sun. The United States may profit to a large extent by the calamities which will befall us; whilst we, under the miserable and lunatic idea that we are about to set the worn-out Turkish Empire on its legs and permanently to sustain it against the aggressions of Russia, are entangled in a war. Our trade will decay and diminish; our people, suffering and discontented as in all former periods of war, will emigrate in increasing numbers to a country

whose wise policy is to keep itself free from the entanglement of European politics—to a country with which rests the great question whether England shall for any long time retain that which she professes to value so highly—her great superiority in industry and at sea.

"This whole notion of the 'balance of power' is a mischievous delusion which has come down to us from past times; we ought to drive it from our minds, and to consider the solemn question of peace or war on more clear, more definite, and on far higher principles than any that are involved in the phrase, the 'balance of power.' What is it the government propose to do? Let us examine their policy as described in the message from the crown, and in the address which has been moved to-night. As I understand it we are asked to go to war to maintain the 'integrity and independence of the Ottoman Empire,' to curb the aggressive power of Russia, and to defend the interests of this country.

"But what is the condition of that empire at this moment? I have already described to the house what it would have been if my policy had been adopted—if the thrice modified note of Prince Menschikoff had been accepted, or if the Vienna note had been assented to by the Porte. But what is it now under the protection of the noble lord and his colleagues? At the present moment there are no less than three foreign armies on Turkish soil: there are 100,000 Russian troops in Bulgaria; there are armies from England and France approaching the Dardanelles to entrench themselves on Turkish territory and to return nobody knows when. All this can hardly contribute to the 'independence' of any country. But more than this; there are insurrections springing up in almost every Turkish province, and insurrections which must from the nature of the Turkish government widely extend; and it is impossible to describe the anarchy which must prevail, inasmuch as the control hitherto exercised by the government to keep the peace is now gone, by the withdrawal of its troops to the banks of the Danube, and the license and demoralization engendered by ages of bad government

will be altogether unchecked. In addition to these complicated horrors, there are 200,000 men under arms; the state of their finances is already past recovery, and the allies of Turkey are making demands upon her far beyond anything that was required by Russia herself. Can anything be more destructive of the 'integrity and independence' of Turkey than the policy of the noble lord?"

This then was the position taken by the man who may be said to be in absolute opposition—representing a minority, as he himself implied, too insignificant even to be called a party; but he and the coadjutor who stood by his side in this as they had stood together in a question where they at last had the country at their back, were not among the men who were likely to yield to a compromise.

There was, as we have since seen, a good deal of force in the objection that we were undertaking to repress and to curb Russian aggression. These were catching words; they had been amplified in newspapers, and had passed from mouth to mouth, and had served to blind the eyes of multitudes wholly ignorant of the details of this question. If Turkey had been in danger from the side of Russia heretofore, would she not be in far greater danger when the war was over? "Russia is always there. You do not propose to dismember Russia, or to blot out her name from the map and her history from the records of Europe. Russia will be always there—always powerful, always watchful, and actuated by the same motives of ambition, either of influence or of territory, which are supposed to have moved her in past times. What, then, do you propose to do? and how is Turkey to be secured? Will you make a treaty with Russia and force conditions upon her? But if so, what security have you that one treaty will be more binding than another? It is easy to find or make a reason for breaking a treaty when it is the interest of a country to break it."

But Mr. Bright could not let the question of "British interests" alone. "How are the interests of England involved in this question? This is, after all, the great matter which we, the representatives of the people of England, have to consider. It is not a question of

sympathy with any other state. I have sympathy with Turkey; I have sympathy with the serfs of Russia; I have sympathy with the people of Hungary, whose envoy the noble lord the member for Tiverton refused to see, and the overthrow of whose struggle for freedom by the armies of Russia he needlessly justified in this house; I have sympathy with the Italians, subjects of Austria, Naples, and the pope; I have sympathy with the three millions of slaves in the United States; but it is not on a question of sympathy that I dare involve this country, or any country, in a war which must cost an incalculable amount of treasure and of blood. It is not my duty to make this country the knight-errant of the human race, and to take upon herself the protection of the thousand millions of human beings who have been permitted by the Creator of all things to people this planet.

“I hope no one will assume that I would invite—that is the phrase which has been used—the aggressions of Russia. If I were a Russian, speaking in a Russian parliament, I should denounce any aggression upon Turkey, as I now blame the policy of our own government; and I greatly fear I should find myself in a minority, as I now find myself in a minority on this question. But it has never yet been explained how the interests of this country are involved in the present dispute. We are not going to fight for tariffs, or for markets for our exports. In 1791 Mr. Grey argued that, as our imports from Russia exceeded £1,000,000 sterling, it was not desirable that we should go to war with a country trading with us to that amount. In 1853 Russia exported to this country at least £14,000,000 sterling, and that fact affords no proof of the increasing barbarism of Russia, or of any disregard of her own interests as respects the development of her resources. What has passed in this house since the opening of the present session? We had a large surplus revenue, and our chancellor of the exchequer is an ambitious chancellor. I have no hope in any statesman who has no ambition; he can have no great object before him, and his career will be unmarked by any distinguished services to his country.

“When the chancellor of the exchequer en-

tered office, doubtless he hoped, by great services to his country, to build up a reputation such as a man may labour for and live for. Every man in this house, even those most opposed to him, acknowledged the remarkable capacity which he displayed during the last session, and the country has set its seal to this—that his financial measures in the remission and readjustment of taxation were worthy of the approbation of the great body of the people. The right honourable gentleman has been blamed for his speech at Manchester, not for making the speech, but because it differed from the tone of the speech made by the noble lord, his colleague in office, at Greenock. I observed that difference. There can be no doubt that there has been, and that there is now, a great difference of opinion in the cabinet on this eastern question. It could not be otherwise; and government has gone on from one step to another; they have drifted—to use the happy expression of Lord Clarendon to describe what is so truly unhappy—they have drifted from a state of peace to a state of war; and to no member of the government could this state of things be more distressing than to the chancellor of the exchequer, for it dashed from him the hopes he entertained that session after session, as trade extended and the public revenue increased, he would find himself the beneficent dispenser of blessings to the poor, and indeed to all classes of the people of this kingdom. Where is the surplus now? No man dare even ask for it, or for any portion of it.

“With regard to trade I can speak with some authority as to the state of things in Lancashire. The Russian trade is not only at an end, but it is made an offence against the law to deal with any of our customers in Russia. The German trade is most injuriously affected by the uncertainty which prevails on the Continent of Europe. The Levant trade, a very important branch, is almost extinguished in the present state of affairs in Greece, Turkey in Europe, and Syria. All property in trade is diminishing in value, whilst its burdens are increasing. The funds have fallen in value to the amount of about £120,000,000 sterling, and railway property is quoted at about

£80,000,000 less than was the case a year ago.

“But we are sending out 30,000 troops to Turkey, and in that number are not included the men serving on board the fleets. Here are 30,000 lives! There is a thrill of horror sometimes when a single life is lost, and we sigh at the loss of a friend—or of a casual acquaintance! But here we are in danger of losing—and I give the opinions of military men, and not my own merely—10,000, or it may be 20,000 lives, that may be sacrificed in this struggle. I have never pretended to any sympathy for the military profession; but I have sympathy for my fellow-men and fellow-countrymen, wherever they may be. I have heard very melancholy accounts of the scenes which have been witnessed in the separation from families occasioned by this expedition to the East. But it will be said, and probably the noble lord the member for Tiverton will say, that it is a just war, a glorious war, and that I am full of morbid sentimentality, and have introduced topics not worthy to be mentioned in parliament. But these are matters affecting the happiness of the homes of England, and we who are the representatives and guardians of those homes, when the grand question of war is before us, should know at least that we have a case—that success is probable, and that an object is attainable which may be commensurate with the cost of war.”

No wonder, we might almost say, if Lord Palmerston felt restless and took the first opportunity of letting so hard-hitting an antagonist have it back; but it was to be deplored that on the occasion already referred to “the Tipton Slasher,” as his lordship was sometimes nicknamed by the lower satirists, after a once famous pugilist, did not hit fair. Probably Palmerston would have said that he took so entirely different a point of view that he would not attempt to controvert the statements of his opponent, who had misapprehended, if not misrepresented, the circumstances which alone would explain the situation.

It may be noted that Mr. Bright spoke differently with regard to Mr. Gladstone. He knew, as we have said, that he at least de-

plored the war, and that all his calculations were upset, and his hopes of achieving a great financial measure were frustrated by it. But Mr. Gladstone could give no practical support to Mr. Bright’s arguments against interposition, and it was too late for such moral support as he could show to be of any immediate avail. In fact there has been no more emphatic, and perhaps unanswerable reply to Mr. Bright’s contention than that given by Mr. Gladstone, part of which has been already noted.

“The design of the Crimean war,” he wrote in 1878, “was in its groundwork the vindication of European law against an unprovoked aggression. It sought, therefore, to maintain intact the condition of the menaced party against the aggressor, or, in other words, to defend against Russia the integrity and independence of the Ottoman Empire. The condition of the Christian subjects of the Porte in general was a subject that had never before that epoch come under the official consideration of Europe. The internal government of a country, it may safely be laid down, cannot well become the subject of effective consideration by other states except in cases where it leads to consequences in which they have a true *locus standi*, a legitimate concern on their own particular account, or on account of the general peace. In the case of Greece an insurrection growing into a civil war, and disturbing the Levant, had created this *locus standi*; and the interference of the three powers, led by Great Britain, had redressed the mischief. No like door had been opened in the other Christian provinces of Turkey. The dispute upon the holy places in 1853 had very partially opened it when Russia demanded for herself exclusively an enlarged right of intervention on behalf of the Oriental Christians. It thus became necessary, in determining the policy of the future, to take notice of the condition of the subject races. The greatest authorities, and pre-eminently Lord Stratford de Redcliffe, believed in the capacity of the Porte by internal reforms to govern its subjects on the principle of civil equality. The resolution, therefore, was taken to pursue this end, but without that infringement of the Porte’s sovereign rights which Russia had

attempted; and this resolution was formally embodied in a protocol at the outbreak of the war by the allies and by Austria. The conclusion of the peace in 1856 fell to the lot of Lord Palmerston and his colleagues. In the interest of the Porte and of the general peace of Europe they cancelled the rights of separate interference previously possessed and claimed by Russia. They took the principalities under a direct European protection. On behalf of the subject races generally they embodied in the treaty the record of the Hatti-humayoum, or edict issued by the sultan, which purported to establish securely the civil equality of all races and religions in Turkey. This was undoubtedly a covenant on the part of the sultan. But it was a covenant without penalty for breach; for the powers expressly renounced any right to call him to account—not, however, generally, but only as growing out of the communication he had made. It was thus, in cancelling the Russian treaties with the Porte, that the powers of Europe first became, by the treaty of Paris in 1856, responsible in the last resort for securing the government of the subject races in Turkey on principles of civil equality. The terms demanded from Russia before the war had been exceedingly moderate. When the war had broken out the allies justly availed themselves of their understood right to enlarge these terms. Now in July, 1854, appeared on the ground for the first time the celebrated Four Points. After the fall of Sebastopol they were again enlarged; a territorial cession, the extinction and not merely the limitation of naval power in the Black Sea, and some provisions relating to the Baltic, were exacted from Russia."

A "day of prayer and supplication" for the success of our arms by sea and land had been held on the 26th of April, 1854. It would have been called, according to precedent, a "day of humiliation;" but to this the queen had objected in a letter to the prime minister, which said: "Were the services selected for these days of a different kind from what they are, the queen would feel less strongly about it; but they always select chapters from the Old Testament and Psalms, which are so totally

inapplicable that all the effect such occasions ought to have is entirely done away with. Moreover, to say (as we probably should) that *the great sinfulness of the nation* has brought about this war, when it is the selfishness and ambition and want of honesty of *one man* and his servants which has done it, while our conduct throughout has been actuated by unselfishness and honesty, would be too manifestly repulsive to the feelings of every one, and would be a mere bit of hypocrisy. Let there be a prayer expressive of our great thankfulness for the immense benefits we have enjoyed, and for the immense prosperity of the country, and entreating God's help and protection in the coming struggle. In this the queen would join heart and soul. If there is to be a day set apart, let it be for prayer in this sense."

In a second letter on the same subject her majesty wrote: "The queen had meant to speak to Lord Aberdeen yesterday about this day of 'prayer and supplication,' as she particularly wishes it should be called, and not 'fast and humiliation,' as after a calamity. Surely it should *not* be a day of *mourning*. The queen spoke very strongly about it to the archbishop, and urged great care in the selection of the service. Would Lord Aberdeen inculcate the queen's wishes into the archbishop's mind, that there be *no Jewish imprecations* against our enemies, &c., but an earnest expression of thankfulness to the Almighty for the immense blessings we have enjoyed, as well as of entreaty for protection of our forces by land and sea, and to ourselves in the coming struggle? If Lord Aberdeen will look at the service to be used at sea he will find a beautiful prayer, 'To be used before a fight at sea,' which the queen thinks (as well as other portions of that fine service) would be very applicable to the occasion, as there is no mention of the sea."

This opinion was supported by the national feeling, and the prayers used on the occasion were such as were deemed suitable for a people entering upon a great conflict which they believed to be justifiable, and the issues of which they desired humbly to leave to the divine wisdom and to Him who judgeth

righteously. At the end of the year the determination for war had not abated. There was a general demand that a blow should be struck at Russia by direct invasion of the Crimea for the purpose of seizing Sebastopol. This was the course recommended by the Emperor of the French, and Lord Palmerston had by a circular addressed to the cabinet considerably influenced the action of the government. He believed that some heavy blow should be struck at the naval power and territorial dimensions of Russia, and that if that were not done during the year it would become much more difficult, and that the reputation of England and France would materially suffer. It had become evident enough that the whole brunt of conflict would be left to the two nations. Prince Albert, deploring the war in a letter to his stepmother, the Dowager-duchess of Coburg, said, "If there were a *Germany* and a *German* sovereign in Berlin it could never have happened." And the opinion was probably shared by the majority of the people of England.

The invasion of the Crimea would have appeared less difficult but for the necessity to support Omar Pacha in raising the siege of Silistria, which had been invested by the Russians. The garrison of that place was suffering from the effects of a prolonged resistance, but the allied forces were not able at that time to transport troops to the scene of action, and Lord Raglan was expecting to hear that the defenders had been compelled to surrender. Palmerston had, as Cobden implied, miscalculated the defensive strength of the Russian fortifications. He thought there were not more than 40,000 of the troops of the czar in the Crimea, and that if 25,000 English and 35,000 French could be landed somewhere in the large bay to the north of Sebastopol, they would be able to take the fort on the hill on the north side of the harbour, and would then command the harbour, fleet, and town. The capture or destruction of the Russian fleet would of course imply the surrender of the Russian troops forming the garrison of the place, or their evacuation of the Crimea by capitulation; but if the attack

were deferred the Russian government would have time to strengthen the defences of the place and to increase the garrison. The allied troops, he argued, were fresh, eager, and ready for enterprise. If they remained inactive till the following spring their health might give way, their spirits flag, their mutual cordiality and good understanding be cooled down by intrigues, jealousies, and disputes; while public opinion, which now stood by the two governments and bore up the people of the two countries to make the sacrifices necessary for the war, might take another turn, and people might grow tired of the burdens which had produced no sufficient and satisfactory result. Palmerston's firm conclusion was that our only chance of bringing Russia to terms was by offensive and not by defensive operations. We and the French ought to go to the Crimea and take Sebastopol and the Russian fleet the moment our two armies were in a position to go thither. Sixty thousand English and French troops would accomplish the object in six weeks after landing. There was, he said, not the slightest danger of the Russians getting to Constantinople. The Turks were able to prevent that; but even if they could not, the Austrians would be compelled by the force of circumstances to do so. Austria had, as usual, been playing a shabby game. When she thought the Russians likely to get on, and while she fancied England and France needed hastening, she bragged of her determination to be active against Russia. As soon as she found our troops at Varna she changed her tone, and according to a despatch received by Lord Clarendon, stated that she should not enter the principalities, and that the Russians must be driven out by the English and French. She could hardly think us simple enough to do her work for her; but the best way to force her to act would be to send our troops off to the Crimea.

These were Palmerston's conclusions, but they were not altogether accurate—he had not received an intimation of the latest events. When the czar refused to retire from the principalities, Austria had concluded a convention with the Porte, by which she began to move a large and well-disciplined army into the

principalities for the purpose of restoring there the state of affairs which had existed previous to the Russian invasion. This was followed by two striking and unexpected events. The resistance of the Turks to the continued assaults of the Russian forces had excited a good deal of surprise and admiration. The whole efforts of the Russian generals were now directed against Silistria, and at the very time when its fall was considered to be imminent, and after the Duke of Newcastle here received intelligence that it was about to surrender, there came news that the garrison there had repeatedly repulsed the besiegers. Urgent representations had come from Silistria itself that the place must be taken unless the defending force could be supported by the allied forces, but Lord Raglan had found it impossible for want of the means of land transport to move any of his troops from Varna to the scene of action. As many as 70,000 Russians were engaged under Prince Paskiewitsch in the siege and bombardment of Silistria, and tremendous preparations had been made for taking a place which was in reality the gate through which Turkey was to have been invaded. The chief fortifications of Silistria were earthworks, the principal of which was about 2000 yards in advance of the ramparts, while about midway was another. All the conventional resources of a siege were brought against them, but were ineffectual. As often as the enemy entered they were driven back in spite of mines and a storm of artillery, and the works were repaired almost as soon as they were destroyed. Nothing could overcome the dogged obstinacy of the fighting Turks. Omar Pacha, fully alive to the importance of the position, sent reinforcements to the almost overwhelmed garrison, and on the 4th of June 30,000 men went to the rescue, broke through the Russian lines, and entered the outworks. Four days afterwards 1000 Turkish soldiers stole in at midnight over the corpses of the Russians who had fallen in heaps during the repulse. The end was near, and it was perhaps to be attributed to the presence of two British officers to whom the Turks yielded the command when their own general Mussa Pacha was slain by a cannon-ball, that the

result was so speedily effectual. These officers, Captain Butler and Lieutenant Nasmyth, both belonged to the East India Company's service, and had offered themselves at Silistria as volunteers. Their services were at once accepted as invaluable, and to their abilities no less than to their courage the defenders owed the success of the defence. The Russians had to prepare their own defences against the expected attack of the allied forces from Varna, and they had so to concentrate their troops as to be able to retreat in case of not holding their ground. They therefore determined on a grand assault on the 13th of June, and after a tremendous cannonade and the explosion of mines, the Russian order was given to advance; but the men were suffering from sickness, they were dispirited and unwilling, and the assault was postponed to the following day. When the time came they were twice driven back from the earthworks. In vain their commanders threw themselves in front of the wavering and halting troops. Prince Paskiewitsch was slightly and Prince Gortschakoff seriously wounded, and so were Count Orloff, General Luders, and General Schilders, who had taken Silistria in the war of a quarter of a century before. Nearly all the leaders were struck down, and others had to take the command when, on the 18th, the Russians advanced to the assault towards a gap twelve yards long which had been made in the Turkish parapet. The breach seemed to promise a successful attack, but on reaching it they discovered that a new wall had been constructed behind it, manned by ready troops and bristling with guns. They fell back, and as they retreated the Turks rushed out and repaired the damage on the outer wall amidst a heavy fire of musketry. With all the enormous appliances for a regular siege, and with the loss of 12,000 men either during the assaults or by disease, the Russians had not been able to get beyond even the first earthwork. They were disheartened, and the siege was raised without much further attempt. Lieutenant Nasmyth survived the terrible conflict to receive the rewards of his gallantry, but his fellow-officer Captain Butler died of the exhaustion of endemic fever brought on by his exertions and

the privations which he in common with the rest of the garrison had to endure.

No one was more surprised than Lord Raglan at the news that the siege of Silistria had been raised, and soon afterwards another reverse was given to the Russian arms by the complete defeat of General Soimonoff at Giurgevo on the 7th of July, after which the whole of the Russian forces precipitately retired beyond the Pruth, their movements having probably been accelerated by the preparations made by Austria, added to the necessity for giving all their resources to the defence of Sebastopol and the prevention of the advance of the allied armies in the Crimea.

The retreat of the Russians from Silistria made the invasion of the Crimea easier, because the Turkish garrison was released, and there was no longer need to send troops from Varna to their assistance. In any case an attack on Sebastopol would have taken place; all England seemed to be crying out for it, and the popular voice was represented in the House of Lords by no less a personage than the aged Lord Lyndhurst, who spoke with much fire and enthusiasm, his words being hailed with repeated cheering.

"Look," he said, "at her whole conduct, and then, if any person can be credulous enough to trust in any statement of Russia, or in any engagement into which she may enter contrary to her own interests, all I can say is, that I admire the extent of his faith. Let me recall to your lordships' recollection what took place at St. Petersburg. . . . Sir H. Seymour heard that Russian troops were being collected on the Russian frontier: he was satisfied with his authority, and he mentioned the circumstance to Count Nesselrode. The count contradicted the statement; he said to Sir H. Seymour: 'Do not believe what you hear, believe only what you see; all that is taking place is only a change in the position of our armies, which is usual at this season of the year. I assure you, you are mistaken. . . .' Is this the system, and are these the persons on whose assurances we are to depend. . . . ?

"When the interests of millions are at stake, when the liberties of mankind are at issue,

away with confidence. Confidence generally ends in credulity. This is true of statesmen as of individuals. My lords, the history of Russia, from the establishment of the empire down to the present moment, is a history of fraud, duplicity, trickery, artifice, and violence. The present emperor has proclaimed himself protector of the Greek Church in Turkey, just as the Empress Catherine declared herself protector of the Greek Church in Poland. By means of that protectorate she fomented dissensions and stirred up political strife in the country. She then marched into Poland under the pretence of allaying tumults, and stripped the kingdom of some of its fairest provinces. We know the ultimate result; it is too familiar to require more particular reference.

"Look at another instance of Russian policy of more recent occurrence. Russia agreed to a treaty with Turkey, by which she recognized the independence of the Crimea. Nevertheless she stirred up insurrections in that country, under the old pretence of protecting one party against another, and when the opportunity offered she sent Suwaroff, one of her most barbarous generals, into the Crimea, who murdered the inhabitants and despoiled them of their territory, while a line of Russian ships invested the coast, and cut off all communication with Constantinople. At the very moment when this was being done Russia was not only at peace with Turkey, but was actually negotiating a treaty of commerce with her. . . . Russia has doubled her European territories within the last fifty years, and yet she is bent on possessing herself of Khiva. The loss of two armies does not deter her from prosecuting this purpose, although the place cannot be of the slightest value to her, except as affording her the means of annoying us in respect to our Eastern possessions. In this way does Russia go on for ever. Take the most recent instance. While Nicholas was pretending to act the part of protector of Turkey, and trying to cajole the sultan with professions of friendship and esteem, he was at the time planning the partition of his empire. This is the emperor with whom you are now dealing, and on whose statements and representations we are to rely."

On the subject of the object of the war and of material guarantees he said:—

“This will depend a good deal on the events of the war. This, however, I unhesitatingly declare, that in no event, except that of extreme necessity, ought we to make peace without previously destroying the Russian fleet in the Black Sea, and laying prostrate the fortifications by which it is defended. . . . My lords,” said the old orator in conclusion, “I feel strongly on this subject, and I believe that if this barbarous nation, this enemy of all progress except that which tends to strengthen and consolidate its own power, this state which punishes education as a crime, should once succeed in establishing itself in the heart of Europe, it would be the greatest calamity that could befall the human race.”

This was strong enough, and it roused Lord Clarendon into the declaration on the part of the government, that all Europe was not to be disturbed, great interests were not to be injured, the people were not to have fresh burdens imposed upon them, great social and commercial relations were not to be abruptly torn asunder, and all the greatest powers of Europe were not to be united in arms for an insignificant result.

The effect of these declarations was somewhat damaged by what followed. Lord Derby rose and delivered a violent harangue, which was little more than a repetition of the emphatic protest of Lord Lyndhurst, and the Earl of Aberdeen then thought fit to reply in terms so mild and reluctant, that they increased the suspicion that he was coldly prosecuting a war, which, as it was now unavoidable, must be prompt and effective. So quick were the indignant remonstrances at his supposed desire to defer hostile operations, that he had to defend himself by references to his expressed opinions at the time of the treaty of Adrianople. There were still so many men who held moderate views, and who deplored the war, that the prime minister was able for a time to convince the house that he had acted throughout only with a desire to avoid war as long as possible, and with no intention of abating the demands or the just claims of the nation against Russia.

The bitter attacks on his personal sincerity (for he was accused of acting under a sentiment of friendship for the czar) or his honest patriotism he would not stoop to reply to. Of his attitude with respect to the war he said:—

“It is true, my lords, that I have, perhaps more than any other man in this country, struggled to maintain a state of peace. I have done so because I thought it a duty to the people of this country, a duty to God and man, first to exhaust every possible measure to obtain peace before we engaged in war. I may own, though I trust my conscience acquits me of not having done the utmost, that I only regret not having done enough, or lest I may have lost some possible means of averting what I consider the greatest calamity that can befall a country. It has been said that my desire for peace unfits me to make war; but how and why do I wish to make war? I wish to make war in order to obtain peace, and no weapon that can be used in war can make the war so sure and speedy, to attain peace, as to make that war with the utmost vigour and determination.”

A plan for the attack of Sebastopol had been sketched by the Emperor of the French, and received by the Duke of Newcastle, who stated that it met with his approval as well as that of Lord Raglan, Lord de Ros, and Lord Clarendon. It could not be carried out in the early part of the campaign, while Constantinople had to be protected by the whole force, but now it became more feasible, and at a cabinet council at Lord John Russell's house at Richmond it was determined to adopt a draft of instructions, urging a prompt attack upon Sebastopol and the Russian fleet. It was understood that the final decision was to be left to Lord Raglan and Marshal St. Arnaud after they had consulted with Omar Pacha; but, perhaps with the peculiar indefinite blundering which characterized so many of the immediately practical details in relation to the war, this decision does not seem to have been very clearly expressed. The document may have been drawn with anxious care and attention, but if we are to believe Mr. King-

lake's account of the meeting of the cabinet, all its members except a small minority were asleep. At any rate, Lord Raglan regarded the message as little short of an absolute order from the secretary of state, and on that ground would have prepared to obey it.

He replied, indeed, that he intended to attack Sebastopol more in deference to the views of the British government, and to the known acquiescence of the Emperor Napoleon in those views, than to any information in the possession of the naval and military authorities, either as to the extent of the enemy's forces or their state of preparation. "The fact," he said, "must not be concealed, that neither the English nor the French admirals have been able to obtain any intelligence on which they can rely, with respect to the army which the Russians may destine for operations in the field, or to the number of men allotted for the defence of Sebastopol; and Marshal St. Arnaud and myself are equally deficient in information upon these all-important questions, and there would seem to be no chance of our acquiring it." The English commander would not take more than his share of so great a responsibility, and though he determined to proceed at once to move against Sebastopol, he afterwards received precise instructions to take that course. Hostile preparations had gone almost too far now to be recalled, even if a reaction had set in, but there were no signs of reaction, and only a few people contended that arbitration might still be possible.

"Parliament," says Mr. Kinglake, "was sitting, and it might be imagined that there was something to say against the plan for invading a province of Russia at a moment when all the main causes of dispute were vanishing. But parliament had shown that it did not consider, any more than did the country, that 'the main causes of the dispute were vanishing;' while the response awakened by Lord Lyndhurst's words showed conclusively enough how eager it was for the invasion of the Crimea. The destruction of Sebastopol, indeed, was the thought uppermost in men's minds, and between this time and the period when it was known that the

expedition with that object had been decided upon, the press rang with reproaches on the supineness of the government in not hurling the allied forces at the great naval stronghold of the czar."

To the same end the *Times* insisted (and it represented the general voice of the country):—"We are now approaching the sixth month of actual hostilities, and as yet not a shot has been fired by the land forces of England. . . . The broad policy of the war consists in striking at the very heart of the Russian power in the East, and that heart is at Sebastopol. . . . To destroy Sebastopol is nothing less than to demolish the entire fabric of Russian ambition in those very regions where it is most dangerous to Europe. This feat, and this only, would have really promoted the solid and durable objects of the war."

But there was another powerful incentive to further action. The troops at Varna were dying of cholera, which was most fatal in the French camp, where it increased with such rapidity that it was said fifteen died out of every twenty-five who were attacked with the pestilence, and fatigue parties were constantly engaged in burying the dead. Varna, with environs lovely to the eye, was just the town which, when crowded with soldiery, was liable to such a fearful mortality. Standing in Bulgaria on the shores of the Black Sea, 160 miles north-west of Constantinople, and containing ordinarily about 14,000 inhabitants, it was about as ill calculated as any other Turkish fortified town to receive a large accession to the number of those who dwelt in its vicinity, or took up quarters in the ill-drained, irregular, and neglected streets. Forty thousand men were encamped around the walls, and those streets were crowded with soldiery in all the disorder of a camp where there is little space to move. The British troops had their camp at Aladyn amidst a beautiful landscape a few miles distant; but there was hearty fellowship between the forces. The English and French soldiers, as well as the officers, were always ready to show that they regarded each other as good comrades, and to prove by deeds of kindness and mutual help that they desired a lasting friendship. They had one common

grievance, which increased after the raising of the siege of Silistria till it almost overcame discipline. Why were they not led against the enemy? The impatience of some of the French regiments, like the Zouaves, those agile soldiers from Africa, who had been used to be foremost in active assaults, was extreme. It may be imagined what were the feelings of the men when the cholera was so thinning their ranks that they began to ask themselves how many of the army would be left to meet the foe when it pleased their governments and their generals to take them into action. The French hospital at Varna soon became incapable of receiving the number of sick, and the sufferers had to be treated in field hospitals. A dark cloud of gloom and depression fell upon the men. The change from their former gaiety and light-heartedness made the effects of the calamity more conspicuous than it was in the British camp. The English troops suffered less at first; but the malady increased, and fifteen to sixteen deaths a day were the hospital returns. Aladyn, where the camp had been pitched, was known (to the inhabitants) as a hotbed of malaria, and Devus, the neighbouring beautiful valley, where a number of the tents had been placed, had long been named by the Turks "the Valley of Death." This title had been too sadly justified before our decimated troops were removed and spread over a larger space in a wider encampment. The vicinity of the late encampment became a cemetery, so numerous were the graves; and the men who recovered, like those 600 of the 3000 guards, the flower of the army, who took two days to march ten miles into Varna, though they had their packs carried for them, moved about like sickly shadows of their former selves. It may easily be imagined how the ordinary men suffered; and the mortality and sickness was increased by the strange reckless excess which has so often followed the first terror of pestilence. Discipline was necessarily less strict, and many of the men, French and English, often clubbed together to procure extras, consisting too frequently of coarse and unwholesome stimulants, or of improper articles of food. The epidemic reached the fleet, and so increased

that the English and French ships in Baltchik Bay and the harbour of Varna stood out to sea. As is frequently the case fire followed plague, and Varna was threatened with destruction by the lighting of a spirit-shop near the French commissariat stores. For ten hours the sailors were using every effort to avert the progress of the flames which ran from street to street, and were not extinguished till a fourth part of the town and a very large quantity of military rations and stores were consumed. Had the fire not been suppressed the whole place might have been burned, and the armies left to famine. The catastrophe was attributed to the Greeks, one of whom was seen to set light to the spirits with a torch as they flowed into the streets. He was cut down, and six or seven of his countrymen were bayoneted by the French soldiers.

Not only the men but many officers were suffering from the effects of cholera or dysentery. Marshal St. Arnaud was himself among the number, and his condition was serious. But the order to leave Varna and embark for the Crimea was heard with delight by the soldiers. Their comrades had been falling around them attacked by a foe against whom they seemed to be powerless. Now orders came to move forward to assault a tangible enemy. They had not all been inactive. Lord Cardigan with the light cavalry had been sent to ascertain the position of the Russian army; but though he had explored the country as far as Trajan's Wall on the border of the Dorbrudscha, he had only learned that the siege of Silistria was raised and the Russian army in retreat towards Bessarabia. Sir George Brown, General Canrobert, and several French and English officers had been on board the *Fury* to explore the Crimean coast and search for a proper landing-place for the army near Sebastopol; but they were discovered and fired upon from the ramparts. Then Marshal St. Arnaud sent a division under Canrobert for another expedition to the Dorbrudscha, expecting that they would meet with a Russian force; but nothing came of it except a slight cavalry skirmish and an alarming number of deaths by cholera, which the troops took with them on their march, and

of which seven thousand of them perished. No large force of the Russians was encountered, and it was afterwards known that the Emperor of the French was exceedingly displeased at so fruitless an expedition having been undertaken. The voyage to the Crimea could not and need not be any longer delayed. On the 7th of September the allied forces, consisting of 24,000 English, 22,000 French, and 8000 Turks, sailed from Varna, and on the evening of the 14th were landed at the "Old Fort," some distance from the town of Eupatoria. It was a tremendous movement, in which 600 vessels were employed, protected by a fleet carrying 3000 cannon. Some blunders and a good deal of confusion would have been excusable, and there were more than could well be excused; but once landed, the troops recovered their spirits, military discipline and efficiency were restored, and the two armies were ready to act in concert. No enemy opposed them. The town of Eupatoria, formidable as it appeared from the sea, surrendered at the first summons. It would appear from the fact of the armies being suffered to land, and then meeting with no resistance, that the czar and his generals thought they could keep them in the Crimea like rats in a trap, and so allow them to come on, only to annihilate them as they approached. A Russian officer and four mounted Cossacks were seen, the officer taking notes of the debarkation of the troops; but the reconnoitering steam-vessels reported that the Russian army was encamped on the heights to the south of the river Alma. Thither the two armies commenced their march on the 19th of September, 1854. During the night bivouac the allied commanders arranged the plan of the engagement. On the morning of the 20th a thick mist obscured the heights and nothing could be seen. It was thought that the Russians had retired; but a breeze stirred, the haze lifted like a curtain, and there were the Muscovite troops with formidable batteries and strong natural ramparts of rock and ravine. The allied inshore squadron of vessels, headed by the *Agamemnon*, were to keep close to the coast and cover an advance and attack by Bosquet's division, which was to advance

along the sea-shore, force the heights, and turn the enemy's left flank. The *Agamemnon* took up a position at the mouth of the Alma, and General Bosquet's men with a contingent of Turks descended from the heights of Bouljavak, followed and supported further inland by the divisions of Prince Napoleon and Generals Caurobert and Forey.

General Bosquet's division crossed the river near the mouth about 11:30, the Turkish battalion passing at the same time close to the bar and within musket-range of the beach. This movement was unopposed. With inconceivable rapidity the Zouaves swarmed up the cliff, and it was not till they formed on the height and deployed from behind a mound there that the Russian batteries opened upon them. Waiting the development of the French attack, Lord Raglan caused our infantry for a time to lie down and remain quite passive; but, wearying of this inactivity and anticipating a little in a military point of view the crisis of action, he gave orders for our whole line to advance. "Up rose those serried masses," wrote the *Times'* correspondent, "and, passing through a fearful shower of round case-shot and shell, they dashed into the Alma and floundered through the waters, which were literally torn into foam by the deadly hail. At the other side of the river were a number of vineyards occupied by Russian riflemen. Three of the staff were here shot down; but, led by Lord Raglan in person, they advanced, cheering on the men. And now came the turning-point of the battle, in which Lord Raglan, by his sagacity and military skill, probably secured the victory at a smaller sacrifice than would have been otherwise the case. He dashed over the bridge followed by his staff. Then commenced one of the most bloody and determined struggles in the annals of war. The 2d division, led by Sir De Lacy Evans, in the most dashing manner crossed the stream on the right. The 7th Fusiliers, led by Colonel Yea, were swept down by fifties. The 55th, 30th, and 95th, led by Brigadier Pennefather (who was in the thickest of the fight cheering on his men), again and again were checked, indeed, but never drew back in their onward progress, which was marked by

a fierce roll of Minié musketry; and Brigadier Adams, with the 41st, 47th, and 49th, bravely charged up the hill and aided them in the battle. Sir George Brown, conspicuous on a gray horse, rode in front of his light division, urging them with voice and gesture. The 7th, diminished by one half, fell back to reform their columns lost for the time; the 23d, with eight officers dead and four wounded, were still rushing to the front, aided by the 15th, 33d, 77th, and 88th. Down went Sir George in a cloud of dust in front of the battery. He was soon up, and shouted, '23d, I'm all right,' be sure I'll remember this day,' and led them on again; but in the shock produced by the fall of their chief the gallant regiment suffered terribly while paralysed for the moment. Meantime the guards on the right of the light division and the brigade of the Highlanders were storming the heights on the left. Their line was almost as regular as though they were in Hyde Park. Suddenly a tornado of round and grape rushed through from the terrible battery, and a roar of musketry from behind it thinned their front ranks by dozens. It was evident that our troops were just able to contend with the Russians, favoured as they were by a great position. At this very time an immense mass of Russian infantry were seen moving down towards the battery. They halted. It was the crisis of the day. Sharp, angular, and solid, they looked as if they were cut out of the solid rock. It was beyond all doubt that if our infantry, harassed and thinned as they were, got into the battery, they would have to encounter a formidable fire, which they were but ill calculated to bear. Lord Raglan saw the difficulties of the situation. He asked if it would be possible to get a couple of guns to bear on these masses. The reply was 'Yes;' and an artillery officer brought up two guns to fire on the Russian squares. The first shot missed, but the next, and the next, and the next cut through the ranks so cleanly, and so keenly, that a clear lane could be seen for a moment through the square. After a few rounds the columns of the square became broken, waded to and fro, broke, and fled over the brow of the hill, leaving behind them six or seven distinct lines

of dead lying as close as possible to each other, marking the passage of the fatal messengers. This act relieved our infantry of a great incubus, and they continued their magnificent and fearful progress. The Duke of Cambridge encouraged his men by voice and example, and proved himself worthy of his proud command, and of the royal race from whence he comes. 'Highlanders,' said Sir Colin Campbell, ere they came to the charge, 'I am going to ask a favour of you; it is, that you will act so as to justify me in asking permission of the queen for you to wear a bonnet! Don't pull a trigger till you're within a yard of the Russians!' They charged, and well they obeyed their chieftain's wish. Sir Colin had his horse shot under him; but he was up immediately and at the head of his men, shouting, 'We'll hae nane but Highland bonnets here!' but the guards passed on abreast, and claimed with the 33d the honour of capturing a cannon. They had stormed the right of the battery ere the Highlanders had got into the left, and it is said the Scots Fusilier Guards were the first to enter. The 2d and light division crowned the heights. The French turned the guns on the hill against the flying masses, which the cavalry in vain tried to cover. A few faint struggles from the scattered infantry, a few rounds of cannon and musketry, and the enemy fled to the south-east, leaving three generals, 700 prisoners, and 4000 killed and wounded behind them."

The allied loss was 619 killed and 2860 wounded. The Russian loss was reported to be about 8000. Soon after the commencement of the engagement it was evident that the battle would be decided by the energy and courage of our men rather than by any remarkable strategy on the part of the commanders, and this was the case throughout the Crimean campaign. It was fighting against a foe whose forces and dispositions were unknown, and of which little intelligence could be obtained. The chief orders that could be given were: "There is the enemy," or "There is the position"—"go and beat him," or "go and take it." The officers were unable to do more than to give initial directions to lead and encourage, and to share the dangers and privations



FIELD-MARSHAL SIR COLIN CAMPBELL, G.C.B.
LORD CLYDE.

FROM THE PORTRAIT BY SIR FRANCIS GRANT, P.R.A.
BY PERMISSION OF HENRY GRAVES & CO, LONDON.

of their men. Following the attack of the Alma, which had been bravely opposed by the Russians, the allies forced their way into the enemy's entrenchments, but were too much fatigued and too weak in cavalry to follow up their advantage. After resting they marched on, keeping near the sea, and it was afterwards said that had the fleet forced its way into the harbour of Sebastopol immediately upon the landing of the troops, and had the land forces attacked the north-west side of the stronghold, which was but poorly fortified, Sebastopol would have been taken. Of course there were plenty of critics at home who, after the necessary information had been obtained, found it easy to say what should have been done; but there seems to have been reason to think that Lord Raglan, old and cautious, but calmly intrepid, would have achieved or at least attempted it. He would, however, have needed the aid of his fellow commander St. Arnaud with all the French dash and daring, but St. Arnaud was dying, and would not, perhaps could not, give his concurrence. He was suffering great agony, and the enterprise which might have prevented a protracted siege was abandoned. The allied armies continued their march southwards past Sebastopol to Balaklava, where they pitched their camps near the coast, whence they would receive ammunition, provisions, and all the material supplies for carrying on an assault against a fortress-town, which the czar probably thought would be impregnable.

Meanwhile every day brought to England fresh tidings of the events of that memorable fight, when, in a few hours, the Russian army was driven from a commanding position, which Prince Menschikoff had pledged himself to the czar to hold against the invaders for three weeks. On the 8th Lord Burghersh arrived in London, bearing despatches from Lord Raglan with the details of the battle. The Duke of Newcastle, writing to the queen the same day, said the report as to the commander-in-chief was "that never for a moment did Lord Raglan evince any greater excitement or concern than he shows on ordinary occasions. Never since the days of the great Duke has any army felt such confidence in and love

for its leader, and never probably did any general acquire such influence over the allies, with whom he was acting." To the same effect was the report, the day after the battle, of Brigadier-general Hugh Rose (afterwards Lord Strathnairn) to the Duke of Newcastle. "As my duty," he wrote, "is to report to your lordship facts, I certainly ought not to omit an important one, which ensured the success of the day. I speak of the perfect calmness of Lord Raglan under heavy fire, and his determination to carry the most difficult position in his front, a feat in arms which has excited the universal admiration of the French army."

What Lord Raglan himself had to report of the conduct of the troops was all that could be wished. Wasted for two months previously by the scourge of cholera, which "pursued them to the very battle-field . . . exposed since they had landed in the Crimea to the extremes of wet, cold, and heat . . . in the ardour of the attack they forgot all they had endured and displayed that high courage for which the British soldier is ever distinguished; and under the heaviest fire they maintained the same determination to conquer as they had exhibited before they went into action."

For some time a report that Sebastopol had been taken was widely believed, the Earl of Aberdeen being himself at last induced to give it credence; but the rumour was of course unfounded. Enough had been done, and enough remained to be done, to cause intense excitement in London. Even at the theatres and in the streets the victory of the Alma was announced and rejoiced over. The war-fever was not likely to abate then—nor did it.

The cordial co-operation between France and England had been strengthened by a visit from Prince Albert to the emperor, who had invited him to view the French army of 100,000 men established during the summer in a camp between St. Omer and Boulogne. It was the great desire of Napoleon III. at that time to secure the personal friendship of the queen and the prince consort, and he proceeded with judicious caution to inquire of Lord Cowley confidentially whether such an invitation would

be acceptable. It was obvious enough that the interview would be of great importance, not only in removing the prejudice which still existed against the "*parvenu*," but in increasing the confidence of the French people in his position. On the other hand it would secure the firm alliance of the French nation in carrying out the war. Some emphasis was laid by the English minister on "the impression which Prince Albert's sound understanding must make upon his majesty," and on the results which it might produce. That the emperor was greatly pleased with the visit may well be understood. The King of the Belgians had also been invited, but could not remain for more than three days, and left before the arrival of the prince. The Belgian government had been so averse to his majesty's compliance with the request that they almost forbade it. Leopold, however, was not the kind of man to submit to ministerial dictation arising from mere suspicion, and paid the brief visit even though his ministry actually resigned in consequence of it. The young King of Portugal and his brother were the other imperial guests; but they had departed for England before Prince Albert's arrival. The companionship of the prince with Napoleon III. became, therefore, the more confidential, and in that sense the more complimentary. During the few days that they were together they agreed well enough, and the emperor afterwards expressed a high admiration for the knowledge possessed by the prince consort, as well as for his frank and truthful manner, which was guarded only by an evident desire to present his views with a serious and scrupulous accuracy. The liking was mutual, for the cordial courtesy and evident gratification of the emperor was flattering, and his expressed desire for information on many topics relating to the political history of the time was apparently sincere. No one ever supposed that Napoleon the Third was what the Americans call a first-class man, and Prince Albert, whose range of knowledge and mastery of political questions was very remarkable, found his imperial host surprisingly ignorant on points which should have been made of the first importance. He noticed also a barrack-room tone about his surround-

ings;¹ but there was politeness, unbounded hospitality, evident pleasure, and even gratitude for the distinction of a visit from the husband of the queen, and remarkable modesty of demeanour. The emperor was below the prince both in ability and in attainments, a fact which Lord Palmerston, who knew them both well, had found out already, and had expressed with his usual shrewd candour. One example of the frankness of the prince was his expression of opinion that the Belgians had a right to object to the visit of King Leopold if it was against the interests of the country; but of course he did not conclude that any such reason for objection existed. The emperor had been delighted with the conversation of the king, and now equally enjoyed the companionship of his nephew. Only four days were occupied by the visit, and they were days of fatiguing activity, for the weather was exceedingly sultry; the French were early risers, and reviewing, riding, driving, or walking occupied the time from morning till night, with intervals for necessary lunching and dining; but much conversation occurred during the rides or drives. Not a minute but seems to have been turned to some account in this respect. Napoleon the Third may well have been

¹The prince, in the accurate memoranda which he made of this visit, said:—

"His court and household are strictly kept, and in good order, more English than French. The gentlemen composing his *entourage* are not distinguished by birth, manner, or education. He lives on a very familiar footing with them, although they seemed afraid of him. The tone was rather the *ton de garnison*, with a good deal of smoking; the emperor smoking cigarettes, and not being able to understand my not joining him in it. He is very chilly, complains of rheumatism, and goes early to bed; takes no pleasure in music, and is proud of his horsemanship—in which, however, I could discover nothing remarkable.

"His general education appeared to me very deficient, even on subjects which are of a first necessity to him—I mean the political history of modern times and political sciences generally. He was remarkably modest, however, in acknowledging these defects, and showed the greatest candour in not pretending to know what he did not. All that refers to Napoleonic history he seems to have at his fingers' end; he also appears to have thought much and deeply on politics; yet more like an 'amateur politician,' mixing many very sound and many very crude notions together. He admires English institutions, and regrets the absence of an aristocracy in France; but might not be willing to allow such an aristocracy to control his own power, whilst he might wish to have the advantage of its control over the pure democracy."

gratified, not only by the cordial tone in which the prince consort had accepted his invitation, but by the autograph letter which he carried from the queen, and by the evident intention of her majesty to make a personal friendship with the empress. The prince, in a letter to the queen written immediately before his return, says:—

“I have in general terms expressed to the emperor your wish to see him in England, and also to make the empress’s acquaintance. His answer was, he hoped on the contrary to have an opportunity of receiving you in Paris. Next year the Louvre would be completed for the Exhibition. I must leave the matter here, and unless he says, ‘I will come, when can the queen receive me?’ I cannot fix any date.”

After reaching Osborne he wrote to the emperor:—

“The remembrance of the days I have just spent there (in France), as well as of the trustful cordiality with which you have honoured me, shall not be effaced from my memory. I found the queen and our children well, and she charges me with a thousand kind messages for your majesty.”

This was effusive enough, and must have been peculiarly acceptable to a sovereign who had succeeded to power by a *coup d’état*, and had not yet obtained full recognition from the other sovereigns of Europe. The English alliance was indeed an important event to him, and Prince Albert knew it.

“The emperor’s best chance,” he recorded in his memoranda, “is the English alliance, which not only gives steadiness to his foreign policy, but, by predisposing in his favour the English press, protects him from the only channel through which public opinion in France, if hostile to him, could find vent. I told him that we should be glad to see him in England, and that the queen would be delighted to make acquaintance with the empress.”

In reading of the cordial feeling manifested towards the Emperor of the French we can scarcely help suspecting that the mean and shifty conduct of the King of Prussia gave it greater emphasis since the emperor’s manner and avowed policy contrasted favourably with

the attitude assumed by the self-excusing sovereign, who had written another long and rather whining letter, to again receive a very direct and reproachful reply. The emperor, if he played diplomatically for the good-will of the queen and the prince, did it so well that nobody discovered he was playing at all, and the friendship which ensued between the royal and imperial acquaintances apparently continued undiminished. Napoleon the Third always used warmly appreciative language in speaking of the ability and the character of Prince Albert. The letter which he sent back to the queen after this first visit said: “The presence of your majesty’s estimable consort in the midst of a French camp is a fact of the utmost political significance, since it demonstrates the intimate union of the two countries. But to-day I prefer not to dwell on the political aspect of this visit, but to tell you in all sincerity how happy it has made me to be for several days in the society of a prince so accomplished, a man endowed with qualities so seductive, and with knowledge so profound. He may feel assured that he carries with him my sentiments of high esteem and friendship. But the more I have been enabled to appreciate Prince Albert, the more it behoves me to be touched by the kindness of your majesty in agreeing on my account to part with him for several days.” The return visit of the emperor and empress to England was, as we know, paid in the following year, and was marked by the warm reception given to the sovereign who had shown himself to be our firm ally in the war which was then at a point that caused the gravest anxiety, since Sebastopol was not taken, and the two armies in the Crimea seemed to have been committed to an indefinitely protracted campaign. It is well known that the emperor was impatiently desirous of going out himself to the camp, and the representations which were made to him in England no less than the remonstrances of his ministers and his own generals in command delayed the resolve until the fall of Sebastopol rendered further military operations unnecessary. This determination had been made known to England through a letter

to Lord Palmerston. Napoleon III. was, like the rest of the world in Paris and London, restless while the allied armies were inactive; and he conceived that a more decisive movement would be made if he went in person and in conference with Lord Raglan and General Canrobert took the undivided command for the purpose of securing necessary unity of view and of action. Obviously the camp at St. Omer and the army which had been gathered there were not without purpose, and here was the opportunity; but such a proposition was not to be received without grave representations from England as well as from France, although the emperor emphatically stated that should he go to the Crimea the honour of the British flag would be his first consideration even beyond that of his own. This was said after Lord Clarendon had gone to Boulogne for the purpose of discussing the whole question and laying before him the objections to his proposed assumption of military leadership in the Crimea. It did not appear to have occurred to him that such serious objections would exist. He had argued that Sebastopol could not, as matters stood, be taken except at an immense sacrifice of life. The army defending it, reinforced from time to time as it was from without, was in a position of immense advantage. The army from which it drew its reinforcements, on the contrary, was badly placed for meeting any vigorous attack on the part of the allies. Let them succeed in that attack, and Sebastopol must fall into their hands upon comparatively easy terms. For this purpose two things were necessary:—first, a plan of action conceived in secret and executed promptly; next certain reinforcements in men, with an adequate transport service of horses and mules. He was prepared to find the additional men if England on her part would find the vessels to carry what was wanted in the way of horses and mules to the Crimea. Leaving a sufficient force at Sebastopol for the purposes of the siege, he expected to be able to take into the field 62,000 French and the 15,000 Piedmontese, who, under a convention concluded in the previous January with the King of Sardinia, were then upon their way to support the allies in the Crimea. "With

these forces at the disposal of the allies, all the chances would be on their side, for the Russians had only 30,000 men at Sebastopol, and 45,000 echeloned between it and Simpheropol, and very probably they would not receive much in the way of reinforcements before the 1st of April." "Strike quickly," he said, "and Sebastopol will be ours before the 1st of May."

"You will tell me, perhaps," he had written to Lord Palmerston, "that I might intrust some general with this mission. Now, not only would such a general not have the same moral influence; but time would be wasted, as it always has been, in memorandums between Canrobert and Lord Raglan, between Lord Raglan and Omar Pasha. The propitious moment would be lost, the favourable chances let slip, and we should find ourselves with a besieging army unable to take the city, and with an active army not strong enough to beat the army opposed to it."

There was much in these representations; but the objection to the emperor's proposals were as strong in Paris as in London, and Lord Clarendon put the matter plainly before him, that should he go at once to the Crimea his presence could not expedite the transport of men nor the coaling of the ships which were to convey 10,000 additional French troops and the Sardinian contingent. After the emperor left France he would have to wait inactive for about a month, and it would be six or perhaps eight weeks before the reinforcements arrived. Would it not be better for him to wait till all was ready, and then to go and give only the *dernier coup de main*—the finishing stroke? This was a happy phrase, and it took. "That is the word," said the emperor; "the finishing stroke." It was good advice, and he yielded. He must inevitably have been away from Paris for four months even under favourable conditions; and should he have failed at first he must have carried on the campaign till he succeeded. It would never have done for him to return to France carrying a defeat, nor could he venture to be away from France for any long time. He must be there by the beginning of May. The representation that the alliance would be in instant danger if it began to be supposed that England was merely

to be the carrier for the French and Sardinian troops, and that her men were to be allowed to go on rotting in the trenches while the honour and glory of a new campaign would be allotted to the French with the emperor in supreme command, affected him keenly, and he protested with much emphasis that he hoped nobody considered him capable of entertaining any such intention for a moment. To support the alliance and the honour of the English flag was his desire and his unvarying determination. However, the imperial expedition to the Crimea was postponed on the 16th of April, and he came on a visit to England, accompanied by the empress. They arrived at Dover in a dense fog, in which two steamers of the French squadron had run aground near the South Foreland; the fleet of English war steamers assembled off the port to add distinction to the imperial visit had become invisible, and the imperial yacht had considerable difficulty in making the admiralty pier. But the emperor was no stranger to the casual peculiarities of the English climate, and he and the empress received a compensating welcome not only at Dover, but on their arrival in London on the way to Windsor. Two significant circumstances of the visit were noted at the time. One was the scene presented by the clubs in Pall Mall which was particularly animated. Among those who watched the cortege there must have been many who had known the imperial guest in those days when he was an exile in London. He himself drew the attention of the empress to the house in which he had formerly lived in King Street. The other incident occurred at Windsor. The splendid suite of apartments prepared for the visitors, including the Rubens, the Zuccarelli and the Vandyke rooms, were the same as those formerly assigned to Louis Philippe and his family, and the emperor's bedroom was the same which had been occupied by the King of the French, and earlier still by the Emperor Nicholas. Only three days before the arrival of Napoleon III. the queen had received a visit from the deposed and widowed Queen Marie Amélie. In the royal diary the entry ran:—"It made us both so sad to see her drive away

in a plain coach with miserable post-horses, and to think that this was the Queen of the French, and that six years ago her husband was surrounded by the same pomp and grandeur which three days hence would surround his successor. The contrast was painful in the extreme."

But the welcome to the coming guests was none the less simple and cordial. Indeed they were quickly regarded with feelings of friendship which appeared to be warmly reciprocated. Of the Empress Eugenie especially both the queen and the prince consort spoke with admiration and regard. The emperor seemed entirely to have lost the *ton de garnison*, or he knew how to leave it behind at St. Omer. The queen records that he was "so very quiet" that his voice was low and soft, and that instead of dealing in mere phrases he spoke with an earnestness and even an intensity of meaning which made all his serious conversation important. The grace, beauty, and gentleness of the empress is also warmly mentioned in the royal diary. One of the most important days during the visit to Windsor Castle was that on which the emperor was invested by the queen with the Order of the Garter. After the ceremony, as they were going along to the emperor's apartments he said, "I heartily thank your majesty. It is one bond the more; I have given my oath of fidelity to your majesty, and I will keep it carefully." He added a little later, "It is a great event for me, and I hope I may be able to prove my gratitude to your majesty and to your country." At dinner, among other topics, that of the French refugees in London came up. "He said that when assassination was loudly and openly advocated they should not enjoy hospitality. . . . He had the same opinion as his uncle, which was, that when there was a conspiracy that was known, and you could take your precautions, there was no danger; but that when a fanatic chose to attack you and to sacrifice his own life, you could do little or nothing to prevent it."

After dinner the queen had some conversation with Maréchal Vaillant, French minister of war, whom her majesty describes in her

graphic, piquant manner as "tall and very large, quite in the style of Lablache, with small but fine features—a charming, amusing, clever, and honest old man who is an universal favourite." He was very much against the emperor's going to the Crimea. He hoped, however, that the council of war which had been held at Windsor had had some effect on him. Of Prince Albert the marshal said, "Le Prince votre époux a été bien net," and had always brought people back to the point when they digressed. The emperor also told the queen that if it had not been for Prince Albert nothing would have been done.

An orchestral concert closed the evening. In concluding her record of the day the queen says of the emperor, "His manners are particularly good, easy, quiet, and dignified—as if he had been born a king's son and brought up for the place."

It is certain that the hospitalities of Windsor were given with infinite tact, grace, and simplicity. It was that most complimentary reception which at once introduces the guests into the confidence of family life, and this gave greater zest to the pomp and ceremony of those public occasions, when the imperial guests were, so to speak, received by the people of England. They were greeted with great enthusiasm not only at the Windsor review but at the Crystal Palace, where about twenty thousand persons had assembled in the grounds to see the royal and imperial party, who from the balcony beheld the spectacle of a vast and loyal multitude, whose evidently hearty welcome moved even the usually impassive emperor and greatly affected his wife. Of course there were not wanting certain apprehensions that the visit of Napoleon III. to this country might become an opportunity for an attempt by some assassin among the refugees known to be in London. The queen with all her courage felt a little nervous. On returning to the Palace after luncheon the royal visitors found it filled with people, who lined the avenue of the nave, and cheered them enthusiastically as they passed along towards the balcony, whence they were to see the fountains play, the upper series of which had just been completed and were now put in

motion for the first time. "Nothing," the queen writes, "could have succeeded better. Still I own I felt anxious, as we passed along through the multitude of people, who, after all, were very close to us. I felt, as I walked on the emperor's arm, that I was possibly a protection to him."

But the queen had herself introduced her guests to her people, and with a grace and confidence peculiarly her own. On the night before the visit to Sydenham a state visit was paid to Her Majesty's Theatre to hear the opera of *Fidelio*. Not only the house but the streets, which had been illuminated, were crammed with a multitude who cheered and who pressed to get near the carriage. The emperor, who seems to have had, or to have assumed, that kind of superstition which seeks for or easily discovers small omens, noticed that the letters formed by the gas jets and coloured lamps made the word "N. E. V. A." As the party entered the royal box the enthusiastic crowd in the house broke into tumultuous applause; and the queen, taking the emperor by the hand, led him forward bowing to the people, and as it were presented him, while Prince Albert led forward the empress. There can be no doubt that Napoleon III. was greatly gratified and affected by the incidents of his visit. "I tender to your majesty the feelings which one entertains for a queen and a sister, respectful devotion and tender friendship," he wrote in the queen's album where he had inscribed his signature. After his return to France he repeated this sentiment with equal emphasis and in happy phraseology when he wrote:—

"Though I have been three days in Paris I am still with your majesty in thought; and I feel it to be my first duty again to assure you how deep is the impression left upon my mind by the reception, so full of grace and affectionate kindness, vouchsafed to me by your majesty. Political interest first brought us into contact; but to-day, permitted as I have been to become personally known to your majesty, it is a living and respectful sympathy by which I am, and shall be henceforth, bound to your majesty. In truth, it is impossible to live for a few days as an inmate of your home

without yielding to the charm inseparable from the spectacle of the grandeur and the happiness of the most united of families. Your majesty has also touched me to the heart by the delicacy of the consideration shown to the empress; for nothing pleases more than to see the person one loves become the object of such flattering attentions."

There are good reasons for dwelling at some length on these particulars, for they indicate one of the most important changes which ever took place in the history of the country. It has been seen that in these pages no favourable view is taken either of the character of Napoleon the Third, of the means by which he attained to the throne of France, or of his national policy in other respects; but even apart from the enormous advantage which it gave him, his desire to maintain a frank and complete alliance with England was sincere. He declared that he was carrying out the policy which would under similar circumstances have been adopted by his uncle, and that he had always looked forward, even when his fortunes were darkest, to the opportunity of forming an alliance between the two nations as one of his most hopeful and encouraging ambitions. Be this as it may, there was genuine emotion on both sides when the imperial guests departed from Windsor. It had been a singularly agreeable and yet a strangely suggestive visit. A grand ball in the Waterloo Room at Windsor, where the queen, of course, danced in a quadrille with the emperor, is referred to thus in her majesty's diary:—"How strange that I, the grand-daughter of George III., should dance with the Emperor Napoleon, nephew of England's great enemy, now my nearest and most intimate ally, in the *Waterloo Room*, and this ally only six years ago living in this country an exile, poor and unthought of!" A similar reflection was made on the occasion of the visit of her majesty to the tomb of the first Napoleon at the Hotel des Invalides during the return visit which was made to the emperor in August, the same year:—

"The coffin is not yet there, but in a small side chapel de St. Jérôme. Into this the emperor led me, and there I stood, at the arm of

Napoleon III., his nephew, before the coffin of England's bitterest foe; I, the grand-daughter of that king who hated him most, and who most vigorously opposed him, and this very nephew, who bears his name, being my nearest and dearest ally! The organ of the church was playing 'God save the Queen' at the time, and this solemn scene took place by torch-light and during a thunder-storm. Strange and wonderful indeed! It seems as if in this tribute of respect to a departed and dead foe, old enmities and rivalries were wiped out, and the seal of Heaven placed upon that bond of unity which is now happily established between two great and powerful nations. May Heaven bless and prosper it!"

There is no need to describe that return visit of the queen and the prince consort with their two elder children. Enough to say that it was throughout characterized by magnificent hospitality and a generous welcome not only on the part of the imperial hosts but on that of the French people. The concord of the two nations appeared to be complete, the alliance to be firmly established. Much had happened even during the few months that had elapsed since the first success of the armies in the Crimea.

On the czar the news of the defeat of his troops on the Alma had a terrible effect. He had expected that the attempt to invade the Crimea would be disastrous to the assailants, and waited for the pleasing intelligence that they had been overwhelmed and driven back or that they would be taken prisoners. It was said that he had already given orders for the captives, and especially the English, to be treated with kindness. Prince Menschikoff could not or dared not send despatches to St. Petersburg announcing his failure. An aide-de-camp carried the tidings. The emperor had been waiting impatiently for several days when it was announced to him that the messenger was in the ante-room, and he instantly ordered him to be brought into his presence. By brief word or eager gesture he was ordered to speak. He spoke, "Sire, your army has covered itself with glory, but——" Then instantly the czar knew that the tale to be

told was one of disaster. With violent imprecations he drove the aide-de-camp from his presence. The aide-de-camp, however, understood that he was liable to be again called in, and in a short time he was ordered once more to present himself. The czar was changed in look. He seemed to be more composed than he had been, but was pale. When the aide-de-camp approached, the czar thrust forward his hand as though to snatch at something, and imperatively cried, "The despatch!" The aide-de-camp answered, "Sire, I bring no despatch." "No despatch?" the czar asked, his fury beginning to rekindle as he spoke. "Sire, Prince Menschikoff was much hurried, and——" "Hurried!" interrupted the czar. "What—what do you mean? Do you mean to say he was running?" Again his fury became uncontrollable, and it seems that it was some time before he was able to bear the cruel sound of the truth. When at length the czar came to know what had befallen his army he gave way to sheer despair; for he deemed Sebastopol lost, and had no longer any belief that the Chersonese was still a field on which he might use his energies.¹

But Sebastopol was not yet taken. Probably Nicholas had feared such a movement as Lord Raglan had contemplated, and supposed that the allied forces, aided by the fleet, would be able to advance and follow up the first success.

Marshal St. Arnaud, acting on sealed orders which he had taken out with him, had before his death transferred the command of the French army to General Canrobert, who had already done distinguished service in Africa with those Zouaves, who were among the most active and conspicuous of the troops in the Crimean campaign. Canrobert, a dashing soldier with plenty of personal courage and great promptitude, was very popular with our army. The queen, who met him while she was in Paris after he had relinquished the command to General Pelissier, describes him with her usual graphic touch:—

"A large dinner party. General Canrobert, only just returned from the trenches—'I was

in the trenches,' he said, 'just fifteen days back'—was the principal addition. He sat next to me. I was delighted with him, such an honest, good man, so sincere and friendly, and so fond of the English, very enthusiastic, talking with much gesticulation. He is short, and wears his hair, which is black, rather long behind, has a red face and rolling eyes, moustaches and no whiskers, and carries his head rather high. He praised our troops immensely, spoke of the great difficulty of the undertaking, the sufferings we had all undergone, the mistakes which had been made, and most kindly of our generals and troops. I said I looked upon him as an old acquaintance, from having heard so much of him. He said, 'I am almost a subject of your majesty,' from being a member of the Fishmongers' Company."

Canrobert was a brave and successful soldier and a good general, but not quite equal to the entire command of the army. His personal *elan* and the quickness with which his men responded to his orders were, however, of incalculable advantage. He was always on the look-out, cared nothing for Russian sharpshooters, and continued to wear his gold-laced hat and white feathers even when in action. From all accounts it would appear that the French troops, both officers and men, attended much more to the pomp and circumstance of war than the English did, and their camp was on the whole more gay and was provided with more amusements than ours. Canrobert had an opportunity of distinguishing himself at the battle of Inkerman, and he succeeded; though, as he afterwards said, and as both English and French officers agreed, it was truly the soldiers' battle, won by sheer hard fighting and without much exhibition of, or even occasion for, brilliant tactics or skilful generalship. Both tactics and generalship might better have been displayed before the engagement, and the result would then have been far more successful, the defeat inflicted on the enemy complete and irretrievable.

We have already seen that the news of the victory of the Alma was received in England, and especially in London, with enormous en-

¹ Kinglake.

thusiasm. In the churches it was alluded to along with thanksgivings for the abundant harvest; it was mentioned with triumph at the theatres; and at those "monster promenade concerts" which had just then become popularized in London by M. Jullien. The word *Alma* in gigantic letters was seen above the great orchestra which he had erected at Covent Garden Theatre; and the Allied Armies' Quadrilles, the national and patriotic airs, and the spirited warlike music which occupied half the programme were nightly applauded by immense audiences. But the campaign in the Crimea was only beginning. The place which in 1780 had been nothing more than an insignificant Tartar village named Akhtiar was now the enormous stronghold of Sebastopol. Commenced by Catherine, continued by Alexander, and completed by Nicholas, it was an imposing fortified city, the chief naval arsenal of the Russian Empire, a mile long and three-quarters of a mile broad, occupying for its site the peninsula on the south side of the roadstead and rising in the form of an amphitheatre from the shore. Its quays, magazines, and storehouses were of vast strength and solidity. It possessed a complete system of docks constructed with great skill and at enormous expense, of solid masonry, and supplied with fresh water by an aqueduct twelve miles long, formed of immense blocks of stone. Six large batteries on the south and four on the north defended it—the former mounting from 50 to 190, and the latter from 18 to 120 guns each. To these were added a number of smaller batteries. Even before the commencement of the war the port was guarded by 850 pieces of artillery, 350 of which could be brought to bear upon a single ship entering the bay; but during the siege which was now commenced enormous additions were made to the defences. Those on the land side of the stronghold, which had been less fortified, as an invasion had scarcely been dreamed of, were rapidly multiplied; and were protected by earthworks, renewed daily according to the changes of attack, and so armed that at the commencement of the siege 25,000 rounds were fired upon us before our batteries opened upon them.

"The position occupied by the enemy," wrote Lord Raglan in one of his despatches, "is not that of a fortress, but rather that of an army in an intrenched camp on very strong ground, where an apparently unlimited number of heavy guns amply provided with gunners and ammunition are mounted." Opposed to this were the allied armies exposed, unprotected by any reserve or covering force, their very existence staked on capturing a place which seemed to be impregnable, having within it an army almost as numerous as that of the assailants; while outside lay another army more numerous still, under the command of the Russian general Prince Menshikoff. But we had beaten that army, and Sebastopol was before us. Every day's delay gave the enemy more time to pile defences and to call countless troops to swell the ranks of the host to which we were opposed; every day would increase the impatience of the people of France and England that Sebastopol had not been taken by a *coup de main*. Cobden was not altogether wrong when in January, 1856, at the time that the "four points" for concluding a peace were being debated, he said that the expedition to the Crimea had been a leap in the dark; that ministers, generals, admirals, and ambassadors were all equally ignorant of the strength of the fortress and the numbers of the enemy they were going to encounter. Cobden argued that according to the evidence of the Sebastopol Committee (of which we shall presently have to speak) Lord Raglan could obtain no information; Sir John Burgoyne believed that none of the authorities with the British army when it landed had any knowledge of the subject; and that Admiral Dundas could get no intelligence from the Greeks, who were hostile, and the "Turks knew nothing." Our authorities guessed the number of the Russian forces in the Crimea variously at from 30,000 to 120,000 men. "In this state of ignorance," wrote Cobden, "Lord Raglan, under a mild protest which threw the responsibility on the government at home, set sail from Varna for the invasion of Russia. Yet whilst confessedly without one fact on which to found an opinion, the most confident expectations were

formed of the result. Lord Aberdeen and Mr. Sidney Herbert state that it was the general belief that Sebastopol would fall by a *coup de main*. Sir John Burgoyne was in hopes we should have taken it 'at once' until he saw it, and then he 'altered his opinion.' And according to Admiral Dundas, 'two-thirds of the people expected to be in Sebastopol in two or three days.'"

On the arrival of the allied troops at Balaklava the investment of Sebastopol was commenced by the formation of a line of earthworks, those of the English being in charge of Sir Colin Campbell with the 93d Highlanders and 3000 Turkish irregulars. The French works were more extensive, of greater strength, since they occupied better ground, and the possession of the Woronzoff road gave more facilities for constructing them. The English batteries overlooked Sebastopol, those of the French were level with its defences, and the lines had to be extended from the inlet of the sea called the harbour of Balaklava, where the English vessels lay (the French anchoring in the Bay of Kamiesch), to the encampment of the allied forces, a high bare plateau sloping gradually on the north to Sebastopol and on the west to Cape Chersonese. From our shipping at Balaklava harbour, all the provisions, ammunition, and military stores for our army had to be conveyed to the camp, an operation which took some days, especially as the great siege-guns had to be got into position, and the Russian batteries were already at work pouring a heavy fire upon the besiegers. On the 17th of October (1854) the allies made a tremendous and simultaneous attack by sea and land, but without any very successful result. The attempt to enter by the mouth of the harbour was partly frustrated by the shallowness of the water on each side which prevented the ships from acting in concert. The fortifications, too, were so strong that they resisted even the tremendous fire brought to bear upon them, and such damage as was inflicted was speedily repaired. It was much the same with the land attack. The system of earthworks, which was now for almost the first time brought into operation, gave remarkable facilities for rapid repairs and changes of position,

while, though the batteries of the allies poured upon the town such a dreadful hail of bombs, rockets, and heavy balls as had never before been known in any siege, the Russians replied with almost equal vigour. At an early period of the day the explosion of a powder-magazine in the French works crippled the attack from that line, and left the Russian batteries free to concentrate their fire on the British, who were engaged in an attempt to demolish one of the batteries called the Redan, which they eventually exploded though without entirely silencing it. It was evident that the Russians did not intend their apparently impregnable fortress to be taken; but they had evidently less confidence since their recent defeat and the obvious determination of the allies. A striking proof both of the caution of the Russians and of their intention to present an obstinate resistance had already been witnessed. At the entrance to the harbour they had sunk five ships of the line and two frigates, and these added to the shallow water formed an obstacle with which the vessels of the allied fleet were unable to contend. When the seven vessels weighed anchor it was thought that they were about to go out and try conclusions with the investing fleet; but while the English were looking on, the ships began slowly to sink at their moorings, and within half an hour they lay at the bottom with nothing visible but the tops of their masts, effectually barring the entrance for many a month to come.

Our attempts to storm the Russian stronghold had failed, and it was necessary to continue the siege, and to continue it with insufficient means for making any effectual demonstrations. Two English and six French ships of the line had been so damaged by the fire from the Russian forts that they had to be sent home for repairs. Our losses were 44 killed and 266 wounded; that of the French 30 killed and 164 wounded; while it was estimated that the enemy had lost 500 men. The allies had plied their batteries with vigour, but with little effect, except to strike fortifications which resisted the light ordnance with which we were alone provided. Our artillery was inferior in calibre to that of

the enemy; the guns had to be taken from our ships in order to complete our batteries; the supplies of gunpowder ran short, provisions were scarce, and could only be obtained at a high price. The troops, who, on their landing were still suffering from dysentery and other diseases, had found some relief by partaking of the fruit of the vineyards and orchards which they passed on their march; but privations, wounds, and incessant toil had so thinned their ranks, that out of our 35,000 men not more than 16,500 rank and file were fit for service. Large contingents of the Russian army continued to arrive, and though they too suffered greatly in the long march, and numbers fell on the way, there were countless detachments to fill their place. The battalions of their army of observation had been joined by the force under General Liprandi, who had come from the Danubian Principalities. For some days the Russian commanders had been reconnoitring the position of the allies, and now 30,000 men were ready to bear down upon our lines, cut us off from the harbour and its supplies, and place us between the fire of the land force and that of Sebastopol. That portion of the British line held by the Turks was the weakest, and there the Russians began their attack. On the night of the 24th of October they brought against four hillocks of earth, each defended by 250 men and two or three heavy ships' guns, a battery of heavy artillery placed on an opposite ridge. On the morning of the 25th, while this battery opened fire, it was seen that, at the eastern end of the valley, Liprandi's *corps d'armée* was drawn up in order of battle with a strong reserve on the Simpherophol road, while a large body of Russian cavalry was advancing steadily down the valley, and a column of Russian infantry moved along the foot of the hill towards the first Turkish redoubt. The Turks, dismayed, fired a few rounds and fled, leaving their guns to be turned against them by the enemy. If the Russians reached the ground overhanging the harbour our shipping and stores would be lost. There were but a few minutes in which to decide—but there was time for an orderly to leap into the saddle and gallop to the head-

quarters of Sir Colin Campbell to warn him of the advance and the attack on the redoubts. Sir George Cathcart and the Duke of Cambridge were ordered by Lord Raglan to lead their divisions to the scene of action; the division of General Bosquet was ordered to the aid of the British in holding the valley. What would become of the town of Balaklava, where the 93d Highlanders alone had to hold the approach against an overwhelming force, which consisted of two light batteries of guns playing upon the redoubts, immense bodies of cavalry and a body of infantry; while a mile behind these, coming up the valley, were six large masses of infantry marching in regular order, and in their front a regular line of artillery? The Turks, who had fled towards the Highlanders, recovered themselves and formed into companies, and the Russian cavalry in pursuit reached the high ground, and seeing the Highlanders half a mile beyond, checked the advance until the squadrons behind them had come up. About 3500 men then went thundering on in a charge towards Balaklava, the Turks fired a second volley and again fled. To oppose the impending mass there stood alone the thin red line of the 93d, who had been drawn up only two deep. It was a terrible moment. It seemed that the tremendous charge must annihilate them. The Russians approached within 250 yards, and then in front of the red line of the 93d shone a line of fire. A close volley from the Highlanders' rifles emptied scores of the saddles of the nearest Russian cavalry, who pulled up, wavered, opened their files, and fled. A shout went up from the troops who stood and watched the 93d, but there was another mass of cavalry advancing down the hill. The Scots Greys and the Inniskillen Dragoons had moved from their quarters under the command of Lord Lucan, and saw the approach of the enemy, who outnumbered them four to one, and came on confidently down the hill. Another moment and the word of command was given; the Greys and Inniskillens charged straight at the centre, broke it, and were lost in the mass. The spectators were breathless, but again there was a wild cry of victory, our troops had crashed through the first line

of the Russians, and though many of them had fallen, were already hurling themselves against the second. If the first line had had time to rally and close upon them they must have been overwhelmed, but the 4th and 5th Dragoons were already tearing onwards, and in a single charge broke again the line through which their comrades had swept their way. The defeat was complete. But there followed another charge, the story of which has been told again and again, and not only in despatches and histories of the battle, but in those lines of the poet laureate which have become a part of our popular literature, and, if rightly read, should provoke detestation of war even while they fire the imagination and cause us to admire the daring courage which they so vividly commemorate.

"Somebody blundered!" and long afterwards the "Charge of the Light Brigade" continued to be a subject for acrimonious discussion. It had, however, furnished a fresh proof of what no one had ever denied, that Englishmen would fight against overwhelming odds, and rather than yield, would face any danger, or would obey an order to go forth and meet almost certain death.

The enemy was in retreat, but it seemed as though the guns were being taken from one of the redoubts which had first been captured, and this it was necessary to prevent if possible.

A rapidly written order from Lord Raglan to Lord Lucan to advance and pursue the retiring foe was carried by Captain Nolan of the 15th Hussars, an officer of ardent courage and great ability. Before the message had reached its destination, however, the disposition of the Russian troops had so changed, that, instead of having merely to follow and charge a hastily retreating body of men, encumbered as they appeared to be with the guns which they had seized, the Light Brigade would have found itself engaged in a rapid onslaught upon the main body of Liprandi's *corps d'armée* drawn up ready to receive it at the bottom of the valley, with the batteries of the two redoubts in advance, with another battery on the Tchernaya ridge, and with the steep hill sides lined with riflemen supported by columns

of infantry. It was 600 light horsemen against an army occupying a regular defensive position. The order of Lord Raglan was, "Lord Raglan wishes the cavalry to advance rapidly to the front, follow the enemy, and try to prevent the enemy carrying away the guns; troops of horse artillery may accompany. French cavalry is on your left. Immediate." Was this order to be obeyed under all conditions—at any hazard? Lord Lucan thought that it was,—that the message was imperative. In his despatch afterwards Lord Raglan said, "From some misconception of the instruction to advance, the lieutenant-general considered that he was bound to attack *at all hazards*." But there the order was, and the aide-de-camp spoke (or so it was afterwards said) in an authoritative and, if not in a disrespectful, in a significant manner, when Lord Lucan stated the objections—in which he concurred with Lord Cardigan—to an attack which would then expose the brigade to probable destruction. It was Lord Raglan's orders that the cavalry should attack immediately. "Where and what to do?" was the question, for neither the enemy nor the guns were in sight. "There, my lord, is your enemy and there are your guns," was Nolan's retort, as he pointed to the further end of the valley. There was no more to be said but "forward;" and the Light Brigade, summoned hastily to the charge, swept on towards the "valley of death," with Captain Nolan at their head. The shout by which he cheered on those who followed him was turned into a death cry. The fragment of a shell had struck him to the heart. His uplifted arm dropped to his side, but his horse, unchecked, galloped forward, and for some seconds the charge was led by a dead officer who still sat in the saddle. Yet onward sped that devoted force, till at 1200 yards from the enemy the fire from thirty cannon and a murderous hail of bullets from the Russian infantry opened upon them. Without drawing rein, but with the grim determination of men who see their comrades falling around them, they plunge at the rampart of steel that lies in front—a rampart of steel amidst a volcano of fire. Breathlessly the French and English troops watch them

from the ridges. They are lost in the vortex, and men groan and clench their hands. How is it possible that they can come out alive? Yet at that moment it is seen that they have hewn their way through the serried ranks of the enemy, have cleft the Russian army from front to rear, and those who still live emerge on the other side. Their sabres, hacked and bloody, still flash in the air, as with renewed cheers the men wheel round, and again with desperate valour plunge into the Russian masses, to come out, few indeed in number, fighting hand to hand with the cavalry sent to intercept them, or falling from the cannon shot of the Russian gunners, who are now firing upon them, indiscriminately mowing down friend or foe in the determination to destroy the remnant of opponents whose terrible courage may well have caused them to fear, as they certainly cannot comprehend it. "It is magnificent, but it is not war," said Bosquet, as he gazed with surprise and admiration at the returning horsemen. All that remained of the 607 who had gone to that unequal, and, so far as the material result was concerned, useless encounter, were 198, the rest having been killed, wounded, or made prisoners. Even this remnant would not have reached the British lines alive but for their return being covered by the Heavy Brigade—which was to have followed them in the charge, but which had been halted, as a support, beyond the reach of the enemy's fire,—and for the prompt action of the French general, Bosquet, who ordered his Chasseurs d'Afrique to go and silence the battery that was pouring destruction from the ridge of the Tchernaya. Only one squadron of the brave fellows could be spared to charge the Russian artillerymen, but they went at their work with a fierce determination and an activity which swept the battery of its gunners, and maintained the position against all odds, till the British Light Brigade had passed.

Among the many disputes on the subject of the order given by Lord Raglan, and the action of Lord Lucan, was one which involved a censure upon Lord Cardigan for having allowed his men to gallop to the charge too rapidly for the heavy cavalry to follow them. To

this he retorted, that each commander had to do only with his own men, and his only duty was to obey orders as promptly as possible.

Lord Lucan was so little satisfied with the reference made to his misconception of the orders given him, that he afterwards brought the matter before the House of Lords, and Lord Raglan then declared that a previous order had been given, saying, that the cavalry was to advance and would be supported by infantry, that this order was not attended to, and that the second was only dependent on the first, and was not intended to be separately obeyed at all hazards. Lord Lucan demanded an inquiry by court martial, but the contention ended in recriminations, and the death of Lord Raglan, no less than the events which engrossed public attention, caused the dispute to sink into the long catalogue of grievances of which the war was so fruitful a source.

The Earl of Cardigan had shared the blame for the misdirection of the light cavalry under his command. What was worse, he had been accused of neglecting to *lead* his men in that desperate charge, and imputations were whispered of a want of courage, which were altogether unfounded. But Lord Cardigan was a man who, by his arrogant bearing, quarrelsome temper, and unnecessary and unequal strictness to his men, had caused a widely spread dislike and suspicion. It was true that when he had succeeded to his title he spent large sums of money in completing and perfecting all the arrangements connected with his regiment, but he was popular neither with his own officers and the men under his command, nor with the world outside military discipline. It was not forgotten that at an earlier part of his career, when he was Lieutenant-colonel James Thomas Brudenell of the 8th Hussars, he had left his regiment because a captain, whom he had charged with insubordination on a more or less private quarrel, was acquitted after trial by court martial; that when, as Lord Cardigan, he commanded the 11th Hussars, he had fastened another quarrel on a Captain Tuckett, in resentment of an alleged insult, consisting of the appearance on the mess table of a "black bottle" when the wine should have been in a decanter.

This led to a duel, and he was tried before the House of Peers and acquitted. Four years afterwards, in 1840, he had fallen foul of another of his officers, a Captain Reynolds, charging him with writing an improper and intemperate letter, which it appears was one strongly remonstrating against Lord Cardigan for using language at a party reflecting on the captain's character, and implying that his conduct had excluded him from visiting his superior officer. This caused much adverse comment, since Captain Reynolds was dismissed the service, and almost directly afterwards, by order of the commander-in-chief, the adjutant-general read a memorandum to the officers of the regiment, in which it was distinctly said of Lord Cardigan, "he must recollect that it is expected from him not only to exercise the military command over the regiment, but to give an example of moderation, temper, and discretion. Such a course of conduct would lead to far less frequent reference to his lordship from the 11th Hussars than has been the case in the last few months."

This did not prevent the agreeable officer and gentleman from causing a hundred lashes to be inflicted on one of the soldiers of the regiment in the riding-school at Hounslow immediately after divine service on a Sunday morning, before the rest of the men could return to barracks. Such were the antecedents of the officer whose conduct in the Crimean war was impugned, whose character was regarded with dislike and distrust, and who, though he had certainly kept up a high degree of efficiency in his regiment, was scarcely likely to be either loved or trusted by those over whom he had control. A man of violent temper and overweening pretensions, he was perhaps justly regarded as a tyrant whose own conduct was unworthy of respect; but it was probably a still greater injury to his pride to be stigmatized as a coward. This charge was afterwards abandoned, for there was nothing to sustain it, and if he suffered for the want of that self-control which is necessary for a commander, he did not go altogether unrewarded, though it is possible that he felt himself shelved when he came to be appointed inspector-general of cavalry.

The attacks of the Russians were constantly directed against the British position, and the enemy seemed to possess singularly accurate information of our weak points. On the very morning after the battle of Balaklava a sortie was made from Sebastopol by a force of about 6000 men, infantry, cavalry, and artillery, in another attempt to take the town, where they expected the co-operation of the Russian army outside. It appeared as though their intention was to join the force of General Liprandi by the road through the Inkerman valley, or as its name implies, "the fortress of caves," but they suddenly turned to the right towards a weak part of our defences approached from the ravines of the Tchernaya and overlooking the valley. This was held by the division under Sir de Lacy Evans, who had long seen the need of a stronger force at that particular spot, and had made representations to headquarters that it was not sufficiently secured. But the general was on the alert, and though the Russians came rapidly down the hill, the pickets, on whom their first onslaught was made, opposed their advance until Sir de Lacy had time to draw up his lines in advance of the camp. At the sound of the cannonade the Duke of Cambridge with the brigade of guards and General Bosquet with five French battalions came rapidly to support the division; but before they could render any decided assistance eighteen of our guns had been placed in position and opened a fire which drove back the Russian artillery and then ploughed through their infantry. This was followed by a charge with the bayonet, which utterly routed them. They fled, pursued by our men, over the ridges, and hurried back to the shelter of the citadel, losing 600, who were dead or wounded. This success, achieved by one division of only about 1200 men, was one of the most decisive achievements of the campaign, and for that and his subsequent services Sir de Lacy Evans afterwards received the thanks of parliament. But the Russians still contemplated a grand *coup*. The allies, unable to take the citadel, were scarcely capable, with the diminishing force at their disposal, to hold the position which they had

taken up. With an apparently impregnable fortress and its unceasing cannonade on one hand and an encamped army on the other;—half-starved, insufficiently clothed, badly sheltered, and suffering not only from the inclemency of the weather but from the effects of disease;—they maintained a spirit which was the wonder of their commanders and of those who at home were anxiously awaiting intelligence. Meanwhile Prince Menschikoff was preparing for one great effort which should annihilate them between the fortress, where fresh troops, artillery, and provisions were arriving from the Russian base of operations at Perekop, and the army, numbering something like 60,000 men, which occupied the heights of Inkerman. The allies must now be vanquished at any cost, and there was no other way than to overwhelm them by a furious attack from the Russian vessels in the harbour, from the heavy artillery of the town itself, and from the converging forces that might assail the British at once at the point which was known to be weakest, while Liprandi could so engage the French as to prevent their coming to the rescue. It would be strange, indeed, if an army 50,000 strong, with parks of artillery, aided by a continuous discharge of the heavy ordnance from Sebastopol and the harbour could not at length avenge previous defeats. "A terrible calamity impends over the invaders of your dominions," wrote Menschikoff to the Emperor Nicholas. "In a few days they will perish by the sword or be driven into the sea. Let your majesty send your sons here, that I may render up to them untouched the priceless treasure which your majesty has intrusted to my keeping." It was believed that the two sons of the czar, the Archdukes Nicholas and Michael, were thereupon despatched to the Crimea. They arrived to witness another and a terrible proof of the unyielding determination of the foe against whom the resources of the empire had been concentrated.

On the night of the 4th of November a deluge of rain was falling. The ground of the camp was washed into mire, the tents were soaked, and the whole scene was desolate and dispiriting. On the dawn of the next day—it was Sunday—the vapour rising from the

sodden ground and the ravines of Inkerman darkened the air. Through the heavy mists were heard the pealing of church bells and the singing of psalms from the distant city—the kernel of that great outer shell of stone and fortress. At an earlier hour, a sentry of an outlying picket on the heights, had heard what he supposed was the usual creaking and rumbling of carts and wagons on their way to the town, and he bestowed little attention on sounds which were afterwards known to be caused by the passage of masses of Russian troops and artillery slowly creeping up the rugged acclivities leading to the heights above the valley of Inkerman, where they drew up, ready to make a sudden and resistless onset upon the defenceless flank of the second division.

It was remarkable that Brigadier-general Codrington, having, according to his usual custom, visited the outlying pickets of his brigade at about five in the morning, had said to one of his officers that it would not be surprising if the Russians took advantage of the darkness and the wet to attempt a surprise. He had scarcely ceased speaking when the noise of a fusillade was heard in the valley below, and the general galloped back to arouse the sleeping troops. The camp was in commotion; the Russians had dragged up artillery to every point which commanded the English lines. The host swept down upon the pickets of the second and light divisions, which were soon driven in. By a crafty stratagem the outlying sentinels had been prevented from giving the alarm. A small party of Russians had come forward as though they were stragglers about to give themselves up as prisoners, and the picket advancing to meet them were taken prisoners by a number of others, who had been concealed, and rushed upon them before they could fire a shot. The battle began, and raged round the front British position, which the enemy seemed determined to storm at all hazards. It was at first 50,000 men against a handful, for even when all our available troops were engaged, we only numbered about 10,000 men, so greatly had the ranks been reduced by death, wounds, and sickness. A brigade coming to the relief of

the pickets checked for a moment the onward rush of the enemy. Another brigade belonging to the second division endeavoured to take them in flank, when the guns which had been brought up in the night opened a tremendous fire of shot and shell. The guards came up and with dauntless valour plunged into the thick of the fight. But so many points were attacked at once, and such masses of Russians were directed against each, that only the utmost individual exertions of every general and every soldier could save the army. Sir George Cathcart, hoping to effect a diversion, charged with his division, but they were surrounded in a ravine, and that distinguished soldier fell at the head of his troops. No one who had fallen on that fatal 5th of November was so deeply regretted by the queen and prince as this distinguished officer. Returning to England from the Cape, where he had brought a difficult war to a successful close, he had gone out at once to the Crimea, landing there in the same battered uniform which he had worn throughout the Caffre war. His experience, genius, and energy had designated him as the man most likely at no distant date to have the command in chief. In fact he had been selected by the government as Lord Raglan's successor in case of emergency, and took out with him to the Crimea a dormant commission for the purpose. This commission he had accepted with reluctance. Carrying him as it did over the heads of his seniors in the service, he knew that it must place him in an invidious position towards them. But as he could not regard it otherwise than in the light of a command from his sovereign, he conceived that no choice was left him but to accept it. When, therefore, the government subsequently decided on recalling the commission, he felt greatly relieved. Only ten days before he fell he had placed it in the hands of Lord Raglan, who, in writing to the Duke of Newcastle (27th October), speaks of General Cathcart's conduct throughout the affair as having been "exactly what might be expected from a man of his high feeling." The *Times*, in an eloquent commentary on the dearly-bought victory of Inkerman, spoke of him as "that rare and precious character in the British service—

a soldier devoted to the science and experienced in the practice of his profession. There was nothing which might not be expected from him, and, with such as he to fall back upon, there was no fear that the army would ever be at a loss for commanders. He now lies, one of thousands, slain by a chance bullet in the tempest of war."

Writing to his widow, the queen said: "I can let no one but myself express to you all my deep feelings of heartfelt sympathy on this sad occasion, when you have been deprived of a beloved husband, and I and the country of a most distinguished and excellent officer. I can attempt to offer no consolation to you in your present overwhelming affliction, for none but that derived from reliance on Him who never forsakes those who are in distress can be of any avail; but it may be soothing to you to know how highly I valued your lamented husband, how much confidence I placed in him, and how very deeply and truly I mourn his loss. Sir George died, as he had lived, in the service of his sovereign and his country, an example to all who follow him." The Hon. Emily Cathcart, daughter of Sir George, was immediately afterwards appointed maid of honour to her majesty, and remained long attached to the court in that capacity.

Not only Sir George Cathcart, but General Goldie and General Strangeways were killed, and General Torrens and Sir George Brown were wounded. The whole English line, including Sir Colin Campbell's Highlanders and the third division, which acted as a reserve, was soon engaged in a fierce and bloody conflict.

Mr. W. H. Russell, the *Times*' correspondent, in his account of the war says, "The battle of Inkerman admits of no description. It was a series of dreadful deeds of daring, of sanguinary hand-to-hand fights, of despairing sallies, of desperate assaults in glens and valleys, in brushwood glades and remote dells, hidden from all human eyes, and from which the conquerors, Russian or British, issued only to engage fresh foes—till our old supremacy, so rudely assailed, was triumphantly asserted, and the battalions of the czar gave way before our steady courage and the

chivalrous fire of France." The struggle around the battery on the descent towards the Tchernaya was terrific. It was this point which the Russians strove to capture, and here the guards made an obstinate resistance, fighting like lions, their numbers diminishing till only a few were left; and still they drove back the host that was opposed to them, a host frantic with doses of strong spirit, which had been served out to them before the battle, animated by the promises of their priests and by the knowledge that this was to be a desperate struggle to retrieve the fortunes of Holy Russia and cheer the heart of the emperor. Again and again they were forced back by the remnant of our brave guards, who had determined to hold the position till the last man of them fell, and who—their ammunition being nearly exhausted—fought with their clubbed muskets and even hurled stones at their assailants. For three hours the conflict raged at this point, and the position was already desperate when a shout and a quick clatter of steel announced the arrival of aid from General Bosquet's division. Our ready allies came rapidly to the spot, and held the ground against the discomfited Russians, while those who remained of the English guards retired and took up a position with the second division. It would have been almost impossible for the British alone to have held out against such tremendous odds—nearly five to one—and the Russian attack was so contrived as to carry out the orders of the czar to punish the English and let them have no rest. Liprandi's force was, therefore, directed so to engage the French position as to prevent the co-operation of Canrobert's troops with our own; but General Bosquet, with a soldier's quick perception, saw how hardly things were going at the "sandbag battery," and sent aid to our guards to protect a position which the enemy appeared resolved to capture at any cost.

For a time he imagined that this would suffice, but he soon became aware that the attack of Liprandi's *corps d'armée* was a feint to draw off the attention of the French, and instantly the French general determined to abandon any serious operations there and to hasten to our support.

This probably saved both armies from ruin. The British right was being overborne by the tremendous fire of the guns and the enormous masses of the enemy, when two troops of French artillery and a field battery came flying to their aid, followed by two light-footed regiments of those Zouaves and "Indigenes" or Arabs, who had already fought like tiger-cats against the Russians. These again were followed by the steadily marching troops of the line. The whole affair then assumed a new aspect. The battle was confined to the single locality, where the enemy was bringing up regiment after regiment against the yet unyielding ranks of our men. The allies were still outnumbered, but they fought side by side, and their valour rose as they mutually cheered each other against the common foe. With a fresh and irresistible ardour our troops rushed against the advancing host, which,—assailed by antagonists, some of whom, like Turcos and Zouaves, fought in a manner and with an activity which surprised them,—recoiled from the shock, wavered, were borne back, broke, and at last retreated through the ravine. Over the whole field their columns were soon in full retreat, leaving behind them heaps of slain and wounded, but slowly and steadily retiring with every vestige of the battle which might have been a trophy for the victors; every gun and even every splintered gun-carriage being carried with them. The allies had no such force of cavalry as might have followed and changed the retreat into a rout. The retiring columns were still protected by the Russian artillery, which remained upon the heights till Lord Raglan ordered two eighteen-pounders of our siege train to be dragged up, a feat performed on that rough and miry ground by the united strength of men and horses. These guns were placed in position, and their shot crashed through the Russian batteries and compelled them to move to the top of the hill and finally to retreat altogether, leaving the vanquished and retiring columns to the pursuit of the Zouaves and Indigenes, who followed them and hung about their rear as they hastened towards Sebastopol. "On our part it had been a confused and desperate

struggle; colonels of regiments led on small parties and fought like subalterns, captains like privates. Once engaged, every man was his own general. The enemy was in front, advancing, and must be beaten back. The tide of battle ebbed and flowed; not in wide waves, but in broken tumultuous billows. At one point the enemy might be repulsed, while at a little distance they were making their most determined rush. To stand on the crest and breathe awhile was, to our men, no rest, but far more trying than the close combat of infantry, where there were foes with whom to match, and prove strength, skill, and courage, and to call forth the impulses which blind the soldier to death or peril. But over that crest poured incessantly the resistless cannon shot in whose rush there seems something vindictive, as if each were bestridden by some angry demon; crashing through the bodies of men and horses, and darting from the ground on a second course of mischief. Rarely has such an artillery fire been so concentrated, and for so long, on an equally confined space. The whole front of the battlefield, from the ravine on the left to the two-gun battery on the right, was about three-quarters of a mile. Nine hours of such close fighting, with such intervals of cessation, left the victors in no mood for rejoicing. When the enemy finally retired there was no exultation as when the field of the Alma was won; it was a gloomy, though a glorious triumph."¹ The nation appreciated it, however, and Lord Raglan received the baton of a field-marshal.

The English fought in a half famished condition, many of them not having broken their fast. The losses were serious indeed, in our army, already greatly reduced. Fifty officers were killed and about a hundred wounded. Fourteen were officers of the guards. Above 2500 non-commissioned officers and privates were killed, wounded, or missing. The Russian loss could not well be estimated, but it was believed to be at least 15,000, though Russian official reports placed it at 11,959 in killed, wounded, or prisoners. The French loss was 1800 in killed and wounded.

Much horror and indignation was excited in England by the barbarous atrocity practised by the Russians who threw shells upon our fatigue parties while they were engaged in burying the dead, slaughtered our wounded upon the field of battle, and even killed prisoners. It has been explained by the fact that the men were brought from a long and exhausting journey half frenzied with drink, and aroused to fanatic fury by the representation that the allied troops had desecrated their churches by turning them into barracks, magazines, and stables.

There was sufficient evidence to show that the stories told of the slaughter of the helpless and the wounded on the field of Inkerman were not without foundation, and our men were furious, and many of them eager to make reprisals.

Such are the immediate attendants upon the glory and the triumph of war.

The queen, writing to King Leopold said, "Many of our poor officers who were only slightly wounded were brutally butchered on the ground. Several lived long enough to say this. When poor General Sir G. Cathcart fell mortally wounded, his faithful and devoted military secretary (Colonel Charles Seymour), who had been with him at the Cape, sprang from his horse, and with one arm—he was wounded in the other—supported his dying chief, when three wretches came and bayoneted him."

The Russians behaved like savages, and upon the proof of it in a court of military inquiry, remonstrances were addressed to Prince Menschikoff, who, while denying the general truth of the charge, admitted that individual instances of such brutality might have occurred in the heat of combat. But he went on to vindicate the conduct of his men as having been provoked by a religious sentiment. They had learned that the church of St. Vladimir, near Quarantine Bay, which was very holy in their estimation, had recently been pillaged by the French; and thence, as Mr. Kinglake says, "he went on to conclude that if any of the French or the English had been despatched on the battlefield while lying disabled by wounds, they must have owed

¹ *The Story of the Campaign*, by Captain Hamley.

their fate—not to the ruthlessness, but—plainly to the outraged piety of the troops.”

But at any rate this was no defence for the Russian artillery fire being directed, as it was upon more than one occasion, on English and French soldiers when they were engaged in bringing help, not to their own, but to the Russian wounded. A signal instance of this occurred, some months afterwards, at the close of the battle of the Tchernaya, on the 16th of August, 1855. While the Russians were still in the act of retreating from the battlefield, the French set actively to work to collect the Russian wounded, and to lay them out in an open space to wait the arrival of the ambulances. While occupied in this task, the Russians, who could see plainly how they were engaged, suddenly opened fire from their guns upon them, heedless of the destruction they were pouring upon their own countrymen.

The French, General Bernard wrote to Colonel Phipps, two days after the battle, “took in 1800 of the Russian wounded, but were obliged to leave crowds out, because the Russians opened a heavy fire on their parties engaged in this merciful and Christianlike duty.”

The *Times*' correspondent, who was upon the spot, thus reports the answer of a Russian soldier, who was limping along with deep flesh wounds in both his thighs, to the question what he thought of the behaviour of his friends in firing among their own wounded: “They are accustomed to beat us when we are with them; no wonder they try to ill-treat us when we are upon the point of escaping from their power!”

To return to the result of the battle of Inkerman. Again the Russians had failed to drive the allied forces from their position, and preparations could now be made for continuing the siege of Sebastopol on a scale better calculated to lead to its ultimate destruction. But where were troops to be found to supply the place of those which had perished, and to raise the regiments to an effective strength? Before the battle of Inkerman Lord Raglan had written to the Duke of Newcastle that what he wanted at the moment was troops of

the best quality. “Ten thousand men,” he said, “would make us comfortable. As it is, the divisions employed are overworked, and of necessity scattered over a too extensive position, and we are enabled, and that with difficulty, to give but one British brigade, the Highlanders, for the defence of Balaklava, assisted, however, by marines and sailors, and a French brigade.”

The stress of the Russian attack had chiefly fallen on the British force; and the diminution of that force was alarming, not only to us, but to the Emperor of the French, who at once announced his determination to send large reinforcements to the Crimea if we would find the means of transport. If England would help him with ships, he told our ambassador in Paris, he was ready to send every man he had. He had employed all the vessels at his disposal, including his own yacht, and he urged the recall of the Baltic steam fleet, that it might be employed for the transport of troops. In this respect, however, we were not much behindhand. On the 12th of November English transports were already on their way from the Black Sea to Toulon to embark French troops, and it was stated that an additional fleet of steam transports would be sent to Toulon from England, which would embark 8000 men there before the 10th of December. It was understood that provision had already been made for despatching 6000 English and 20,000 French troops, to arrive in the Crimea before Christmas.

While preparations were being made for sending reinforcements, the sufferings of the men who had been sustaining the brunt of the battle had not been forgotten. There was no lack of money, and provisions for housing, clothing, and feeding the troops during the winter were liberal enough, but our whole practical administration was so disorganized that men were starving, shelterless, and half-clad, while huts for 20,000 soldiers, large supplies of warm clothing, greatcoats, blankets, ample stores of comforting food and drink, and appliances of various kinds, were either knocking about in other ports or had been landed in the wrong place, or in some inscrutable manner had utterly failed to reach the

people for whom they were intended. During the campaign there were examples of the usual iniquities of dishonest contractors, who supply vamped-up boots and shoes, damaged or inferior provisions, shoddy cloth, or bad forage; but there were plenty of stores which were good if any proper means of transport and delivery had existed. The truth was that we had been long unprepared for a war of this kind, and though after a time our official departments began to work into regular order, and the evils of which the whole nation was complaining were remedied, our ample resources, the liberal expenditure of money for the support of the troops, and even the intensity with which popular feeling encouraged the prosecution of the war, were to a great extent cancelled by the almost hopeless confusion and apparent incapacity of the land transport and commissariat services in the Crimea. On the 20th of November it was understood that not only had the huts been ordered, but the stores of clothing and fuel had been already sent out and received, and yet during the rigorous winter, for many weeks afterwards, the poor fellows were encamped amidst the storm, the wind, and the snow upon the bleak heights of that inhospitable shore, with scanty unpalatable rations, worn and tattered clothes, only the most meagre materials for making fires, and the prospect of an entire failure of the small supply of wood which could be obtained from the surrounding country. In an extreme irony of misfortune, newspapers from England reached the officers' quarters containing reports of the medical comforts, the luxuries, the fur coats and woollen wraps, the savoury meats and compact cooking-stoves and fuel which had been supplied to the soldiers who were still labouring in hunger and cold at the trenches in the bitter knowledge that not one article in all the tempting catalogue had come to hand.

It should be remembered that the executive had only continued, with some improvements, the system which they had found in operation when they were appointed to office, and that it broke down, or rather was found to be ineffectual, under the strain of a great struggle under conditions which demanded the greatest

promptitude and order in providing and transmitting everything of which a besieging army, liable to repeated attacks and occupying an exposed situation in a rigorous climate, could need to sustain it. The Czar Nicholas had not used words without meaning if he really said that our troops would succumb to Generals January and February. The climax of misery and desolation seemed to have been reached when on the very eve of abundant provisions and shelter, food and clothing, reaching our camp, along with the large contingent of men who were sent out to increase the forces, a violent and destructive storm swept the Black Sea, wrecked the vessels which contained the comforts that were so eagerly longed for as they lay off the harbour, and expended its fury on the heights, tearing away tents, snapping their poles like twigs, carrying off stores and baggage, and rendering it impossible either to light fires or to serve out rations to the starving men, who, in a deluge of rain and amidst the confusion of a hurricane, had little or no protection. When the storm was over, having neither proper shelter nor food, they were obliged to lie down to rest as best they could, in mud trampled into a quagmire by the hoofs of frightened animals and the feet of those who had struggled to save all that could be snatched from the general wreck. It was a time of dreadful confusion and dismay, and it may only be faintly imagined what was the condition of the sick and wounded who were exposed on those heights above Inkerman with only rags or coverlids to protect them. Many deaths were attributed to the sufferings caused by this fearful night, when there was neither help nor protection from the cold furious blast and the driving rain. The story, told with graphic details by the correspondents of London newspapers, roused a feeling at home which took the form of bitter accusations against the government.

It would have been difficult to exaggerate the extent of the disaster, nor could anyone deny that some of its worst results were to be attributed to the disorder, the divided authority, and the blundering delay that had prevented the unloading of vessels, which were lost with their cargoes, or so damaged that they

had to leave for immediate repairs. One magnificent steamer, *The Prince*, of 2700 tons burden, only recently purchased for the transport service, was laden with stores,—a great part of the winter clothing intended for the men, and provisions and medicines especially designed for the sick and wounded. She had conveyed a large body of troops, but the harbour was already crowded, and before she could discharge her cargo she was ordered outside. During the fury of the gale additional anchors were cast out, but the chain-cables not having been secured, ran out at the hawse-holes and she was driven on to the rocks, and there dashed to pieces, the whole of her valuable freight being lost. Only a mid-shipman and six of the crew escaped, the rest, including some officers of the army and of the medical staff, perished. The vessel and her almost invaluable cargo represented a money loss of at least half a million. Another ship, the *Resolute*, freighted with munitions of war and carrying 700 tons of gunpowder, met a similar fate, and all on board were drowned. Thirty-two English transports, many of them of great size and value, were wrecked either on the steep cliffs of Balaklava and the Chersonese promontory, or on the coast of Eupatoria, and many of them were burned to prevent their falling into the hands of the Cossacks, who galloped down to the shore and were said to have fired on the seamen who clung to the rigging of the ill-fated vessels. Two of the finest ships in the British navy—the *Agamemnon* and the *Sanspareil*—were stranded, but were afterwards got off. The French transports were of smaller size and therefore could seek shelter in the bays and creeks, where they lay off the French position, but most of the transports that were saved were either dismasted or otherwise injured. Above 1000 lives were lost, and the value of the shipping destroyed was estimated to be over £2,000,000. It was a fearful calamity, heightened by the knowledge that the forces to which those ships had brought the means of relief were perishing for want of food, exposed to the fatal cold of that fearful gale by which even the coverings wherein the sick and the helpless endeavoured to wrap themselves were

carried away. A number of soldiers were found dead in the trenches. Horses perished of cold and starvation. The mortality among the wounded was terrible. What were the sufferings of the Russians who were on the march across the steppes of the Crimea and Southern Russia was of course never known.

But even under these appalling conditions the spirit and determination of our troops survived. For some time the disorder and bungling continued, but stores soon began to arrive. All kinds of absurd mistakes continued to be made, though a better system was at length established. Letters coming from the camp as well as the reports of Sir Edmund Lyons, who had gone out to the Crimea, testified to the undaunted and hopeful courage of the allied armies; but the personal correspondence from officers and soldiers, as well as the accounts sent by the representatives of the newspapers, and especially those of the *Times'* correspondent, also exposed the incapability of the authorities. One of the private letters of the time told how a vessel arrived at Balaklava loaded with boots and shoes. Having no bill of lading, and the cargo being merely stated as, shoes for the army, the ship was ordered out of the harbour to wait her turn. A few days afterwards an order came from Lord Raglan to obtain a vessel to go to Constantinople instantly on a most pressing service. This ship was consequently ordered to proceed to Constantinople with Lord Raglan's agents without unloading. When she had nearly reached that place one of the agents imparted in confidence to the captain that he was going to Constantinople to purchase boots and shoes, the army being in a great state of destitution for want of a supply. The captain replied, "Why, my vessel is filled with boots and shoes!" Upon which the ship was put immediately about and returned to Balaklava.

This is almost a ludicrous example of what had been going on, and such revelations of inefficiency aroused the anger of the country. People could not, at a time of such strong excitement, make sufficient allowance for the rapidity with which the war had been undertaken, nor for the want of experience which prevented the executive from fulfilling the

immediate demands that were made upon its resources. In a word, vicissitudes which would have taxed all the energies of a military dictator with great administrative genius, were not to be instantly met by the uncertain efforts of an unaccustomed department, with a few inapplicable traditions. But amidst the bitterness of popular feeling there was an element well calculated to sustain the hopes and determination of the troops. Not only was increased taxation for the support of the war borne without reluctance, but the funds of the government were to be supplemented by direct contributions from people who were willing and even eager to subscribe for the relief of the army in the Crimea by private consignments of the accessories so urgently needed. Early in October a letter written by Sir Robert Peel to the *Times* led to a subscription list being opened by the proprietors of that journal for the relief of the sick and wounded in the Crimea. In less than a fortnight the sum received amounted to something like £15,000, and the *Times* sent out a commissioner to convey the medicines and necessary comforts which had been purchased. The relief was timely, and the effect of the prompt benevolence was so thoroughly appreciated that when the subscription list was afterwards reopened above £10,000 was added to the original fund. Before this had been all expended, that is to say, about the middle of October, a royal commission, under the immediate direction of Prince Albert, was issued for the establishment of what was known as "the Patriotic Fund," for "relief of the orphans and widows of soldiers, sailors, and marines who may fall in the present war." So warmly was this accepted by the nation that half a million was received before the end of the year; bazaars, sales of works of art, concerts, and various other means of maintaining it were adopted, and even the elder children of the royal family contributed to the art sales, drawings of a creditable, but of course of a juvenile character, reminding one somewhat of these "Skelt's theatrical characters," representing knights and other figures intended for exhibition on the toy stages which were then still popular. The "Patriotic Fund" eventu-

ally rose to above a million and a quarter, and separate subscriptions were made for sending additional chaplains to the seat of war and for other purposes directed to the comfort and relief of the troops who were to pass a hard and unusually inclement winter in that desolate place.

The appeals made for contributions to this fund had incidentally the effect of again exciting a great deal of animosity against many of the leading members of the peace party, and particularly against Mr. Bright, who was its chief exponent. There can be little doubt that while holding the views which they professed these men could not with strict consistency subscribe to any fund which even indirectly served to perpetuate war; but neither is it surprising that the temper of the general bulk of the people resented their refusal to join in what was regarded as a national act of beneficence directed to the relief of those who had a great and even a permanent claim. Mr. Bright and those who thought with him, professed to regard war as so evil a thing that they could not justify any attempt which by mitigating its immediate results might tend to maintain it as a recognized alternative. They had denounced from the first the whole policy which had led to the invasion of the Crimea and all the sufferings which they were now asked to help to alleviate, and they had been abused, ridiculed, and anathematized. To yield to this outburst of practical enthusiasm would be regarded as a desertion of the principles which they had upheld against the common voice, and they might be justly taunted with having abandoned their beliefs. Eight months before this time Mr. Bright had stood up in the House of Commons and opposed the French alliance which was then rising in popular favour. "You are boasting your alliance with France," he had said. "Alliances are dangerous things. It is our alliance with Turkey which has drawn us into this war. I would not advise alliances with any nation, but I would cultivate friendship with all nations. I would have no alliance that might drag us into measures which it is neither our duty nor our interest to undertake. By our present alliance with

Turkey, Turkey cannot make peace without the consent of England and France, and by this boasted alliance with France we may find ourselves in great difficulties at some future period of these transactions."

It is possible that some of his hearers remembered these words when we were afterwards so nearly embarrassed by the Emperor of the French in his policy towards Italy while he was scheming for the acquisition of Savoy and Nice—a matter which, as we shall see by-and-by, was very near leading us into a serious difficulty. It was a peculiarity of Mr. Bright's utterances, that, however extreme may have been the views which he professed and however repugnant the general opinion was to his conclusions, he frequently struck out some luminous and almost prophetic warning which his followers, at all events, remembered long afterwards, and which told among thoughtful men who were opposed to him. This faculty often gained for him the deep attention of those who were inevitably averse to his views, and who, at the time of which we are now speaking, were to be found in the ranks of his bitterest antagonists. Another attraction, among men, was his courage, or rather that quality which has on some eminent occasions distinguished Mr. Gladstone—the indifference to popularity itself when a deep conviction or a clearly-recognized principle was involved. "I am told that the war is popular," said Mr. Bright on the occasion to which we have just referred, "and that it is foolish and eccentric to oppose it. I doubt if the war is very popular in this house. But as to what is or has been popular I may ask, What was more popular than the American war? There were persons lately living in Manchester who had seen the recruiting party going through the principal streets of that city, accompanied by the parochial clergy in full canonicals, exhorting the people to enlist to put down the rebels in the American colonies. Where is now the popularity of that disastrous and disgraceful war, and who is the man to defend it? But if honourable members will turn to the correspondence between George III. and Lord North on the subject of that war they will find that the king's chief argument for continuing the

war was that it would be dishonourable in him to make peace so long as the war was popular with the people. Again, what war could be more popular than the French war? Has not the noble lord (Lord John Russell) said not long ago in this house that peace was rendered difficult if not impossible by the conduct of the English press in 1803? For myself, I do not trouble myself whether my conduct in parliament is popular or not. I care only that it shall be wise and just, as regards the permanent interests of my country; and I despise from the bottom of my heart the man who speaks a word in favour of this war, or of any war which he believes might have been avoided, merely because the press and a portion of the people urge the government to enter into it. I recollect a passage of a distinguished French writer and statesman which bears strongly upon our present position; he says: 'The country which can comprehend and act upon the lessons which God has given it in the past events of its history, is secure in the most imminent crisis of its fate.' The past events of our history have taught me that the intervention of this country in European wars is not only unnecessary but calamitous; that we have rarely come out of such intervention having succeeded in the objects we fought for; that a debt of £800,000,000 sterling has been incurred by the policy which the noble lord approves, apparently for no other reason than that it dates from the time of William III.; and that not debt alone has been incurred, but that we have left Europe at least as much in chains as before a single effort was made by us to rescue her from tyranny. I believe if this country seventy years ago had adopted the principle of non-intervention in every case where her interests were not directly and obviously assailed, that she would have been saved from much of the pauperism and brutal crimes by which our government and people have alike been disgraced. This country might have been a garden, every dwelling might have been of marble, and every person who treads its soil might have been sufficiently educated. We should indeed have had less of military glory. We might have had neither Trafalgar nor Waterloo; but we should have

set the high example of a Christian nation, free in its institutions, courteous and just in its conduct towards all foreign states, and resting its policy on the unchangeable foundation of Christian morality."

The enthusiasm evoked by the institution of the Patriotic Fund had reached Manchester, and as their representative in parliament Mr. Bright's constituents invited him to take part in a meeting for the purpose of raising money to augment the resources of the charity. He positively refused to contribute to remove the evils which had resulted from a war which he had emphatically declared to be unnecessary. In a letter explaining his position he said, "My doctrine would have been non-intervention in this case. The danger of the Russian power was a phantom; the necessity of permanently upholding the Mohammedan rule in Europe an absurdity; our love for civilization, when we subject the Greeks and Christians to the Turks, is a sham; and our sacrifices for freedom, when working at the behests of the Emperor of the French and coaxing Austria to help us, are pitiful imposture. The evils of non-intervention were remote and vague, and could neither be weighed nor described in any accurate terms." There was no mistaking this avowal. He had not changed his sentiments, nor had he concealed them, when Manchester elected him as the representative of opinions which at the time of his election had received its adhesion. Many of his admirers among the peace party supported him in his determination, and also refused to contribute. The *Herald of Peace*—a publication representing their opinions—stated the conclusions at which they had arrived after a meeting had been held to consider their position. "It does not seem to us possible to take part in this movement without directly contributing to feed and further the system by which these orphans and widows have been created, and which, the more it is encouraged, will only add the more to the number of such sufferers day by day and year by year. For, in the first place, no one can have marked the tone of the meetings which have been held to promote this fund without observing that, with very few and rare exceptions, their whole tendency

is to glorify the entire war-system and to fan into a broader and hotter flame the sinister enthusiasm for the present war which already burns so fiercely among the people." It is easy to imagine what kind of reception was given to such expressions. The "pitiless Quakers" were charged with meanness, hypocrisy, and cruelty, and they were told with contempt to "keep their dirty money." When the time came for another election Mr. Bright lost his seat; but he took the consequences in an apparently calm and equable temper. Before he left parliament, however, he had still an opportunity to make another appeal and another protest.

We have already seen that among the remarkable changes which had taken place during the period now under our view, the scope and influence of the newspaper press was not the least striking. During the Crimean war this was emphasized in a very remarkable manner. The "special correspondents" of the leading journals occupied a position which in the old time would never have been tolerated or permitted. Their presence with the allied armies was completely recognized, and was mostly encouraged, and long before the war was over they had come to be regarded by the country as an almost indispensable adjunct to an army in active service. It was soon discovered that if they were non-combatants these gentlemen were often indifferent to the dangers of the campaign, and while forming what may be called a competent "intelligence department" in the public service, were employed in the important duty of making known to readers at home, conditions, which, when explained, removed much prejudice and misunderstanding, and preserved that sympathy between the army and the nation without which a campaign in a foreign war is often a period of uncertainty embittered by unfounded accusation or suspicion.

We have learned by recent experiences what importance is now attached to the position of "war correspondent" to a leading newspaper, and it may be said that the office was created and established by those gentlemen who so ably represented the principal journals during

the operations of the allied armies in the Crimea. To them, and especially to Mr. William Howard Russell of the *Times*, and Mr. N. A. Wood of the then existing *Morning Herald*, the army was indebted for singularly graphic and accurate descriptions of the various engagements, and for those earnest accounts of the necessities and sufferings of the men, which contributed to a more energetic action on the part of the authorities at home, and roused the nation itself to an effort for the relief of the brave fellows who were fighting their battles under vicissitudes which threatened to be more fatal than the actual warfare in which they were engaged. The special correspondents, and artists who went out for the *Illustrated London News* to send home veracious pictures of the camp and of the more striking events of the siege of Sebastopol, made a new era in military history, and added to the scant intelligence of ordinary despatches the complete and intelligible narratives of independent, and for the most part disinterested witnesses accustomed to observe and to describe what they saw around them. The result of the accounts which had appeared in the newspapers at home, and the establishment of a fund for the relief of the sick and wounded as one of its results, has already been mentioned. At a still earlier date the philanthropy of a number of devoted men and women had been deeply moved by the narratives which had reached them of the sufferings of our soldiers in the East, and a staff of nurses and medical attendants had already arrived at Scutari, where a more complete system of hospital accommodation had been organized under the superintendence of Miss Florence Nightingale.

The name of Florence Nightingale has long been associated in the public mind with works of charity and mercy. Her whole life was devoted to the care of the sick and the suffering, and from an early age she chose for herself the mission which, during the terrible two years of the Crimean war, she carried on with such energy and success. Not in England only, but all over Europe, the story of the untiring ministrations of this gentle woman

amidst scenes by which even strong men were appalled, was known and appreciated, and the example set by her, and many of those who accompanied her, may be said to have originated those organizations which have since been recognized, as affording at once an amelioration of the sufferings inflicted by war, and a silent protest against its inhumanity. This is not the place in which to discuss the question whether the efforts of societies for providing nurses to tend the victims of the battlefield are liable to be made excuses for perpetuating an appeal to the sword for the settlement of international quarrels; nor can the argument that war is more likely to cease when the universal sense of mankind revolts from the horrors that must inevitably accompany it, be practically upheld to forbid such alleviations to the misery of the sufferers as are to be found in the exercise of a noble philanthropy, like that which induced a band of English ladies to face the sickening spectacles and the arduous duties awaiting them on their arrival in the hospital at Scutari immediately after the battle of Inkerman.

Florence Nightingale, who was born in Florence in 1820, was the daughter of Mr. William Edward Nightingale of Lea Hurst, in Derbyshire, and her education included a very considerable knowledge of modern languages. It would seem that she possessed an instinctive desire to turn her acquirements to practical account by entering upon a career of charitable effort, especially in connection with the care of the sick, and her serious and earnest character found in such a mission full scope for activity, though her physical strength would have been unequal to the task had she not been sustained by a calm and sincerely religious conviction that she had undertaken a duty which she was bound to fulfil. From the local institutions in the county, where her father resided on his estate, she extended her experience by visiting the schools, hospitals, and workhouses of London, and then entered on a regular course of training as voluntary nurse in the Kaisersworth Hospital at Dusseldorf. After a careful examination of the systems adopted at similar

institutions in other parts of Germany she returned to London and founded a sanatorium for English invalid ladies in Upper Harley Street, and there became associated with Mr. and Mrs. Sidney Herbert in the charitable efforts in which they were so deeply interested. It was this association which led to the request of the secretary at war that Miss Nightingale would set out to the Crimea as superintendent of a staff of voluntary nurses, and on her consenting she was readily accompanied by about forty women, many of them ladies of rank and fortune.

The Rev. Mr. Bracebridge (of Atherstone Hall, Warwickshire, and his wife), accompanied them, and their journey through France was one of public honour, the people saluting them everywhere with enthusiasm, and many of the innkeepers and proprietors of hotels refusing payment for entertaining them.

Except for a short time, during which she was herself suffering from a severe attack of hospital fever, Miss Nightingale was in constant attendance upon the sick, and when, after the want and exposure suffered by the troops in the winter of 1854-5, cholera attacked the camp, and the duties of the nurses were still more exacting, she remained to encourage and support them by her example, to minister to the sick, and to console the dying with an assiduous care which caused many of the soldiers to regard her as a ministering angel sent to soothe their sufferings or to listen to their latest words of love and remembrance to the friends whom they would never again see in this world. It may be mentioned here that upon the return of Florence Nightingale to England in 1856 her name had become a household word throughout the country, and the national enthusiasm demanding that some recognition should be given to her unselfish services, a testimonial fund was opened and the amount of £50,000 was subscribed. This sum, at her own request, was devoted to the establishment of a Nurses' Training Institution which bore her name. The band of nurses had reached the great hospital at Scutari in time to receive the wounded after the battle of Inkerman, and

though the official attendants and the surgeons at first regarded their arrival with some degree of doubt, and feared that they would increase the confusion, and by falling sick themselves, become a fresh burden on the resources, these prognostications were quickly set at rest. The skill with which Miss Nightingale organized her staff, the quiet promptitude and efficiency which they soon displayed, and the order they introduced into the various departments, no less than the skill with which they assisted the patients, made them invaluable, while the effect of their sympathy was, in general, to exercise a marked improvement in the condition of the sufferers. It was a new thing in the land, and sticklers for routine were ready to oppose and to decry the experiment of employing voluntary and, as they supposed, amateur nurses; but in a very short time these prejudices were for the most part refuted, and had quite disappeared when, to meet the urgent and increasing needs of the large military hospital at Scutari and one which had been opened at Kululee, another staff of forty ladies and nurses under the direction of Miss Stanley, the sister of the late Dean of Westminster, arrived to aid in the good work. There were at that time 4000 patients in the two hospitals, and but for this systematic and ready assistance the official staff would have been unable to meet the terrible exigency.

While the government transport service had failed, and the commissariat department had broken down, the people of England were endeavouring to furnish the soldiers at Bala-klava with clothing and provisions by private effort. The royal family and thousands of other families in the kingdom were making or buying warm garments, or preparing various kinds of food, to be sent out whenever there was an opportunity of conveying them. Women and children were knitting socks, mittens, and comforters, or scraping linen for lint for the wounded. Men were purchasing thick coats, blankets, and boots, and consigning them to the camp, where the desperate condition of the soldiers had been somewhat alleviated by the consignment of some stores of clothing purchased at Glasgow for the

emergency and by the safe arrival of a large transport ship similarly laden.

The battle of Inkerman had so dispirited the Russians that there was apparently little probability of another assault on the position of the allies; but Sebastopol was not yet taken, and though its fall was believed by many to be certain, the time of its surrender was so indefinite that it became a question how a starving army, which was being seriously diminished by sickness and exposure, could hold its ground outside the walls.

As a result of their continued privations, cholera was attacking the men with a more deadly result than would have ensued from any renewed assault by the enemy. Even when vessels arrived with their cargoes the difficulties were not overcome. In describing the situation, Mr. Theodore Martin said: "The siege operations were practically at a standstill. The camp was drenched with rain. The men, reduced in numbers and enfeebled by want of food, and rest, and shelter, were tasked to the utmost limit of their strength to hold their own in the trenches. The commissariat had broken down for want of the means of transport. With abundance of provisions a few miles off at Balaklava men and horses were perishing for lack of food. The horses, that had carried their riders so magnificently into the enemy's lines on the memorable 25th of October, were either rotting in a sea of mud, or being wasted away in doing the ignoble work of sumpter mules; while the survivors of Inkerman, after spending a day and night in the trenches, were often compelled to wade through mire to Balaklava to bring up the rations, which the commissariat were without the means of forwarding to the front. All the evils, in short, were threatening the army, which want of foresight and of effective organization for the exigencies of a lengthened campaign could not fail to inflict. Who were to blame? was the question in every mouth. It was by no means easy to find an answer to a question which only too many were ready to discuss; but to find and to apply the remedy was the one thing needful."

A correspondent, writing in December, thus

pictures the scene between the harbour and the English position:—

"Compared with the dull, marshy solitude of the camp, Balaklava is quite a metropolis; in fact there is not another village in the world which, for its size, could show the same amount of business and excitement as is perpetually going forward in that little collection of huts which all the world is talking of under the name of Balaklava. The harbour is now like the basin of the London docks, so crowded is it with shipping of all kinds; and from every one of these vessels, at all times of the day, supplies are being constantly landed. Along a flat, dirty causeway rather beneath the level of the harbour are boats and barges of all kinds, laden with biscuit, barrels of beef, pork, rum, bales of winter clothing, siege-guns, boxes of Minié ammunition, piles of shell, trusses of hay and sacks of barley and potatoes, which are all landed in the west and stacked in the mud. The motley crowd that is perpetually wading about these piles of uneatable eatables is something beyond description. The very ragged, gaunt, hungry-looking men, with matted beards and moustaches, features grimed with dirt, and torn greatcoats stiff with successive layers of mud—these men, whose whole appearance speaks toil and suffering, and who instantly remind you of the very lowest and most impoverished class of Irish peasantry, are the picked soldiers from our different foot regiments, strong men selected to carry up provisions for the rest of the camp. Mixed with these are about 200 horsemen, whose feeble steeds seem barely able to move about with their riders through the thick, tenacious mud. The horsemen themselves are all pretty much alike—that is, they are all ragged and all muddy; yet on examining these men closely you perceive that some have dingy brass helmets on their heads, others the small Scotch cap of the 'Greys;' the remnants of red trousers indicate a hussar; while a head-dress singularly misshapen discovers a lancer. The led horse carries one bag of biscuit, and frequently is unable to bear this weight (80 lbs.) more than half the distance to the camp."

The French suffered less than our soldiers,

and their commissariat and hospital ambulance departments were better organized, but they also were in great distress and food was very scarce with them. Their condition was less publicly known than that of our troops, and if there were newspaper correspondents in their camp they issued no detailed reports. Even allowing that the reports of the English correspondents were greatly exaggerated, however, the situation of the British troops was bad enough. The condition of our men in the trenches was wretched. "Fancy working five nights out of seven in the trenches," wrote Miss Nightingale to a friend. "Fancy being thirty-six hours in them at a stretch, as they were all December, lying down or half lying down, often for forty-eight hours, with no food but raw salt pork sprinkled with sugar, rum, and biscuit; nothing hot, because the exhausted soldier could not collect his own fuel, as he was expected to do, to cook his own ration; and fancy, through all this, the army preserving their courage and patience as they have done, and being now eager¹ (the old ones more than the young ones) to be led even into the trenches. There was something sublime in the spectacle."

The poor Turks, 800 of whom were on the heights at the back of our position, died almost neglected—half of them were lost by sickness, hunger, and privation, and their own government took little heed of them. The French, it is said, suffered less than we did, mainly because of their larger forces enabling them to divide the work in the trenches. They had also two harbours for their ships, both of them nearer to the camp than ours and connected with it by good roads. But the mortality from sickness was, it was declared, greater than ours; they lost an enormous number of horses for want of forage, and they were often on very short rations. Colonel Vico, the French commissioner attached to Lord Raglan's staff, while he recognized the sufferings of the army, declared that the position of the British, bad as it was, was much exaggerated by writers who represented it to be of no efficient service; but after all he

apparently attributed this to the courage and determination of the men under circumstances that might well have dismayed them. The state of things complained of he attributed to the fault of the system, but he said that the English newspapers represented the condition of the men to be worse than it really was. They had suffered more than the French for want of transport and a *corps d'intendance*. For this want of means of transport they had found it impossible to be in the same state of forwardness as their allies; but their army was very far from having ceased to be of practical help, as some would have it to be believed, and were the enemy to appear he would find they would give him quite enough to do. (Il trouverait bien à qui parler de leur côté.)

This was no doubt true, for our men were ever ready to fight—nothing seemed to daunt them when they had to face the enemy. They had given sufficient proofs of their valour, and their comrades on the French side did not stint their praise.

"Les vingt mille Anglais campés devant Sébastopol comptent par leur bravoure comme cinquante mille hommes aux yeux de l'armée française." "The 20,000 English encamped before Sebastopol count, by reason of their pluck, as 50,000 men in the eyes of the French army," wrote Napoleon III. These were encouraging words and pleasant, and no doubt they were a genuine record of the estimation in which our men were held. Praise even of the most honourable kind, however, could not always sustain our battalions. There is a homely adage which says, "Fine words butter no parsnips," and in this case there were no parsnips to be buttered. Things were about to improve, however,—just soon enough to revive the spirits of the poor fellows who had almost begun to wonder whether they were to succumb to the monstrous neglect and disorder which had already so reduced their numbers. One thing was painfully obvious—if the reports of correspondents of the newspapers said too much, the reports of the commander-in-chief said far too little. The fact was that Lord Raglan was an excellent field-officer, but he lacked the genius, and the prompt forethought, of a competent general. or he would not have

¹ This was written on the 15th of May, 1855.

left the way between the camp and the harbour from which its supplies were drawn without a road and without sufficient means of transport. The whole wretched business was a proof that the departmental system of our army was rotten, and if further proof had been wanting it might have been furnished by the fact that while the men in camp and in hospital were perishing for want of shelter, clothing, nourishment, and medicine, the very supplies they needed, were lying in ships' holds, or were buried beneath piles of still uncleared commodities, or could not be delivered in time because somebody had failed to sign one of half-a-dozen routine documents, or, as in one instance, had placed his signature half an inch too high or too low. There was a good deal of squabbling and wrangling while the men went on starving and shivering and fighting, and the newspapers contained the only information which acquainted the people at home with the real state of affairs. It was afterwards asserted that the letters of the commander-in-chief were silent as to the sufferings, with accounts of which private letters as well as newspapers were teeming. From the despatches it was impossible to learn what was wanted for the supplies and comfort of the troops, and the government could, therefore, only act upon conjecture, and send out whatever they thought was likely to be required. Scarcely less meagre, it was said, were the official returns, which were barren of the most essential information as to the numbers of the army available and not available for action, the provision made for their shelter, clothing, and food, the supply of horses, the means of transport—all those details, in short, in the absence of which the government could neither know on what force they had to depend nor how that force was to be maintained in a state of efficiency.

It seems to have been Prince Albert who first emphatically called attention to this want of intelligence, and he wrote to the Duke of Newcastle proposing to send out to the general an efficient and detailed form of returns for him to fill up, as the only remedy "when people are not born with the instinct of method and are prevented by want of time or

inclination from writing." The returns themselves should, he said, be so framed as to draw the attention at once to the points of the greatest importance; and he accompanied his letter with a form drawn up by himself, which, if properly returned by the commander, would acquaint the government at home with such full information of every particular that they would be able to provide for the comfort and appointments for the men and materials for the siege. It was, however, not till the Duke of Newcastle had gone out of office that the arrangement was made by Lord Panmure, who succeeded him, and who wrote in the month of February, 1855:—

"It appears to me that your lordship's reports to my department are too scanty, and, in order to remedy this inconvenience, I have to request that you will call upon general officers commanding divisions, and they in their turn will desire their brigadiers to furnish reports once a fortnight, which you will regularly forward for my information. These reports must exhibit fully the state of the troops in camp. They will mention the condition of their clothing, the amount and regularity of issue of their rations, the state of their quarters, and the cleanliness of the camp in its several parts. . . . The general officers will mention in these reports any difficulties which may have occurred as to the issue of rations, fuel, or forage, and you must inquire strictly and immediately into all neglect, and visit upon the delinquent the punishment due to his fault.

"By following the above directions you will, at little trouble to yourself, convey to me most interesting information, for all which I am at present compelled to rely on the reports of unofficial individuals."

The instructions here given were carried out; and from this time reports, accompanied by tabular returns, were regularly forwarded to the secretary for war, and by him to the queen.

All this looks a good deal like a successful shifting of blame from the shoulders of one to those of another, and it is tolerably clear that by the time that this information was provided, the government at home had begun to get their own departments into better order.

It may be doubted whether if such formal reports had come at the earlier date of the occupation of the Crimea, the organization here would have been capable of responding to it in any proportion to the representations which they contained. However, it was clearly the duty of the commander-in-chief to send explicit information, and now that it was furnished, it was fortunate that the authorities here had so far reformed their ways as to be able more promptly and efficiently to respond to it. This was one of the important improvements which did much to relieve the troops now pursuing the siege with more vigour; but it had been preceded by two others of immediate and practical advantage. The first of them had also been pointed out by the prince consort, who had written in his diary on the 26th of November (1854), the words, "The army must be increased," and two days afterwards wrote to Mr. Sidney Herbert, saying that the step which had previously been taken of bringing each regiment up to twelve companies, though the right one, had failed in supplying with sufficient quickness the tremendous expenditure of men in the Crimea, and particularly in supplying the army of Lord Raglan on account of the distance of 3000 miles between the basis and the field of battle. A mere reference home in writing and its answer required six weeks, and the time for providing troops increased it to two months under the most favourable circumstances, during which the whole state of things might be altered. What was imperatively demanded was an intermediate depot upon which Lord Raglan would draw at pleasure, and which would be kept supplied from home. The prince contended that for every four companies in depot at home there should be an equal depot established at Malta—these depots to be united in provisional battalions like the provisional battalions at home. They would form at the same time the whole garrison, and would require all the accommodation at that place, setting free all the regiments now there. If Malta would not hold sufficient depots the system might be further extended to Gibraltar. Our present depots might go out at once, and fresh ones be formed at home. We

should then have depots of four companies in England for recruiting and instruction; depots at Malta as a reserve to the army in the field, and for further training; and battalions of eight companies in the field, always kept complete, while the invalids might join the reserves, and a great deal of shipping would thus be saved. Without reserves for the army, between it and the home depots it could not be carried on. Lord Raglan could have his reserves within command, and the knowledge of what he had, and what he had to expect, would be his safest guide in regulating his operations.

This appeared to be sound enough, and probably had occurred to others, when it was found that, instead of being taken by a *coup de main*, Sebastopol would have to be invested, and that the fortifications and earthworks by which the Russian military engineer, General Todleben, had protected it, would be a hard nut to crack. The subject was at all events discussed on the very next day; the plan was submitted to the cabinet with the approval of Lord Hardinge and Mr. Sidney Herbert, and on the 1st of December Lord Aberdeen informed the queen that it had been adopted. An army of reserve amounting to 16,000 men was to be formed at Malta, and one half of this force, it was hoped, would soon be completed. But the same letter also mentioned another, or rather two other practical and really intelligent advances that were now made towards successfully remedying the errors which had caused such irretrievable loss. It announced that a contract had been sanctioned for a railroad from Balaklava to the camp before Sebastopol, "principally in order to spare the incredible labour necessary to drag the artillery from the coast, which had hitherto been performed by the seamen of the fleet," and that a contract was also entered into for laying a telegraphic cable at the joint expense of France and England between Cape Kalerga, near Varna, and the monastery of St. George between Balaklava and Kamiesch Bay.

The prospect of these two undertakings may have helped to raise the spirits of the men, who with invincible courage prepared

to spend an English Christmas in the trenches and the camp. Some stores, and even a few seasonable luxuries, reached them in time to give them a reminder that in the general celebration of the national holiday, they had an abiding-place in the hearts of men and women who would willingly have shared with them their own good cheer. The queen and the royal household had held them constantly in remembrance, and the anxiety of her majesty, and her earnest desire to relieve their distress, had been conveyed to them by many gracious and affectionate messages, and by not a few gifts which bore tribute to the loyalty and courage of the recipients.

Preparations were made for employing a staff of navvies who had been organized under the direction of Sir Morton Peto, the well-known contractor, and in January, 1855, they were equipped and sent out to construct a railroad from Balaklava to the trenches before the heights round Sebastopol. One of the firm of Sir Morton Peto had already arranged with Sir de Lacy Evans the plan of operations. Every navvy, besides his pay and rations, was provided with complete suits of clothing, adapted to the variation of the weather and the work on which he was to be employed, and capable of resisting the cold and wet to which he would certainly be exposed. Before the end of the following month there were nearly 900 men employed on the work, including some who had been sent from Constantinople. The whole distance over which they had to construct the line was nearly seven miles, and a mile and a half had been completed by the 16th of February, the first four miles being the most important. There were of course a number of horses employed, and these had to be sent from England as well as the fodder for their consumption; but the promptitude and completeness of the preparations and the manner in which they were carried out by the practical staff of the "navvy commission" offered a marked contrast to the bungling of the government officials. The comfort of the men was also well cared for; they had proper huts, good rations, and were superintended by their own foremen and officers, while a chaplain and a surgeon were

also engaged for the navy corps, which on the whole behaved admirably and accomplished its work in a very praiseworthy manner. It was no light labour that these sturdy fellows had to perform, and before they had been on the ground many weeks, such were the vicissitudes of the climate that they were obliged to discard much of their winter clothing and resort to the change of costume which had been provided for them. Balaklava and its surrounding approaches were in a frightful condition. The roads were mere quagmires, the men often working up to their middles in mud, while dead horses strewed the ground in every direction. This was all the more dangerous because of the change of weather, which before the end of February had become comparatively sultry, the temperature having reached 58 degrees, though a few days previously the thermometer had registered 16 degrees below freezing-point. It may easily be understood what invaluable service was rendered by the "excavators," who, acting as scavengers, cleared the place, and afterwards under direction of their officers took measures for improving its sanitary condition. For some time the "navvy" and the "naval" brigades, the jovial handy sailors of our fleet, who had their own camp with its tents before Sebastopol, were among the most popular of the forces in the Crimea; the Zouaves and the men of the French navy being also held in great estimation.

Before long there was an extraordinary representation of various nationalities before the walls of the beleaguered fortress. In June (1855) a company of Spanish muleteers, with their animals, arrived from Vigo in one of the Peninsular and Oriental Company's steamships (the *Iberia*) at Gibraltar, whence they were taken to the Crimea in the ordinary transport vessels. There were thus inside and outside the city Russians, Finns, Cossacks, and people of the various nations of the Black and White Seas, and the Caspian, and perhaps as far as the borders of China itself; while outside were French, English, Turks, Africans, Egyptians, Tunisians, Arabs, Tartars, and various examples of the Moslem races, a Sardinian contingent, sundry Teutonic addi-

tions to the army, Swiss officers of the Anglo-French legion, Corsicans, Maltese, and Ionians, and beside these a few were hourly expected from Roumelia and Anatolia.

In addition to the railway there was, as we have mentioned, the new electric telegraph. The cable, 400 miles in length, was connected with a telegraph from Varna to Rutchuk, from which place a complete system of communication with England already existed. In this way direct and secret communication was established between the offices of the war department in England and Paris and the headquarters of the English and French commanders-in-chief. The first telegram transmitted was on the 4th of May, 1855. Hitherto the first news of what was passing in the Crimea had reached us through St. Petersburg. From this time St. Petersburg got its earliest news through London and Paris.

With these vigorous measures for prosecuting the war, and the advent of warm weather, the condition of the camp soon began to improve, and while the operations of the allies settled down into a regular and completely ordered siege the soldiers were able to enjoy greater comfort than can usually be secured during a campaign. Indeed life at the camp, apart from the losses sustained from the fire of the enemy, was far from intolerable. This, however, was not until the late spring of the year. An eye-witness who visited Balaklava at the beginning of February wrote:

“The morning was bitterly cold; wind and snow, and twelve degrees of frost. The sight that met our eyes when we went on deck in the morning was really quite sickening. The stern of our vessel was about twenty yards from the shore, and there we saw scores of miserable, half-clothed, half-starved objects shivering on the wharfs, or trying in vain to keep their blood in circulation by shambling up and down; no workhouse could have shown a more abject set of paupers than did Balaklava that morning. Good heavens! was one’s first thought, can these miserable objects, with scanty ragged coats, clothes in tatters, and boots in holes, or with none at all, be British soldiers, whom the country is informed by their rulers are at this moment actually

borne down with warm clothing, and furnished with every luxury that the mind of the soldier can conceive? How fearfully have the government been deceived, or how cruelly have they deceived the people of England?

“The warm clothing was just now, on the 3d of February, being served out, slowly enough, heaven knows! and boots were being issued at the rate of six and seven pairs to each regiment. The distribution of warm clothing was not completed before the middle of February, and many officers’ servants and bätmen had not even received them by the 20th of the month!

“Miserable as the men were when I arrived, I was assured that their condition had wonderfully improved during the last three weeks. If that was true, in what a pitiable case must they have been during January!

“About nine or ten o’clock fatigue parties began to drop in from the front; gaunt, haggard, bearded men, with a reckless, desperate look that was indescribable. Many of these had sheep-skin coats; some of the artillery and cavalry good long blue great-coats, and even long boots; but the majority of the men, especially those of the line, were clothed in every imaginable patched-up, worn-out garment it is possible to conceive; there was not an atom of uniform visible amongst the lot of them.”

In the trenches the condition of the poor fellows was still worse, but no one who visited them found them either cowed with their reverses or wishing for anything more earnestly than to have an opportunity for another decisive contest with the enemy.

As to the town of Balaklava itself there was nothing to be done but to destroy, and in a sense to rebuild it. Colonel Harding, who was sent out early in February, found the place hopelessly swamped with mud, impregnated with filth, and the very stones of the houses containing the germs of disease. He therefore determined to pull down one house after another, and to erect wooden houses in their places. The cellars were cleaned out, and the filth and rubbish brought to the light of day, heaped up in the open places, and burned, the evil-smelling smoke

hanging in a cloud over the town. The stones of the ruined houses were carried away, broken up, and used for the improvement of the roads. The places where the houses stood were levelled and large quantities of quicklime strewed over them. It was a curious and interesting sight to watch the fatigue parties of soldiers, in their uncouth and motley winter dresses, invading a doomed house. In they marched, with axes and picks, and in a few minutes out came from the windows and by the doors, abominations, old and new, foul straw, broken bottles, soiled rags, bits of biscuit, bones with the blackened and shrivelled flesh still sticking to them, mouldy cheese, piles of broken furniture covered with vermin, and whole heaps of unalloyed, indescribable, unmentionable dirt—were thrown up into a funeral pile—a matchbox was produced and a wisp of straw, the pile was properly lighted, and a dense cloud of smoke rising up proclaimed that another act of purification had commenced. Next came the work of the axe and the pick. Part of the fatigue party outside separated the wood from the rubbish and stones, and others at once carted away the stones and levelled the place. Where the morning sun shone on a house, there the evening sun shone on a smooth level place, whitened over with lime and prepared for house-building, in the sense of the camp. Holes were dug, posts fixed, the place was crowded and busy all day, and in the evening there stood a large wooden hut. Such huts sprang up between sunrise and sunset; and sheds, too, for stabling horses, as if by enchantment.

At last there seemed to be some prospect of real improvement, though the stores came slowly for some time afterwards and provisions were exorbitantly dear. Speculators made a great harvest. One of them bought a cargo of poultry at Sinope and Samsoun, the geese costing him sixpence and the turkeys a shilling a piece; and for these he charged at the camp, turkeys 15s. and geese 5s., and the prices afterwards rose to 22s. for a goose, and for a skinny fowl 5s.; other articles of consumption being equally unattainable except at real famine prices. These were the reports that came to England in private

letters, and while the army had lain inactive a considerable number of officers had returned to England on "urgent private affairs." Now there were great preparations for the siege; the Russians were accumulating enormous supplies of stores and ammunition at Sebastopol for a spring campaign, but soon there came news that the stronghold itself was being severely damaged by the tremendous fire which was launched upon it by the allies. Intelligence from Berlin announced that the south side side of the town had suffered very considerably; a number of houses were piles of ruins, of others only the external walls were distinguishable; the theatre had ceased to exist. The northern portion of the town had not suffered so much, but yet there was hardly a house there the walls or roof of which had not been perforated by grenade, shell, ball, or rocket, or the window-panes and frames of which had not been destroyed by fragments of exploding shells. The inhabitants of Sebastopol had, however, by no means deserted the town; with few exceptions they continued to occupy their houses, even though battered. In the shops and warehouses traffic was said to be kept up with but little diminution; even the hotels were not shut. The only promenade left to the fashionable world in those parts was a new Boulevard, from which there was a fine view—on the one side the surrounding mountains, with the allied camp, its trenches, and its fortifications; on the other side the sea, with the allied fleets keeping ward and watch over the Crimea. On the northern side steamers and boats were seen all day and all night plying to and from the Catherine harbour, laden with gabions, fascines, balls, shells, powder, and *matériel de guerre* of all sorts; while on the landing-places stores of cannon and carriages, mortars, beams, and other artillery materials were piled up.

Perhaps not much dependence could be placed on these reports at the time, but the news from the camp itself was more cheering, and before the end of March the aspect of the allied position was materially changed. A correspondent describing the camp, said:

“What a sad noisy place it is—such bargaining, quarrelling, I should fancy quite equal to the original Donnybrook. The French soldiers were all busy, some making roads, others carrying fascines, &c., and I was much struck with their cleanly appearance. I passed several ‘vivandières,’ looking really smart and pretty—a very small glass of good brandy they gave for 6*d.* I got early to —’s tent, and was at once warmly received; would not hear of my going back till the following day; lunched and set out for a stroll, and to get a good view of Sebastopol, which I was surprised to see so very little damaged. It looked very pretty and very quiet; boats were plying in the harbour, and ladies walking about; it looked like anything but what I expected a besieged town would appear. We saw our besieging batteries and took a long turn through the various camps of several divisions. Met many I knew, and was surprised at the very healthy though rough appearance of them all; and they all seemed satisfied and happy. Hospitality is certainly one of the most distinguishing features of camp life: every one offered a welcome, and all had a something in the eating and drinking way to offer. We got back by five or half-past; had a wash in some freezing water; pulled off my boots, which were knee-deep in mud, put on another borrowed pair, and a dry, warm, coat, and at six dined. There were eight of us in all. We had mutton broth and sheep’s head, salmon and lobster from preserved tins, roast mutton, fowls, ham, capital bread, cheese, loads of sauces, sherry, port, and porter; and all of us in capital spirits. The stove was troublesome; having no funnel, it was kept outside till the smoke was gone, and with the smoke went most of the heat in the men’s tents; close to us we heard all sorts of jovial singing old familiar songs; and no set of men could to all appearance have been happier than those besieging Sebastopol, though it was blowing hard and snowing, and any moment their songs might have been stopped by war in its stern reality. We heard constant firing of heavy guns and musketry, which my companions seemed insensible to the noise of. By ten p.m. the singing and fiddling among the men ceased,

but we sat chatting and talking till twelve. I had a tent to myself to sleep in, a camp bed, and plenty of warm clothing, and a very good fire. The tent pole was hung round with hams. It blew very hard, and the tent shook, so that I expected it would blow down; however, I suffered no misfortune beyond a few hams tumbling on me. Turned out and had a cold wash. Breakfasted at eight—coffee, mutton chops, fried potatoes. A Frenchman brought from the French camp some excellent bread, but dear—2*s.* for a small loaf. At nine I mounted and rode to headquarters. Near Lord Raglan’s little bit of road; loads of carriages, carts, and all sorts of things piled up; plenty of turkeys and poultry strutting about—in fact his quarters have a good deal the appearance of a Dutch farmyard.”

The famous M. Soyer, then *chef de cuisine* of the Reform Club, appeared on the scene in the Crimea at about this time. He had, it will be remembered, taken part in the relief of distress in Ireland by making a professional tour to give lessons in the preparation of cheap and nourishing food, and though some people were inclined to ridicule his pretensions it could scarcely be denied that he did some service in calling attention to the proper use of common food-materials and the best methods of converting them into palatable dishes. At all events, when he proposed to go out to Scutari and organize the hospital culinary service there, his offer was not refused, and he himself has left a more or less amusing account of the expedition.¹ It is sufficient here to say that he effected some very useful reforms in the barrack hospital kitchen, that the rations for the sick were greatly improved under his regulations, and that he showed the staff, which he organized, how to utilize much good soup, which it had been the custom to throw away as mere “pot liquor.” Considerable interest was manifested in his plans, and his success was rewarded with the recognition not only of the officers but of the medical staff, and the nurses, who acknowledged the value

¹ *Soyer’s Culinary Campaign: being Historical Reminiscences of the Late War, with the Plain Art of Cookery for Military and Civil Institutions, the Army, Navy, Public, &c. &c.* 1857.

of his instructions. He afterwards went to the camp, where he introduced a new cooking stove, by which rations for 300 men could be prepared at one time, and hot meals could be served in the trenches, the fire by which the stove was heated being completely concealed.

The allied armies then, were preparing for a protracted siege, or rather they hoped by the concentration of their efforts, and by the large accession of men and the material of war before Sebastopol, to force the Russians to surrender. Our intrenchments, and still more those of the French, were pushed forward towards the enemy's works, and the entire position was developed into a form of attack. The month of May opened with beautiful weather, and the scene was a remarkable one. Again quoting the description in a letter from the camp: "A gentle breeze fanned the fluttering canvas of the wide-spread streets of tents, here pitched on swelling mounds covered with fresh grass, there sunk in valleys of black mould, trodden up by innumerable feet and hoofs, and scattered broadcast over the vast plateau of the Chersonese;—it is enough to make one credulous of peace, and to listen to the pleasant whispers of home, notwithstanding the rude interruption of the cannon before Sebastopol. This bright sun, however, develops fever and malaria. The reeking earth, saturated with dew and rain, pours forth poisonous vapours, and the sad rows of mounds covered with long dank grass, which rise in all directions above the soil, impregnate the air with disease. As the atmosphere is purged of clouds and vapour the reports of the cannon and of the rifles become more distinct. The white houses, green roofs, and the domes and cupolas of Sebastopol stand out with tantalizing distinctness against the sky, and the ruined suburbs and masses of rubbish inside the Russian batteries seem almost incorporated with the French intrenchments. The French on the left are indeed too near the enemy's lines; they are exposed to constant annoyance and loss by frequent volleys of hand-grenades and cohorn, and their works are interrupted by little sorties of a few yards—out and back again. On the extreme right, however, the English works towards the Round Tower are

in advance of the French works towards the Mamelon. On our proper left we can make no considerable approaches in advance of our actual works up to the Redan in consequence of the deep ravine before our batteries. The ravine winding from the right between the two attacks sweeps down below the Green-hill, with a precipitous ascent on the Russian side, towards the Redan, and a gentle rise up to the Green-hill. The French approach towards the Round Tower is obstructed by the Mamelon, which is due south of it, and we cannot approach much nearer towards the Round Tower, working from our right, till the Mamelon is taken. The distance from the Mamelon to the Redan is about 550 yards. From the Round Tower to the sea (of the harbour) behind it the distance is about 1700 yards. The French are now within a few hundred yards of the Mamelon, and our advanced parallel, which is connected with theirs, inclines forward of their line towards the Round Tower. Although the Mamelon is pierced for eleven guns there are not apparently more than five guns mounted; but all the embrasures are screened. The Russians have been checked in their attempts to advance upon our right towards Inkerman; and, as I have said, the French on the left towards the sea have pushed their lines inside the old Russian outworks; but the centre, protected by the Garden Battery, Road Battery, Barrack Battery, and Redan, still offers considerable difficulty to an approach, and presents a very strong position. Not only must we have ample guns and ammunition to fight the Russian batteries again, but we must be prepared with a siege train and matériel to move up to the heights inside the town, commanding the fleet and the northern forts and batteries, as soon as we get into the south side, which must be entered by hook or crook—by the window if not by the door, to use the idiom of General Canrobert. At present there is an interregnum—nothing to report—nothing to write about except the movements of guns and wagon-loads of shell, the arrivals of horses and detachments of men, or the events of the race-course."

The mention of the race-course at once sug-

gests that the *entourage* had changed indeed. At Karain, not far distant, the "spring meeting" of the camp attested that the national sport of the English had been observed even under these apparently unpropitious conditions. The spirits of the men as well as those of the officers had recovered, the camp had been victualled, and supplies were constantly arriving not only of food, but of forage for the horses, most of which were now in good condition, though it may be easily supposed that "the field" upon the race-course was of rather a mixed character, to say nothing of the steeds ridden by some of the spectators.

On the 1st of May the advance of the position of the allies had enabled them to make a sharp and sudden attack by which they took possession of the whole of the Russian rifle-pits and captured 200 prisoners. The investment of Sebastopol had begun in earnest. The enlistment bounty had been raised to £8 per man in the previous year, and recruiting had been going on briskly in Scotland, and especially in Glasgow, whence a large body of fine young men had entered the service. It appeared from the returns that in Scotland recruiting had been going on at the rate of above 6000 per annum, and it was computed that should the same rate be maintained throughout the kingdom a total of upwards of 60,000 would be added to her majesty's forces. But in addition to the home recruiting the Foreign Enlistment Act had resulted in the engagement of a foreign legion enlisted in British America—a measure which caused considerable suspicion and ill feeling on the part of the government of the United States. A large number of Swiss volunteers were recruited, and also some Poles and Germans, who were quartered and disciplined at Heligoland, not altogether to the satisfaction of some Prussian politicians.

It was at this time that the camp at Aldershott was formed; and although so many troops were in the Crimea, it was estimated that about 9000 men occupied the ground there on the occasion of the camp being opened by her majesty and Prince Albert, when battalions were brought from all parts of the kingdom, including about 1100 cavalry,

2500 guards and infantry of the line, and about 4800 militia; which, added to 500 artillery and 150 sappers and miners, constitute a force exceeding 9000 men. These were to be relieved occasionally until the whole force quartered in England had received a month's instruction in field evolutions.

The foreign enlistment yielded after all but a comparatively small force for actual service in the Crimea. Of far greater importance—and indeed of very considerable importance both as regarded the war itself and much that was to follow in European politics—was the co-operation of the Sardinian contingent, which became one of the allied forces, and occupied a prominent position in the later operations of the war.

The Sardinian prime minister, Count Cavour, probably the most astute statesman in Europe, was ready at once to enter into the proposed alliance. It has been said that the suggestion was first made by his niece, a quick-witted young lady, who foresaw the enormous advantage to the Piedmontese claim, in the coming condition of Italian affairs, if Sardinia were ranged with two great powers of Europe in a struggle which must eventually lead to a conference where Austria and Prussia would take a place, but not as having joined in armed opposition to Russia. Whether this be true or not, it is certain that Count Cavour would not have been slow to perceive the importance of bringing Sardinia to the front under the auspices of England and France. Comparatively few people were aware of the subtle and yet often bold (some said unscrupulous) manner in which Cavour often strove to accomplish the one great end which he had in view—the union and independence of the Italian states. For this object he made use of the revolutionary party so far as it suited his purpose, and events were favourable to the result which ensued, when, in 1860, after Tuscany, Modena, Parma, and the Papal Legations had united themselves to Piedmont, the successes of Garibaldi left the rest of Italy free to found a cohesive kingdom under the sovereign of Sardinia. But, as we shall see, in 1860 the cession of Savoy and Nice, as the price paid to France for helping Italy against Austria,

roused amongst the patriotic party an intense feeling against Cavour, who, by the by, was himself a Savoyard by descent. Camillo di Cavour was the younger son of an old family of Savoy, but was born in Turin, where he entered the military academy, obtained the rank of lieutenant of engineers, and was afterwards appointed one of the royal pages. He resigned this position that he might travel, and especially that he might visit England. With the benefits of English institutions, and especially with that of constitutional government, he was permanently impressed, and he did not stop at merely theoretical statecraft. Free-trade at once found in him an earnest advocate, and, being an advanced political economist, he was a reformer. It was not surprising, therefore, that on his return to Turin he should have taken part in the disturbances which compelled the King, Charles Albert, to grant the constitution of 1848. This of course connected Cavour with the reforming and patriotic party of Italy, but he was not for a republican but for a monarchical Italy, with a constitution like that of England. On the accession of Victor Emmanuel in 1849, after the disaster of his father at the battle of Novara, when the throne was surrounded with difficulties, and the financial condition of the country was most disheartening, Cavour began to take an active part in regular politics, and in 1850 was nominated minister of agriculture, commerce, marine, and finance. In 1852 he had resigned and again visited England. On his return the king sent for him to form a cabinet, and from that time he was foremost in guiding the political career of Italy until he died in 1861, amidst the general and deeply-felt sorrow of the nation. The majority of his countrymen said he had saved and consolidated the state, while a number of those who were still in favour of a republic, declared that he had betrayed Italy and the cause for which her patriotic sons had fought and died. He was accused, and not without foundation, with alternately encouraging and suppressing the revolutionists for his own purposes and for the erection of a constitutional monarchy on behalf of Victor Emmanuel. The truth was that Ca-

vour was a consummate politician. It was impossible that he could co-operate with the republicans, and especially with a man so severely truthful and uncompromising as Mazzini. Mazzini stood on a pinnacle above most of his fellow "patriots." They could not follow him. It was scarcely likely that one who pursued statecraft, even with the best intentions and the highest principles, could permit a theoretical democracy to lead, even though he may have understood and secretly sympathized with aspirations like those of Mazzini. Those aspirations were thus expressed by the Italian patriot, "We desire that man may be enabled to develop himself in the plenitude of all his faculties, moral, intellectual, and *physical*; but we know that it can only be by placing before him for his object, as Carlyle says, not the highest *happiness*, but the *highest nobleness possible*; by elevating in him the idea of the dignity and of the mission of humanity; by rekindling in him, through faith and the example of devotion, the expiring flame of self-sacrifice; by teaching him to appreciate and to love more and more the joint life of all his brothers in God—that we can approach more nearly to that condition. Remove this, or but make it subordinate in your plan, and you will do nothing. You may preach the well-being of *all*, but you will succeed only in creating egotists, who, as soon as they shall, by chance or by a greater aptitude in the chase, have snatched their quantum of happiness, will intrench themselves as in a fortress, ready to fire upon all those who would traverse the same path by which they arrived. You may achieve commercial liberty—the liberty of competition—but you will not prevent the crushing of the weak by the strong, of the labourer by the capitalist. You may found *phalansteries*; they may endure while they exist merely as model systems, and amongst you, whose inspirations unceasingly protest without your knowing against the theory; but they will fall the moment you seek to multiply them. You may glut your man with the good things of the earth—you may open to him every possible way of finding a recompense for his labour in the love of women; he will desire the good things due to his

neighbour's share, and the woman who has vowed her love to another. You have spoken to him of the legitimacy of his instincts; and thither his instincts, excited by some inappreciable influence which your organization has been unable to see and prevent, compel him. You have told him to enjoy; you cannot now say to him, Thou shalt enjoy in such and such a manner; he chooses to enjoy after *his own* fashion—to satisfy his appetite, which is, in fact, his whole being. This for the many; the few chosen souls gifted with an exceptional power of love and sorrow will curse your *happiness*—which here below is but a bitter irony to every nature that aspires; they will go far from you into the solitude of concealment, to utter the long cry of suffering which burst from Byron at the beginning of our calculating and sceptical century, and which so few men have yet understood.”¹

What were political manœuvre and clever practical worldly statesmanship in face of such declarations as these?

Cavour was, so to speak, only at the beginning of those achievements which in a short career made his name famous in Europe, and almost coupled it with those of the great Italian statesmen of former times. He was a man eminently capable of seizing an opportunity, and the proposal for Sardinia to become an ally of France and England in the Crimea was one of which he promptly availed himself. Sardinia thereby became a party to the treaty of April, 1854.

“An alliance between England and Sardinia,” thus wrote the English foreign minister to Sir James Hudson, the English ambassador at Turin, “will necessarily be for the essential advantage of both states. It will augment our resources by the addition of an admirable military force, and will assign to Sardinia that position amongst the peoples of Europe to which the king, the parliament, and the nation of that country have acquired an incontrovertible right. . . . You may assure Count Cavour that, on our side, this alliance is hailed with enthusiasm in all the towns, great and small, and is popular to a degree not easy to

conceive. Throughout the whole of England, which, in other instances, is wont to take no special interest in the affairs of foreign states, such great admiration prevails of the wisdom and courage which Sardinia has displayed in situations of difficulty, and such strong sympathy with the successful endeavours of that country to consolidate its reasonable liberty, that every measure directed towards a more intimate connection between us and Sardinia is received here with a feeling bordering on enthusiasm.” In December, 1854, Count Cavour had entered into official negotiations with the cabinets of London and Paris, but not until he had previously ascertained the sentiments of the Sardinian army. All the superior officers assured the premier that the army was eager to take its place by the side of the veterans of England and France; but upon this condition, that the Sardinian auxiliary corps should be led by a commander belonging to their own nation, and should take part in the conflict as the allies, and not as the mercenaries, of the western powers. With this understanding the treaty of alliance between Piedmont on the one part and France and England on the other, was concluded on the 26th of January, 1855. Piedmont contributed a contingent of 15,000 men, which, however, in the course of the war, was increased to 25,000 men under the command of General Lamarmora. By a separate article England and France agreed to guarantee the integrity of the king's dominions. England undertook the charges of transporting the troops to and from the Crimea, and, under the treaty, a recommendation was to be made to parliament to advance a million sterling to the King of Sardinia at 4 per cent.

When the conclusion of the treaty became known so great was the enthusiasm diffused throughout the Sardinian army, which was burning to wipe away the disgrace of Novara, that hundreds of officers and subalterns, who were left out when the expeditionary corps was formed, petitioned the war minister to be allowed to take part in the campaign as common soldiers. The treaty was not so well received in the Italian parliament. The opposition, which in this important question was

¹ *Thoughts upon Democracy in Europe.*

loudly seconded within the ranks of the ministerial majority itself, not only gave expression to serious political apprehensions, but also dislike of the treaty on account of the financial sacrifices and the disturbance of commerce involved in it. The alliance found warm and eloquent apologists in the persons of Luigi Torelli, Cesare Correnti, Giacomo Durando, Dr. Luigi Farini, and Antonia Gallenga, all members of the Chamber of Deputies. Count Cavour himself, in a speech of five hours, illustrated the question in all its aspects, with a degree of energy and courage which decided the hesitating opinion of parliament and people in favour of the treaty. The kind of national significance which he attached to the alliance may be gathered from the conclusion of his speech:—"The experience of late years and of bygone centuries has shown that Italy has never reaped any advantage from the conspiracies and revolutions with which she has been but too often visited. On the contrary they have always proved most unfortunate for us as a nation. They have been injurious, not only because they have entailed ruin upon countless families and countless individuals, and have furnished the excuse and opportunity for still worse oppressions, but also because, by their incessant repetition, they have robbed us of the respect, and to a certain extent of the sympathy, which the nations of Europe otherwise entertained for Italy. . . . The most indispensable condition of a better future for Italy consists, as I think, in raising the reputation of our country, and in endeavouring to secure the fair recognition of our good qualities by the governments and subjects of every nation. And for the attainment of this end two things are pre-eminently necessary. We must, in the first place, prove to Europe that Italy possesses a sufficiency of good sense to govern herself without foreign aid; that she is of age, and quite in a position to appropriate the freest forms of government under which the most civilized nations live and flourish. The second thing is to show that our worth as soldiers is still, at this day, the same which made the arms of our fathers respected and feared. As regards the former point we have now for seven years past given

a glorious demonstration to foreigners, how moderately, prudently, and loyally Italians can use their liberties. We have now the opportunity of rendering our country another, and perhaps a still greater service, viz., that of proving that our soldiers can fight as well on fields of glory as the bravest warriors; and I am convinced that the laurels which our army is about to win in the distant East will be more influential on the future destinies of Italy than all the declamations and all the books with which ardent and inexperienced patriots have endeavoured to bring about its regeneration."

By the 18th of May upwards of 10,000 of the Sardinian army had landed in the Crimea under the command of General Lamarmora, who had married an English lady, Miss Bertie Matthew. The Sardinians were a light, active, and thoroughly military-looking body of men. They took their own ambulances, forage-carts, commissariat officers, and all other military equipments, and fetched their own rations, which were supplied to them by the English. Their cavalry were compact, light men, mounted on good and strong horses. Their infantry, composed of strong and serviceable-looking men, showed an amount of discipline highly satisfactory; but, above all, the most picturesque in dress and manner were their riflemen—dressed in green, with a kind of Swiss hat similar in shape to an ordinary stiff felt hat, and ornamented with a large bunch of green feathers. It was placed on the head in a most jaunty style. Their arms were Minié-rifles with 800 yards' range, and with sword-bayonets; and they were found to be clever shots. They marched at a remarkable pace, amounting almost to a trot, and looked very hardy; they all, upon landing, marched away, and camped in different places. They were cheered most lustily by our soldiers, who had a singular pleasure in welcoming them as brothers in arms to the Crimea and its sufferings; and this was responded to by both officers and men most cordially.

General Canrobert, who had been wounded, and suffered much in the campaign, had resigned the command of the French army to General Pelissier, general of the First Corps

d'Armée, who had distinguished himself as a lieutenant-colonel in Africa in General Bugeaud's expedition against the Arabs. It was under his command as colonel, during a skirmish against a tribe who maintained a persistent opposition by retreating to the numerous inaccessible caverns which their part of the country contained, that Pelissier incurred the blame of most of the civilized nations of Europe for exacting a terrible retribution on a small body of Arabs, who had massacred with great cruelty a messenger whom he had sent to them to propose a conference after they had fled to one of their strongholds. The French troops were ordered to construct a vast pile of wood and combustible materials at the mouth of the grotto or cavern where these people were concealed, and a second messenger was sent to warn them that if they did not yield themselves prisoners they would be put to death. Either not understanding what was said to them, or in a fit of furious desperation, they attacked the man who took the message, or his cries led those outside to believe that he was being slain, the pile was fired, and in a short time the flames were roaring in the cavern, which was soon converted into a furnace in which every soul perished, though the shrieks of the women were so piteous that many of the French soldiers rushed in at last, at the risk of their own lives, for the purpose of rescuing the unhappy creatures. Nine hundred charred corpses were found stretched in heaps along the ground, nearly two hundred poor wretches survived for a few hours, but all died in the course of the day. The deed produced a profound sensation, and several of the more influential French newspapers demanded the dismissal of the colonel. The Chamber of Peers took up the matter, and on the 12th of July, 1845, the Prince of Moskowa, seconded by Count Montalembert, called on the minister of war, Marshal Soult, to express his disapproval of the proceeding. This he did, but Marshal Bugeaud defended his lieutenant and pleaded with success the inexorable necessities of war. The government acknowledged the force of his arguments:—in the following year Pelissier was made *maréchal de camp*. Having been

again promoted to be a general of division by Louis Napoleon when he was made President of the French Republic in 1851, he was in a position to take the command of the 1st Division of the Army of the Crimea, from which he was elevated to the chief command on the retirement of Canrobert. Pelissier was doubtless an energetic, and he was said to be an able general. At any rate on his accession to the command he succeeded in giving a fresh impetus to the operations before Sebastopol, especially as he had "discovered the means of stirring up Lord Raglan," to whom it was reported that he simply said, "I have given such and such an order. I have indicated a certain part to your troops; if you are not decided let me know without any delay, and I shall lose no time in providing for the necessity." The same report goes on to say: "Lord Raglan, who is naturally desirous that his army should bear a part in all the important actions with the French, yields to the desire of the general-in-chief. When General Canrobert used to communicate a plan to Lord Raglan the latter invariably replied, 'I shall give you my answer in writing in three days.'"

This was the current representation at the time, but men did not themselves realize what were the difficulties and responsibilities of the English commander in the Crimea. Not till Lord Raglan, suffering from long sickness, disappointed, and perhaps too sensitive to the adverse comments on his proceedings which reached him from England, lay dead in the camp, did people here begin to speak again of his high qualities. He had borne the brunt of starvation and mismanagement which he was unable to avert, and appeared to be incapable of alleviating by making more complete preparations at the camp itself, and after lying ill for several days, seemed to be somewhat recovering, when the disease terminated fatally, and the command devolved on General Simpson.

But it is time to take a short survey of the situation outside the circle comprised by the allied armies and the fortress before which

they had at last been able to sit down in more regular order.

The government, with more embarrassments than it could surmount, had been still further hampered by the singular attitude assumed by Lord John Russell. He had, by some peculiar process of reasoning, come to the conclusion that it was his duty to urge the prime minister to get rid of the Duke of Newcastle and to give the seals of the war department to Lord Palmerston. That such an alteration would have been popular there was no doubt, for amid a very widely-spread mistrust of the administration, or that part of it which had control of the war department, there appeared to be an especial doubt of the efficiency of the war secretary. There appear to have been few grounds for thus singling him out, and much of the ill-feeling with which he was regarded, proceeded from false insinuations or from actual ignorance. He had the most arduous duties to fulfil, at a time when there were few either to co-operate with or to advise him. It was afterwards well known that even during the vacation, when other cabinet ministers were taking repose or recreation, he and his chief (Lord Aberdeen) remained in London working day and night to endeavour to remedy the blunders and misapprehensions which had been caused by the need for organization and the control of an experienced and powerful hand.

Lord John gave it as his opinion that the secretary of state for the war department should be in the House of Commons, and by inference that the two offices, secretary of war and secretary for the war department, should be combined in one person—a man who, from experience of military details, from inherent vigour of mind, and from weight with the House of Commons, could be expected to guide the great operations of war with authority and success. There was, he said, only one person belonging to the government who combined these advantages, and his conclusion was that before parliament met in December (1854) Lord Palmerston should be placed in the office. Lord Aberdeen, like most other people, had been under the impression that of the two men Russell had

certainly preferred the Duke of Newcastle; but in any case it was evident that to make such a change, would at once be disloyal to a colleague and damaging to the reputation of the ministry, and the premier declined to act on the suggestion or to recommend it to the queen. In this resolve he was supported by Palmerston himself, who frankly declared that to combine the two offices held by Mr. Sidney Herbert and the Duke of Newcastle would be impracticable, as it would be impossible for one man to do the work. Lord Aberdeen justly represented that whoever might have been the fitter to fulfil the office originally, it was a very different thing to displace a man who had discharged his duties honourably and ably, merely in the belief that another might be found more efficient. The Duke of Newcastle himself was willing to relinquish his office at once if it were thought that the ministry and the country could be best served by his making way for Lord Palmerston or any one else; but the cabinet was against it, and Lord John, finding his advice was disregarded, resorted to his former method of retort by threatening to resign. His resignation at that time might seriously have damaged, and would, perhaps, have overthrown the ministry; so he thought better of it after a conversation with Lord Panmure, and consented to remain, or rather announced that he had changed his intention. Palmerston seemed in no way anxious to undertake the duty which Russell endeavoured to force upon him. He and Lady Palmerston had been over to Paris chiefly for the purpose of paying a visit to the emperor. It was perhaps on this occasion that Napoleon III. first hinted at his notion of himself taking the command in the Crimea. Palmerston, in a letter to his brother, says in his characteristic manner: "Yesterday Emily and I dined at St. Cloud. The dinner was very handsome and our hosts very agreeable. The empress was full of life, animation, and talk, and the more one looks at her the prettier one thinks her. I have found the emperor and Drouyn de Lhuys in very good opinion on the subject of the war, and acting towards us with perfect fairness, openness, and good faith." When the proposal

some time afterwards took more definite form that Palmerston should supersede the Duke of Newcastle in office, he admitted that somehow or other the public had a notion that he could manage the war department better than anybody else, but at the same time, protested that as for himself, he did not expect to do it half so well as the Duke of Newcastle. At all events he deprecated any change at the time of Lord John Russell's recommendation, as it would inevitably weaken the position of the ministry; and he equally deprecated the threatened resignation of the noble lord, to whom the Earl of Aberdeen would have been ready to relinquish the premiership if there had been any probability of his being able to form a ministry that could successfully carry on the war, or could count on the support of a majority. No such ministry could have been formed by Lord John, and he withdrew his resignation, but only to take another and the very first opportunity of again embarrassing his colleagues by adopting a similar course, and leaving them in the lurch during a crisis which particularly demanded that they should act in unison and without any symptom of division in their ranks.

Our relations with Austria had assumed a better position, and there was already some expectation on the part of those who desired peace rather than war, that a basis for concluding a treaty with Russia might after all be adopted. A treaty between England, France, and Austria was concluded, by which the latter power obtained assurances of protection, and at the same time gave in her complete adhesion to the cause of England and France against Russia. She was to receive assistance in case of hostilities breaking out between her and Russia, and neither of the three powers was to entertain any overtures regarding the cessation of hostilities without a general understanding among all the contracting parties. It must be understood that the conditions on which a peace might be concluded were already under consideration; indeed they had theoretically never ceased to be under consideration, notwithstanding the misinterpretation on which Russia had insisted, and the consequent commencement of hosti-

ties. The "four points" of the agreement which were to be the basis of any conference for the purpose of obtaining peace had still to be defined, and their exact meaning agreed upon. Prussia—acting the part of the man who, preferring to be friendly with both sides, watches the fight from round the corner, that he may be ready to take an apparently virtuous part in the final adjustment, and a share in whatever may be going—was invited to join in the alliance with the three other powers, but professed to be satisfied with their intentions, and required a new interpretation of the four points.

The four points were:—1. Russian protectorate over the principalities of Wallachia, Moldavia, and Servia to cease; the privileges granted by the sultan to these provinces to be placed under a collective guarantee of the powers. 2. Navigation of the Danube at its mouths to be freed from all obstacle, and submitted to the application of the principles established by the Congress of Vienna. 3. The treaty of the 13th of July, 1841, to be revised in concert by all the high contracting parties in the interest of the balance of power in Europe, and so as to put an end to the preponderance of Russia in the Black Sea. 4. Russia to give up her claim to an official protectorate over the subjects of the Sublime Porte, to whatever rite they may belong; and France, Austria, Great Britain, Prussia, and Russia to assist mutually in obtaining from the Ottoman government the confirmation and the observance of the religious privileges of the different Christian communities, and to turn to account, in the common interests of their co-religionists, the generous intentions manifested by the sultan, at the same time avoiding any aggression on his dignity and the independence of his crown.

The meeting of parliament in December, 1854,—that by a short session before Christmas measures might be taken for prosecuting the war with the utmost vigour and effect,—gave an opportunity to the opponents of the government to charge it with the neglect of which it had been previously accused not only in parliament but by the newspapers, and especially by the *Times*, whose articles, describing the

condition of affairs in the Crimea and denouncing the ministry for supineness and incapacity, had aroused public indignation. In the Upper House Lord Derby, after paying an eloquent tribute to the courage and devotion of the troops in the Crimea, condemned the manner in which the war itself had been carried on. The fatal words, "too late," were, he said, applicable to the whole conduct of the government in the course of the war, while the number of troops sent out had been quite insufficient to overthrow the power of Russia. The Duke of Newcastle combated this assertion, and without attempting to defend everything that had been done from the commencement, announced that the ministry were prepared to prosecute the war with unflinching firmness.

In the House of Commons the indictment of the government was upheld at considerable length by Mr. Layard.

The name of Austin Henry Layard is even more closely associated with remarkable discoveries of the remains and monuments of ancient Nineveh and Babylon than with the inquiry into the conduct of the Crimean war, in which he bore a conspicuous part, or with his political career during the years in which he several times held office. Both his name and his reputation are now inseparable from those discoveries, previous to which, as he said, all that remained of Nineveh and of Babylon might have been carried in a little hand-box. The greater part of his youth had been spent in Florence, and like many other young men of ardent temper and considerable culture in literature and art, he had abandoned the idea with which he first came to London, and instead of devoting himself to the study of the law set out on a journey to the East, where he not only learned the Turkish and Arabic languages, but adopted the dress and mode of living of the natives. He afterwards continued his journey to Persia for the purpose of exploration amidst the remains of Susa, and there he discovered the tomb of Daniel. In 1844 he commenced his examination of the ruins of Nimroud, a task which his command of the language and his appearance enabled him to prosecute success-

fully without raising the insuperable opposition of the people inhabiting the country. The Layard Collection now in the British Museum are, as any one may see, of such size and weight that it was only with considerable difficulty they could be conveyed to their destination. They were, in fact, floated down the Tigris on rafts supported in the water by inflated skins.¹ The attainments as well as the special knowledge and experience of Mr. Layard had peculiarly fitted him for the position of attaché to the British embassy at Constantinople, and in 1848 he occupied that position, when he had an opportunity of again visiting the site of the city of Nineveh. In 1851 he had for a short time acted as under-secretary for foreign affairs, and in 1852 had entered the House of Commons as member for Aylesbury. Mr. Layard, whose knowledge and experience on oriental questions had given him some weight in the house and in the country, had visited the allied camps in the Crimea, and it was therefore felt that his criticisms of the government were worthy of attention. No member of that government rose to reply to them, however, though Mr. Disraeli keenly said that they were bound to answer the speech of a supporter of their own and a man of genius, who would be remembered when a great portion of the existing cabinet was forgotten. It may easily be imagined that he did not neglect such an opportunity for launching well-directed sarcasms at the heads of the government, who had, he declared, at first treated the war not as a great but as a very little affair. In reviewing the subsequent occurrences he referred to the Baltic fleet "greater than any armada that ever figured in the history of our times," which had gone out "with the blessings and the benison of our most experienced statesman, and had the advantage of being commanded by a true reformer." This had destroyed the half-finished fortifications of Bomarsund. Then, with regard to the attack on Sebastopol, he said, "You attack with a force of 20,000 or 30,000 men a fortress probably as strong as Gibraltar, and better provisioned. And under what

¹ Mr. Layard's books on Nineveh and Babylon give an interesting account of his explorations and their results.

circumstances did you undertake this enterprise? The secretary of war tells you that their object is to strike at the heart of Russia in the south, and therefore they attack Sebastopol. . . . But why attack the place at the wrong time, and with ineffective means? It may be a question that there should be a campaign in the Crimea; none that there should not be a winter campaign. But you have chosen a winter campaign, and what have been your preparations for it? In November you gave orders to build huts. You have not yet sent out that winter clothing which is adapted to the climate. . . . You have commenced a winter campaign in a country which most of all should be avoided. You have commenced such a campaign—a great blunder,—without providing for it—the next great blunder. The huts will arrive in January, and the furs probably will meet the sun in May. These are your preparations.” Mr. Disraeli continued—“I believe that this cabinet of coalition flattered themselves, and were credulous in their flattery, that the tremendous issues which they have had to encounter, and which must make their days and nights anxious—which have been part of their lives—would not have occurred. They could never dream, for instance, that it would be the termination of the career of a noble lord to carry on war with Russia, of which that noble lord had been the cherished and spoiled child. . . . It has been clearly shown that two of you are never of the same opinion. You were candid enough to declare this, and it is probable that no three of you ever supposed the result would be what it has been found to be.” He concluded by declaring against an Austrian alliance, against the four points, and against secret articles. “England and France together should,” he said, “solve this great question, and establish and secure a tranquillization of Europe.”

Lord John Russell replied in a speech which was wanting neither in force nor in dignity. The object of the last speaker, he said, was to destroy confidence in ministers, and to weaken our alliance with France. He then proceeded to justify the course taken by the government, and the treaty with Austria.

The bringing up of the report on the address gave Mr. Gladstone an opportunity of explaining the details relating to our forces in the Crimea, and he also pointed out some of the unfounded charges brought against the government. It soon became evident, however, that the attacks made upon the ministry were echoed by the expression of opinion outside. When the foreign enlistment bill was introduced immediately afterwards it was violently opposed in both houses. Mr. Disraeli expressed great dislike to it on the ground that the foreigners whose services might probably be obtained, were hardly likely to be valuable as soldiers, and because Englishmen had a strong antipathy to mere mercenaries. They could fight side by side with foreigners of every race if they fought as allies; but they did not like the *condottieri* of modern Europe. He also objected to the scheme because it would convey the impression abroad that the resources of England for recruiting were exhausted. The object of the bill was to raise a force of 15,000 foreigners who were to be drilled in this country. Lord Ellenborough in the House of Lords censured the proposal in severe terms; but the Earl of Aberdeen utterly denied the insinuation that foreign recruits were to be used as substitutes for militia, or to be employed here at all. Some amendments were made; the number was reduced to 10,000, and the bill passed; but its results were costly and comparatively worthless, especially as they aroused a certain amount of jealousy and suspicion in other countries. On the whole the short session which terminated on the 23d of December had shown pretty plainly what was the temper of the country, and though, as was afterwards proved, the chief opponents of the government could not actually supersede it, parliament had only just reassembled on the 23d of January after the Christmas recess when the sound of defeat began to be heard.

It was expected that an attack would again be made on the ministry, and probably a good many people outside the house knew the form that the attack would take, if not who would initiate it. They had not long to wait. Immediately on the reassembling of parliament

Mr. Roebuck gave notice that he intended to move "for the appointment of a select committee to inquire into the condition of our army before Sebastopol, and into the conduct of those departments of the government whose duty it has been to minister to the wants of that army." It could not be said that the blow was unexpected; but the question was, would the ministry be able to avert it? It was just possible that at such a juncture, when it was of extreme importance to continue without a break the government of the country, the votes of the opposition might not carry the motion; but there was no opportunity of trying. At the critical moment Lord John Russell resigned his office as president of the council, and in the letter which he wrote to Lord Aberdeen virtually abandoned his colleagues to their adversaries. "Mr. Roebuck has given notice of a motion to inquire into the conduct of the war," he said. "I do not see how this motion is to be resisted; but as it involves a censure upon the war department with which some of my colleagues are connected, my only course is to tender my resignation. I therefore have to request you will lay my humble resignation of the office which I have the honour to hold before the queen, with the expression of my gratitude for her majesty's kindness for many years." There could be but one opinion on the part of Lord Aberdeen, namely, that the object of Lord John was to overthrow the ministry on the forlorn chance of a Whig government being called to power. The Duke of Newcastle, still believing that he was the person against whom much of the ill feeling and discontent had been raised, again offered to resign and to take the blame rather than that the cabinet should be broken up; but to this neither Aberdeen nor his colleagues would consent. Lord Palmerston was stanch as usual, and when he heard from Lord John that he had resigned, wrote—"I feel bound in candour to say that I think your decision ill-timed. Everybody foresaw that on the meeting of parliament after Christmas some such motion as that given notice of by Roebuck was likely to be made; and if you had determined not to face such a motion your announcement of such a decision a fortnight

ago would have rendered it more easy for your colleagues to have taken whatever course such an announcement might have led to. . . . As it is you will have the appearance of having remained in office, aiding in carrying on a system of which you disapproved, until driven out by Roebuck's announced notice, and the government will have the appearance of self-condemnation by flying from a discussion which they dare not face; while, as regards the country, the action of the executive will be paralysed for a time, in a critical moment of a great war, with an impending negotiation, and we shall exhibit to the world a melancholy spectacle of disorganization among our political men at home, similar to that which has prevailed among our military men abroad."

Though there was so much dissatisfaction in the country because of the blunders and mismanagement in the transport service, there was no lack of enthusiasm for prosecution of the war. Mr. Bright had already offended the people of Manchester by his refusal to support the Patriotic Fund, and it was understood that at the next election he would have some difficulty in retaining his position. Mr. Cobden was in a similar situation. He had addressed his constituents at Leeds on the subject of the war at a meeting which was to have been held at the Music Hall; but the number of those who attended was so great that it was adjourned to the yard of the Coloured Cloth Hall. Between 5000 and 6000 persons were present. The chair was taken by Mr. Alderman Carbutt, a Liberal of the West Riding, who had been the chairman of Mr. Cobden's last election committee, and he prefaced the proceedings by stating that he did not agree with their representative on the subject of the war. Mr. Cobden was received with only partial applause. With his usual fearless candour he said he had come there to explain his opinions with regard to the war, because he understood that a majority of his constituents were opposed to the views which he advocated. He quite agreed with those who said that if England was to have a war it could not be a little one. She must carry it on with vigour. That, however, required money; and then came the most important

question of all, How were the supplies to be raised? If they were determined to carry on the war with vigour they must make up their minds to pay for it, and that must either be done by a loan or by additional taxation. He was opposed to loans, because the money could be raised too easily that way. He held that the greater the difficulties in obtaining money to carry on a war, the better for the country, as it would make government all the more careful not to quarrel with other nations. As regarded the peace question, he was not in favour of peace at any price. He had been urged by the members of the Peace Society to disavow that doctrine, because, unless he did so, he should lose all influence with practical minds in the advocacy of peace principles. He then went on to discuss the policy of the war, and the way in which it had been conducted, both of which he condemned in the strongest terms.

"I think," said Mr. Cobden, "that the expedition to Sebastopol was a mistake. It has, indeed, been acknowledged to be a mistake so far that it was a leap in the dark. I think the practical question for Englishmen is how you are best to get out of that mistake. If you are going to fight it out there, then I say the course hitherto pursued by our government is wholly inadequate to the object you have in view. You must raise enormous armies. You must find an immense amount of treasure; and you must carry on the war in the Crimea on a very different scale from what you have done hitherto. But I think there is another way by which your brave men may be removed from that position in which, by a mistake, they have been placed; and I think that, without consulting our own position, and without looking too much to exaggerated hopes and expectations, we are bound in all fairness to consider the position of those brave men, and we are bound not, if we can help it, to throw any obstacles in the way of restoring peace to those countries, and restoring those men to their homes. I would further have these brave men, when brought home from Sebastopol, to be received with all honour as if they had succeeded in their object, because you may depend on it they have

suffered ten times as much in their abortive effort to take that place as they would have done had they succeeded in taking it by a *coup de main*. Now, is there no reason to suppose that there is a possibility of effecting a safe and honourable peace? Is there not ground for supposing that, at the present moment, the governments of Europe have approximated, by their negotiations to such a state of things, as may render it possible to arrange the terms of an honourable peace? And now I would address a word to my friends behind me. They propose, I believe, to submit to this meeting a resolution calling for the vigorous prosecution of the war. I have told you frankly that if the war is to be carried on it must be carried on in a very different spirit and on a very different scale from what it has hitherto been. But I would put it to my friends around me, and I put it to this meeting, as representing so important a community, whether you may not be throwing an obstacle in the path of peace—whether you may not be frustrating the objects which the government may now have in view in order to effect a peace—by passing in the midst of this important constituency such a resolution as I understand has been prepared? My own impression, drawn from those public sources of information which are open to us all, is that attempts are now being made—which are not unlikely to prove successful, if they are not thwarted by the public opinion of this country—to arrive at an honourable peace, and I ask you to consider well before you say or do one single thing that can by possibility impede the progress of these pacific negotiations. As for destroying Sebastopol, of what use would that be? In less than ten years Russia would come to Baring Brothers in London for a loan, and would build up Sebastopol with more skill and in greater perfection." He ridiculed the fears of those who spoke of danger to England from Russian aggression. As for the increase of territory, about which so much was said, England was far more to blame than Russia. He concluded by urging them not to commit themselves to the passing of any resolutions which might hinder the negotiations for peace.

But this advice fell upon ears not willing to listen to it without suspicion of its wisdom, or at all events of its patriotism. The representatives of what was then called the "national policy" had a resolution ready which declared, that, in the opinion of the meeting, the war in which England and France are now engaged with Russia is a great contest forced upon them by the outrageous aggression of the latter power upon the Turkish Empire, and a spirit of aggrandizement on the part of the czar, which threatened the independence of other nations, and that the war ought to be prosecuted with the utmost vigour until safe and honourable terms of peace could be obtained.

Mr. Edward Baines seconded the resolution. He was sure, as regarded the interests of peace, that it would have no unfavourable effect upon the government. But there was another party to be consulted before they could have peace, and that was the Emperor of Russia. It was not by a resolution in favour of peace, but by a strong army being sent to the Crimea, that they could work upon the mind of the czar. The true plan was to be slow in going to war; but, once engaged in a just war, to prosecute it with such vigour to an issue that their enemy would not be likely to renew it again. He regarded this as a great and important crisis, when a league was being formed which might affect the destinies of Europe for ages to come. For the last century and a half the attitude in which Russia had presented herself to Europe was that of an ambitious, encroaching, and selfish power, while she was at the same time the most despotic, intolerant, and barbarous of European nations. Nothing was therefore, more to be deprecated, than that Russia should acquire a predominant influence among the continental powers.

The following amendment was proposed by the peace party amidst much disapprobation:—

"That this meeting, without giving any opinion on the origin or conduct of the war, earnestly desires that the present negotiations for peace may be carried to a successful issue, and the further evils of a protracted contest

spared to this country, to Europe, and to the world."

Mr. R. M. Milnes, M.P., supported the resolution. He hoped that no sham peace would be made, but one of permanent character, so that the expense of keeping up a large standing army for fear of war breaking out might be avoided, and such a peace would be best procured by showing a firm confidence in the justice of the war in which this country had engaged. The amendment was urged by Major-general Thompson, who condemned the way in which the government had commenced and carried on the war; but on the question being put to the meeting the original resolution was carried, only a very few hands being held up against it.

The war fever had not yet abated; but the government which had reluctantly declared the war was itself to fall a victim to it. There were many who asserted that the ministry had brought defeat on themselves, and who, though they entirely disapproved of the action of Lord John Russell, had agreed with him when, in recommending the substitution of Lord Palmerston for the Duke of Newcastle, he said that the head of the government must be the moving spirit of the machine, or the minister of war be strong enough by himself to control every department connected with the military operations—neither of which conditions were to be found under the existing arrangement.

On the second night of the debate on Mr. Roebuck's motion for a committee of inquiry the discussion grew high, and it was evident that the fate of the ministry would be decided on that question. To propose such an inquiry while the war was at a critical point was so extreme a test that it could be regarded only as another method of compelling a vote of want of confidence or the reverse, and ministers felt that they could not honourably meet such a motion by offering to reconstruct the cabinet, though the Duke of Newcastle was still anxious to retire, and so relieve the government by making room for Lord Palmerston. The whole cabinet would have resigned, but at that juncture a dissolution of parliament

would have been a serious thing, and the queen's request that ministers would retain office decided them to await the result of the motion for a select committee.

Palmerston with his wonted courage declared that he fully concurred in the decision that the responsibility for the conduct of the war fell not on the Duke of Newcastle alone, but on the whole cabinet. He did not deny that there had been something calamitous in the condition of our army, but he traced it to the inexperience arising from a long peace. If the house thought the government not deserving of confidence, the direct and manly course would have been to affirm that proposition. The course to be pursued would be dangerous and inconvenient in its results abroad. He hoped that when the house had determined what set of men should be intrusted with public affairs, they would give their support to that government, and not show to Europe that a nation could only meet a great crisis when it was deprived of representative institutions.

Mr. Sidney Herbert declared that the reports of the condition of things in the Crimea had been grossly exaggerated and that great improvements had taken place; but a speech from Mr. Stafford, who supported the motion for inquiry, produced some sensation, as he said his only claim to attention was that he would tell the house what he himself had seen. One radical defect of the hospitals both at Scutari and at Abydos was the unhealthiness of the sites. That objection applied to all the district between the two seas, and therefore he was rejoiced to hear that the government were about to open a new hospital at Smyrna. Other defects in the hospital at Scutari were pointed out by him. But matters were much worse at the Balaklava hospital, where the bed-clothes had never been washed, and where men sick of one disease, had caught another disease by being put into the place where a man had just died before of fever. In one room he found fourteen, in another nine, men lying on the floor, while in the passage between them were excellent bedsteads which might have been put up on an average of three minutes each. The honourable member went at great

length and minuteness into specific cases of neglect and consequent misery endured by the soldiers, the general effect of which may be summed up in the words addressed by a French officer to himself: "You seem, sir," said he, "to carry on war according to the system of the middle ages; and," he added, "our regret for your backwardness is increased because we see the noble lives you are losing." From the general censure he excepted Miss Nightingale and her nurses, he also spoke of the attachment of the soldiers to their officers, and especially to the Duke of Cambridge.

We have already seen that subsequently considerable improvements took place at Scutari, and Miss Nightingale and some of her nurses afterwards visited the hospital at Balaklava much to its advantage.

The debate was continued with considerable spirit, one of the most damaging speeches to the government being that of Sir E. Bulwer Lytton, who was then in the zenith of his parliamentary career. It was during his remarks on this occasion that, in a passage which has become famous, he said: "Looking through our modern history, I find that most of our powerful, even popular administrations, have been coalitions. Both the administrations of Mr. Pitt were coalitions, and the last was very remarkable, for he first turned out the Addington government, and then coalesced with six of its members. Nay, he was not contented till he had netted the expelled prime minister himself and made him lord president of the council. But then there is one indisputable element of a coalition, and that is, that *its members should coalesce.*" He argued that the justification of the motion was to be found in the extremity of the case. The noble lord the member for London had left his colleagues rather than resist it, notwithstanding the pain which such an abandonment must have given to so gallant a mind; and he gave the noble lord the more credit for his pain because of the more than Spartan fortitude with which he had concealed the fact. The expedition to the Crimea had been undertaken in utter ignorance of the country they were to invade, the forces they were to encounter, and the supplies which they might

expect; and it was this ignorance, and not the petty collateral causes which the secretary of war had cited, to which the disasters were to be attributed. It was stated that the people were equally ignorant. That might be, but the ignorance which was excusable in a people was a crime in a ministry. But the people did not deserve this censure. The people looked to triumphs on the sea rather than on the land; but when nearly the whole Black Sea lay defenceless before them, the fleet contented themselves with an ineffectual bombardment of Odessa, for which—in consequence, he was sure, of private instruction—the admiral afterwards made an apology. It was said that the destruction of Odessa would have been an act of inhumanity. Why, Odessa was the feeder of Sebastopol, and to spare it was the grossest inhumanity to our soldiers. The whole campaign was mismanaged. Of the whole year the government had chosen the two unhealthiest months to encamp the army at Varna, and they had chosen the winter as the time to attack the Gibraltar of the East. He did not blame the government because the army had been exposed to wind, and rain, and mud; but he did blame them for not taking those precautions against the Crimean winter which any traveller could have told them were necessary. He traced many of the evils to the fact of a coalition government, in which everybody's principles agreed with nobody's opinions. It was said that the noble lord the member for Tiverton was likely to be advanced in position as the result of these disputes. He regarded that noble lord with feelings of the greatest admiration, and he believed his greatest danger would arise from the armed neutrality of his unsuccessful advocate and friend the noble member for London.

There is something in this speech which may well remind us of Disraeli, for it has the touch of one who may be called a professional satirist. In the speeches of Sir Edward Bulwer Lytton his literary faculty was obvious, and the same but in a less prominent degree may often be said of Disraeli.

Mr. Gladstone stood up not only to defend the government but to protest against the proposal for a committee of inquiry, or, if such

a committee were proposed to declare that the ministry was bound to abide by its own acts, and not to seek an uncertain tenure of office by a compromise, or an effort at reorganization which might pacify adverse opinion. He pointed out that Lord John Russell had not urged his remonstrances from November up to the time of his resignation, and in November there were no complaints against the war office. In October Lord John had actually written to the Duke of Newcastle, stating his belief that he had done in his office all that man could do. More than that, the Earl of Aberdeen being doubtful of the intentions of the president of the council asked him on the 16th of December whether he still adhered to his intention of pressing changes in the war department; and the noble lord stated in reply, that, on the advice of a friend of his own, he had abandoned the views he pressed in November. Therefore, up to the night when the noble lord sent in his resignation, his colleagues did not know that he was dissatisfied, or that he meant to press his former views as to the reorganization of the war department; and it might be thought that, after losing the services of the noble lord, the government ought not to have met the house, or at least not to have met them without some reorganization. But he felt it was not for them either to attempt to make terms with the house by a reorganization or to shrink from the judgment of the house upon their past acts. If they had shrunk, what sort of epitaph would have been placed over their remains? He himself would have thus written it:—Here lie the dishonoured ashes of a ministry which found England at peace and left it at war—which was content to enjoy the emoluments of office, and to wield the sceptre of power, so long as no man had the courage to question their existence. They saw the storm gathering over the country; they heard the agonizing accounts which were almost daily received of the state of the sick and wounded in the East. These things did not move them. But so soon as the honourable member for Sheffield raised his hand to point the thunderbolt they became conscience-stricken with a sense of guilt, and, hoping to escape punishment, they ran away

from duty. With regard to the motion now before the house he would be himself the first to vote for it if it could be proved that it would benefit the army. He believed it would aggravate, rather than alleviate, the evils complained of.

Mr. Gladstone then pointed out that the last accounts represented matters in the Crimea as improving. The whole army was improving; warm clothing was being served out; huts were being erected; the railway was approaching completion, and Englishmen would be relieved by a large accession of Frenchmen doing service in the trenches. The honourable baronet (Sir E. Lytton) condemned the government for not destroying Odessa. Why, Odessa was an open town, with 100,000 inhabitants, and with an army of 300,000 men within easy reach. Would that have proved comfortable winter quarters for the British army? He admitted that the administration of the war departments at home was defective; but he did not admit that they were not much improved, or that they remained so defective as to call for censure. He then dwelt upon improvements in the military preparations, and in the arms and artillery, and defended the Duke of Newcastle against any suspicion that he had not performed the duties intrusted to him. The complaints as to the state of the hospitals and of the army before Sebastopol had only become clamorous since the middle of December. What would the house have had his noble friend do? Was he to recall Lord Raglan? Why, the house had just voted their unanimous thanks to that gallant commander! Was he then to recall the subordinates of Lord Raglan? Before doing that, his noble friend had called for a report from Lord Raglan as to his subordinates, and they had received a statement from Lord Raglan, giving hope that these abuses would be remedied. It was for the house to say whether they would censure the government for trusting to the representations of Lord Raglan. It was admitted that the appointment of this committee was improper and impracticable, and was avowedly supported by many members as a means of turning out the ministry. If this motion were to be carried

he should ever rejoice that his last words as a member of Lord Aberdeen's government were an indignant protest against a measure useless to the army, unconstitutional in its nature, and fraught with danger to the honour and the interest of the Commons of England.

Of course Mr. Disraeli was not silent. He gave a few effective hits all round. He said his first impression on seeing the honourable member for Sheffield sit down after simply reading his motion was, that the honourable and learned gentleman, as a consummate rhetorician, had done so as the most effective way of supporting his motion. He might well, indeed, dispense with a speech in support of his motion, for that had been made for him by the noble lord who but a few hours before was the first minister of the crown in that house. It was said that this motion implied a vote of want of confidence. He would ask, in what government did it imply a vote of want of confidence? Was it in the government as it existed forty-eight hours ago, or was it in the government as it now existed? Why, they had themselves admitted that they required reconstruction. Or was it want of confidence in the government as it was to be? The House of Commons had often before voted confidence in a government whose principles they did not know, but now they were called upon to vote confidence in an administration with whose very persons they were unacquainted. He denied that this motion was directed exclusively against the Duke of Newcastle. His own colleagues had described him as deficient alike in energy and experience; but the duke ought not to be made the scapegoat for a policy for which the whole cabinet was responsible. Neither would he consent to throw the blame upon a system which, whatever might be its faults, when in the hands of able men had accomplished great ends. It was the cabinet as a whole that must be held responsible for the evils that existed. Recurring to the explanatory speech of the noble lord the member for London, he said it reminded him of a page from the *Life of Bubb Doddington*, in the unconscious admission it contained of what, in the eighteenth century, would have been described as profligate intrigue. Such an all

unconscious admission of profligate intrigue was not to be matched in that record which commemorated the doings of another Duke of Newcastle, who was a minister of England when the House of Commons was led by Sir Thomas Robinson, and when the opposition was actually carried on by the paymaster of the forces and the secretary of war. These dissensions would prove most injurious to the character of England. Two years ago England was the leading power in Europe; would any man say that she now occupied that position? Under these circumstances he felt that, being called upon to give a vote on this question, he could not refuse to give it against a deplorable administration.

Lord John Russell rose to enter into explanations and to attempt to refute the attack. If the whole of what had passed between himself and Lord Aberdeen and the Duke of Newcastle were placed before the house the transactions would have a different complexion, but he would not enter into that subject. He would repel the expression characterizing his conduct as a political intrigue. As a precedent for what he had done he referred to the substitution of Lord Stanley for Lord Goderich as colonial secretary in Lord Grey's administration. No man would characterize that as a profligate intrigue, and he had proposed no more than was done there. In his anxiety to keep clear of everything like intrigue he had, unadvisedly for himself perhaps, not communicated his intention of resigning to any of his colleagues.

Those who thought that the resignation of Lord John Russell caused the overthrow of the ministry were mistaken. If the country did not trust them, neither did it trust him; and when a new ministry had to be formed he was incapable of inspiring confidence in his ability to keep a cabinet together, or even to head a government that could stand for an hour. Nobody really believed that the coalition was so weak as it really was; and had it been as strong as was supposed Mr. Gladstone's determined attitude and Lord Palmerston's protest, already referred to, which practically wound up the debate, might have saved it. As it was, when the house divided there were 305 votes in favour of the committee of

inquiry, and only 148 against it. Instead of a burst of cheering saluting this unlooked-for result, a profound silence seemed for a minute to have fallen on the assembly. Then there arose a murmur of astonishment, succeeded by a sudden and almost simultaneous outburst of satirical laughter.

The resignation of ministers was announced in the House of Lords by the Earl of Aberdeen and in the Commons by Lord Palmerston. In the former assembly the Duke of Newcastle took the opportunity of defending himself from the charges brought or implied against him, and he did so with spirit and with dignity. There was something both eloquent and touching in his assertion of his devotion to the public service, and his protest against being accused of want of zeal and industry. "I have been charged with indolence and indifference. My lords, as regards indolence, the public have had every hour, every minute of my time. To not one hour of amusement or recreation have I presumed to think I was entitled. The other charge of indifference is one which is still more painful to me. Indifference, my lords, to what? Indifference to the honour of my country, to the success and the safety of the army? My lords, I have myself, like many who listen to me, too dear hostages for my interest in the welfare of the military and naval services of the country to allow of such a sentiment. I have two sons engaged in those professions, and that alone, I think, would be sufficient; but, my lords, as a minister—as a man—I should be unworthy to stand in any assembly if the charge of indifference under such circumstances could fairly be brought against me. Many a sleepless night have I passed in thinking over the ills which the public believe and say that I could have cured, and which, God knows, I would have cured if it had been in my power. Indolence and indifference are not charges which can be brought against me; and I trust that my countrymen may, before long, be satisfied—whatever they may think of my capacity—that there is no ground for fixing that unjust stigma upon me."

It was a true and manly defence, and vindicated the speaker against the particular

charges of which he complained; but there remained the belief that he was not capable of grasping the situation in which he had been placed. It was a pretty general opinion that nothing in his official life became him so much as the leaving of it.

It was all very well to turn out the Aberdeen ministry; but who were to replace its members? Johnny had again succeeded in upsetting the coach; but who was now to take the reins with any chance of reaching the end of the journey? A strong government was needed, and there was considerable difficulty in securing any government at all. Lord Derby was the head of the party which was most numerous, and they had helped to carry Mr. Roebuck's motion; to him, therefore, the royal message was first sent. It was, however, one thing to lead a large party, and quite another thing to be able to hold the House of Commons in control; and it soon became evident that no ministry could be formed except by a fresh coalition. To begin with, it was necessary to obtain the support of Lord Palmerston. The general opinion of the country had decided that he alone was competent to direct the future progress of the war. Lord Derby did not agree altogether with this conclusion, and instead of offering to him the appointment of minister of war, proposed that he should join the government as leader of the House of Commons—a position which Mr. Disraeli was ready to relinquish in his favour. Even with Lord Palmerston, however, it would have been hopeless to expect success unless the support of the party still known as "Peelites" could be secured, and it was believed that Palmerston's influence might induce them to take office in a Derby administration. Palmerston was reluctant to belong to any government in which the management of foreign affairs did not remain in the hands of Lord Clarendon, and to this there would probably have been little opposition; but it would seem that in face of the public demand that he should be placed where he could direct the prosecution of the war, Palmerston would not consent to occupy a less influential place in the ministry. "Having well reflected upon the proposition which you made to me," he

wrote on the same day in which he received the offer, "I have come to the conclusion that if I were to join your government, as proposed by you, I should not give to that government the strength which you are good enough to think would accrue to you from my acceptance of office. I shall therefore deem it my duty, in the present critical state of affairs, to give, out of office, my support to any government that shall carry on the war with energy and vigour, and will, in the management of our foreign relations, sustain the dignity and interests of the country, and maintain unimpaired the alliances which have been formed. I have conveyed to Gladstone and Sidney Herbert the communication which you wished me to make to them; but it seemed to me to be best that they should write to you themselves." The reply of Gladstone and Sidney Herbert was not reassuring, but it was, apparently, such as had been expected, for Lord Derby had already suggested to the queen that should he fail to obtain their assistance she might attempt other combinations with Lord John Russell and Lord Lansdowne and their friends. In the event of all other attempts failing, however, he would be "ready to come forward to the rescue of the country with such materials as he had, but it would be a desperate attempt." No time was lost. In a few hours he had to inform her majesty that Lord Palmerston, Mr. Gladstone, and Mr. Herbert could offer him only "an independent support," which, he said, reminded him of the definition of the independent member of parliament, namely, one that could not be depended upon.

The state of affairs was serious. Abroad the condition of England was being discussed with little friendly feeling. The reports which had been so fully published concerning the state of our army in the Crimea and of mismanagement in the prosecution of the war were now emphasized by the sudden collapse of the government and the difficulty of forming a strong administration. Prince Albert, in a long conference with Lord Derby, discussed the critical condition of affairs and the unpatriotic attitude of statesmen, who took advantage of every mishap and strove to

aggravate it for the purpose of snatching party advantages. Lord Derby capped some of the prince's illustrations of the effect which had thus been produced on the opinion of foreign governments, by quoting a remark alleged to have been made by Count Walewski, the French representative, on the subject of our probable position at the approaching conference at Vienna. "What influence can a country like England pretend to exercise, which has no army and no government?" Supposing that Walewski ever said this, it was certainly indiscreet, and had his imperial master known it he might have received a sharp rebuke, or perhaps the emperor would have made light of it, as he afterwards did of a really authenticated speech communicated to him by the queen while she was in Paris. Her majesty was frankly explaining to him the footing on which she stood with the Orleans family; that they were her friends and relations, and she could not drop them in their adversity; but that they were very discreet, and politics were not touched upon between them. The emperor replied that he quite understood this, and felt that she could not abandon those who were in misfortune. The queen rejoined that she was certain this was the emperor's feeling, but that other people tried—and Walewski was one—to put a great stress on her communications with the family, and to make her understand that the emperor would be very much displeased. "That is just like Walewski," replied the emperor. Doubtless it was also just like Walewski to say that England had no army and no government; but the phrase perturbed the prince consort, who thought there was truth in it—that "every one here took pains to prove that we had no army, and to contrive that the queen should have no government." The prince was likely to hear a great deal of the depreciation of England by foreign critics, and it is not to be wondered at that he should have attributed rather undue importance to another remark retailed by "one of the shrewdest observers in Europe, who was in a position to hear what was said in the most influential quarters abroad," that England as a great power was to be feared no more; that she never could

find men enough to carry on the war effectually, although she might effect great exploits; that the Russians everywhere were in the highest spirits; that the Emperor Nicholas had written to his sister, she might rely on his assurance, Sebastopol never would be taken.¹

As Lord Derby had failed in the attempt to form a ministry, the queen sent to ask the advice of Lord Lansdowne. That veteran peer, who had left office with Lord John Russell in 1852, might himself have formed a ministry in which both Palmerston and Russell would have taken office; but it could only be a temporary one, for he was seventy-five years old and suffering severely from gout. A temporary administration would be worse than useless; and moreover, he believed that though Lord Palmerston could form an administration, it would certainly fall to pieces unless it included Lord John, who on the other hand could not expect that Palmerston would again serve under him. The strange part of the business was that Lord John himself seemed to believe he was strong enough to form a government without the aid of the "Peelites," and Lord Lansdowne thought that no effective combination could be made until he had been called upon to try and had failed. That he *would* fail was a foregone conclusion. The queen did the best she could by addressing herself "to Lord John Russell as the person who may be considered to have contributed to the vote of the House of Commons which displaced her last government," and expressing her hope that he would be able to present to her such a government as would give a fair promise successfully to overcome the great difficulties in which the country was placed. She also added a distinct declaration that "it would give her particular satisfaction if Lord Palmerston would join in the formation." This was naturally a very pleasant intimation for Palmerston, who saw in it the obliteration of former objections and disagreements. With his customary cheerful alacrity

¹ *Life of the Prince Consort*, by Sir Theodore Martin. These remarks are cited as an indication of the reports that came to the prince, but the name of "one of the shrewdest observers in Europe" is not mentioned.

and good humour he requested an audience for the purpose of assuring the queen of his readiness to do anything in his power to put an end to the existing difficulty. He was willing to take office under Lord John Russell as leader of the House of Commons, but he considered it essential that Lord Clarendon should remain at the foreign office—an opinion in which, as it turned out, Lord John himself entirely agreed. But Lord Clarendon utterly repudiated the idea of the ability of Lord John Russell to form a government. Nobody really believed it to be possible that he could command a permanent ministry, composed as it would be of the same men who had been utterly defeated in 1852, and minus two of their number, Lord Lansdowne and Lord Grey. Were he (Lord Clarendon) to remain at the foreign office his language to foreign countries would lose all its weight, because it would be known not to rest on public opinion; and what would be thought of him were he to accept as his leader, the man who, while in the late ministry, had worked for the overthrow of Lord Aberdeen and his colleagues and for the reinstatement of an exclusively Whig ministry? Lord Clarendon respected the loyalty of his colleagues too much to form an alliance with the minister who had overthrown them though they were his colleagues also.

Lord Palmerston considered that he could not refuse his support, for, as he afterwards wrote in a letter to his brother, Sir William Temple, "John Russell, by the way in which he suddenly abandoned the government, had so lost caste for the moment, that I was the only one of his political friends who was willing to serve under him. I could not refuse to do so, because he told me that upon my answer depended his undertaking to form a government, and if I had refused, and he had declined the task, and the queen had then sent for me, people would have ascribed my refusal to personal ambition. Besides, he broke with the late government because the war department was not given to me, and it would have been ungrateful of me to have refused to assist him. It is, however, curious that the same man who summarily dismissed me three years

ago as unfit to be minister for foreign affairs, should now have broken up a government because I was not placed in what he conceived to be the most important post in the present state of things."

When this was written a conclusion had been arrived at, which a good many people must have been expecting for several days. The crisis had really become serious. From the 23d of January to the 4th of February (1855) there had virtually been no government, and on the latter date Lord Cowley had written from Paris to Lord Clarendon, speaking of the mischief which was being done to our reputation and the disrepute that the delay was bringing to constitutional government. There was nothing for it but to send for Lord Palmerston, and he had shown enough of public spirit to make it desirable, if not necessary, for the queen to ask him if he could form a ministry capable of acting in "that momentous crisis." The Earl of Aberdeen behaved nobly, and with a high-minded and unselfish determination to devote himself to the service of the country which had always distinguished him whatever may have been his failings of statesmanship. Palmerston was able to report the next day that Lord Lansdowne, the lord-chancellor, Lord Clarendon, Lord Granville, Sir George Grey, and Sir Charles Wood had agreed to take office under him, and there were sufficient indications that he might hope for success, but in order to make that success secure, it was most desirable that he should be able to count on the support of the men who represented the strength of the late ministry in the House of Commons, and Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Sidney Herbert, and the Duke of Argyll declined to give in their complete adhesion on the ground that to do so would be to act disloyally to Lord Aberdeen and the Duke of Newcastle. But the Earl of Aberdeen and the Duke of Newcastle were not the men to permit the interests of the country to suffer, if, by an act of self-abnegation, they could prevent it. They called on their friends, and by their persuasions induced them to change their determination. Palmerston was not ungrateful. "I called at your door yesterday, and was sorry not to have found you at home,"



GEORGE WILLIAM FREDERICK VILLIERS.
FOURTH EARL OF CLARENDON.
FROM A PHOTOGRAPH BY JOHN WATKINS

he wrote to the earl. "I wanted to say how much I have to thank you for your handsome conduct, and for your friendly and energetic exertions in removing the difficulties which I at first experienced in my endeavour to reconstitute the government in such a manner as to combine in it all the strength which, in the circumstances of the moment, it was possible to bring together. I well know, that without your assistance that most desirable and important combination could not have been effected." The queen also warmly thanked him for his kind and disinterested assistance.

Palmerston went to work in his usual prompt and vigorous fashion, and with that kind of easy gaiety which distinguished him. "I think our government will do very well," he says in the letter to his brother, already quoted. "I am backed by the general opinion of the whole country, and I have no reason to complain of the least want of cordiality or confidence on the part of the court. As Aberdeen has become an impossibility I am for the moment *finévitable*. We are sending John Russell to negotiate at Vienna. This will serve as a proof to show we are in earnest in our wish for peace, and in our determination to have sufficiently satisfactory terms." He then goes on to say what must be demanded of the Emperor Nicholas, in whose sincerity he has no great faith, "though it is said he is much pressed by many around him to make peace as soon as he can."

Palmerston had the inestimable support of public confidence; but he had also the important advantage of having succeeded to power at a time when it had begun to be known what were the real needs of the army, and when provisions were being made to supply them. He set himself at once to work to remedy the evils of which complaints had been made; and soon a sanitary commission under Dr. Sutherland, Dr. Gavin, and Mr. Rawlinson were sent out, and, as we have seen, began to improve the hospitals, the camp, and the harbour. "They will of course be opposed and thwarted by the medical officers, by the men who have charge of the port arrangements, and by those who have the cleaning of the camp," he wrote to Lord Raglan.

"Their mission will be ridiculed, and their recommendations set aside unless enforced by the peremptory exercise of your authority. But that authority I must request you to exert in the most peremptory manner for the immediate and exact carrying into execution whatever changes of arrangement they may recommend. . . . It is scarcely to be expected that officers, whether military or medical, whose time is wholly occupied by the pressing business of each day, should be able to give their attention or their time to the matters to which these commissioners have for many years devoted their action and their thoughts."

With a remarkable grasp even of minor details, and with a promptitude of action which went far to justify Lord John's obstinate recommendations of his earlier appointment to a post of responsible power, Palmerston directed the various modes of provision and relief, and he was ably seconded by Lord Panmure, who had accepted the office of secretary of war, which was thereafter to be amalgamated with that of secretary of state for the war department. The reappointment of Mr. Gladstone as chancellor of the exchequer gave real strength to the government. Mr. Sidney Herbert was colonial secretary, and the Duke of Argyll lord privy-seal. Earl Granville became lord-president of the council; Sir George Grey, home secretary; Sir C. Wood took the board of control; Lord Cranworth was lord-chancellor; Mr. Cardwell, Indian secretary; the Earl of Carlisle, Lord-lieutenant of Ireland; Mr. Horsman, Irish secretary; Sir James Graham, first lord of the admiralty; and Sir B. Hall took the control of woods and forests. It will be seen that the new ministry had been formed not so much by a change of men as by a redistribution of some of the offices. The coalition cards had, so to speak, been shuffled; but there was little change, except that Lord Palmerston had become the head of the government, and the Duke of Newcastle had been superseded by Lord Panmure. The latter appointment, however, was an important one.

Lord Panmure, who was better known as Mr. Fox Maule, had been minister of war during the six years of the Russell administration, and had

a great knowledge of the duties that belonged to the office. He was an army reformer in a moderate degree, and had displayed remarkable talent in relation to the various details of military organization. For twenty years, as Mr. Fox Maule, he had held a distinguished position in parliament, and whenever his party was in power had satisfactorily filled offices of greater or less importance. His father, the youngest son of the eighth Earl of Dalhousie, had changed his name from Ramsay to Maule on succeeding through his grandmother to the estates of the old earls of Panmure, whose title he took when he was raised to the peerage in 1831. Mr. Fox Maule, who had succeeded to the title only just before the formation of the Aberdeen government, had served twelve years as an officer of the 79th Highlanders, and was thirty-four years old before he entered the civil service of the country. In November, 1842, he had been elected Lord-rector of the University of Glasgow, in 1849 became Lord-lieutenant of Forfarshire, and in 1853 lord-keeper of the privy seal of Scotland. As under secretary of state for the home department in the government of Lord Melbourne he had shown such business aptitude that he was afterwards nominated vice-president of the Board of Trade; but it was in the war department that he displayed the marked ability which led to his being appointed to the onerous position which he accepted under Lord Palmerston. A cheerful, rather jovial, witty man, but with a certain dignity, which, in conjunction with his appearance, stamped him as belonging rather to the old school of manners. There was in his appearance something to remind one of Elliston the theatrical manager, and of the fashion of the best men of the fourth Georgian period. A fur-collared cloak, a full-bosomed coat, and what has been called "a cataract of black satin," forming a stock fastened with a double pin; a face clean shaven, and neatly brushed curling hair; this is the portrait of Lord Panmure at the time of which we are speaking. There was much fun in the expression of his mouth, much penetration in his eyes, and he was, in fact, distinguished for his ready *bonhomie*, except when he had an attack of gout, and, as

it was said, remained shut up in his room, where nobody was admitted to speak to him except on urgent business.

Lord Palmerston appealed to the house to support a government which he said he thought would be able to carry on public affairs. It contained, he believed, sufficient administrative ability, sufficient political sagacity, sufficient patriotism and determination to justify him in asking the house and the country for support in the present critical state of our national affairs. In sketching the intentions of the government he said that the secretary of the admiralty had established a board to superintend the transport service at sea. We were engaged in warlike operations with France as an ally, but we had not the means of sending so many men into the field as France, and it was but fair that we should make some return to France in the shape of additional naval arrangements. He was convinced that the establishment of that board would lead to increased economy and efficiency in that department. Well-grounded complaints having been made as to the condition of our war-hospitals, it was intended to send out three civilians for the purpose of making good sanitary arrangements for the hospitals, camps, and ships, and from their scientific labours he anticipated the greatest advantages. No means would be omitted to reinforce the army in due time. Charged as the government was with the interests of a great nation, they had to look not only to the means of carrying on the war with great vigour, but it was their duty to take all measures in their power to put an end to it. They had been informed that certain arrangements agreed to between England and France had been submitted to Austria, and adopted by Russia as the basis of negotiation. In order that these negotiations might be most solemnly conducted they proposed to Lord John Russell to undertake the duty, being convinced that when they were placed in the hands of a man so generally respected at home and so well known throughout Europe, if their efforts should fail they would stand acquitted from blame. The noble lord would first proceed to Paris, thence to Berlin, where

he would be in communication with the King of Prussia, and although some time might elapse before his arrival in Vienna, the time he spent in those two capitals would not be thrown away.

Mr. Layard, however, was still in bitter opposition to the government, though the new administration had begun its work with energy, and Lord Panmure had already put forward a plan for obtaining more recruits by enlisting experienced men for shorter periods of two or three years, instead of the young fellows who, being unseasoned, died on being despatched to the Crimea. Mr. Layard was not to be pacified, and in the House of Commons rose to "call attention to the existing state of affairs." The country, he asserted, stood on the brink of ruin—it had fallen into the abyss of disgrace, and had become the laughing-stock of Europe. The new ministry differed little from the last. Was Lord Palmerston willing to accept peace on any terms? Was the country going to engage in prolonged hostilities? Was it proposed to engage on our behalf oppressed nationalities? Would the Circassians be assisted? In short, what was the government going to do? The people of England demanded a thorough reform. What the country wanted was not septuagenarian experience, but more of youthful activity and energy. He commended the plan of the French revolutionary convention, and intimated that it would be well if the house should send out a commission of its own members to inquire and to regulate proceedings in the Crimea. Lord Palmerston's retort was ready. He suggested that it might be satisfactory to the house to take the honourable member at his word, and to add to the direction that he and his colleagues should proceed instantly to the Crimea, the further instruction that they should remain there during the rest of the session. This was of course received with great laughter; but Mr. Roebuck's motion still hung over the government, and this was no laughing matter. It would seem to have been unreasonable that a committee of inquiry levelled against one administration should be continued against another which had neither been tried nor found wanting;

but it was contended that there had been no real change of ministry—that the same men remained, but were distributed in different offices. On these grounds Mr. Disraeli demanded the prosecution of the inquiry by a select committee, in accordance with Mr. Roebuck's motion, satirically basing the demand upon the recommendation of Lord John Russell: "the first minister of the crown in this house—the man of whom as a member, irrespective of all party politics, this house is most proud—the man who had previously been prime minister of England for a long period of years—the man whose qualities, whose sagacity, whose wisdom, whose statesmanlike mind have been just eulogized by the first minister on the treasury bench—a man of such qualities, that though he had intentionally destroyed his late colleagues, they have already employed him upon an august mission—this eminent person comes down to parliament and tells you that although as a minister of the crown he cannot, with all the advantages of official experience, penetrate the mystery of the national calamity that has occurred, that he thinks inquiry ought to be granted, as the plea for it is irresistible." Mr. Disraeli then went on to say that after this opinion had been endorsed by a majority almost unprecedented in the records of parliament, they were told that the House of Commons was to stultify itself—to recede from the ground which it so triumphantly occupied—to rescind the resolution which it so solemnly affirmed.

Mr. Roebuck, however, had no intention to recede from his original proposal; he had been suffering from illness, but he pressed the inquiry with renewed energy. Lord Palmerston, believing that to make the motion for an inquiry into one of want of confidence would, in the condition of the public temper, again break up the government and provoke another crisis, consented to the appointment of a select committee. The country, it was argued, was bent on having the inquiry, and therefore it was that the House of Commons insisted upon it, and not from hostility to the new ministry. Had such hostility existed, the house, it was felt, would not have voted, as they had just done, without a murmur, largely

increased estimates for the purpose of increasing the strength of both army and navy.

With these conclusions, however, Mr. Gladstone and some other influential members of the new administration did not agree, or at all events they felt that they could not now consistently consent to an inquiry which they had previously affirmed was not only unnecessary but impolitic. They were opposed to the inquiry, at such a juncture, as a breach of constitutional principle and a dangerous precedent. Sir James Graham said that he could not consent to the appointment of a committee which included no member of the government, and he was also opposed to a select committee. If secret, its investigations could not be checked by public opinion; and if open, the evidence taken would be immediately made public and canvassed in a manner injurious to the public service. Mr. Sidney Herbert declared that as a vote of censure the motion for the committee was valueless, while as an inquiry it would be a mere sham. Mr. Gladstone significantly represented that the committee, being neither for punishment nor remedy, must be for government, and could not fail to deprive the executive of its most important functions. All three, therefore, announced their intention to retire from the ministry, and they were followed by Mr. Cardwell; so that the Palmerston government was at the outset considerably shaken; but it was felt that it had become necessary to keep it together on the best terms possible, for another serious crisis would have been mischievous while negotiations were supposed to be pending, and yet it was necessary to prepare for a vigorous prosecution of the war. On this subject—the success of negotiation or the continuance of war—opinion was divided; but most people seemed to share Lord Palmerston's doubts of the good faith of the czar, and were for increased armaments. Mr. Bright and those who agreed with him, however, were of a different opinion, and thought that they saw in the proposed negotiations at Vienna an opportunity which the Emperor of Russia would accept for bringing hostilities to a close. During the debate which followed the explanations of the retiring ministers, he

made a fervent, an impassioned appeal to the house and to Lord Palmerston to stay the war.

"You are not pretending to conquer territory," he said; "you are not pretending to hold fortified or unfortified towns; you have offered terms of peace, which, as I understand them, I do not say are not moderate; and breathes there a man in this house, or in this country, whose appetite for blood is so insatiable that even when terms of peace have been offered and accepted, he pines for that assault in which, of Russian, Turk, French, and English, as sure as one man dies, 20,000 corpses will strew the streets of Sebastopol? I say I should like to ask the noble lord—and I am sure that he will feel, and that this house will feel, that I am speaking in no unfriendly manner towards the government of which he is at the head. I should like to know, and I venture to hope that it is so, if the noble lord, the member for London, has power at the earliest stage of these proceedings at Vienna at which it can properly be done—and I should think that it might properly be done at a very early stage—to adopt a course by which all further waste of human life may be put an end to, and further animosity between three great nations be, as far as possible, prevented? I appeal to the noble lord at the head of the government and to this house; I am not now complaining of the terms of peace nor, indeed, of anything that has been done; but I wish to suggest to this house what, I believe, thousands and tens of thousands of the most educated and of the most Christian portion of the people of this country are feeling upon this subject, although, indeed, in the midst of a certain clamour in the country, they do not give public expression to their feelings. I cannot but notice in speaking to gentlemen who sit on either side of this house, or in speaking to any one I meet between this house and any of those localities we frequent when this house is up—I cannot, I say, but notice that an uneasy feeling exists as to the news which may arrive by the very next mail from the East. I do not suppose that your troops are to be beaten in actual conflict with the foe, or that they will be driven into the sea; but

I am certain that many homes in England, in which there now exists a fond hope that the distant one may return; many such homes may be rendered desolate when the next mail shall arrive. The angel of death has been abroad throughout the land; you may almost hear the beating of his wings. There is no one, as when the first-born were slain of old, to sprinkle with blood the lintel and the two side-posts of our doors, that he may spare and pass on; he takes his victims from the castle of the noble, the mansion of the wealthy, and the cottage of the poor and the lowly, and it is on behalf of all these classes that I make this solemn appeal. I tell the noble lord, that if he be ready honestly and frankly to endeavour, by the negotiations about to be opened at Vienna, to put an end to this war, no word of mine, no vote of mine, will be given to shake his power for one single moment, or to change his position in this house. I am sure that the noble lord is not inaccessible to appeals made to him from honest motives, and with no unfriendly feeling. The noble lord has been for more than forty years a member of this house. Before I was born he sat upon the treasury bench, and he has spent his life in the service of his country. He is no longer young, and his life has extended almost to the term allotted to man. I would ask, I would entreat the noble lord to take a course which, when he looks back upon his whole political career—whatever he may therein find to be pleased with, whatever to regret—cannot but be a source of gratification to him. By adopting that course he would have the satisfaction of reflecting that, having obtained the object of his laudable ambition—having become the foremost subject of the crown, the director of, it may be, the destinies of his country and the presiding genius in her councils—he had achieved a still higher and nobler ambition: that he had returned the sword to the scabbard—that at his word torrents of blood had ceased to flow—that he had restored tranquillity to Europe, and saved this country from the indescribable calamities of war.”

The effect of the appeal on the critical sense of the house was very great, and the impressive peroration, as fine a piece of oratory as

had ever been heard in the House of Commons, was listened to with a profound and impressive silence which was almost painful in its intensity, and might by a less able or less earnest speaker have been too easily turned into a laugh by some misplaced word. Such silence is often only relieved by some half hysterical outburst; but on this occasion it was deep and unbroken. “The beating of the wings” seemed for a moment possible, for in that almost breathless hush the house seemed to be listening for something even beyond the words of him who addressed them.

The new trial to the ministry was sharp, but it was short; and the concession of Lord Palmerston to what he believed to be the demand of the country having been made for the purpose of avoiding the inconvenience and danger of the government being again in abeyance, it was necessary to fill up the vacant places without delay. Sir G. C. Lewis therefore succeeded Mr. Gladstone as chancellor of the exchequer. Sir C. Wood replaced Sir James Graham at the admiralty; Mr. Vernon Smith went to the board of control, and Lord Stanley of Alderley to the board of trade. At the same time Sir Robert Peel (the son of the repealer of the corn-laws) was made a lord of the admiralty, and Mr. Harrison became secretary for Ireland. Lord John Russell was nominated colonial secretary in place of Mr. Sidney Herbert, the appointment reaching him as he was on his way to Vienna.

Before the conferences could be commenced, and while the new government was settling into its place, and perhaps reckoning the advantages that had been gained by the victory of Omar Pasha, who, aided by the British fleet, had repelled and defeated the attack made by 40,000 Russians under General Liprandi on the Turkish position at Eupatoria; an event happened which startled and impressed Europe, and gave a new direction to the hopes of those who were most anxious for the conclusion of a lasting peace.

On the 2d of March the Czar Nicholas of Russia lay dead. It almost seemed as though he could not survive the intelligence that a smaller force of the despised Turks had beaten back his regiments at Eupatoria. Soon after

that news reached him he became delirious; but it is not therefore to be assumed that his fatal illness was attributable to reverses, which, in spite of the continued hold upon Sebastopol, had befallen the Russian arms. In another sense, however, he may be said to have hazarded his life in the war and lost it. (General Februnary had not proved to be an ally. The weather, inclement and rigorous in the Crimea, was almost insupportable at St. Petersburg to anybody who was exposed to its severity, especially to one who had been suffering from influenza, and refused to take even ordinary precautions for preventing a worse disorder. The chief anxiety of the Emperor Nicholas, with regard to his own health, was to observe a regimen which would prevent corpulency, of which he had a peculiar dread; and this may account for many of his active and almost restless habits, as well as for his usual abstemiousness. He had during the bitterest weather persisted in attending reviews of the troops and inspecting defences. He had been on the ice to examine the fortifications of Cronstadt, and, in fact, gave himself no leisure and no repose in preparing for the exigencies of the conflict which he had challenged. He even seemed to have a presentiment of death, occasioned either by his gloomy reception of the news of repeated defeat in the Crimea, or from a sense of departing strength; but he would relax no exertion even though the affection of the chest, from which he had begun to suffer, became more serious. It was not till Dr. Mandt expressed an earnest desire for a second physician to be summoned that he consented to consult Dr. Karell, his physician-in-ordinary, and agreed to remain in bed. The health of the empress was at this time so feeble that she also was confined to her own apartment, so that the emperor was without the consolation which her presence might have afforded him. He daily grew worse, he was sleepless, and his cough was incessant. He could not tolerate a condition which imposed inactivity, and announced his determination to review a corps of infantry of the guard which was on its way to Lithuania. The weather was still intensely cold, and a hard

frost continued. "Sire," said one of his physicians, "there is not in the whole army a military surgeon who would permit a common soldier to quit the hospital in the state in which you are, for he would be sure that his patient would re-enter it still worse." "'Tis well, gentlemen," answered the emperor; "you have done your duty, now I am going to do mine;" and upon this he entered the sledge. In passing along the ranks of his soldiers his air of suffering and continual cough betrayed his condition. On his return he said, "I am bathed in perspiration." Before going home he called upon Prince Dolgorouki, the minister of war, who was ill, and, more prudent for him than for himself, he urged him not to go out too soon. He passed the evening with the empress, but complained of cold and kept on his cloak.

The result of his imprudent excursion was a serious relapse, which compelled him to remain in the small room which was his working cabinet, whence for some days he continued to issue orders respecting the defence of Sebastopol and the disposition of the army; but it was evident that his brain had become affected. The empress left her own apartments to attend upon him; but he continued, by the exercise of a powerful will, to fight against increasing weakness, and during the first days of Lent attended the religious services of the season in the usual manner. But after three or four days he was compelled to absent himself; and the empress, who was borne down with distress, then suggested to him the serious nature of his illness by proposing that he should receive the sacraments. For some time he did not or would not realize his dangerous condition; but at last, noticing the deep grief of the empress, he began to comprehend it, and having dismissed his physician, sent for the hereditary prince and told him that his recovery was hopeless. He then sent for his confessor, the archpriest Bajanoff, with whom, after having blessed the empress and the prince, who remained during the preliminary prayers, he was left alone, the empress and the czarowitch returning afterwards, when he took the communion. He then sent for all the members of his family, of whom he

took leave, giving them his blessing. His ministers were then summoned, and finally he took leave of his servants. He himself gave directions for the funeral ceremonies, which were to be conducted without unnecessary display, since no expenditure was to be incurred when it could be so ill spared from the requirements of the war. On the 2d of March, at noon, after having been unable for more than an hour to articulate a syllable, he recovered for a few minutes the power of speech, and bade his son Alexander thank the garrison of Sebastopol in his name. His anxiety that Prussia should continue in the policy which it had, to so great an extent, observed, was manifest in what were almost his last words: "Dites à Fritz (his brother-in-law the King of Prussia) de rester le même pour la Russie et de ne pas oublier les paroles de papa."¹

Thus died Nicholas of Russia at the age of 59, and after reigning 29 years. He had lived longer than his predecessors on the throne, and had already noticed that fact when he seemed to have a premonition that his end was approaching. The cause of his death was said to be pulmonary apoplexy, but of course poison was hinted at, though there appears to have been no foundation for any suspicion that he had died from other than natural causes. It was also asserted that the disease of which he died was either caused or accelerated by the violent fits of passion which overmastered him when he received intelligence of the reverses of his troops, the last having been occasioned by the news of Sardinia joining the allies; but it was pointed out at the time that these uncontrollable or uncontrolled outbreaks of fury, may have been a result rather than a cause of serious cerebral disorder.

The news of the death of the czar took the government and the country by surprise. It was solemnly announced in parliament, and was received by the public without unseemly exultation, but rather with a sense of awe and with deep seriousness. One of the most striking notices of the event in the public

press took the form of a cartoon in *Punch* by the famous John Leech. It was entitled "General Fevrier turned Traitor," and represented a skeleton in the uniform of a Russian officer laying his icy hand on the breast of the prostrate emperor. This picture caused a great sensation, and was afterwards referred to as a new example of the deep and often solemn significance, which had become an element even in some of the so-called lighter literature of the time.

It was everywhere being asked, What will be the effect of the death of the czar in relation to the war? Shall we be obliged to continue hostilities to the bitter end, or will an opportunity be afforded for such negotiations on the "four points" as will lead to a pacific arrangement? It was generally believed that the Grand-duke Alexander, who had succeeded to the imperial throne under the name of Alexander II. Nicolaiewitch, was of a milder nature than his father, that he was very popular, and inherited neither the character nor the obstinacy of Nicholas. It was generally hoped that he would be willing to accede to peaceable overtures. But nobody knew what were the last instructions given by the late emperor to his heir, and the manifesto made by the latter at his accession was little less ambiguous than such declarations usually are. It was understood that he would be actuated by the same sentiments as those which animated his father. That might mean that he would prosecute the war without receding from former demands. He swore to regard the welfare of the empire as his only object, and expressed his desire to maintain Russia on the highest standard of power and glory, and in his own person accomplish the incessant wishes of Peter, of Catherine, of Alexander, and of his father. That might be still more significant. The only course which could be taken by England would be to continue pushing on preparations for a final blow at the power of Russia, and at the same time to send Lord John Russell to Vienna to see whether the proposed terms would be favourably received. These were the opinions of the government, and probably of the large ma-

¹ The words referred to were an injunction to maintain under all contingencies the principles of the "Holy Alliance."

majority of the nation. Palmerston's suspicion of the good faith of Russia was apparently little altered by the accession of the Grand-duke Alexander to the throne, and most people shared his doubts, and regarded the appeals of Bright and Cobden at the best as mere sentimental delusions, and at the worst as mean-spirited truckling to a base, cowardly, and huckstering policy. There was no longer any slackness on the part of the government in sending supplies to the Crimea, and recruiting was carried on with renewed energy. The hospitals were still full of the sick and wounded, while numbers of men suffered severely from frost-bite occasioned by the intense cold and the arduous duties they had to fulfil amidst ice and snow. There was too little disposition on the part of some of the commanding officers to give their men the full benefit of the suitable clothing sent out to them, and in many instances a return to the regulation uniform was insisted on. There was even a whisper when some of the regiments were reorganized that they were to return to the complete regimentals, including the stiff military stock. The Highlanders were made to abandon the comfortable fur caps with which they had been provided, and to resume the Scotch bonnets, which left their ears exposed to the cutting wind. The siege was being carried on with increasing effect, and the victory at Eupatoria released the Turkish contingent, which was ordered to march southward towards the north of Sebastopol, in order either to cut off the Russian supplies, or make it necessary for the enemy to keep a large body of men to prevent their communications from being intercepted.

The arrival of a number of our wounded soldiers who had been sent home to England had some effect in maintaining rather than in mitigating the desire to pursue the war until a more definite result had been achieved. The queen lost no time in giving practical expression to her sympathy with the brave men who had suffered so much during the terrible campaign, from which they had returned maimed or mutilated. Accompanied by the prince consort she visited the hospital at Chatham, and went through the wards, speaking to the

men who were lying there disabled, or to those who, being less seriously hurt or nearer to convalescence, were drawn up for her inspection. It was a pitiful spectacle; but the soldiers were so touched by the interest shown by the sovereign that before she left the building they raised a cheer; the ghost of a cheer,—so feeble was its tone as compared to the sound that had rung out many a time during the heat and ardour of battle,—but full of meaning. At Buckingham Palace the wounded and disabled guards were mustered, that her majesty might speak to each man and inquire how he was wounded, and what were his hopes of regaining strength. Many who could not walk from the barracks were conveyed to the palace in an omnibus. There were strange stories to be told, and it was a sad sight to see so many fine fellows permanently injured by the loss of limbs, or by wounds which would leave them unfit for further duty. But most of them were still capable of following some occupations which were afterwards found for them, as care-takers in warehouses, gate-keepers, private watchmen, light porters at public buildings, and such comparatively easy callings as required discipline, punctuality, and order. Many situations of this kind were offered to those least seriously disabled, and the appeal made in their behalf may be said to have originated the organization which has since become so useful under the name of the Corps of Commissionaires.

The suspicions that the attempt to restore peace by a congress of the great powers at Vienna had altogether failed were too quickly justified. No basis of negotiations could be agreed upon. The proposed limitation of the preponderance of the power of Russia in the Black Sea was the rock upon which diplomacy split. M. Drouyn de Lhuys inquired whether Russia would consider her rights of sovereignty infringed if she deprived herself of the liberty of building an unlimited number of ships of war in the Black Sea. This question was asked on the 19th of March, and after taking forty-eight hours to think it over Prince Gortschakoff replied that Russia would not consent to the strength of her navy being

restricted to any fixed number either by treaty or in any other manner. He suggested a counterpoise of forces in the Black Sea by opening the Straits of the Dardanelles to the flags of war of all nations—a proposition really involving a general competition in the maintenance of enormous naval armaments, which would have meant a constant state of war instead of a permanent or practical peace. After this little weight was given to the profession with which Prince Gortschakoff accompanied this refusal, that Russia was prepared to examine any measures which might be proposed to her not inconsistent with her honour. Only one result was anticipated after the express declaration which her plenipotentiaries had made, that “any restriction upon her naval force in the Black Sea was derogatory to the sovereign rights of the emperor their master, and dangerous to the independence of the Ottoman Empire.”

All this time the Russian representative was playing the old game of endeavouring to weaken the alliance between England and France by flattering the French emperor. It was against this country that the anger of Russia seemed to be directed.

In a letter dated 26th of March, 1855, by Count Nesselrode to his son-in-law Baron Seebach, the Saxon minister at the court of the Tuileries, which was written really *à l'adresse* of the Emperor of the French, and of which a copy was at once forwarded by him to the English government, Count Nesselrode says, speaking of his master, “L'empereur, quelles que soient ses dispositions pacifiques, n'acceptera jamais des conditions semblables, et la nation se soumettra à tous les sacrifices plutôt que de les subir.” “Entre la France et la Russie il y a guerre sans hostilité,” he says in another communication. “La paix se fera quand il (the Emperor of the French) la voudra. A mes yeux la situation se résume dans cette vérité.”

The commission of inquiry obtained by Mr. Roebuck had soon examined a great number of witnesses, many of them (including the Duke of Cambridge) officers of high rank and considerable importance. The general ten-

dency of the evidence was to show that the commissariat and the land transport service at the seat of war were grossly mismanaged. Even at Scutari there was a great deficiency of forage and only one place at which to obtain it, so that a man would have to wait all day before he could procure the supplies he wanted, and the same blundering policy was carried out before Sebastopol, where the irregular feeding of the horses wrought incalculable mischief. The Duke of Cambridge laid much emphasis on the fact that the guards were unable to obtain the London “porter” which had been sent out to them as a prime necessity. “We got porter at Scutari and at Varna, but not afterwards. . . . I attribute the sickness to the climate; but I think the great mortality in the guards arose from the men not being able to get porter.” The special correspondent of the *Illustrated London News* and the almoner of the *Times'* benevolent fund were also examined. Though the evidence taken was quoted in some quarters as a reason for assailing Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Sidney Herbert for resigning office, it would not appear that any particularly useful end was answered by it, especially as it had little or no application against the existing government, from which these gentlemen had retired. Some of the testimony elicited not only before the commission but by admissions of officials in answer to questions in parliament, revealed a condition of things which would have been ludicrous had the consequences not been so sad. The greatcoats of some of the soldiers, for instance, were said to have been made of the worst possible material, and utterly useless to the wearers. This was scarcely denied; but the answer was that they were “quite up to the pattern,” the “object being to give the soldiers as little as possible to carry.”

There was no actual slackening of hostilities during the Vienna conference, and extensive preparations for a more vigorous prosecution of the siege continued to be made. Wednesday, the 21st of March, was appointed to be observed as a day for fasting and special prayer for a blessing on “the just and necessary war in which we are engaged.” The

House of Lords attended divine worship in Westminster Abbey, and the Commons in the parish church of St. Margaret's, while services were held at almost all the principal churches and chapels throughout the country.

By this time it was generally understood that the negotiations at Vienna had proved abortive, and that the prospects of peace were, in fact, more remote than ever. The Russian government having on the 21st of April definitely rejected the proposals for neutralizing the Black Sea, or for limiting their own naval force there, the plenipotentiaries of England and France declared their powers exhausted, and announced their intention to return home. Lord John Russell left Vienna on the 23d of April, and was immediately followed by M. Drouyn de Lhuys. The salient features of the Austrian proposal were that the allies might each have two frigates in the Black Sea; that, if the Russians increased their fleet there beyond its existing number, the allies might each maintain there one half the number of the Russian ships of war; that Russia should be asked by Austria not to increase her naval forces in the Black Sea beyond the number actually there in 1853, and that whether she accepted this engagement or not Austria would sign a treaty making any increase beyond that number a *casus belli*. This was an extraordinary proposal, and as Prince Albert at once pointed out, "the proposal of Austria to engage to make war when the Russian armaments should appear to have become *excessive* is of no kind of value to the belligerents, who do not wish to establish a case for which to make war hereafter, but to obtain a security upon which they can conclude peace now." The same view had already been taken by our government and by the Emperor of the French. The Austrian proposals were not likely to deceive so astute a minister as Lord Palmerston, and they bore more of the appearance of Russian diplomatic suggestion than of the advice of a friendly ally. But there was a new complication. The French and English plenipotentiaries had both expressed their personal approval of the Austrian recommendation, but having no instructions to accept it had left the conference.

Lord John Russell had in his despatches indicated his concurrence, and we soon heard from the Emperor of the French that Drouyn de Lhuys had pressed the proffered terms upon him, urging the necessity for prompt decision. Various speculations have been made on the reasons for the French minister's acceptance of the Austrian proposals. It was hinted that he disliked the alliance of England with France, and was not unwilling to see a check placed on the power of England by compelling her to conclude an unsatisfactory peace. More probable was the notion, that he hoped the preparations of Austria to take the field against Russia, in case of a refusal of the offered terms by the former, or, eventually, in case of an undue increase of naval armaments in the Black Sea, would break up the continental league which had for so long kept France in check. It seldom occurs to English critics to suspect foreign diplomatists of weakness, or folly, or incapacity. The conduct of the French plenipotentiary could only be accounted for by supposing it to proceed from some more or less subtle policy. No such excuse was made for Lord John Russell, nor did he seem to give ground for it. At all events the Austrian proposal was utterly rejected by both governments, and the arguments of their representatives, who had returned from the conference, failed to convince them. There was one essential difference in the subsequent proceedings of the French and the English "plenipos." M. Drouyn de Lhuys resigned his office and was succeeded by M. Walewski as minister of foreign affairs, M. Persigny being sent as ambassador to London. Lord John Russell, who had so recently resigned, to the embarrassment and ultimate defeat of a ministry, remained in office to embarrass even if he could not defeat another government.

On the 4th of May, a week having elapsed without the papers relating to the Vienna conference being presented to the House of Commons, Mr. Disraeli sharply attacked the government, contrasting its dilatory conduct with that of 1796, when Lord Malmesbury was attempting to negotiate peace with France. Lord Palmerston in reply said the

cases were different, as we were endeavouring to negotiate through the intervention of Austria. He was not prepared to say that there might not be other means open, by which, through the friendly intervention of Austria, a proposition might be made which would have the effect of bringing hostilities to a close. He wished to leave the door open for negotiations. While on the one hand the government were determined to continue the contest in a manner consistent with the honour, the dignity, and the interests of the country, on the other hand they would not be parties to shutting the door against any possibility of concluding an honourable and satisfactory peace. This was not satisfactory to the opposition, who were determined to impugn the conduct of the ministry.

Meanwhile an Administrative Reform Association had been organized, which on the day following held a meeting at the London Tavern to carry resolutions that "the true remedy for the system of maladministration which had caused so lamentable a sacrifice of labour, money, and human life, is to be sought for in the introduction of large experience and practical ability into the service of the state; that the exclusion from office of those who possess in a high degree the practical qualities necessary for the direction of affairs in a great commercial country, is a reflection upon its intelligence and a betrayal of its interests; that, while we disclaim every desire of excluding the aristocratic classes from participation in the councils of the crown, we feel it our duty to protest against the pretensions of any section of the community to monopolize the functions of administration."

The chair at this meeting was taken by Mr. Samuel Morley, and the meeting itself chiefly consisted of merchants and traders in the metropolis, whose object it was to organize an association for administrative reform. Mr. Morley at the outset said he had come there because he honestly feared that we were drifting into that state which, if unchecked, must land us in revolution, and because, in all seriousness, he had no faith in order or peace which was not founded on contentment; and he for one was not disposed to say "Peace,

peace," when he felt that there ought to be no peace. An attempt had been made to show that this movement was a mere trading affair; but they would show that it was something more serious. They wished to see the public business of the country conducted in an efficient manner. They had been accused of a wish to attack the aristocracy; but there need be no alarm on that head in a country like England, where the great mass of the people are so much attached to the aristocracy. The meeting had not been called to discuss the war, upon the wisdom or justice of which he would not pronounce. Their sole object was to obtain a reform of the present system of government.

The speakers at this meeting emphatically protested that their representations were not a mere flash in the pan, but were founded on convictions which they were determined to follow to some practical issue. It soon appeared that they were likely to be supported by resolutions in both houses of Parliament. Immediately after the meeting we find the Earl of Ellenborough proposing an address to her majesty to declare the persuasion of the House of Lords "that, amidst all their disappointments, the people of this country still retain the generous feelings which led them at the commencement of the war willingly to place all the means required from them at her majesty's disposal; that they will still protect the weak against the aggression of the strong; and that they are not prepared to consent that Russia shall, by her increasing preponderance, so control the Turkish government as practically to hold Constantinople within her grasp.

"To acquaint her majesty, that while we admit and lament the privations to which war necessarily subjects all classes of the people, we yet venture to assure her majesty that they would, in so just a cause, bear those privations without complaint, if they could feel that the war had been well conducted, that the troops had not been exposed to any hardships which could have been avoided by forethought, and that everything had been done to enable them to achieve decisive success; and humbly to represent to her majesty that

her people, suffering privations on account of this war, have, as yet, had no such consolation; that, on the contrary, we cannot withhold from her majesty the avowal of our conviction, that the conduct of the war has occasioned general dissatisfaction, and given rise to just complaints, and that we must humbly lay before her majesty our deliberate opinion that it is only through the selection of men for public employment, without regard to anything but the public service, that the country can hope to prosecute the war successfully, and to attain in its only legitimate object—a secure and honourable peace.”

In speaking of Lord Palmerston's “pretended” knowledge of military affairs, the noble earl narrated a reminiscence of the Duke of Wellington. “I recollect sitting by the side of the Duke of Wellington in the House of Lords during the unfortunate difficulty between him and Mr. Huskisson which led to the resignation of a portion of the gentlemen forming the government. The Duke of Wellington was suddenly called out of the house, and when he returned he said to me, ‘That was Palmerston who wanted to see me, to tell me if Huskisson went he must go too.’ The duke continued, ‘I said nothing; it was not for me to fire great guns at small birds.’ That was the opinion of the Duke of Wellington.” This was not a very remarkable story, and was not very appropriate as applied to the Palmerston of 1855. On the whole it may have been considered to have been at the expense of the memory of the Duke of Wellington rather than that of the existing prime minister.

Lord Granville, who before he came to the title was George Leveson Gower, took up the defence of the government chiefly on the ground that able, practical men engaged in commercial or other pursuits could not be induced to give up their business to accept political office. In the course of his remarks he referred with some humour to the charge made by the noble earl that the cabinet was composed of Gowers, Howards, and Cavendishes. “My lords,” he said, “I had better make a clean breast of it at once; and I am obliged to admit that some of those who went before me had such quivers full of daughters

who did not die old maids, that I have relations upon this side of the house, relations upon the cross-benches, relations upon the opposite side of the house, and I actually had the unparalleled misfortune to have no fewer than three daughters in the Protectionist administration of my noble friend opposite.”

The resolutions of the Earl of Ellenborough were rejected, and in the House of Commons a motion made by Major Reid, calling attention to the critical state of public affairs and to the necessity of at once introducing reforms in every branch of the state, was answered by Lord Palmerston, who said, in forming his government he was not influenced by family connections, but rather by the distinguished abilities which individuals had displayed in public affairs; and he only regretted that commercial men of the greatest ability and talent were generally so absorbed in their commercial pursuits that it was difficult—indeed, impossible—to obtain their assistance. The government as it stood was, he thought, such as should command the confidence of the public. He was aware that great improvements might be made in various branches of the public service, and the utmost attention was paid to the subject, with a view to their introduction. “It was intended to abolish the office of master-general of the ordnance, and also the ordnance board itself. The artillery and engineers would be placed under the same authority as the rest of the army. The civil department of the ordnance would be placed under the control of the secretary for war, as would also the medical department of the commissariat. The object which the government had most at heart was to render all the branches of the public service as effective and vigorous as possible; for he felt the war was with a colossal power, who would become dominant in Europe—France and England sinking into secondary states—if we should be worsted in the struggle.”

There was something about this answer which brought up Mr. Disraeli, who insinuated that Palmerston was himself the author of the motion.

These tentative resolutions, if they produced no other effect, kept alive public criticism, and



GRANVILLE GEORGE LEVESON-GOWER
SECOND EARL GRANVILLE

Engraved from a drawing by Sir Martin Archer Shee, R.S.A.

made it by no means an easy task for the government to hold their own, with Lord John Russell in office, and the question of the negotiations still unsettled.

The financial statement of Sir George Cornwall Lewis had been received with little or no opposition, and the budget was passed with alacrity, though it necessarily had to provide for an enormously increased expenditure.

Sir George Cornwall Lewis was just the kind of man whom the administrative reformers had asserted should hold office. He belonged to a family who had adopted politics as a business, and he had very considerable faculties for pursuing that business successfully. Probably the witty saying attributed to him, that "life would be tolerable if it were not for its amusements," was only one of the many humorous remarks for which this shrewd and able gentleman was famous among his friends. It might stand, however, as an expression of his capacity and liking for hard work and constant occupation in the business of the state. He had left the editorial chair of the *Edinburgh Review* to become chancellor of the exchequer, and had long been known to fame as a philosophical writer, his first important literary production having been a translation of Müller's *History and Antiquities of the Doric Race*. Another book, the *Inquiry into the Credibility of Early Roman History*, was of more importance in establishing his fame as an author, however; while in the field of political writing he had published an essay, *On the Use and Abuse of Political Terms*, a treatise *On the Method of Reasoning in Politics*, and one on the *Government of Dependencies*. These were rather painstaking and conclusive, than brilliant or very original efforts, but they displayed great liberality and just the kind of ability that might be expected of a man who, from a comparatively early age, followed his father in a career of practical, and one might also say, professional politics. The name of Sir Thomas Frankland Lewis was well known as the holder of the by no means popular office of chairman of the poor-law commission from 1834 to 1839; and his son became a member

of the board while he occupied that position. But Sir Frankland Lewis had achieved distinction before the latter date by a long course of public service. Belonging to a Radnorshire family of independent means, he had obtained a baronetcy from Sir Robert Peel, and had sat in parliament successively for Beaumaris, Ennis, and Radnorshire. His chief business, however, was on "commissions," and for about twenty years there was scarcely ever a parliamentary "inquiry" in which he did not take a part. In 1827 he was secretary to the treasury, then became vice-president of the Board of Trade, and then gained the lucrative post of treasurer to the navy, an office long ago abolished. Thus his son, Sir George, was trained to political life and had begun it early. In 1828, when he was twenty-two years old, he was already distinguished at Oxford, and three years later was called to the bar, with a view, as it seemed, to secure the "seven years' legal standing" which was at one time, and is often still, regarded as an advantage to anyone seeking official position. In 1835 he began with the commission of relief of the poor in Ireland, and afterwards was on the Irish Church inquiry commission. From 1836 to 1847 he was on the poor-law board, and just before the defeat of Lord John Russell in 1850 had been joint secretary to the treasury. In 1851 he had lost his seat for Herefordshire, and it was in 1854 that his father's death left him at once the baronetcy and the representation of the Radnor district in parliament. His ability as chancellor of the exchequer was acknowledged by competent judges to be superior to that either of Sir Charles Wood or of Mr. Goulbourn; but he was far inferior to Mr. Disraeli in brilliant and incisive statement, and to Mr. Gladstone both in grasp of financial policy and in the power to make the usually dry details of a budget attractive. Still his fiscal arrangements were sound, and though a number of members did not stay to listen to the whole of the budget speech, that speech was not without real interest. The condition of the country was such that the necessity for procuring revenue left little choice to a practical and careful financier. It had become impossible to con-

tinue the method employed by Mr. Gladstone to meet the expenses of the war out of annual revenue. Although the estimated income for the year was close upon 63½ millions, the expenditure exceeded that sum by nearly 23 millions.

On the 20th of April Sir George explained that he proposed to meet the deficiency by raising sixteen millions on loan at three per cent., of which the whole had been taken at par by the Messrs. Rothschild and the Bank of England,—five millions by means of an additional twopence in the pound on the income-tax,—and three millions by exchequer bills. Some of the details of his plan provoked discussion, but the resolutions for giving it effect were carried on the 23d without difficulty. The nation was thoroughly in earnest, and to achieve the objects of the war, it was prepared to find the necessary sinews without a murmur.

The progress of the war began now to be accompanied by some events which were fortunate for the ministry, inasmuch as they tended to raise public confidence. Of the resignation of General Canrobert we have already spoken. He felt his own want of the grasp and risk of responsibility which are requisite in a commander-in-chief. An admirable soldier, thoroughly in earnest, and loyally attached to the English, he differed from his successor Pelissier in many important respects. Marshal Vaillant had said, "Pelissier will lose 14,000 men for a great result at once, while Canrobert would lose the like number by dribbets without obtaining any advantage." Canrobert had hesitated to seize and fortify the Mamelon hill, a piece of neglect which afterwards cost hundreds of lives and delayed the progress of the siege, and he waited to be attacked instead of leading the assault. Pelissier was another kind of commander. General Changarnier had said of him, "If there was an *émeute* I should not hesitate at burning a quarter of Paris; Pelissier would not flinch from burning the whole." To him Canrobert had, with noble self-depreciation, handed over the army, active, well organized, and ready for hard duty, and asked that he himself might be permitted to serve as a general of division.

The visit of the Emperor and Empress of the French to the Queen had done much to maintain enthusiasm in favour of that alliance which Mr. Bright had so unmistakably disparaged, and, as we have seen, the arrival not only of Russian prisoners, but of our own maimed and wounded soldiers, had not tended to diminish the belligerent temper of the nation. The distribution of Crimean medals to the officers and soldiers who had been engaged in the battles of the Alma, Balaklava, and Inkerman, was another occasion which, while it touched the sympathy of the country, at the same time increased the determination to pursue the war until the pride of Russia was humbled, and peace could be made on a basis which it was imagined would prevent her from again attempting to control the destinies of Turkey. The war-fever was not allayed by the terrible sacrifices which had been made, nor by the deluge of blood that had been shed. If our troops had suffered much, and their numbers had been reduced by famine and sword, the Russians had suffered far more. "The loss and destruction and misery inflicted on the Russians have been threefold that inflicted on the whole armies of the allies," said Lord Lansdowne in reply to the Earl of Ellenborough's charge against the administration. "The noble earl has some idea, perhaps, of the extent to which that loss has gone, that, if our troops have suffered from want of clothing, of habitations, of the means of transport, the Russians have suffered ten times more; but I should astonish your lordships by stating what the amount of that loss to the enemy has been. I have here a statement, made on the very highest authority, and from this it appears that a few days before the death of the Emperor Nicholas a return was made up, stating that 170,000 Russians had died, and according to a supplementary return, made up a few days later, 70,000 were added to the list, making a total loss of 240,000 men." It is true that the thought of this dreadful destruction of human life sent a thrill through the house, and that the arrival of detachment after detachment of invalids, who were visited by the queen and the prince consort, kept alive public pity. As Mr. Bright had said, the beating of

the wings of the angel of death could almost be heard, and throughout England many houses were in mourning; but the dead were buried out there in the dreary cemetery at Scutari or on the wind-swept plain of Balaklava; the maimed and the wounded could still make some warlike show when they hobbled or crept to parade that they might receive the medal for valour from the royal hand. It was on the 18th of May that this ceremony took place. A great dais was erected in the centre of the parade between the Horse Guards and St. James's Park, and the public offices by which it is surrounded were fitted up with galleries for spectators. The recipients of the honours were drawn up in the rear of the foot-guards who kept the ground. An immense assemblage had gathered to witness the presentation. Soon after ten o'clock the queen and the prince took their places on the dais. After a march past the line formed three sides of a square facing the dais. Each officer and man of the Crimean invalids had a card on which had been inscribed his name and rank, in what manner he had been wounded, and in which battles he had fought. As each approached he handed the card to an officer, who read it to the queen, and her majesty then with tenderness and sympathy presented to him his appropriate medal, which she had received from Lord Panmure. It was her majesty's own suggestion that these medals should be given by her own hands, for she desired to manifest her personal interest in the brave fellows, to whom she had sent messages of regard while they were in the Crimea. It was a grand, a touching, and yet to the thoughtful mind a saddening spectacle. The queen afterwards wrote to the King of the Belgians, "Ernest will have told you what a beautiful and touching sight and ceremony (the first of the kind ever witnessed in England) the distribution of the medals was. From the highest prince of the blood to the lowest private, all received the same distinction for the bravest conduct in the severest actions, and the rough hand of the brave and honest private soldier came for the first time in contact with that of their sovereign and their queen. Noble fellows! I own I feel as

if they were my own children; my heart beats for them as for my nearest and dearest! They were so touched, so pleased—many, I hear, cried; and they won't hear of giving up their medals to have their names engraved upon them, for fear they should not receive the identical one put into their hands by me! Several came by in a sadly mutilated state. None created more interest or is more gallant than young Sir Thomas Troubridge, who had at Inkerman one leg and the foot of the other carried away by a round shot, and continued commanding his battery till the battle was over, refusing to be carried away, only desiring his shattered limbs to be raised in order to prevent too great a hæmorrhage! He was dragged by in a Bath-chair, and when I gave him his medal I told him I should make him one of my aides-de-camp for his very gallant conduct; to which he replied, 'I am amply repaid for everything.' One must revere and love such soldiers as these."

Operations in the Crimea were not only pushed forward, but preparations were made for attacking the foe in another quarter than at Sebastopol by means of an expedition for destroying the depot from which stores were supplied to the besieged fortress. It was believed that a large portion of these supplies were derived by a circuitous route from Kertch, and it was determined to organize a force which should be conveyed to that place, and the straits of Yenikale, which lead into the Sea of Azoff. An expedition of the same kind had been previously organized, but had been recalled in consequence of a telegram from the Emperor of the French; but now (on the 21st of May) it again sailed with a large body of troops, English, French, and Turkish, under the direction of Sir George Brown. On disembarking at Kertch it was found that the Russians had retreated, having first blown up all their works along the coast, spiked all their guns, and, before evacuating Kertch, destroyed immense stores of provisions. Advancing into the Sea of Azoff with his squadron of steamers on the 25th of May, Captain Lyons (son of Admiral Sir Edmund Lyons, a young officer who afterwards died of wounds received at a later period of the war)

found that four Russian war-steamers, which had escaped from Kertch, had been run ashore and burned to the water's edge at Berdiansk. Here many vessels and extensive corn stores were taken and destroyed. At Genitchi four days later the expedition also burned many corn stores and vessels laden with corn, and these injuries were inflicted without loss of life and with scarcely a casualty.

The stores destroyed at Kertch and in the Sea of Azoff were alone computed to be equal to the rations of 100,000 men for four months, and it was now apparent that the available forces of the Russians were by no means so numerous as had been represented, otherwise they would never have allowed so formidable a blow to be struck without some show of resistance. This conclusion was confirmed by an intercepted letter from Prince Gortschakoff, from which it appeared that General Wrangel, who commanded the troops in the peninsula of Yenikale, and had repeatedly asked for reinforcements in anticipation of an attack by the allied forces, had been told in reply that none could be sent. It was viewed by the English troops as a good omen that the successful descent upon Kertch was made on the queen's birthday, the 24th of May. It had, indeed, struck the enemy in his weakest point—his supplies of food and the means of transport—and the results were not long in making themselves felt.

A success of equal or more than equal importance before Sebastopol made the taking of Kertch still more significant. We have seen that Canrobert, who had hesitated to take the Mamelon, had resigned the command to Pelissier, and petitioned to be made a general of division. He was, however, placed in command of the first corps of the army. Pelissier soon set to work in his usual persistent manner, and at the same time reinforcements began to arrive, which brought the French force up to 120,000, and the English to its former number of 30,000, while the Sardinian contingent of 15,000 and the Turkish contingent made a total of above 200,000 effective men, an army, as it was believed, amply sufficient to carry on the siege and protect the men in the trenches. Now that the transport of rein-

forcements and supplies was provided for the allied troops, and the Russians in Sebastopol had increasing difficulties in conveying their stores for long distances by land carriage and marching their men over great tracts of country, it was felt that the contest, however prolonged, would end in our favour. But it was necessary to take prompt and active measures, and on the 9th of June the French and English artillery commenced a tremendous bombardment of the town, to which the Russians replied with scarcely less vigour. Our cannonade, however, was intended to cover a simultaneous attack against the three important defences of the Russians, the Sapone or White Redoubts, the Mamelon, and the Quarries which lay between the British position and the Redan. The assaults on the two former were made by the French, that on the latter by the British, while the Turks were left to defend the positions from which the allied forces had withdrawn. The three points of attack were separated from each other by two ravines, which served as shelters for the British and French reserves. The Quarries, the assault against which had been assigned to our men, had been converted by the Russians into rifle-pits, and formed a kind of outwork to the Redan, so that it was necessary to capture them before that fort could be attacked. On our troops arriving there they found that the Quarries were undefended, and therefore immediately took possession of them, and converted them into a sheltered position from which to carry on the attack on the fortress. About a thousand of our troops were able to hold them against the repeated efforts of five thousand of the enemy to retake them, for the parapets were reversed, and the fire from our batteries so kept the Russians in check that some of our officers actually made their way into the Redan itself, and afterwards declared that had the English general known of its condition and given the order, it might easily have been taken, and the siege would have been considerably shortened. General Bosquet commanded the French attack on the Mamelon, and it was taken in brilliant fashion by the Zouaves, who clambered up the hill like cats, and carried battery after battery at the

point of the bayonet in a succession of fierce and impetuous assaults which carried them at last into the redoubt. So successful were they, that they forgot discipline, and in disobedience to the orders they had received, rushed precipitately towards the Malakoff battery in a wild courageous effort to carry that also, but they were met with a tornado of artillery which compelled them to pause and then to retreat. It was a critical moment. The Russian reserves bore down upon them, driving them back in confusion (but fighting still), and retook the Mamelon, but only to be swept out of it again by the French reserves of General Brunet, who in their turn came on with an irresistible rush, and soon were masters of the position, which a large body of engineers rapidly converted into a fortress of attack against the place of which it had been one of the most formidable defences. Thus the allies won, at great cost of life, a position which might have been occupied without resistance at an earlier date. The Sapone or White Works were taken with equal *élan* and daring, but the cost of that day's work altogether to the allies was 5000 men killed and wounded.

The French Palace of Industry was opened in Paris on the 17th of May. We have already noted the return visit of the queen and the prince consort to the emperor and empress in the following August. In his address on the inauguration of the Exhibition the emperor said, "In inviting all nations hither, it has been my desire to open a temple of concord." On the same day the attack on the Russian fortresses before Sebastopol was renewed by another tremendous bombardment. The English had advanced their "zigzags" from the Quarries considerably beyond the Redan, of which they were now to attempt to take possession. The French holding the Mamelon and the White Forts were to endeavour to seize the Malakhoff, and as this was the more important, it was agreed that the advance of the English troops in the Redan should be regulated by the progress made by their allies in their assault on the Malakhoff. The plan which was subsequently adopted may have been good, but

unfortunately its success greatly depended upon the prompt response to a given signal. The Russians fought bravely and offered a stubborn resistance, which it would have required the united effort of the French troops to overcome. Through an unfortunate mistake that effort was divided. The firing of a rocket was to be the signal for a simultaneous attack of the two French divisions. General Meyran mistook an exploding shell for the rocket, and gave the word for his division to advance before that of General Brunet was ready. The consequence was, that the tremendous fire of the Malakhoff and all its subsidiary batteries was concentrated on his division, which, after the fall of the general himself, was thrown into confusion and retreated; so that when the signal rocket was really fired, General Brunet, who was to have advanced against another side of the Malakhoff at the same moment that General Meyran made his attack, found his division exposed as the other had been to the whole fire of the Russian batteries, and was also obliged to retire. The consequence of these failures extended to the British operations, and though Major-general Eyre, leading his men gallantly onward, actually forced his way into a large suburb of the town and for seventeen hours held the position he had gained, till he was obliged to withdraw his troops for want of a reinforcement which never came,—the repulse was complete, and the Russians made the most of their triumph. This serious, though only temporary check, added to the physical weakness and the great mental anxiety which he had endured, probably hastened the fatal effects of the sickness from which Lord Raglan had for so long been suffering. He had borne much blame, had gone out to besiege Sebastopol in a manner which he had not personally accepted as wise or advisable, and he must have felt that he was unable to cope with the difficulties by which he was at first surrounded, while he was unsupported by practical administrative ability at home. On the 8th of June, ten days after the unsuccessful attack on the Malakhoff and the Redan, he died. His death was attributed to cholera, but the disease had doubtless been aggravated

by overwork and anxiety. General Simpson, a man who was also broken in health, succeeded him by right of seniority, and he was confirmed in the command by the appointment of the government, but only subsequently to make way for Sir William Codrington.

This then was the position of the army in the Crimea, and at home the government was already beginning to feel some embarrassment because of the increasing number of its previous supporters as well as of its opponents, who were now desirous of continuing negotiations, on the basis of the proposed four points, for the purpose of obtaining peace. The failure of the conference at Vienna had caused a great deal of excitement in the country, and, as we have seen, the ministry was sharply attacked in both houses. Earl Grey had proposed that a humble address be presented to her majesty "to thank her for having ordered the protocols of the recent negotiations at Vienna to be laid before us; to inform her majesty that this house deeply deplores the failure of the attempt to put an end by these negotiations to the calamities of the war in which the country is now engaged; and to express an opinion that the proposals of Russia were such as to afford a fair prospect of concluding a peace by which all the original objects of the war might have been gained, and by which her majesty and her allies might have obtained all the advantages which can reasonably be demanded of Russia." The debate which followed ended in negating the motion without a division. But the opposition from another point of view was equally vigorous. While, on one side, there were expressions of a decided hope that the negotiations, which Lord Palmerston had declared had not been absolutely closed, would be continued and conducted to such an issue as to obtain peace; on the other, severe strictures were passed on the government for not having more effectually prosecuted the war. On the 24th of May, just before the Whitsuntide recess, Mr. Disraeli brought forward a resolution as follows:—

"That this house cannot adjourn for the recess without expressing its dissatisfaction with the ambiguous language and uncertain conduct of her majesty's government in refer-

ence to the great question of peace or war, and that under these circumstances the house feels it a duty to declare that it will continue to give every support to her majesty in the prosecution of the war until her majesty shall, in conjunction with her allies, obtain for the country a safe and honourable peace."

Besides this motion there was one by Mr. Milner Gibson for an address to the crown, expressing regret that the opportunity offered by the Vienna conferences for bringing the negotiations to a pacific issue had not been improved, and asserting that the interpretation of the third point conceded by Russia furnished the elements for renewed conferences and a good basis for a just and satisfactory peace. It was understood that this motion was to be supported by Mr. Gladstone, Sir James Graham, and Mr. Sidney Herbert; but on being assured by Lord Palmerston, in answer to a question from Mr. Sidney Herbert, that the conferences were not yet closed, and that Austria was still charged with propositions for peace, these gentlemen brought their influence to bear on Mr. Milner Gibson, who consented to postpone his motion until after the Whitsuntide recess.

On the reassembling of parliament, Mr. Disraeli, in a speech of three hours' duration, vigorously attacked the government in introducing the motion of which he had given notice, but his sarcasms were chiefly levelled against Lord John Russell, who had, he said, first as foreign minister and again as plenipotentiary, compromised the interests of the nation. Nor were the government less to blame. They had been weak and vacillating in their action, appealing to Austria as a mediator, and vainly expecting her to be an ally. It was time to end these "morbid negotiations" for peace, which only inspired distrust in our allies, our generals, our officers, our aristocracy, and to close the conferences. "I am against this principle of 'leaving the door open,'" said Mr. Disraeli; "shut the door, and let those who want to come in knock at the door, and then we shall secure a safe and honourable peace."

A member for a great city, he continued, one of her majesty's privy council, placed on

the paper a notice of an address to the queen. He hoped that if the first minister had been enabled to screw up his courage to present an address to his royal mistress, it would have been of a different character from that proposed by the right honourable gentleman the member for Manchester—that it would have contained declarations of an entirely different character; and one of his objects was to extract from the government an intimation to that effect. He had no idea that the discussion on that motion would be abandoned. The country, and indeed all Europe, were, by a well-kept secret, baulked of a discussion in a matter of the most momentous importance since the peace of 1815. In reference to the conduct of her majesty's government as to the question of peace and war, he maintained that their language was ambiguous and their conduct uncertain; and he should call upon the house to arrest a course of policy which must, in its results, prove most disastrous to the country. Lord John Russell, he said, had been distinguished for his inflammatory denunciations of Russia, and was incompetent to negotiate a peace. Before he went to make peace he had signalized himself by tripping up the prime minister because he was not earnest enough in prosecuting the war.

Those portions of the speech which referred to the prosecution of the war were warmly cheered, and the debate seemed likely to be a long one, for there were two amendments. The first was by Mr. Lowe:—That this house having seen with regret that, owing to the refusal of Russia to restrict the strength of her navy in the Black Sea, the conferences of Vienna have not led to the cessation of hostilities, feels it to be its duty to declare that, by that refusal the means of coming to an arrangement on the third basis of negotiation having been exhausted, this house will give its best exertions to carry out the successful prosecution of the war.

The second was by Sir Francis Baring:—That this house, having seen with regret that the conferences of Vienna have not led to a termination of hostilities, feels it to be a duty to declare that it will continue to give every support to her majesty in the prosecution of

the war, until her majesty shall, in conjunction with her allies, obtain for this country a safe and honourable peace.

In the evening debate it became evident that Mr. Gladstone was one of the strongest advocates for endeavouring to make such negotiations as should put an end to the war. For some time it had been well known that he was less inclined to support a policy which would make the prosecution of hostilities a measure of popularity, and Mr. Bright had already noted that he was averse to prolonging the bloodshed and cruelty with which all war is associated, and the horrible carnage for which this conflict had been distinguished. Mr. Gladstone was opposed both to the resolution and Sir F. Baring's amendment. He defended the expedition to the Crimea, and denied that it had been entirely unsuccessful, for while, in August, 1854, Russia refused to accept the four points, in the month of December following the emperor accepted those very propositions as a basis of negotiations which he had so strenuously refused before. Looking at the question at issue as one only of terms, how did it stand? Russia had agreed to the first and second points and part of the third point. The fourth would be agreed to at any time. The only matter to be settled now, was as to the limitation of the power of Russia in the Black Sea. He was of opinion that the Russian proposal to give to Turkey the power of opening and shutting the straits was one calculated to bring about a settlement. As regarded the position of Russia now, he challenged any person to show him a case in the whole history of the world, in which the political objects of war had been more completely gained, without the prostration of the adverse party. He felt that he would be incurring a fearful responsibility if he did not raise his voice to beseech the house to pause before they persevered in a war so bloody and so decimating, while there was a chance of returning to the condition of a happy and an honourable peace. If we now fought merely for military success, let the house look to this sentiment with the eye of reason, and it would appear immoral, inhuman, and unchristian. If the war

were continued in order to obtain military glory, we should tempt the justice of Him in whose hands was the fate of armies to launch upon us his wrath.

Mr. Gladstone was accused of inconsistency, and his attitude in relation to the war was denounced in severe terms, but he was not alone in the opinions which he had so unhesitatingly expressed. While the Derbyites had combined with Layard and his friends and with Lord Ellenborough to overturn the ministry without success, and the motion brought forward by Lord Grey had been concerted with Lord Aberdeen, it was suspected that the "peace party" would obtain the adherence not only of Mr. Gladstone but of the Peelites with Gladstone and Graham at their head.¹ The debate on Mr. Milner Gibson's motion, resumed after the recess, was to clear up the state of parties. The house and the country were to know whether Lord John Russell had actually approved the proposals of Austria. Lord Palmerston could not explain the situation fully while communications were still proceeding, but Mr. Disraeli, Sir Bulwer Lytton, and others, were determined, if possible, to draw the government into a declaration.

Russell himself replied to Gladstone with considerable force, and in quite a warlike spirit. The naval power of Russia in the Black Sea must be restricted, and to restrict it was no more of an indignity than it was when Mr. Gladstone had joined his colleagues in the measure. The refusal of Russia to submit to it was a sure indication that she continued to cherish designs against Constantinople, and that the peace of Europe would again be disturbed at no distant date if the means of aggression were not taken away

¹ Four years afterwards Sir James Graham, speaking to Mr. Bright about the attack he (Mr. Bright) had made upon him and the government after the Napier dinner at the Reform Club, said, "You were entirely right about that war and we were entirely wrong, and we should never have gone into it."

Sir George Cornwall Lewis, after he had succeeded Mr. Gladstone in the Palmerston government, wrote, "This war has been distasteful to me from the beginning, and especially so from the time when it ceased to be defensive and the Russian territory was invaded. My dislike of it, and my conviction of its repugnance to the interests of England and Europe, was only increased with its progress."

from her by the conditions of peace. Security for Turkey for the future as well as for the present was the object of the war. So determined was the speech of the ex-plenipotentiary that it was taken as an assurance that the government would adopt a course rendering Mr. Disraeli's motion unnecessary, and a great many votes against it (including Mr. Roebuck's) were influenced by this vigorous denunciation of Russia.

These arguments were of course entirely contradicted by Mr. Bright and Mr. Cobden. The latter had moved the adjournment of the debate till after the holidays, and the former rose to ask the government what really were the objects of the war, whether these objects had been secured and accomplished, and whether there could be anything in prospect which would justify the government and the house in proceeding further with the war. He showed from their own declarations that there was no kind of sympathy that could lead them into war for the oppressed nationalities of Europe, for Hungary or Poland, and probably they would also repudiate interference on behalf of Italy. It was for Turkey and the general system of Europe that we were struggling, and in fact the whole matter always resolved itself into some general mystification. Without charging Lord John Russell with dishonesty he asked whether the terms which were offered to Russia at the conference were offered in earnest, or whether the statement made by the *Times* was correct, that the object of the conference was not to bring about a peace but to shame Austria into becoming a faithful and warlike ally.²

"When the Aberdeen government, of which the noble lords were members," said Mr. Bright, "originally agreed upon these terms, their object was that the Black Sea should be

² It may be noticed with no other emphasis than belongs to a peculiar coincidence, that Lord Palmerston, writing (May 23th) to the Emperor of the French, who was more inclined for hastening a peace and attached more value to the active co-operation of Austria than we did, had said: "Victorieux en Crimée, nous commanderons l'amitié, peut-être même l'épée de l'Autriche; manquant de succès en Crimée, nous n'avons pas même sa plume." ("Victorious in the Crimea, we shall command the friendship, perhaps even the sword of Austria; failing there, we have not even her pen.")

thrown open, or at least that the closing of the straits should be relaxed; and I presume that it was not until after it was known that while Russia had no objection to the opening of the straits, Turkey was very much opposed to it, that it was found necessary to change the terms and bring them forward in another form. But surely, if this be so, the house and the government should be chary indeed of carrying on a prolonged war with Russia, Russia having been willing to accept a proposition made originally by us, and which I believe to be the best for Turkey and for the interests of Europe. If this be so, was the government justified in breaking off these negotiations, because that really is the issue which this house is called upon to try? Can they obtain better terms? If the terms are sufficient for Turkey, they ought not to ask for better ones. I do not say they may not get better terms. I agree with my honourable friend the member for the West Riding (Mr. Cobden) that England and France, if they choose to sacrifice 500,000 men and to throw away £200,000,000 or £300,000,000 of treasure, may dismember the Russian Empire. But I doubt whether this would give better terms to Turkey. I am sure it would not give better terms for England and France. Now what has it cost to obtain all this? . . . Is war the only thing a nation enters upon in which the cost is never to be reckoned? Is it nothing that in twelve months you have sacrificed 20,000 or 30,000 men, who a year ago were your own fellow-citizens, living in your midst, and interested, as you are, in all the social and political occurrences of the day? Is it nothing that in addition to these lives a sum of—I am almost afraid to say how much, but £30,000,000 or £40,000,000 will not be beyond the mark—has already been expended? And let the house bear in mind this solemn fact—that the four nations engaged in this war have already lost so many men, that if you were to go from Chelsea to Blackwall, and from Highgate and Hampstead to Norwood, and take every man of a fighting age and put him to death, if you did this you would not sacrifice a larger number of lives than have already been sacrificed in these twelve months of war. . . . Are

these things to be accounted nothing? We have had for twelve years past a gradual reduction of taxation, and there has been an immense improvement in the physical, intellectual, and moral condition of the people of this country; while for the last two years we have commenced a career of reimposing taxes, have had to apply for a loan, and no doubt, if this war goes on, extensive loans are still in prospect.

“Honourable members may think this is nothing. They say it is a ‘low’ view of the case. But these things are the foundation of your national greatness, and of your national duration; and you may be following visionary phantoms in all parts of the world, while your own country is becoming rotten within, and calamities may be in store for the monarchy and the nation of which now it appears you take no heed. Every man connected with trade knows how much trade has suffered, how much profits in every branch of trade—except in contracts arising out of the war—have diminished, how industry is becoming more precarious, and the reward for industry less, how the price of food is raised, and how much there is of a growing pressure of all classes, especially upon the poorest of the people—a pressure which by-and-by—not just now, when the popular frenzy is lashed into fury morning after morning by the newspapers—but I say by-and-by, this discontent will grow rapidly, and you (here he pointed to the ministerial bench), who now fancy you are fulfilling the behests of the national will, will find yourselves pointed to as the men who ought to have taught the nation better.”

It will be seen that Mr. Bright had not been daunted either by the abuse or by the more cultured criticism with which he had been assailed. He would not consent to regard the “blood-red blossom of war,” as it was then in bloom, as anything but a Dead Sea growth. He naturally regarded the declarations of Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Milner Gibson, and Sir James Graham as an accession to the side of the “peace party.” The conduct of these gentlemen on that question had, he said, been the cause of great debate and of language which the state of the case had not

wholly justified. He presumed it would be admitted that they knew the object of the war as well as any other men in the house, and that entertaining as they did a very serious idea of the results of a prolonged war, they were at liberty to come to the conclusion that certain terms, to which they themselves were parties, were sufficient. If this was the conviction at which they had arrived, surely no member of the house would say that, because they had been members of a cabinet some time before, which went into the war, therefore they should be forbidden to endeavour to avert the incalculable calamities which threatened their country, but should be expected to maintain a show of consistency for which they must sacrifice everything that an honest man would hold dear. Had these men, he asked, gained anything in popularity with the country, or even with the members of that house, by the course they had taken?

Hopeless as the prospects appeared to be of a change in the view of the government and the people of England, the advocates of a pacific policy were doubtless encouraged by the attitude of the so-called "Peelites," and they spoke with vigour and effect. It was in this debate that Mr. Cobden in reply to Sir W. Molesworth made a humorous allusion which for some years remained famous. Sir William opposed the conclusion, that in that stage of the war, the country was bound to accept the same terms which would have satisfied it before hostilities were proclaimed. In order to maintain peace and avert the calamities of war as long as possible, the allied governments in the first instance lowered their demands upon Russia, as long as they could do so with honour. But, having been once compelled to draw the sword, and having expended in this war a vast amount of treasure and sacrificed so many valuable lives, the chief reason for abating their demands as much as possible no longer existed, and they were now entitled to stand upon their rights, and to demand that these should be fully secured to them; they were even entitled, if they thought proper, to increase their demands in proportion to the continuance of the war and the success of their arms. He denounced

the temptations which had been presented for the conclusion of a recreant peace, contending that the safety, as well as the glory, of the British Empire would be perilled by any signs of cowardice or surrender of the high principles which constituted the real bond of union among the scattered elements of our national grandeur.

In the adjourned debate, Mr. Cobden referred to the slanderous charges against him and his friends, that they were Russian emissaries, and reminded the house that similar charges were thrown out against Burke and Fox. For himself, he had no object in view but the just interests of England. He characterized the speech of the right honourable baronet the member for Southwark as the most inconsistent with his former opinions that had ever been delivered in that house. "Does the right honourable gentleman remember a *jeu d'esprit* of the poet Moore, when dealing in 1833 with the Whig occupants of those benches, shortly after they had emerged from a long penance in the dreary wilderness of opposition, and when the Whigs showed themselves to be Tories when in office? Does he remember the *jeu d'esprit*? Why, I think he and I have laughed over it when we have been talking over the sudden conversions of right honourable gentlemen. The poet illustrated the matter by a story of an Irishman who went over to the West Indies, and before landing, heard some of the blacks speaking tolerably bad English, whereupon, mistaking them for his own countrymen, he exclaimed, 'What! black and curly already?' Now, we have all seen metamorphoses upon these benches—how colours have changed and features became deformed when men came under the influence of the treasury atmosphere; but I must say that never to my knowledge have I seen a change in which there has been so deep a black and so stiff a curl." This was received by the house with signs of great amusement, and the speech was regarded as having been peculiarly damaging to the government.

The general transposition which had taken place among the men who had held a part in the first prosecution of the war made the

debate a very remarkable one. It was not forgotten that Mr. Disraeli had offered to serve in a Derby government, which, had it been formed, would have included Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Sidney Herbert, and that the men who were now strongly advocating the adoption of a basis of negotiation, which might, by conceding somewhat to the demand of Russia, put an end to the war, had retired from the existing ministry rather than submit to an inquiry as to the manner in which that war had been conducted. Nor was it forgotten that they had also formed part of the former government which had been accused of a lack of energy in prosecuting hostilities because of a dislike to oppose Russia. Sir Edward Bulwer Lytton had referred to the inconsistency of Mr. Gladstone, and had asked, "When Mr. Gladstone was dwelling, in a Christian spirit that moved them all, on the gallant blood that had been shed by England, by her allies, and by her foemen in that quarrel, did it never occur to him, that all the while he was speaking, this one question was forcing itself upon the minds of his English audience, 'And shall all this blood have been shed in vain?'"

There were numerous attacks on the men who refused to concur in the abandonment of the negotiations on that disputed "third point" which was to limit the power of Russia in the Black Sea.

Sir J. Graham pleaded for an indulgent hearing, on the ground that he formed one of a small minority. It was painful to him to be taunted as the friend of Russia; his only consolation was that wiser and better men than he, in similar circumstances, had been subjected to the same taunts. He still believed that the war at its commencement was just and necessary; the only question was, whether Russia had not since afforded the means of obtaining an honourable peace. It had been said, in the house, that his conduct in office, with his opinions as now expressed, was a sufficient explanation of our disasters. All he could say in reply was, that he exerted himself to the utmost to equip the fleet; and he believed his successor had not found those means inadequate. He wished to know from

the government what was the nature of the Austrian proposition which the allied powers had rejected; and next, whether the four points were still to be considered the basis of future negotiations, or whether they were now to be altogether discarded. This was the more important, as he had observed the remarkable disposition in the house to raise their terms of negotiation, till he had become altogether at a loss to understand what were the objects of the war. It was a popular thing to commence a war, but it was difficult to maintain it in its popularity. He did not mean to say they ought never to vary the terms of peace according to the fortunes of the war; but he did say that they ought not to extend their object. The question then was, Had not that object been gained? He proceeded, at great length, to state the original demands of Russia, and to contrast them with the terms which she was willing to accept at Vienna, contending that Russia had abated all her original demands, and had been sufficiently humbled both in arms and diplomacy.

But the Vienna conferences were already at an end. Lord John Russell replied that they would never have been entered into but for the obligations imposed upon us by our treaty with Austria. He defended the limitations imposed upon the Danubian principalities, by the arrangement on the first proposition, as the best which could have been adopted under the very delicate circumstances of the case. The principalities could not be independent. If they were to have self-government under the protection of the Porte, it was necessary to stipulate that they should not intrigue against the tranquillity of their neighbours. With regard to the third proposition, he thought the opposite party took advantage of the moderation of the Western powers, and argued, because we had conceded so much, therefore we ought to have conceded more and still more, till the negotiations became perfectly nugatory. It was impossible to see, in the Russian proposition, any difference between Russian preponderance before and after its acceptance. He believed that Russia refused the Western terms, not on the question of honour, but because she had not

yet sustained reverses enough to induce her to abandon her aggressive intentions. The question then came to be, For what object was the war to be continued? His answer must be general, that it still continued to be the maintenance of the independence of Turkey, and consequently the security of Europe. He believed that was the general feeling of this country; and the only blame he apprehended was that the government had not insisted on stronger terms. But the negotiations were now over; and the events of war must determine what new terms they must insist on to attain the one object. In conclusion, he commented on the anomalous position of this debate, discussing the propriety of continuing negotiations which were now finally closed; and suggested that it would be much more regular now to wait till the closing papers of the Vienna conferences were produced, when the minister would propose an address to her majesty, which would then properly and regularly open up the whole question.

The Nemesis for that speech was approaching. It was inevitable in such a division of parties that the minister who could make such a statement, and yet was believed to have gone very near pledging himself to the clause which would have given to Russia what he now denied, should be subjected to a sharp and searching attack, but that was deferred for the present.

As to Mr. Gladstone, he was no more likely than Mr. Bright or Mr. Cobden to recede from a position which he had taken under a sense of duty, and the probable loss of popularity or the sarcasms of those who charged him with inconsistency failed to elicit any token of uncertainty in his determination. Prince Albert, like most of those who advocated the vigorous prosecution of the war as the best means of obtaining permanent and satisfactory terms of peace, was much concerned at the political situation. He wrote to the Earl of Aberdeen:—"The line which your former friends and colleagues, with the exception of the Duke of Newcastle, have taken about the war question has caused the queen and myself great anxiety, both on account of the position of public affairs and on their own account.

"As to the first, any such declaration as Mr. Gladstone has made upon Mr. Disraeli's motion, must not only weaken us abroad in public estimation, and give a wrong opinion as to the determination of the nation to support the queen in the war in which she has been involved, but render all chance of obtaining an honourable peace without great fresh sacrifices of blood and treasure impossible, by giving new hopes and spirit to the enemy.

"As to the second, a proceeding which must appear to many as unpatriotic in any Englishman, but difficult to explain even by the most consummate oratory on the part of statesmen who have, up to a very recent period, shared the responsibility of all the measures of the war, and that have led to the war, must seriously damage them in public estimation. The more so, as having been publicly suspected and falsely accused by their opponents of having, by their secret hostility to the war, led to all the omissions, mistakes, and disasters, which have attended the last campaign, they now seem to exert themselves to prove the truth of these accusations, and (as Americans would say) to 'realize the whole capital' of the unpopularity attaching to the authors of our misfortunes, whom the public has for so long a time been vainly endeavouring to discover.

"However much on private and personal grounds I grieve for this, I must do so still more on the queen's behalf, who cannot afford in these times of trial and difficulty to see the best men in the country damaging themselves in its opinion, to an extent that seriously impairs their usefulness for the service of the state."

This was a pretty accurate representation of the general view of the course taken by the Peelites; but Mr. Gladstone held to his resolve, and in the course of the ensuing debates, argued with his usual power against the further strenuous prosecution of the war for the purpose of exacting unnecessarily stringent conditions. He did not occupy much time in defending his personal reputation, and he has, much more recently, been able dispassionately to explain the situation of affairs and the circumstances that con-

trolled his actions and influenced opinions which he has never relinquished.

In a review of the *Life of the Prince Consort*, Mr. Gladstone in 1877 gave an account of the political situation in 1855, and of the place necessarily occupied by the small section to which he belonged. In this lucid reference to the conditions of affairs we are reminded that the retirement of Lord Aberdeen was a subject of grief to the court and to his friends; but he was so far fortunate that, having been made the victim of a cry partly popular and partly due to political feeling, he was saved, as was the Duke of Newcastle, from the responsibility of an act of difficult and doubtful choice. Their friends, Sir James Graham, Mr. Gladstone, and Mr. Sidney Herbert, were less happy. It was their fate to join the cabinet of Lord Palmerston, formed at a critical juncture, after some delay and difficulty, and then to quit it within a fortnight or three weeks. The Aberdeen government had resisted unanimously and strongly the appointment of what was termed the Sebastopol Committee. The Palmerston government set out with the intention of continuing that resistance. Its head and the majority of its members arrived at the conclusion that the resistance would be ineffectual, and they determined to succumb. The Peelites adhered to their text; and, as the minority, they in form resigned, but in fact, and of necessity, they were driven from their offices. Into the rights of the question Mr. Gladstone does not enter, but he admits that undoubtedly they were condemned by the general opinion out of doors. Moreover, as in the letting out of water, the breach once made was soon and considerably widened. They had been parties in the cabinet, not only to the war, but to the extension, after the outbreak had taken place, of the conditions required from Russia. But when it appeared that those demands were to be still further extended, or were to be interpreted with an unexpected rigour, and that the practical object of the ministerial policy appeared to be a great military success in prosecuting the siege of Sebastopol to a triumphant issue, they declined to accompany the ministry in their course. Again they met with the condemna-

tion of the country; and the prince consort, while expressing his high opinion of the men, recorded his adverse judgment. One admission may perhaps be made in their favour. "In the innumerable combinations of the political chessboard," says Mr. Gladstone, "there is none more difficult for an upright man, than to discern the exact path of duty, when he has shared in bringing his country into war, and when in the midst of that war he finds, or believes himself to find, that it is being waged for purposes in excess of those which he had approved."

"The course of the Sebastopol inquiries likewise tended to show that the high constitutional doctrine which they had set up could not be infringed with impunity. They had held that the inquiry was an executive duty, and could only be conducted aright by a commission under the authority of the crown. The country felt, or thought, it had obtained a triumph by the appointment of a parliamentary committee, which was capped by a commission, this in its turn being traversed by a board of officers. The committee censured the ministers, though it was plain that, in the business of supply, they, and Mr. Sidney Herbert in particular, with an indefatigable diligence, had run far ahead of any demands received from the camp. The commission censured the executive departments of the army on the spot. The board of officers acquitted the military and censured the commissariat at home. No attempt was permitted to try the question to its core, as between these conflicting judgments Mr. Roebuck very properly made a motion to bring the report of his committee under the consideration of the house, when the other two competing verdicts would have been compared with it, and with one another. The Peelites supported his motion. But he was defeated by a large majority; so that the question which broke up one cabinet, and formidably rent another, which agitated England and sorely stained her military reputation in the eyes of Europe, remained then, and remains now, untried by any court of final appeal. Nor did this determined smothering of so great a matter cause public displeasure."

Mr. Gladstone remarks that a survey of these years, conducted in a historic spirit, will leave on the mind, among other impressions, a sense of the great incidental evils which accompany the breaking up of those singularly but finely and strongly organized wholes, our known political parties. "Together with Sir Robert Peel, nearly the whole official corps of the Conservatives was discharged in 1846; and the discharge proved to be a final one. The Tories, when brought into office, had to supply the highest places with raw, that is to say, fresh, recruits. This could not be without some detriment to the public service; but justice requires the admission that the body of English gentry, trained in the English fashion, affords material of great aptitude for public life. There were evils on the other side much more serious than this. It took no less than thirteen years to effect the final incorporation of the Peelites into the Liberal party. When they took their places among its leaders the official staff on one side was doubled, as on the other side it was almost annihilated. It is possible that to this duplication ought greatly to be attributed those personal discontents and political cross-purposes for which the Liberal party has of late years been disastrously remarkable.¹ Moreover, for eleven out of these thirteen years of disembodied existence the Peelites were independent members. They were like roving icebergs, on which men could not land with safety, but with which ships might come into perilous collision. Their weight was too great not to count, but it counted first this way and then that. It is not alleged against them that their conduct was dishonourable, but their political action was attended with much public inconvenience; and even those who think they were enlightened statesmen may feel that the existence of these sensibly large segments of a representative chamber, in a state of detachment from all the organization of party, acts upon the parliamentary vessel as a cargo of corn in bulk acts in foul weather on the trim of a ship at sea. Again, as a party, they had been, like their leader, pacific and

economical. The effects of their separation from official Liberalism during the first government of Lord Palmerston were easily traceable in the policy of that government as to various matters of importance. From this time onwards Lord Aberdeen was in retirement, and Peelism ceased to be, as such, in contact with the court, at which it had certainly weighed as an important factor of political opinion."

On the debate on Mr. Lowe's amendment being resumed, Sir Edward Bulwer Lytton, who had long been regarded as one of the most elegant, though he was by no means one of the most frequent speakers in the house, made another strong appeal for continuing the war with energy. "Let me suppose," he said, "that when the future philanthropist shall ask what service on the human race did we in our generation signally confer, some one trained perhaps in the schools of Oxford or the Institute of Manchester shall answer: 'A power that commanded myriads—as many as those that under Xerxes exhausted rivers in their march—embodied all the forces of barbarism on the outskirts of civilization; left these to develop its own natural resources; no state molested, though all apprehended its growth. But long pent by merciful nature in its own legitimate domains, this power schemed for the outlet to its instinctive ambition; to that outlet it crept by dissimulating guile—by successive treaties that, promising peace, graduated spoliation to the opportunities of fraud. At length, under pretexts too gross to deceive the common sense of mankind, it proposed to seize that outlet, to storm the feeble gates between itself and the world beyond.' Then the historian shall say, that we in our generation, the united families of England and France, made ourselves the vanguard of alarmed and shrinking Europe, and did not sheathe the sword until we had redeemed the pledge to humanity, made on the faith of two Christian sovereigns, and ratified at those distant graves which liberty and justice shall revere for ever." This will be sufficient as an example of the style of the famous novelist when he made a special effort in parliament.

¹ Mr. Gladstone wrote this at the end of 1876.

It is a style which can scarcely be said to have survived to our own day, and perhaps if it had, it would not be often patiently accepted by modern political assemblies of persons with differing and opposite opinions.

The debate was closed by a long speech from Lord Palmerston, in which, as we have noticed in a previous page, he sharply attacked the "peace-at-any-price" party, and gave a shrewd hit at Mr. Bright by saying that, "judging from their speeches, their manner, and their language, they would do much better for leaders of a party for war at all hazards." Mr. Baring's amendment was then accepted without a division, a conclusion which Mr. Disraeli opposed but in which Mr. Gladstone concurred.

The last of the Vienna conferences had already taken place, and was attended for Austria by Count Buol-Schauenstein and Baron Prokesch-Osten; for France, by Baron Bourqueney; for Great Britain, by the Earl of Westmoreland; for Russia, by Prince Gortschakoff and M. de Titoff; for Turkey, by Aali Pasha and Aariff Effendi. Count Buol stated that, as a last resource, Austria was prepared to make another proposition intended to settle by way of compromise the disputed point of the limitation of the naval forces of Russia in the Black Sea. In the eleventh conference, held on the 19th of April, M. Drouyn de Lhuys had suggested that, as Russia peremptorily objected to treat with the other great powers on the limitation of her own naval forces, an expedient might be found to meet this difficulty, by bringing about a direct arrangement between Russia and the Porte to adjust the balance of their respective forces, which arrangement should have the same validity and effect as the general acts of the conference. To this was added Lord John Russell's very inopportune declaration of the 19th of March, that the best and most admissible conditions of peace would be those which should be most consistent with the honour of Russia, as well as with the security of Europe. Upon these hints the Austrian cabinet set to work to construct its final scheme, to the following effect:—It proposed, in the first place,

that the great powers should distinctly agree to respect the independence and territorial integrity of the Ottoman Empire, and should bind themselves to consider every act or event of a nature to infringe upon it *as a question of European interest*. Secondly, that the plenipotentiaries of Russia and Turkey should propose by common agreement to the conference the equal amount of the effective naval forces to be kept up by them in the Black Sea, such amount not to exceed the number of Russian ships now afloat in that sea, and that this agreement should form an integral part of the general treaty; the straits to remain closed, but each of the other powers to be authorized by firman to station two frigates in the Black Sea, and in case of attack, the sultan to open the passage to all the naval forces of his allies.

A considerable amount of diplomatic contention ensued, the result of which was that Prince Gortschakoff admitted that he found in the general principles of Count Buol's project the basis of a possible solution of the third guarantee. The English and French ambassadors both declared that their instructions were exhausted, and thus the matter ended for the time, though it was renewed earlier than had been expected.

The Crimean committee of inquiry, which had been largely attended, and to obtain admission to which crowds were daily in waiting, had brought its sittings to a close. The evidence was, as we have seen, conclusive as to the incapacity of the former administration of affairs in some of the departments most essential to the maintenance of the army and the prosecution of the war. The Duke of Cambridge had perhaps given the most damaging particulars, for he stated that while a cabinet minister was assuring the House of Commons that the number of men fit for duty amounted to thirty thousand, the real number was only twelve thousand. It will be remembered, however, that little information was obtained from the reports and despatches of Lord Raglan, and, as we have seen, the evidence related rather to what had been done under another administration, than by that in existence at the time of the inquiry. This may have been the reason that the report of the commission,

when it was presented, on the 18th of June, seemed to have little force in it. If it did not exhibit a "lame and impotent conclusion," it at all events appeared to reassert, without any immediately practical application, what had been said in far more forcible language a hundred times before. Indeed it rather provided excuse for previous failures, and wound up with a couple of patriotic platitudes. After describing the condition of the army, and reviewing the evidence given before the committee, it ended as follows:—

"Your committee report that the sufferings of the army resulted mainly from the circumstances under which the expedition to the Crimea was undertaken and executed. The administration which ordered that expedition had no adequate information as to the amount of forces in the Crimea. They were not acquainted with the strength of the forces to be attacked, or with the resources of the country to be invaded. They hoped and expected the expedition to be immediately successful, and as they did not foresee the probability of a protracted struggle, they made no provision for a winter campaign. The patience and fortitude of the army demand the admiration and gratitude of the nation on whose behalf they have fought, bled, and suffered. Their heroic valour and equally heroic patience under sufferings and privations have given them claims on the country which will doubtless be gratefully acknowledged. Your committee will now close their report with a hope that every British army may in future display the valour which this noble army has displayed, and that none may hereafter be exposed to such sufferings as have been recorded in these pages."

That Mr. Roebuck considered the result not quite in accordance with the threats which had originated and accompanied the inquiry, may be inferred from the terms of the motion that he almost immediately brought forward, "that this house, deeply lamenting the sufferings of our army during the late winter campaign in the Crimea, and coinciding with the resolution of their committee, that the conduct of the administration was the first and chief cause of those misfortunes, hereby visits with

its severe reprehension every member of the cabinet whose counsels led to such disastrous results." This resolution was discussed on the 17th and 18th of July, and dawdled along until it was got rid of by the usual expedient of moving and carrying "the previous question." Thus the inquiry was after all extinguished. It had done little or nothing more, after causing the retirement of three able ministers, than confirm the reports which had been published in the newspapers, and with which the country was already familiar.

The censure upon the government, and much depreciation of the manner in which the war was conducted, had to some extent been mitigated, however, and this result was partly attributed to a speech made by Prince Albert at the annual banquet at the Trinity House on the day after the closing of the debate on Mr. Lowe's amendment, when crimination and recrimination had run so high. The speech had been well thought out beforehand, and it was certainly telling, not only on account of the gravity with which it was spoken, but because of the serious representations which it contained—representations, the truth of which was afterwards largely acknowledged. It was in proposing the toast of her majesty's ministers that the prince said:—

"If there ever was a time when the queen's government, by whomsoever conducted, required the support—ay, not the support alone, but the confidence, good-will, and sympathy of their fellow-countrymen, it is the present. It is not the way to success in war to support it, however ardently and energetically, and to run down and weaken those who have to conduct it. We are engaged with a mighty adversary, who uses against us all those wonderful powers which have sprung up under the generating influence of our liberty and our civilization, and employs them with all the force which unity of purpose and action, impenetrable secrecy, and uncontrolled despotie power give him; whilst we have to meet him under a state of things intended for peace and the promotion of that very civilization—a civilization the offspring of public discussion, the friction of parties, and popular

control over the government of the state. The queen has no power to levy troops, and none at her command, except such as voluntarily offer their services. Her government can entertain no measures for the prosecution of the war without having to explain them publicly in parliament; her armies and fleets can make no movement, nor even prepare for any, without its being proclaimed by the press; and no mistake, however trifling, can occur, no weakness exist, which it may be of the utmost importance to conceal from the world, without its being publicly denounced, and even frequently exaggerated, with a morbid satisfaction. The queen's ambassadors can carry on no negotiation which has not to be publicly defended by entering into all the arguments which a negotiator, to have success, must be able to shut up in the innermost recesses of his heart—nay, at the most critical moment, when the complications of military measures and diplomatic negotiations may be at their height, an adverse vote in parliament may of a sudden deprive her of all her confidential servants.

"Gentlemen, constitutional government is under a heavy trial, and can only pass triumphantly through it, if the country will grant its confidence—a patriotic, indulgent, and self-denying confidence—to her majesty's government. Without this, all their labours must be in vain."

There was for a time a great outcry against the declaration that constitutional government was under a heavy trial—and the words had been distorted into an assertion that constitutional government was "on its trial;" but nobody, except those who were either ignorantly misled or were wilfully perverse attributed to it any but its real meaning, and the intentions of the speaker were not only understood, but appreciated, by the leading newspapers of the country, as well as by its most intelligent politicians.

The allusion made by the prince consort to the effects of information conveyed to the enemy by means of unrestrained reports and comments which appeared in the English newspapers, was not without considerable foundation; but it would have been extremely dif-

ficult to preserve the freedom, which had long been claimed, for open discussion and complete examination of public affairs in the press of the country, and yet to impose a limit of discretion. The leading newspapers had already exposed our mismanagement in the Crimea, and the result had been an amendment of administration, without which we might never have succeeded in maintaining a position in the Crimea at all. It was not likely, therefore, that details of the movements of our troops and of the operations before Sebastopol would be suppressed, although they were said to have given the Russians information which generals seek for with eagerness, but under great difficulties through the medium of spies and deserters. In a private despatch from Lord Cowley it was stated that the young Emperor of Russia had said to a French prisoner, General Lagardie, "We do not learn much from you (the French); it is the English press which gives us information, and certes it has been most valuable to us."

General Simpson, too, wrote to Lord Panmure complaining of the particulars published in the papers. "There is a paragraph in the *Morning Post*," he said, "giving the exact strength of our guards at the trenches, lines of relief, &c. It is very disgusting to read these things, which are read at Sebastopol some days before they reach us here." The success of the expedition to Kertch was mainly due to the fact, that the English press had no chance of divulging the point on which it was to be directed.

The charges against the administration in their prosecution of the war were, however, not permitted to sleep. Before the dismissal of Mr. Roebuck's motion of censure Mr. Layard had introduced into the house the subject of administrative reform, which was being discussed outside with increasing interest and vigour, Mr. Charles Dickens having been amongst the foremost speakers at one of the large meetings. The resolution by which Mr. Layard endeavoured to claim attention to his declarations was, that the house "views with deep and increasing concern the state of the nation, and is of opinion that the manner in which merit and efficiency have been sacrificed,

in public appointments, to party and family influences, and to a blind adherence to routine, has given rise to great misfortunes, and threatens to bring discredit upon the national character, and to involve the country in grave disasters." The house went to a division, and the resolution was negatived by an immense majority; but during a two nights' debate many of the evils complained of were admitted, and the subject was at all events "ventilated."

It was at this time, that by an order in council, candidates for the public service were ordered to be subjected to educational tests, and this was afterwards extended to a more public and competitive examination.

But a still more important parliamentary event had occurred before the disposal of the report of the commission of inquiry, and the motion that arose out of it. Lord John Russell had again resigned—unwillingly this time, and in consequence of the false position in which he was discovered to have placed himself, and of a severe resolution which was brought forward by Sir E. L. Bulwer.

Mr. Milner Gibson had on the 6th of July asked the government for some further explanations of what had really been done at Vienna, for an avowal of their candid opinions and their true designs. He, as a representative of those who desired peace, had understood that Lord John Russell had gone to Vienna in order to make peace; but his colleagues seemed to have thwarted him. It appeared to him that, assuming Count Buol's statement to be correct, Lord J. Russell, when he was calling upon the house to continue the war, must have known that proposals had been made, likely to lead to a peaceful solution of the question at issue. If this were so, the house should be informed of the fact.

The answer given by Lord John,—though it showed that he was not at one with the ministry which had appointed him as their representative on a mission of the utmost importance, and was therefore exceedingly damaging to the government,—might have been less remarkable but for his former warlike and uncompromising speeches, delivered after his return from Vienna. He said he had never under-

valued the difficulties of a contest with Russia, and was of opinion that the war could not terminate in a treaty between that power and the allies, but rather in a general treaty, in which all the great powers of Europe must take part and give their security for maintaining the integrity of Turkey. In this view of the case he thought it of the highest importance to secure the co-operation of Austria, to which government he attributed no bad faith whatever. He thought the proposition emanating from Count Buol, combined with one by which there should be a counterpoise to any force which Russia might have in the Black Sea, did afford a basis for a treaty of peace. That proposition was, that a treaty should be entered into between the powers,—France, England, and Austria,—guaranteeing the integrity and independence of Turkey. He was not authorized to agree to this; but he told Count Buol that he would communicate them to his government. Those propositions were deliberately considered by the British government, which came to the conclusion that they did not offer a safe basis for a peace. The French government came to the same conclusion—Austria still declaring that she thought the third point admitted of more than one solution, and that she was not therefore bound to go to war with Russia. He was of a different opinion, although Austria had represented that her proposition should be made an *ultimatum* to Russia. If he had left office on the decision of the government he would be assuming as a plenipotentiary a course of conduct which could not be justified by such a position; while on the other hand, as a minister of the crown, he felt it his duty not to embarrass a government placed in the difficult circumstances which surrounded that of his noble friend. On the contrary he felt that he ought to support his government, and he was open to the censure of those who entertained a different opinion.

This statement roused Mr. Cobden to indignant remonstrance. He had never, he said, heard a speech that filled him with more grief than that of the noble lord; for he could not help thinking that he had not dealt with fairness or candour towards the country, nor

with a proper spirit in not resigning. Such a course of proceeding on the part of the noble lord was calculated to destroy all confidence in public men. He was of opinion that a change of ministry would give the only chance of an honest party in the house and in the country.

The position of the government was indeed precarious. Lord Palmerston, with his usual loyal pluck, attempted to defend the conduct of his colleague, and declared it to be a novel proposition to say that a minister should retire from a government because he thought terms of peace might have been accepted when his colleagues were of a different opinion. But it was evident that Lord John Russell must resign. Denunciations of his conduct followed from Mr. Roebuck; and Mr. Disraeli with severe irony said that, having arrived at a favourable solution of the difficulties with which he had had to contend, and having in his own mind accomplished measures which would secure peace to his country, all he had to do was to communicate those measures to his colleagues in the cabinet; that having done so and finding no sympathy among them, he had quietly pocketed his own opinions and remained "in a cabinet of war a minister of peace." This was the end of the government, the head of which was to have been a minister of surpassing energy, and no doubt transcendent experience; this the end of the ministry which was to put the right men in the right places; this the end, that even peace and war had become mere party considerations; that the interests of the country were sacrificed to the menace of a majority, and that the tumults and turbulent assemblies of Downing Street were to baffle all the sagacity of all the conferences of Vienna.

On the 10th Sir E. Bulwer Lytton gave notice of the following motion:—"That the conduct of the minister in the recent negotiations at Vienna has, in the opinion of this house, shaken the confidence of this country in those to whom its affairs are intrusted." Two days later Lord John Russell explained to the house that although at the end of April and in the first days of May he thought the Austrian propositions might have been assented to, he

did not consider that they could now, "after the events and proceedings which have since occurred," form the foundation of a satisfactory peace. Neither the house nor the public showed any disposition to accept the statement in mitigation of their displeasure at the position in which they found themselves placed, before their adversary and Europe, of carrying on a war condemned by a leading member of the executive government. The explanation was generally regarded only as making bad worse.

Lord John Russell, anticipating the effect of the coming discussion, announced his resignation, and he was succeeded in the colonial office by Sir William Molesworth; but it was said that he would still have retained office but for the outspoken advice of candid friends, among whom was Mr. Bouverie, the vice-president of the Board of Trade. The government had a narrow escape, and the comments on the political situation both inside and outside the House of Commons were bitter enough. "There have been many instances of friends and friendships," said Mr. Disraeli. . . . "There is the devoted friend who stands by one like the noble lord (Palmerston); but there is another kind of friend immortalized by an epithet which should not be mentioned to ears polite.¹ We all know that friend. It was, I believe, a brilliant ornament of this house who described that kind of friend;² and I must say, that, although the devoted friend, the prime minister, must after to-night be allowed to take the highest position, still, for a friend of the other description—candid and not bad-natured—commend me to the president of the Board of Trade." But Disraeli's satire developed into denunciation: "The foremost of your statesmen dare not meet the controversy which such questions provoke. He mysteriously disappears. With the reputation of a quarter of a century, a man who has reformed parliament, who, as he has told us to-night and often before, is

¹ "Sir Fretful," in Sheridan's *Critic*, says that if one is abused in print "why one is always sure to hear of it from one d—d good-natured friend or another."

² Canning who, in his "New Morality," wrote: "But of all plagues, good Heaven, thy wrath can send, Save, save, oh save me from the candid friend!"

the successful champion of civil and religious liberty, in the cause and the name of which he has accomplished great triumphs—he who has met the giants of debate—he who has crossed his rapier with Canning, and even for a term shared the great respect and reputation which the country accords to its foremost men, with no less a person than Sir Robert Peel—he dare not meet the debate. But who dares meet it? The first minister of the crown . . . has shown by his language and the tone of his mind that if the honour and interests of the country be any longer intrusted to his care, the first will be degraded, and the last, I believe, will be betrayed.”

It is curious to note that the tone adopted by Disraeli towards Lord Palmerston arose ostensibly in defence of Sir E. B. Lytton, of whom Palmerston had said that he had in his speech misrepresented the views of Lord John Russell, and charged Lord Clarendon with expressing only his own opinion in his despatches. Palmerston had said that he would hold the honourable baronet to that statement, and he would give him his choice whether that statement showed misrepresentation or the grossest ignorance. If the honourable baronet ever obtained high office, as his friends expected, he would certainly afford an illustration of his own remark—that the changes of our government made us ridiculous in Europe. He admitted that he had refused to accept the resignation of the noble lord; and had offered to stand or fall with him. But, in answer to the taunts of the honourable baronet, he could tell him, in the name and with the authority of his colleagues, that the cabinet was a united one.

It was upon this that Disraeli rose and began his damaging speech by taunting the noble lord with the bullying tone which he had assumed towards the honourable baronet. The noble lord stated that his cabinet was a united one; but he had good reason to believe that their union consisted in this—that when the noble lord returned from Vienna his proposals were favourably received by all the members of the cabinet, and that their acceptance of them was only prevented by other circumstances which were altogether inde-

pendent of them; in fact, by the opposition of the French government.

Mr. Gladstone spoke towards the end of the debate, just before the motion was withdrawn. He complained that Lord John Russell had, in his speech on Mr. Disraeli's motion, condemned the last of the Russian proposals, then before the house, though that proposal seemed to him to be substantially the very same measure which the noble lord had himself supported at Vienna. As to the charge made against the government by the right honourable gentleman opposite, that the cabinet was at one time disposed to accept the noble lord's proposals, he thought they were not amenable to it, for it appeared from the papers that, on the very day when Lord John Russell's proposals were received in London, Lord Clarendon expressed to Count Colloredo his condemnation of the plan. So far from blaming the government for hesitating about this offer of peace, he blamed them for not giving the propositions that consideration which their gravity demanded, and for abruptly closing the hope of an honourable peace.

The position of the government was constantly assailed, and probably only the widely-spread belief in Lord Palmerston's acuteness and active ability could have sustained it. Only the night after Mr. Roebuck's motion of censure was passed over, the ministry narrowly escaped a serious defeat, and one which would have produced very awkward consequences. By a convention concluded with Turkey on the 26th of June, the governments of France and England undertook to guarantee the payment of the interest of a loan of £5,000,000 to Turkey. The French Chambers had already sanctioned this convention, but the resolutions introduced with a similar object by Lord Palmerston on the 20th of July met with an opposition as determined as it was unexpected. The money was, it was said, absolutely necessary to enable the Porte to bear its share of the costs of the war; but without the guarantee proposed there was no chance of its being raised, yet the resolutions were only carried by a majority of three, the numbers being 135 to 132. The bill to give effect to the resolutions, however, was passed without opposition.

There can be no doubt that the antagonism of Mr. Gladstone and of those who were associated with him, numerically too small to be called a party, but at the same time possessing considerable weight and influence, did much to embarrass the government. Mr. Gladstone had already pronounced against the continuance of the war when a door might be left open for reasonable negotiation on terms which, as he believed, would practically secure the conditions, that at an earlier stage had been demanded. This attitude exposed him to sharp criticism and to no little abuse, not only from the friends of the government but from the opposition, who, while they proclaimed the necessity for prosecuting the war, charged the ministry with uncertainty, feebleness, and divided intentions. Bright and Cobden, however, saw in Gladstone a new and powerful, though not a professed ally, seeking to put an end to hostilities, while Palmerston turned upon his former colleague with that slashing style of reprobation in which he was an adept. The occasion arose when Mr. Laing moved for further papers on the subject of the Vienna conferences. Mr. Gladstone strongly protested against prolonging the war, and blamed the ministry for continuing it by rejecting the Austrian proposals as a basis of agreement to which all the plenipotentiaries at Vienna had agreed. Lord Clarendon, he contended, had not shown in his despatches any real desire for peace. It was to be feared that we might increase the breach between ourselves and Austria, and the alliance of Turkey was such as that of Anchises in relation to Eneas on his flight from Troy. We were gradually drifting away from friendly concert with Austria, Sardinia was dragging heavily through the conflict in mere dependence upon England, and he did not believe that France was likely to add £100,000,000 sterling to her debt for a mere difference between limitation and counterpoise. The Western powers could only for a moment control the future destinies of Russia. He placed the undivided responsibility of the continuance of war on the head of the ministry, and believed that in endeavouring to recall the government from the course of policy they

were then pursuing, he was discharging his duty^o as a patriot and a loyal subject of the queen.

A few days afterwards Lord Palmerston took an opportunity of retorting.

"No man," he said, "could have been a party to entering into the great contest in which we are engaged—no man, at least, ought to have been a party to such a course of policy—without having deeply weighed the gravity of the struggle into which he was about to plunge the country, and without having satisfied his mind that the cause was just, that the motives were sufficient, and that the sacrifices which he was calling upon the country to make were such as a statesman might consider it ought to endure. There must be grave reasons which could induce a man, who had been a party with her majesty's government to that line of policy, who had assisted in conducting the war, who had, after full and, perhaps, unexampled deliberation, agreed to enter upon the war, who, having concurred after that full and mature deliberation in the commencement of the war, had also joined in calling upon the country for great sacrifices in order to continue it, and who had, up to a very recent period, assented to all the measures proposed for its continuance; there must, indeed, be grave reasons which could induce a man, who had been so far a party to the measures of the government, utterly to change his opinions, to declare this war unnecessary, unjust, and impolitic, to set before the country all the imaginary disasters with which his fancy could supply him, and to magnify and exaggerate the force of the enemy and the difficulties of our position."

Mr. Gladstone would have said that he *had* grave reasons for opposing the continuance of a war after terms had been suggested by which it might cease, but there were few more opportunities for discussion. On the 14th of August parliament was prorogued, and it was well for the ministry that events almost directly afterwards occurred which quickly led to the proclamation of peace. In fact it may be said that without those most interested being aware of it, the terms for renewed negotiation were already in sight.

It is now necessary to indicate the successive events which brought the war to a close more rapidly than anybody in England had anticipated. The destruction of Kertch had been a blow to the Russians, and the bombardment of the arsenal and dockyard of Sveaborg by the allied fleets in the Baltic, where Rear-admiral Dundas was able to effect operations, which, for want of heavy mortars, Sir Charles Napier had declined to hazard in the previous year, was an equally important manifestation that the war had really assumed the proportions of a deadly struggle. From the morning of the 9th till the morning of the 11th of August the furious assault was continued almost without intermission. It was computed that 10,000 shells must have been poured into the fortress in one day, and that not less than 1000 tons of shot and shell had been fired by the English alone. "The enemy is now firing thirty rockets a minute," said a Russian account of this tremendous bombardment. The fire was from our gun and mortar boats and from batteries which the French had established on a neighbouring island.

Finding the destruction of the stores and arsenals and every building of importance to be complete, the admiral resolved to make no further attempt on the fortifications themselves, as this must have cost many lives, without any corresponding advantage, even if successful. As it was, he was able, when reporting to the admiralty on the 11th the success of his operations in the destruction of this important arsenal and dockyard, to add that few casualties had occurred, and that no lives had been lost in the allied fleets.

Report said that the condition of the Russian forces showed that their supplies of food and ammunition were beginning to fail, but that the whole military resources of the country were being concentrated on the Crimea, with a view to some supreme effort. Men without end, it was said, were being sent thither as reserves, and a great blow would shortly be struck at the besieging forces. Prince Gortschakoff had not attacked them before, because he had not hitherto had sufficient men. Now everything he could

desire had been placed at his disposal for carrying out his plan of bringing an overwhelming force against the allies, and the numbers at his command were said to be so great, that it was thought they must bear down any resistance. At the same time we were told at what a frightful sacrifice of life the enemy was bringing up the hordes on which he relied so confidently, to destroy us. The route from Sebastopol to Simpheropol, it was ascertained upon the authority of a Russian eye-witness, speaking at St. Petersburg, was already so encumbered with dead bodies, dead horses, and dead cattle, that the whole line was infected with pestilential vapours, was impassable for vehicles, and could only be traversed on horseback.

Meanwhile, the losses of the allies in the trenches were very great. On the 21st of July, General Simpson had reported to Lord Pannure that his trenches were advanced to within 200 yards of the Redan and could not be pushed further, and, moreover, that the Redan itself had been so much strengthened since the attack in June that any attempt upon it must fail. A combined attack by the French and English on the Malakhoff was, in his opinion, the only practicable operation, and the Malakhoff was the key to the position. The troops were waiting for General Pelissier to announce that he was ready for the assault.

But the Russians probably understood this well enough, and their endeavour was directed to raise the siege before any further successes were achieved by the allies. It was a desperate effort to concentrate the whole Russian force upon the invaders, but on the 16th of August, the day before we were to recommence a fierce bombardment during which an attempt was to be made on the two fortresses,—from fifty to sixty thousand Russians, including five divisions of infantry, six thousand cavalry, and twenty batteries, which collected during the night under the command of General Liprandi, descended into the valley of the Tchernaya near the Traktir bridge. This attack was only a portion of a general assault (planned, it was said, at St. Petersburg), by which, from the inside of Sebastopol as well

as from outside, a sudden onslaught should drive the invaders from the harbour and town of Balaklava and compel them to raise the siege.

Liprandi's force, therefore, precipitated itself on the position held by the allies on the river, and the brunt of it had to be borne by the French, who were, however, supported by the indomitable courage of the Sardinian contingent, which had been placed on the right. The Russian commanders had, according to their usual practice, served out large rations of coarse brandy, and the men charged down upon the French position with wild impetuosity, but only to be met with a determined vigour that drove them back with terrible slaughter across the bridge, where the already broken mass became a panic-stricken crowd struggling vainly to return.

The battle began while the mists of early dawn hung heavily upon the valley of the Tschernaya, and by nine o'clock the Russians were in full retreat.

The number of the French killed was comparatively small, but that of the Russians was estimated at about 3000 killed and 5000 wounded. Four hundred prisoners were taken. On the bodies of the dead were found four days' rations, but no water, so confident had their leaders been of securing their hold upon the Tschernaya. "The men dead in the field," General Bernard wrote to Colonel Phipps (18th August), "looked worn and miserable; the grenadiers of the guard were there, men 6 feet 4 inches and well dressed, but thin and worn also. The generality were badly clothed and badly fed, many very young." This was regarded as a proof that the destruction of the stores on the Sea of Azoff had begun to tell. If the forces already on the spot bore such evident marks of being badly fed, there was little to be apprehended from any further reinforcements of men which Russia might be able to send to the front, as they must increase the embarrassment of the enemy, from the already failing supplies of provisions.

The end of the war was nearer than most people supposed. The utter defeat of the force intended to engage and overwhelm the position on the Tschernaya left the siege

operations of the allies uninterrupted. The bombardment was continued, and on the 5th of September, 1855,—just twelve months from the day on which the allied armies sailed from Varna,—was renewed with greater vigour than ever, and was continued for the two following and a portion of the third following days. The cannonade of the French alone extended over a space of four miles; the English fire was more concentrated. This continuous bombardment was the prelude to a determined attempt to seize the Malakhoff and the Redan. Twenty-five thousand French and five thousand Sardinians were concealed in the trenches, as the foremost works were called, and in other places where they could await the word of command to spring out and rush to the assault of the Malakhoff, which was the more important fortress. The attack was to be made about mid-day, as at that time the Russians were known to seek repose and many of them left the ramparts. At twelve o'clock the firing ceased, and the word was given for the assault. The attacking party dashed out, passed the ditches, scrambled up the hill; and in a quarter of an hour the tricolour was floating on the old tower of the Malakhoff. A party of engineers quickly placed the first-gained height in a position of defence, and when the Russians in dense masses came moving onward they were met by the French troops sent by General Bosquet from the other side to support the assaulting party. The struggle was then fierce and stubborn. General Regon, who led the engineers to the summit of the height, said, "I entered the Malakhoff at the head of the sappers with the Zouaves of the first division of the second corps d'armée. We climbed the ditch like cats, dislodged the enemy, forced the lines and carried the redoubts with an enthusiasm and rapidity perfectly French. Our standards, planted on the parapets, were assailed and vigorously defended for more than six hours." The engineers and Zouaves succeeded in holding the redoubt, and the Russians were at last finally repulsed. The key of the position was taken, and a fire was directed from it to the rear of the Redan, where the English had been less successful.

To take this was, it seemed, a more difficult task, but it might have been captured had our men been better supported. General Simpson had committed to Generals Codrington and Markham the task of assaulting it. The attack was delayed till the Russians were engaged at the Malakhoff, and the signal was given directly the French tricolour was seen floating on the height. A thousand of our men of various arms went out to traverse that long 200 yards to the Redan—a road of fire. They were mowed down like reeds by the close discharge of the artillery. Those who at last forced their way into the place were exposed to the same resistless hail, and unless they were soon reinforced it was evident that they must all perish or be driven back. But no messengers could go back on that road to ask for aid, one by one they fell before they reached the spot where General Codrington was to be found. At last Colonel Windham, who commanded the handful of men who still remained, determined to make the attempt himself, and he succeeded, but it was too late, and while he was speaking to the general the remnant of his followers had been driven out by the greatly superior force of the enemy. Meantime the struggle at the Malakhoff was severe and the result uncertain, and Pelissier sent a message to General Simpson, begging him to effect a diversion of the Russian force by making a second attempt on the Redan. The answer was that the trenches were so crowded that no second attacking force could be organized. Thus the first attack failed because it was made by too few, and a second could not be attempted because there were too many. General Canrobert had failed in an attempt to seize the south-western defences of the town, but the attack had served the purpose of diverting the sole attention of the Russians from the Malakhoff, the capture of which was itself an important achievement, though it was dearly purchased. The loss to the besiegers on this terrible day was about 10,000 killed and wounded; that of the Russians must have been far greater. The next day was Sunday, and the attack on the Redan was to be renewed, but before the day had dawned a new scene in the dread drama of war had

opened. A picket party creeping stealthily to the Redan after nightfall found the place deserted. A series of tremendous explosions in the arsenals, and numerous fires, proclaimed that the enemy was preparing to leave the doomed city. The *Times'* correspondent, describing the scene with graphic brevity, says, "Soon afterwards wandering fires gleamed through the streets and outskirts of the town, point after point became alight, the flames shone out of the windows of the houses, rows of mansions caught and burned up, and before daybreak the town of Sebastopol, that fine and stately mistress of the Euxine, on which we had so often turned a longing eye, was on fire from the sea to the dockyard creek. At sunrise four large explosions followed in quick succession, and at 5:30 Fort Alexander and the grand magazine, with all their deadly stores, were blown into the air. The former exploded with a stupendous crash that made the very earth reel." All this time the Russians were marching with sullen tramp across the bridge, which Gortschakoff had caused to be constructed for the retreat, and boats were busy carrying *matériel* off from the town, or bearing men to the south side to complete the work of destruction, and renew the fire of hidden mines, or light up untouched houses. After the Russian retreat had been effected the bridge was removed and thus a deep arm of the sea was left between them and their antagonists. "When the town could be safely entered, heaps of wounded and dead were found lying in stores to which they had been carried after the assault. Of all the pictures of the horrors of war ever presented to the world, the hospital of Sebastopol was the most horrible, heartrending, and revolting. It cannot be described, and the imagination of a Fuseli could not conceive anything at all like unto it. How the poor human body can be mutilated and yet hold its soul within, when every limb is shattered, and every vein and artery is pouring out the life-stream, one might study here at every step, and at the same time wonder how little could kill. In a long, low room, supported by square pillars arched at the top, and dimly lighted through shattered and unglazed window frames, lay

the wounded Russians, who had been abandoned to our mercies by their general." Between the 5th and the 8th they lost four superior officers, 47 subalterns, and 3917 soldiers, without reckoning the artillerymen who perished at the guns. "Taking advantage," wrote Prince Gortschakoff, "of the superiority of their fire at short ranges, the enemy, after the concentrated action of their artillery for thirty days, commenced that infernal bombardment from their innumerable engines of war, and of a calibre hitherto unknown, which destroyed our defences which had been repaired at night with great labour and at great loss under the incessant fire of the enemy, the principal work having experienced considerable and irreparable damage. To continue, under the circumstances, the defence of the south side, would have been to expose our troops daily to a useless butchery, and their preservation is to-day more than ever necessary to the Emperor of Russia. For these reasons, with sorrow in my heart, but with a full conviction, I resolved to evacuate Sebastopol and to take over the troops to the north side of the bridge constructed beforehand over the bay, and by boats. . . . Remember the sacrifice we made upon the altar of our country in 1812. Moscow was surely as valuable as Sebastopol. . . . It is not Sebastopol which we have left to them, but the burning ruins of the town which we ourselves set fire to, having maintained the honour of the defence in such a manner that our great-grandchildren may recall the remembrance thereof, with pride, to all posterity." The Russians had undermined not only the forts of the Redan and the Malakhoff in such a manner that they might be exploded directly the allies took possession, but parts of Sebastopol itself were similarly treated, and had to be entered with the utmost caution.

Thus ended this memorable siege of 349 days' duration. The besieging army had about 700 guns in battery during the various attacks, and upwards of 1,600,000 shots were fired. Our approaches, which were in many cases cut through the rock by means of gunpowder, had an extent of fully fifty miles.

We employed 80,000 gabions, 60,000 fascines, and nearly a million of sand-bags. So Sebastopol was taken, or rather it had fallen into the hands of the allies, and the Crimean war was virtually at an end; a war in which 3500 of our men had been killed, 2800 disabled, and 20,000 had died of disease, accelerated if not caused by hunger, exposure to wet and cold, and the dreadful vicissitudes which they suffered during the earlier part of the campaign; a war which added about £40,000,000 to the national debt, and ultimately cost the country at least another million, beside the enormous losses caused by the interruption to social progress and commercial enterprise.

It is necessary, in order to complete a chronicle of the war, however brief, to refer to one episode which greatly moved the popular sentiments, the heroic defence of Kars by General Williams, who, as Sir William Williams of Kars, was thereafter held in well-deserved honour by the nation. This brave officer, who had been employed in settling the boundaries between Turkey in Asia and Persia, and had acquired a considerable knowledge of the Turkish language as well as of the customs of the Turkish tribes, was sent in August, 1854, to reorganize the Turkish army in order to enable it to oppose the invasion of Asiatic Turkey by the Russians. Had the appointment been followed more rapidly by the orders to commence this duty, a serious reverse to the Turks might have been prevented, for the troops were brave enough, but they were mostly officered by incapable cowards, or by leaders who had joined the service in order to take advantage of a system of speculation.

The Russians had gained a decided victory at Kurchdire before General Williams arrived, accompanied by Dr. Sandwith, a medical man whose name also became famous, and several young English officers. When he reached Kars he found that the Turkish force was altogether disorganized, and that he did not possess sufficient power to reduce to proper subordination the officers who had been the cause of the disaster. It was necessary that he should be nominated to the rank of general by the Turkish government, and this

was ultimately done, but not till after long delay and repeated letters from Lord Clarendon to Lord Stratford de Redcliffe. It took six weeks and fifty-four despatches to obtain the promise that this rank should be assigned to the waiting general, and ten weeks more for the Turkish government to sign the firman carrying the promise into effect. For a long time the pay of the army had been in arrear, the sick in hospital were in a dreadful condition, the soldiers were ill-fed and neglected. Directly General Williams received his brevet he sent three dishonest pachas to Constantinople for trial, appointed Dr. Sandwith as superintendent of the hospital, which was soon put in efficient order, and encouraged the people of the surrounding country to send in supplies, for which they at last believed they would be paid without being robbed by the officer who gave the order. Captain Teesdale, one of his staff, reorganized and restored the discipline at Kars, while the general himself put Erzeroum in a position of defence.

The Russian general Mouravieff was approaching with a large force, and General Williams was obliged to hasten to Kars, which he provisioned for four months and prepared to defend to the utmost. He had entreated the Turkish authorities to send him further supplies, which would have enabled him to hold out for two months longer, but the sultan, for whom England and France had united in a tremendous struggle, was at that time demanding that his own private income should be doubled; and the supplies, after much delay, only reached Yenekoï, a place about fifty miles distant, whence they could not be transported except by cavalry, for which the general had applied in vain to his own government. These provisions were appropriated by the advancing Russians, who seized Yenekoï, or Kars might never have been surrendered. General Williams, however, directed all his efforts to prepare for the attack, and a series of earthworks was constructed. The Russian army, under Mouravieff, amounted to 50,000 men, a portion of whom were deputed to watch Erzeroum, and Kars itself was completely invested. To diminish the number of mouths, General Williams

ordered the Turkish Bashi-bazouks to cut their way out through the Russian army, and this they did though with some loss. It was now August, and the general had been a year achieving the organization of the defence and the establishment of a better system for the administration of the army. All the resources of the hour were utilized to prepare for the enemy should he attempt to take Kars by assault. On the 29th of September the trial was undergone and triumphantly met. Mouravieff advanced his army before daylight and strove to force a way into the town, but behind the earthen ramparts the Turks fought with desperate valour, and after repeated efforts the Russian host, beaten back at every fresh attempt, was compelled to retire, leaving 5000 dead upon the field. The brave fellows who had made defences of their own bodies, or had, in the face of the Russian fire, rebuilt their earthen fortifications as soon as they were demolished, would only have been sacrificed had they rushed out and come to close quarters in the open space beyond; all that could be done was to hold out as long as possible. The small supplies of biscuit, flour, and soup made from horse flesh, were soon doled out in rations only sufficient, and at last not sufficient, to prevent actual starvation. The supplies were soon exhausted, many died of famine or lost their reason. There was no hope of assistance. The sultan was engrossed in the endeavour to provide for his desired increase in salary. Selim Pacha, the nearest Turkish general, would not advance to the rescue. Omar Pacha was too far off to render immediate assistance. It was useless to remain there to die, and on the 24th of September General Williams sent Captain Teesdale with a flag of truce to ask a conference with Mouravieff. The conduct of the Russian general was that of a brave and noble soldier. He might have demanded that the garrison should surrender at discretion, but he testified his admiration of the ability with which a persistent resistance had been maintained, and the garrison was granted the full honours of war, all the military authorities leaving the place under arms, and depositing arms and flags in a spot previously agreed upon,

while to General Williams was accorded the right to designate to the Russian commander a number of persons who might return to their homes. Moreover, the English officers were treated with courteous hospitality by the Russian general and his staff, and plentiful provisions were sent in to the starving garrison.

Sir William Fenwick Williams of Kars met with a cordial reception in England when he arrived after the war was over, and £1000 a year pension was settled on him along with the title.

The question of a basis by which peace might be negotiated was now earnestly resumed. We have seen that the former proposal of Count Buol, the Austrian representative at the congress, was that Russia, Turkey, England, and France should each have the same number of ships in the Black Sea, so that the allied powers might always secure a great preponderance over Russia. This was refused by the English and French governments, and Austria had continued to make fresh propositions, none of which had been acceptable. Count Buol, however, was untiring in his efforts; and now that Sebastopol was taken the Emperor of the French was for more than one reason anxious to conclude a peace. The French people had not, at first, been very enthusiastic in the matter, and though, when the intelligence of success reached them they rose to the occasion, and their reception of our queen and the prince consort soon manifested the warmth of their satisfaction at the alliance with England, they had begun to reflect that the results of the war were of far less national importance to them than to ourselves. There was every reason therefore that the emperor should be in favour of concluding peace while the triumph of the Malakhoff and of Sebastopol was so closely associated with the success of the French arms, especially as he was then in almost daily expectation of the birth of an heir. In England, however, there was a by no means inconsiderable feeling, that there had been too little achieved for the maintenance of national prestige. It appeared to many who had been smitten with the war

fever, that some further opportunity should be afforded to our army for striking a blow worthy of the tremendous provisions which had now been made for carrying on the war, and of the organization which had at last been accomplished.

During the preliminary propositions after the abandonment of Sebastopol, Lord Palmerston, to use a common expression, "kept a stiff upper lip," and it was perhaps necessary not to be too ready to yield all that was sought for, in the first flush of the intelligence that hostilities might soon cease, and especially as (for the reasons referred to) the French plenipotentiary was too ready to yield. Austria was pressing for concessions in a way which led Palmerston to write to Sir Hamilton Seymour, who was then our ambassador at Vienna, "We are happily not yet in such a condition that an Austrian minister should bid us sign a treaty without hesitation or conditions. The cabinet of Vienna, forsooth, must insist on our doing so. Why, really, our friend Buol must have had his head turned by his success at St. Petersburg, and quite forgot whom he was addressing such language to. . . . We shall not sign unless we are satisfied with that which we put our names to. Pray tell him so, and say to him privately from me, with my best regards and compliments, that we feel very sincerely obliged to him for his friendly and firm conduct in these recent transactions, that we accepted with the addition of our own supplementary conditions, the arrangement which he proposed to us, because we felt that it contained all that, in the present state of things, we were entitled to exact from Russia, subject, of course, to any further demands which the fifth article provides for and authorizes us to make. But it is Russia rather than the allies who ought to feel grateful to him for his good offices in these matters, because we are confident that if the war goes on, the results of another campaign will enable us this time twelvemonth to obtain from Russia much better conditions than those which we are now willing to accept. We know the exhaustion, the internal pressure, difficulties, and distress of Russia as well as Buol does; but we know better than he does,

our own resources and strength. He may rest assured, however, that we have no wish to continue the war for the prospect of what we may accomplish another year, if we can now obtain peace upon the conditions which we deem absolutely necessary and essential; but we are quite prepared to go on if such conditions cannot be obtained."

It was evident that Palmerston was prepared to carry out the assertion that England could, if necessary, now maintain the war single-handed or in alliance with the Turks alone; but happily no such experiment was called for. The four new points which had been brought forward were not dissimilar to the old ones, but they were differently worded; and the much-disputed third point proposed that no fleet and no naval station of any country should be permitted in the Black Sea, but that Russia, Turkey, England, France, Sardinia, and Austria might each have the same number of small armed vessels in that sea, to act as a sort of maritime police and to protect the coast, while merchant ships of all nations might freely enter.

The czar readily accepted the first proposals as a basis for negotiating a treaty. His consent was given on the 16th of January, 1856, and the conference was resumed, the sittings having been appointed to be held in Paris, which was then *en fête* because of the International Exhibition.

The representatives for Great Britain were the Earl of Clarendon and Lord Cowley; for Austria, Count de Buol Schauenstein and Baron de Hübnier; for France, Count Colonna Walewski and Baron de Bourqueney; for Russia, Count Orloff and Baron de Brunow; for Sardinia, Count de Cavour and the Marquis di Villamarina; and for Turkey, Ali Pacha and Mehemmed Djemil Bey. According to the etiquette established on such occasions, Count Walewski, as the representative of the sovereign in whose capital the plenipotentiaries were to hold their meetings, was appointed president during the sittings of the conference.

The armistice, which was of easy settlement, was the first subject of discussion, and it was agreed that it should continue till the 31st of

March, unless renewed till after that period by common consent; and that during this interval both armies and fleets should retain their present respective situations, but without any hostile movement on either side. After this, the sittings of the conference lasted till the 30th of March, on which day the treaty of peace was definitively signed, but the ratifications of which were not exchanged until the 27th of April. They were in substance as follows:—

The territories conquered or occupied during the war to be reciprocally evacuated.

The town and citadel of Kars, as well as other parts of the Ottoman territory of which the Russian troops were in possession, were to be restored to Turkey.

The four allied powers to restore to Russia the towns and ports of Sebastopol, Balaklava, Kamiesch, Eupatoria, Kertch, Yenikale, and Kinburn, as well as all other territories occupied by the allied troops.

The allied powers, and also the Czar of Russia and the Emperor of Austria, to declare the Sublime Porte admitted to partake in the advantages of the public law and system of Europe. The six Christian sovereigns also to engage, each on his part, to respect the independence and territorial integrity of the Ottoman Empire; to guarantee in common the strict observance of that engagement, and to consider any act tending to its violation as a question of general interest.

Should any misunderstanding arise between the Sublime Porte and one or other of the signing powers that might endanger the maintenance of their relations, the Porte, and each of such powers, before having recourse to arms, to afford the other contracting parties an opportunity of mediating between them.

The sultan having already issued a firman for the welfare of his subjects, without distinction of religion or race, and recording his generous intentions towards the Christian population of his empire, to communicate to the contracting parties the said firman emanating spontaneously from his sovereign will. The contracting parties, while recognizing the value of this communication, clearly to understand that it does not give them the

right, either collectively or separately, to interfere between the sultan and his subjects, or in the internal administration of his empire.

In regard to the ancient rule of the Ottoman Empire, relative to the closing of the straits of the Bosphorus and of the Dardanelles, it is agreed that the rule shall continue in force: that no ships of war belonging to foreign powers shall enter the straits of the Dardanelles and the Bosphorus; and that so long as the Porte is at peace the sultan shall admit no foreign ships of war to enter the said straits: and on the other hand, the contracting powers engage to respect this determination of the sultan, and to conform themselves to the principle above declared. By a second article the sultan reserves to himself, as in times past, to deliver firmans of passage for light vessels under flag of war which shall be employed, as is usual, in the service of the missions of foreign powers. By a third article it is declared that the same exception applies to the light vessels under flag of war which each of the contracting powers is authorized to station at the mouths of the Danube in order to secure the execution of the regulations relative to the liberty of that river, and the number of which is not to exceed two for each power.

In regard, also, to the amount of naval forces which Russia and Turkey might respectively keep in the Black Sea, it was agreed in a separate convention between these two powers that each should maintain in that sea six steam-vessels of 50 metres in length and not beyond 800 tons burden each vessel, and four light steam or sailing vessels of not more than 200 tons each. It was agreed, moreover, that the Aland Islands should not be fortified, and that no military or naval establishment should be maintained or created there.

The Black Sea to be neutralized, and its waters and ports thrown open to the mercantile marine of every nation; and either of the powers possessing its coasts, or any other power, to be interdicted from the use of the flag of war upon it, with such exceptions as Russia and Turkey should fix by a separate convention. The commerce in the ports and waters of the Black Sea being freed from any impediment,

was to be subject only to regulations of health, customs, and police; and to ensure the security of this commerce consuls were to be admitted into the ports upon the coast, according to the principles of international law.

No toll was to be levied upon the navigation of the Danube, nor duty upon the goods which might be on board of vessels. With exception of the regulations of the police and quarantine, to be afterwards framed to facilitate the passage of vessels, no obstacle whatever was to be opposed to the navigation of the river.

In return for the towns and ports restored to Russia by this treaty, and to secure the freedom of the navigation of the Danube, the czar consented to the ratification of his frontier in Bessarabia. This frontier was to begin from the Black Sea one kilometre to the east of the Lake Bourna Sola, to run perpendicularly to the Akermann road, to follow that road to the Val de Trajan, pass to the south of Bolgrad, ascend the course of the river Yalpuck to the height of Saratsika, and terminate at Katamosi on the Pruth. Above that point the old frontier between the two empires did not undergo any modification.

With regard to the Principalities, which had been such a fruitful source of strife, it was agreed that the territory ceded by Russia was to be annexed to Moldavia; that the inhabitants of this principality should enjoy the rights and privileges secured to the other principalities, and that during the space of three years they should be permitted to dispose of their property freely, and transfer their domiciles elsewhere. This principality and that of Wallachia were to continue under the suzerainty of the Porte, without any exclusive protection of a foreign power or any separate right of interference in their internal affairs; and the Porte engaged to preserve for them an independent and national administration, as well as full liberty of worship, of legislation, of commerce, and of navigation. The same rights and liberties were to be accorded to the principality of Servia, under the collective guarantee of the contracting powers.

On the other *quaestio vexata* between Turkey and Russia respecting their possessions in

Asia, it was agreed between the czar and the sultan that these should remain as they had existed before the breaking out of the war; and that in order to prevent all local dispute the line of frontier should be verified, and if necessary rectified, without any prejudice as regarded territory to either party.

The territories occupied during the war by the allied troops were to be evacuated as soon as possible after the exchange of the ratifications of the treaty. The periods and the means of evacuation were to form the object of an arrangement between the Sublime Porte and the powers whose troops had occupied its territory.

The tidings of the conclusion of an armistice reached the Crimea on the 28th of February, and on the afternoon of the same day, as if to signalize the cessation of hostilities, a pile of edifices in Sebastopol, called the White Buildings, was blown into the air. When the armistice was duly proclaimed on the following day, and the terms of it arranged between the contending armies, the officers and soldiers, between whom there would otherwise have been only a meeting of contention to the death, were now to be seen mixed together in mutual good humour and the interchange of friendly offices; and this although peace was as yet uncertain, and although its failure might renew the war with more than its former bitterness. On the 2d of April all suspense was at an end among the armies by the proclamation of peace, which was announced with a discharge of 101 guns, and followed by the bustle of preparation for the evacuation of the Crimea. This event finally took place on the 12th of July, on which day General Codrington, the British commander-in-chief, formally gave up Sebastopol and Balaklava to the Russians. But what a surrender! The whole war had been concentrated at Sebastopol, which city was now the type of all its miseries and its desolation—the tomb equally of those who had assailed and those who had defended it. Its aspect is thus described by an eye-witness:—

“Had fire been rained down from heaven upon the devoted city its annihilation could not have been more complete. The stranger

who halted to survey it from the neighbouring heights, deceived by the whitewashed and plastered walls of the houses, might think that Sebastopol was still a city; but when he walked through the grass-grown deserted streets, formed by endless rows of walls alone or roofless shells of houses, in which not one morsel of timber could be seen from threshold to eaves; when he beheld great yawning craters, half filled with mounds of cut stones heaped together in irregular masses; when he gazed on tumuli of disintegrated masonry, once formidable forts, and shaken as it were into dust and powder; when he stumbled over the fragments of imperial edifices to peer down into the great gulfs, choked up with rubbish, which marked the site of the great docks of the Queen of the Euxine, and beheld the rotting masts and hulls of the sunken navy which had been nurtured there; when he observed that what the wrath of the enemy spared was fast crumbling away beneath the fire of its friends, and that the churches where they worshipped, the theatres, the public monuments, had been specially selected for the practice of the Russian gunners, as though they were emulous of running a race in destruction with the allied armies—he would no doubt have come to the conclusion that the history of the world afforded no such authentic instance of the annihilation of a great city. It is hard to believe that the site can ever be made available for the erection of houses or the construction of docks; but I am by no means certain that the immense resources in the command of manual labour possessed by the government of Russia, of which this very struggle afforded us all such striking proofs, in the Quarantine battery, the Bastion Centrale, the Bastion du Mât, the Redan, the Mamelon, and the Malakoff, may not be made available in time to clear away these modern ruins, and to rebuild houses, theatres, palaces, churches, forts, arsenals, and docks, as before.”

Before the members of the conference by which the terms of peace were concluded had finally separated, they agreed to some very important improvements of international law relating to maritime operations in time of war. First, privateering was to be abolished;

second, the neutral flag was to cover enemies' goods, with the exception of contraband of war; thirdly, neutral goods with the exception of contraband of war were not to be liable to capture under an enemy's flag; and fourthly, blockades in order to be binding were to be made effective, that is to say, they were to be maintained by a force sufficient really to prevent access to the enemy's coast.

The concurrence of the government of the United States was sought for these resolutions, and was secured for all except the first. To that they refused their concession. The right of privateering, it was contended, was as clear as that of the use of public armed ships, or any other right appertaining to a belligerent.

Even the expectation that the terms of peace would be settled by the conference so greatly relieved the public anxiety, that the tension which had been felt for so long was removed, and preparations were made for a brilliant London season. Everywhere amusements were numerous, and the general disposition for rejoicing was increased by an intimation of the approaching marriage of the Princess Royal with the young Prince Frederick William, nephew of the King of Prussia, an alliance which it was felt would cement the good feeling between England and the only other great Protestant state in Europe.

When peace had been declared, a day of thanksgiving was appointed, and then followed another grand naval review by her majesty at Spithead with a splendid illumination of the fleet in the evening. This was on the 23d of April, 1856, but the great public holiday to celebrate the peace was held on the 29th of May, and was observed throughout the kingdom, the chief towns being illuminated, and displays of fireworks being very general. The spectacle in London was truly magnificent, the illuminations of the streets and public buildings being exceedingly grand, while at various prominent points in and around the metropolis there were brilliant exhibitions of "set pieces" of fireworks, with flights of rockets and other superb inventions of the art of the pyrotechnist. At Primrose Hill, in the Parks, and especially in Victoria Park, that great area which had not very long

before been opened for the east end of London, and inaugurated by the prince consort, the display exceeded any previous spectacle of the kind; and it need hardly be said that in all these places vast concourses of spectators assembled.

We have already noted that the application of the Foreign Enlistment Bill caused much adverse feeling in America, where it was contended that subjects of the United States had been induced to go to Canada that they might there be enlisted in the English service. There were also some disputes with regard to our operations in Central America, and altogether the relations between the two countries were much "strained." The laws of the United States had doubtless been infringed, but not intentionally nor by English officials in authority, and it was felt that the American government acted without consideration when Mr. Crampton, our minister at Washington, received his passports from the president and left the country. Our government took no immediate notice of this proceeding, which was deprecated by the American press and by numbers of the leading public men in the States, and Mr. Dallas, the American consul in London, was received as usual, while not only the court, but American and English representative men in Great Britain, took pains to show that there was no diminution of the *entente cordiale* between the people of the two nations, closely allied in blood and in the institutions, closely common to both countries. The matter afterwards came to a better understanding, and complaints were acknowledged and pacified, but of course opportunity was taken by the opposition to attack the government in no very measured terms, both for the original offence against the United States and their subsequent apologetic attitude. Lord Palmerston pointed out, not without considerable force, that "these gentlemen who were so anxious for peace, tell you that England has been insulted, treated with contempt, contumely, and indignity. What is the effect likely to be produced? Why, to excite a spirit of resentment towards our neighbours and kindred in the United States. Others again tell the Americans that their government has

been deluded and persuaded to accept an apology they ought not to have accepted, and that their laws have been intentionally violated by a foreign government. Is that the way to create good feeling? Is that the way to persuade the American people to cultivate the most friendly relations with England?" The adverse motion of Lord Derby was not carried against the government, supported though it was by an adroit attack by Mr. Disraeli.

Mr. Gladstone had already taken a prominent part in the debate on the address after the termination of the war, and on the terms of the treaty of peace, and many of his declarations were weighty and important.

He said, "If I thought that this treaty of peace was an instrument which bound this country and our posterity, as well as our allies, to the maintenance of a set of institutions in Turkey which you are endeavouring to reform if you can, but with respect to which endeavour few can be sanguine, I should not be content to fall back upon the amendment, expressing that I regarded the peace with satisfaction; but, on the contrary, I should look out for the most emphatic word in which to express my sense of condemnation of a peace which bound us to maintain the law and institutions of Turkey as a Mahomedan state." He denied that the objects for which the war had been undertaken had sought to secure the settlement of any question respecting the internal condition of Turkey. "The juxtaposition of a people professing the Mahomedan religion with a rising Christian population having adverse and conflicting influences, presents difficulties which are not to be overcome by certain diplomatists at certain hours and in a certain place. It will be the work and care of many generations—if even then they were successful—to bring that state of things to a happy and prosperous conclusion. But there was another danger—the danger of the encroachment upon, and the absorption of Turkey by Russia, which would bring upon Europe evils not less formidable than those which already existed. Such a danger to the peace, liberties, and privileges of all Europe we were called upon absolutely to resist by all the means in our power." Mr. Gladstone

proclaimed his regret that a more substantive existence had not been secured to the Principalities, though he owned that this was not the fault of England and France. The neutralization of the Black Sea he objected to, as meaning nothing more in time of war than a series of pitfalls. Recognized rules should also have been established to regulate interference on behalf of the Christians. The proposal to submit international differences to arbitration he regarded as a great triumph, though there was a danger that if encouragement should be given to the trumping-up of untenable claims and bad cases as a matter of diplomatic contention between nations, they would end by making more quarrels than they could possibly avert. He held that no country ought to resort to arbitration until it had reduced its claims to what it considered the minimum, and brought them to that state in which they were fit to be supported by force. If they laid down that rule, then a resort to arbitration was indeed a powerful engine on behalf of civilization and humanity. Under such circumstances, this proposal to establish a system of arbitration (which he rejoiced to say was an English one) might lead to a diminution of what undoubtedly had been a great scourge to Europe of late years—namely, the enormous cost of its military establishments.

It should be remembered that the manner in which the principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia were to be dealt with had formed one of the subjects discussed at the conference. Great variety of opinion existed on this question; but instead of dealing with it conclusively in the treaty of peace, which might have occasioned considerable delay, it was decided to lay down in the treaty the principles upon which the settlement was to be made, leaving the application of those principles to form the subject of a supplementary convention. Accordingly it was provided, that the Principalities should continue to enjoy their existing privileges and immunities under the suzerainty of the Porte, and under the guarantee of the contracting powers, the Porte engaging to preserve to them an independent and national administration, as well

as full liberty of worship, of legislation, of commerce, and of navigation.

In connection with this difficulty of the Principalities, it will be well also to observe, in relation to what will at a later stage of this narrative come before our notice, not only that the manner in which these provisions were to be carried out led subsequently to much angry controversy, as might have been anticipated from the very opposite views of Austria and the Porte on one hand, and of France and Russia on the other, but that the emperor of the French had very early declared to Lord Clarendon his strong conviction in favour of the union of the Principalities under a sovereign of their own choice. This is Lord Clarendon's report to Lord Palmerston of what passed in a conversation between them on the 6th of March; subsequent events have shown how just were the apprehensions, which were strongly felt by English statesmen and expressed at the time, of the injury to Turkey which was likely to result from the emperor's proposal:—

“The emperor said the great fault committed by the congress of Vienna was that the interests of the sovereigns were only consulted, while the interests of their subjects were wholly neglected; and that the present congress ought not to fall into a similar error. From all the information that reached him, the emperor said he was convinced that nothing would satisfy the people of Wallachia and Moldavia but the union of the Principalities under a foreign prince, who should nevertheless admit the suzerain power of Turkey, and that it would be disgraceful to England and France, if they had not the will or the power to establish a state of things in the Principalities that would be in accordance with the wishes of the people, and manifestly be an improvement upon the feeble attempt at re-organization that had been proposed at Constantinople.

“I said that I was not prepared to deny that the plan which his majesty was desirous to adopt might be the best for the Principalities, and I thought it well worthy of consideration, but that there were serious difficulties in the way of its adoption, which could not be over-

looked. In the first place, it might not be easy to find a foreign prince fit for the difficult task he would have to perform, who would admit the suzerainty of the Porte, and he must be either of the Roman Catholic or the Greek religion. If the former, the Greek priests and the people of the Principalities would, from the first moment, be in bitter opposition to him, and, in order to sustain himself, he would have to rely upon Russian aid and influence. If he was of the Greek religion, all his sympathies would be with Russia, and I much feared that we should be establishing another kingdom not unlike Greece, but in a locality where the results would be still more disastrous to Europe. From a conversation which I had had with Count Buol, I had become aware that the objections of Austria to the union of the Principalities were insurmountable, and those of Aali Pasha (the Turkish plenipotentiary) were not less strong. Indeed, I said, Turkey would have a good right to complain, for she would well know, *that the foreign prince so established would, within a few years, be able to throw off the suzerainty of the Sultan and become independent.* The same system must also necessarily be established in Servia as in Moldavia and Wallachia; and it would be attended with the same consequences.

“Turkey would thus be deprived of about six millions of her subjects, and her power and position in Europe would be at an end, and I did not see what answer could be given to the Sultan if he appealed to us as the defenders of the integrity of the Ottoman empire against such an act of spoliation.

“The emperor said that at all events he wished the subject to be discussed by the conference.”

It was so discussed, and with the result which we have stated. But that result left a question open, which led afterwards to the very brink of an European war.

With regard to the debate on the American difficulty Mr. Gladstone contended that wrong had been done to the American government. A cordial understanding with America had not been preserved, and the honour of this country had been compromised, but unless the house was prepared to displace the gov-

ernment, it ought not to weaken their hands. Votes of censure on the government should only be proposed by those who were able to give effect to the principle contained in those votes. Coming to the actual matter at issue, he asked whether wrong had not been done? "In the first place, he charged the government with practising concealment; in the second place, he maintained that the American government were deluded and misled. The law was knowingly broken by the agents of the British government. There was not one hair's-breadth of distinction between the position of Mr. Crampton and the position of the government. What the American government complained of was the employment of an agency within the United States, not only to give information, but to tempt, to induce by the offer of valuable considerations, the subjects of the United States to go beyond the United States for the purpose of enlisting. Mr. Crampton did not communicate this to the American government. He had not only been guilty of concealment, however, but he had broken the solemn promise that he would confine himself to communicate to the persons who addressed themselves to him the terms on which they would be received into the British service." Mr. Gladstone then went on to show the injustice of the charge against the American government, of having at first confined its complaints to the proceedings of unauthorized persons, and subsequently extended those complaints to the British minister and his subordinates. "Aiming, as I do, at a plain and intelligible statement, I must say the American government was deceived by the proceedings of the British government. I say we intentionally broke the law of the Union." After examining the cases of several recruiting agents, the speaker maintained that Mr. Crampton had been made a scapegoat. He and three consuls had been punished, yet, although the British government acquiesced in and indorsed the acts of its agents, it accepted with satisfaction its own acquittal. Mr. Gladstone thus concluded: "When I look back to the period when party combinations were strong in the house—when Sir Robert Peel was on those (the opposition) benches,

and Lord John Russell on these, I think—though many mistakes and errors were committed on both sides—that, on the whole, the government of the country was honourably and efficiently carried on. I believe that the day for this country will be a happy day when party combinations shall be restored on such a footing. But this question, instead of being a party question, is a most remarkable illustration of the disorganized state of parties, and of the consequent impotency of the House of Commons to express a practical opinion with respect to the foreign policy of the country."

It will be seen from the tone of the debates and from the persistency of the opposition that there were some doubts of the stability of the government in the disorganized state of parties, and at the beginning of the following year, 1857, serious occasion arose to call the foreign policy of the government in question, in consequence of the proclamation of hostilities against China. The conduct of the ministry had been censured by Lord Derby in the House of Lords, and he had moved a series of resolutions condemning their proceedings in regard to China, but though the speech in which they were introduced was received with applause, the resolutions were not agreed to. On the same evening, however, in the House of Commons Mr. Cobden moved, "That this house has heard with concern of the conflicts which have occurred between the British and Chinese authorities in the Canton river; and without expressing an opinion as to the extent to which the government of China may have afforded this country cause of complaint respecting the non-fulfilment of the treaty of 1842, this house considers that the papers which have been laid upon the table fail to establish satisfactory grounds for the violent measures resorted to at Canton in the late affair of the *Arrow*, and that a select committee be appointed to inquire into the state of our commercial relations with China."

In the speech from the throne at the opening of parliament the following passage had occurred:—"Acts of violence, insults to the

British flag, and infraction of treaty rights committed by the local Chinese authorities at Canton, and a pertinacious refusal of redress, have rendered it necessary for her majesty's officers in China to have recourse to measures of force to obtain satisfaction." From this language it was evident that we had entered on what might prove to be another "little war," and though the tremendous conflict in the Crimea had dwindled minor contests to a point almost below public attention, there were already difficulties to contend with in Persia, while hostilities in Burmah had only recently been brought to a conclusion, and the memory of the Kaffir war, and Sir Harry Smith's difficulties in 1852, still lingered. The war in Burmah, which men like Cobden and Bright, as well as a good many who took less extreme views, declared had not been justified and might have been prevented by a less high-handed and a more reasonable policy, was caused by the breach on the part of the native government of a treaty made after the former chastisement of the Burmese by the Anglo-Indian government. This treaty provided that British rights and property should be respected, and it was alleged to have been broken by the sudden display of active animosity against our merchants at Rangoon and unwarrantable opposition to British vessels entering the port. Reparation was demanded, and a ship of war and three steamers were sent out to enforce it. This was granted so far as removing the Burmese governor of Rangoon, but he was replaced by a successor, who was equally insulting and offensive, and the British officer, Commodore Lambert, proclaimed a blockade. The answer to this was a fire directed upon our ships from the Burmese battery, which was thereupon silenced by our guns. The King of Ava, however, still refused to apologize, to compensate the merchants for their losses, or to permit the residence of a permanent British agent at Rangoon according to the terms of the treaty, which promised to respect British rights and property. The note of war was sounded, and troops from Bengal and Madras were sent under Major-general Godwin (a commander who had been engaged in the first Burmese war) to the mouth of the

Irrawadi, the river on which Rangoon stands. While waiting for the Madras contingent, the general stormed and captured Martaban. The taking of Rangoon was, however, a much more difficult task; for though the whole of the defences of the town on the river side were destroyed by the fire from our shipping, that fire was returned with deadly effect by the Burmese, and our troops on landing were met by a determined resistance, and the stockade, from which the enemy issued and shot down our men, was only forced after severe loss. The capture of Prome, and that of Pegu, which followed, served to some extent to redeem the credit of the British arms. In the latter case 1000 of our men drove out 4000 or 5000 of the Burmese who were strongly entrenched behind their ramparts, and who afterwards made a futile attempt to recover the city. The whole province of Pegu was then annexed to British India, and though we had some difficulty in suppressing the lawless bands of the Dacoits who under their chieftains joined in hostilities for the purpose of plundering both sides, the war with Burmah was virtually over, the King of Ava agreeing to the demands which had been made by the governor-general.

The Persian difficulty had arisen out of a breach of the convention made in January, 1853, between the Persian government and Colonel Shiel, the British minister at the court of Teheran. The shah had agreed that Herat should remain in an independent position, and undertook not to send any troops thither except in the event of an invasion of the Herat territory by a foreign army, in which case any military force sent there by him should be withdrawn as soon as the foreign intruders retired. The agreement was, in fact, to refrain from undue interference in the internal affairs of Herat, except so far as interference had existed in the time of Yar Mohamed Khan, who had been a ruler of the province and had paid tribute to the shah as a token of nominal fealty. The Persian agent was to be recalled from Herat, and Great Britain was also to desist from interfering with the affairs of the place, while the British minister was to use all his influence to induce foreign powers to

leave it in a state of independence. This in effect was not much less than an engagement on the part of Great Britain to maintain the independence of what was once the kingdom of the descendants of Tamerlane, in Afghanistan, and to keep intruders out of the old capital with its wet ditch and earthen rampart, its citadel and wall of sun-dried bricks, its dark narrow and pestilent streets, its mosques, baths, bazaars, and caravansaries, and its manufactories of gorgeous carpets and brilliant sword-blades. At that moment perhaps the most dangerous intruder was Persia, or it was thought to be so, since it was suspected that Russia might follow in her wake. For twenty years there had been a constant disposition on the part of Persia to endeavour to diminish British influence in Afghanistan, by treating our embassies with discourtesy or with positive insult, and after repeated remonstrances and an endeavour to hold Herat against the terms of a former treaty, the present convention had been secured only when it was made clearly known that if the shah kept possession of the Afghan capital he would have to fight Great Britain. If Russian influence had been behind him at that time it was probably inert during the progress of the Crimean war; but at all events the same tactics seem to have been resumed in 1856, and after a dispute with our representative at the court of Teheran about some apparently trivial matter which afterwards led to more serious misunderstandings, the terms of the agreement were broken, and by October in that year the Persians had again taken Herat, and were in conflict with our troops, who in the following month had seized the island of Karrack in the Persian Gulf; while our naval force, under Sir Henry Leek, had attacked and captured the fortified town of Bushire, which was thus declared to be a military post under British rule, and subject to martial law, the traffic in slaves being at once abolished.

While these operations were being conducted in Persia, where it was doubtless necessary that we should uphold the terms of the treaty, intelligence came of proceedings at Canton, for which only a lame defence could be made on the part of the supporters of our government,

while able and just men on both sides of politics joined in condemning them.

“The lorcha *Arrow*” are words which have almost grown to the dignity of a historical reference. Lorcha appears to have been the name of a Portuguese settlement at Macao, at the mouth of the Canton river, and was applied to denote boats of a certain build and rig. The *Arrow* was one of these boats, and like some others from the same locality appears to have had an evil reputation with the Chinese authorities for piracy and smuggling. She had been built in China, was owned by a Chinaman, and had a Chinese crew; but the owners had at one time contrived to obtain such a register as under an act of the colonial legislature was granted to ships of a different class, or at all events of a more definite character, and thereby claimed to use the British flag and to claim protection under it. While this vessel was at Canton, a number of Chinese commanded by an officer in authority boarded her, pulled down the British flag and carried off the crew, refusing to listen to the remonstrances of the master, though they were supported by the British consul. It was an abrupt way of proceeding, no doubt, but it must be remembered that the vessel was known to be used in nefarious enterprises, and it transpired that though her papers were in the consulate, the registration under which she claimed immunity had expired more than a month before. Though the Chinese commissioners did not admit that any breach of national obligations had been committed, it appears that they were willing to make some reparations, and the form in which their assent was given was described by our consul, Mr. Parkes, as “very proper.” Mr. Parkes had, in fact, demanded that the men who had been seized on board the *Arrow* should be at once returned, and based his demand on a supplementary treaty of 1843, one of the terms of which forbade the Chinese authorities to seize Chinamen who had offended, or were suspected of having offended against the laws, if these men were on board a British vessel. It only gave them a right to apply to the English for the surrender of the men.

The Chinese governor of Canton, to whom this demand was made, was named Yeh. He was a man of remarkable ability and intelligence, and was quite capable of maintaining the argument by which he justified what had been done. He contended that the *Arrow* was not an English vessel, but a Chinese pirate lorcha improperly hoisting the English flag for the purpose of evading the law, and not entitled to the protection of a treaty which made British vessels subject only to consular authority. There was so much of truth in this representation that not only had the former registry of the *Arrow* expired, but the British authorities, who had previously granted it, already knew enough of the character of the vessel to doubt whether the registration could legally be renewed. Unfortunately Mr. Parkes, thinking that the hesitation of Governor Yeh might be followed by some further difficulties, sent off to Hong Kong for the support and assistance of our plenipotentiary Sir John Bowring, who had himself formerly been consul at Canton.

We have already heard of Sir John Bowring when he was associated with the leaders of the league for the repeal of the corn-laws, and helped to fight that battle in parliament and at public meetings. He had been a philosophical Radical, and once edited the *Westminster Review*; had travelled much, and possessed an extensive acquaintance of Asiatic as well as of European languages. With China and the Chinese language he was probably more familiar than any other public man of that time. His attainments therefore were considerable, though his learning was not profound. His public character was highly respectable; but he was not much of a politician, and was nothing of a statesman. It would appear that he was a man likely to be rather self-important, and he had moved amongst people who, because he had seen much, and learned much of which they were necessarily ignorant, showed him the kind of deference which was likely to give him a rather inflated opinion of his own authority. This was not mischievously apparent while he was engaged in writing and translating the numerous books in which he contributed largely to the study

of philology, or added to our knowledge of the countries with which he was familiar. Sir John—or as he continued to be called, Doctor—Bowring was an extraordinary man, not only (perhaps not so much) because of the extent and variety of his attainments, as because he had attained unusual knowledge with few of the regular means of instruction, and by the aid of what must be regarded as exceptional ability for rapidly acquiring information. He had an early aptitude for languages, and devoted himself not so much to studying them in the usual way as to "picking them up," and afterwards mastering their structure and relations. His father's family had for generations been engaged in the Devonshire wool trade, and he was born at Exeter, where he seems to have had what may be called a casual education, learning something of the classics from a Dissenting minister at Moreton Hampstead, mathematics of the master of the Presbyterian Charity School, and French from a refugee priest. These were all the regular masters he seems to have had; and at fifteen years of age he was placed in a merchant's office at Exeter, where he continued to improve himself in linguistic studies during his spare time. He had expressed a desire to become a preacher, influenced probably by the effect of the lectures of the accomplished Dr. Lant Carpenter, the well known Unitarian minister, whose chapel he attended; but his career lay in another direction, indicated by the facility with which it seems he could acquire any language by ordinary and occasional conversation with foreigners, and a reference to a few books. In providing these books the German, Portuguese, and Dutch merchants in Exeter contributed to his instruction by placing their libraries at his service. Italian he contrived to learn from the itinerant sellers and menders of barometers and other instruments. At eighteen Bowring was transferred to London, to a house of business engaged in providing supplies for the British troops during the Peninsular war; and in 1813 was sent to Spain and Portugal, where he moved from place to place in order to be in communication with the army, and took the opportunity of completing his know-

ledge of the Spanish language and literature. He was soon in complete accord with the Liberal party in Spain, and this was afterwards the cause of his intimate acquaintance with Jeremy Bentham, whose follower and close friend he became, and who left him his literary executor. It was Bowring who edited and prepared from the original manuscript Bentham's work on *Free-Trade Principles*, published in 1822; and at this time he was engaged in the commercial business which he had commenced in 1815, after peace had been declared, and in which he continued till 1828. During that period Bowring had written and published several works which introduced to English readers the poetry, language, and literature of other countries. *Specimens of the Russian Poets* was the first of the series, and it was followed by *Ancient Poetry and Romances of Spain*, *Servian Popular Poetry*, *Bohemian Anthology*, *Specimens of the Polish Poets*, *The Poetry of the Magyars*, *The Poets of Holland*, and the *Cheskian Anthology*.

When the *Westminster Review* was founded by Bentham in 1824, Bowring was its first political editor. In 1828 he was sent to Holland by the government to report on the Dutch system of keeping accounts in connection with the introduction of a proposed reform in our own public accounts; and on the accession of the Liberal party to power, and Mr. Poulett Thompson, afterwards Lord Sydenham, to the Board of Trade, commenced his series of commercial missions to the Continent and the East. It was on his return from one of the latter in 1838 that he became at once associated with the movement which resulted in the Corn-law League. He had been member for Kilmarnock from 1835 to 1837, and in 1841 was returned for Bolton, which he represented till 1849, when he was appointed to the consulship at Canton, and subsequently in 1854 governor of Hong Kong. He then received the honour of knighthood and became *Sir John Bowring*. It would be idle to infer that the knighthood had the slightest influence on his "attitude" towards the people about him, or upon his own character; but it certainly appears that the accomplished man of letters, who had taken his

doctor's degree at the Dutch university of Groningen, and had displayed no very unusual tokens of "bumptiousness," suddenly assumed a position which was overbearing even for a British plenipotentiary in China. It has been mentioned as a rather remarkable thing, however, that in a short passage of autobiography Sir John records his having, when a little boy, dreamed that he was sent by the King of England as ambassador to China. Whether the recollection of this dream, and any sudden sense of power, had the effect of emphasizing his desire to assert authority in Canton, may be left to conjecture; but it is certain that when he received the application from Mr. Parkes to support the demands made on the Chinese authorities, he saw an opportunity for enforcing other claims for admission to the port and city of Canton in accordance, as it was alleged, with certain treaty engagements which had not been properly observed.

To begin with, however, all the men taken from the *Arrow* were to be surrendered, ample apologies were to be made for their arrest, and a formal undertaking was to be entered into by the Chinese authorities that nothing of the kind should ever occur again.

All this was to be done within forty-eight hours, under a threat of hostilities from the naval force under the command of Admiral Sir Michael Seymour; but Governor Yeh, though he promptly sent back the men (under a kind of protest that he did so to avert the hostility of the British representative), and at the same time undertook to promise that care should be taken to prevent any British ship from being improperly visited by Chinese officers, refused to apologize for what had occurred with regard to the *Arrow*, which was, he contended, a Chinese vessel, with no right to the protection of the English flag. This Sir John Bowring had already admitted in a letter to Mr. Parkes, wherein he said that the license of the *Arrow*, however it may have been obtained, had expired, but at the same time argued that the Chinese were not aware of that fact, and that they were therefore culpable. At all events not a tittle of the demand for reparation was abated, and Sir John wrote to Sir Michael Seymour: "I

cannot doubt that the imperial commissioner will now feel the absolute necessity of complying with the demands which have been made; and I have to add, that if your excellency and the consul should concur with me in opinion that the circumstances are auspicious for requiring the fulfilment of treaty obligations as regards the city of Canton, and for arranging an official meeting with the imperial commissioner within the city walls, I shall willingly come to Canton for that purpose." Surely when Lord Derby and Mr. Cobden afterwards concurred in accusing Sir John Bowring of a kind of monomania for getting into Canton, they were not outside the mark; for, on the representation that Commissioner Yeh did not pay sufficient attention to the remonstrances of the British consul, hostilities had already commenced by the destruction of the forts on the river, and instead of these hostilities being suspended for negotiations,—they were pursued—the island and fort of Dutch Folly being taken and occupied without any opposition from the Chinese. This was the beginning of an attack which lasted three weeks, during which more forts were taken, many junks destroyed, and the suburbs of Canton were bombarded till they crumbled down and left an open range for the ships to fire shot and shell upon the city.

The news of these proceedings caused much excitement in England, but of course men took different views of it. The name of Commissioner Yeh was in everybody's mouth, and his effigy was subsequently a great attraction in Madame Tussaud's exhibition of wax-work, where it is still a familiar, though no longer a particularly prominent figure. The course taken by Yeh when the attack was made on Canton was not very wise. He opposed to the British hostilities a proclamation offering a reward for every head of an Englishman brought into the city. This is, perhaps, why Lord Palmerston felt justified in referring to him as a "barbarian" when Parliament had dissolved on the Chinese question, and his lordship was defending his government in an address to his constituents at Tiverton. But the barbarian had so much reason on his side at the outset, that his views were

endorsed by the venerable Lord Lyndhurst in the House of Lords, when, on the 24th of February, Lord Derby brought forward the motion to which we have referred. Lord Lyndhurst maintained that nobody could successfully contest the principle that we might give any rights or privileges to a foreigner or a foreign vessel as against ourselves, but that we could not grant to any such foreigner a single right or privilege as against a foreign state; and he declared with earnest reprehension that when we were talking of treaty transactions with Eastern natives, we had a kind of loose law and loose notion of morality in regard to them.

This was the conclusion supported by Cobden when he brought forward his resolution in the House of Commons, and from his point of view the whole argument was plain enough.

In a pamphlet on the war with Burmah, Cobden had shown the danger and injustice of our accepted policy towards the weak nations of the East; and he held that this war which had now broken out in China illustrated the same principles in a still more striking way. The Chinese boarded the *Arrow* and rescued twelve of their countrymen from it on a charge of piracy. The British consul protested on the ground that malfeasants on board a British ship should not be seized, but should be demanded from the consul. Nine men were returned at once. Bowring sent word that unless the whole of the men were returned within eight-and-forty hours, with apologies for the past and pledges for the future, the English men-of-war would begin operations. On a certain day the whole of the men were returned, with a protest from the Chinese governor that the ship was not a British ship, and that therefore he was not bound to demand his malfeasants from the consul. The Chinese governor was perfectly in the right. Bowring's contention was an absolute error from beginning to end. The *Arrow* was not a British ship. Its license had expired. Even if this had not been so, the Hong Kong agents had no power to give a license to a Chinese ship-owner protecting him against his own government. The case stood thus then. Bowring had made a claim

which was legally untenable. The Chinese governor, while declaring it illegal, acquiesced in the demand. Yet the day after the whole of the men had been given up, naval and military operations were begun, a great number of Chinese junks were destroyed, the suburbs of Canton were burned and battered down, the town was shelled.

The government resolved to support Bowring. To do so, they shifted the ground from the particular to the general; if the Chinese were right about the *Arrow*, they were wrong about something else; if legality did not exactly justify violence, it was at any rate required by policy, as orientals mistake justice for fear.

To Cobden (says his latest biographer) the whole transaction seemed worthy of condemnation on every ground. Bowring's demand was illegal, and ought not to have been made. If this was doubtful, at any rate Bowring's violent action was precipitate. It was a resort in the first instance to measures which would hardly have been justifiable in the last instance. If there were general grievances against the Chinese, why not make joint representations with France and the United States, instead of stumbling into a quarrel in which we had not a leg to stand upon, and beginning a war for which in the opinion of our best lawyers there was no proper ground.

The chance of reversing the course of policy depended as usual on the accidents of party combination. In a letter to Mr. Lindsay, written in the last month of 1856, Cobden describes the state of parties at that time. "It is unlike," he said, "everything I have witnessed for the last fifteen years. There seems to be no party having an intelligible principle or policy in which any considerable body out-of-doors takes an interest. The two sides of the house no longer represent opposing parties—unless, indeed, it may be said that our leader is at heart an aristocratic Tory, while the chief of the opposition is, if anything, a democratic Radical. Of this, a considerable number on the Tory side seem to be shrewdly aware, for they evince no desire to turn out Palmerston, in whom they have no more confidence than in Disraeli." Under these circumstances, however, the position of a minis-

ter must always be precarious, for the absence of definitely antagonistic policies places him at the mercy of fortuitous personal coalitions. One of these coalitions came into existence now. The Peelites were only following the tradition of their master in condemning a precipitate and useless war. Mr. Disraeli and his friends played the official part of an opposition in censuring an administration. Lord John Russell obeyed an honest instinct for justice. All these sections resolved to support Cobden. It was on the 26th of February that Cobden brought forward a motion to the effect that, without expressing an opinion on the causes of complaint arising from non-fulfilment of the treaty of 1842, the house thought the late violent measures at Canton not justified by the papers, and that a select committee should inquire into the commercial relations with China. This enabled him to cover the whole ground of our policy in that country. He did so in one of the most masterly of his speeches; it was closely argued, full of matter, without an accent of passion, unanswerable on the special case, and thoroughly broad and statesmanlike in general views.

The house was profoundly impressed. After a long debate, in which Lord Palmerston taunted Cobden with his un-English spirit, and wondered how he could have thought of attacking an old friend like Bowring, the division was taken. There was a majority of sixteen against the government. The sixteen would have been sixty, it was said, if Lord Derby's party had held together. That so many of them were found on Cobden's side, showed that so far as opinion and conviction went, the minority was very small indeed. But, as we are always seeing, it is the tendency of party government to throw opinion and conviction too often into a secondary place. Mr. Gladstone said that if the division had been taken immediately after the speeches of Cobden and Lord John Russell, the motion would have been carried by a majority so overwhelming that the minister could not have ventured to appeal to the country against it. The interval allowed the old party considerations to resume their usual force. As it was, Lord Palmerston, with his usual acute-

ness and courage of judgment, determined to dissolve parliament. Mr. Bright was now at Rome. "I need not tell you," he wrote to Cobden, "how greatly pleased I was with the news, and especially that the blow was given by your hand."¹

The debate by which the result had been achieved lasted for four nights, and many of the principal speakers in parliament took part in it (those who were in favour of Mr. Cobden's motion sat on both sides of the house and represented all parties). It was not to be wondered at therefore that Lord Palmerston should represent the movement as an attack by a coalition for the purpose of upsetting the government. This gave Mr. Disraeli an opportunity for uttering a series of sarcasms, which he delivered with telling effect. "The first minister," he said, "was of all men the man who could not bear a coalition. He was the archetype of political combinations, without avowed political principles. The noble lord could not bear coalitions. The noble lord had acted only with those amongst whom he was born and bred in politics! That infant Hercules was taken out of a Whig cradle! And how consistent had been his political life! Looking back upon the past half century, during which he had professed almost every principle and connected himself with almost every party, the noble lord had raised a warning voice that night against coalitions, because he feared that a majority of the House of Commons, ranking in its numbers some of the most eminent members of that house, might not approve a policy with respect to China which had begun in outrage, and which, if pursued, would end in ruin. . . . Let the noble lord not only complain to the country—let him appeal to the country."

Eminent men of various shades of opinion had, indeed, condemned the government policy. Sir Bulwer Lytton had earnestly and eloquently warned the house that trade could not prosper if traders made themselves an object of detestation to those they traded with. Sir James Graham, Sir John Pakington, Mr. Phillimore, Sir Frederick Thesiger,

Mr. Sidney Herbert, Sir Roundell Palmer—all expressed in terms unusually strong their opposition to a policy which was characterized as cruel and fraudulent. Mr. Gladstone protested against diverting attention from the government by accusations against Sir John Bowring, whose conduct was involved in the decisions, but whom they were not trying judicially. Their prime and paramount duty was to consider the interests of humanity and the honour of England. The policy of Sir John Bowring was not unknown to the government nor by them disapproved. With regard to the general question, he denied that we had festering wrongs against the Chinese. The attorney-general, he said, had argued that the term "British subjects" in the treaty meant any Chinese resident at Hong Kong, Mr. Gladstone asked, When we talked of treaty obligations by the Chinese, what were our treaty obligations towards them? Hong Kong was given to us to be a port in which British ships might careen and refit. Was not our contraband trade in opium a breach of treaty obligations? Had our government struggled to put it down, as bound by treaty? Had they not encouraged it by organizing a fleet of lorchas under the British flag? They who put the British flag to the uses to which it had been put, stained that flag. After earnestly pointing to the calamities which the war had inflicted upon the Cantonese, calamities to which the resolution before the house invited the wisdom of members to put an end, he demanded the reasons why we were at war with the Chinese. Were we afraid of the moral effects upon the Chinese if the acts of the government were disavowed? He implored the house to consider the moral impressions which must be produced, and never could be avoided.

"Every member of the House of Commons," he continued, "is proudly conscious that he belongs to an assembly which in its collective capacity is the paramount power of the state. But if it is the paramount power of the state it can never separate from that paramount power a similar and paramount responsibility. The vote of the House of Lords will not acquit us; the sentence of the government will not

¹ Mr. Morley's *Life of Cobden*.

acquit us. It is with us to determine whether this wrong shall remain unchecked and uncorrected. And at a time when sentiments are so much divided, every man, I trust, will give his vote with the recollection and the consciousness that it may depend upon his single vote whether the miseries, the crimes, the atrocities that I fear are now proceeding in China are to be discountenanced or not. We have now come to the crisis of the case. England is not yet committed. With you, then, with us, with every one of us, it rests to show that this house, which is the first, the most ancient, and the noblest temple of freedom in the world, is also the temple of that everlasting justice without which freedom itself would only be a name, or only a curse to mankind. And I cherish the trust and belief that when you, sir, rise to declare in your place to-night the numbers of the division from the chair which you adorn, the words which you speak will go forth from the walls of the House of Commons, not only as a message of mercy and peace, but also as a message of British justice and British wisdom, to the farthest corners of the world."

The message went forth from the House of Commons by a majority of 16 in favour of the resolution proposed by Mr. Cobden and seconded by Mr. Gibson; but that message was not endorsed by the nation, or at all events by that part of the nation which had votes. Palmerston accepted the challenge of Disraeli, and appealed to the country by dissolving parliament. "The Tory chief of a Radical cabinet," as Mr. Disraeli called him, who "with no domestic policy was obliged to divert the attention of the people from the consideration of their own affairs to the distractions of foreign politics;"—the minister whose "external system was turbulent and aggressive, that his rule at home might be tranquil and unassailed,"—went to his constituents at Tiverton, and denounced Governor Yeh as "an insolent barbarian," who, "wielding authority at Canton, violated the British flag, broke the engagements of treaties, offered rewards for the heads of British subjects in that part of China, and planned their destruction by murder, assassination, and

poison." Would the British nation, he asked, give their support to men who, if they got into power and were prepared to be consistent, must apologize to the Chinese government, and offer compensation to the Chinese commissioner, and who had endeavoured to make the humiliation and degradation of their country the stepping-stone to power?

The British nation believed so implicitly in the name and the foreign tactics of Palmerston that they did nothing of the kind. It was everywhere understood that he had so upheld British influence abroad as to make this country "feared and respected." It was believed that foreign official functionaries bowed humbly at the sight of his signature on a passport, when that signature was once translated to them. Remarkably enough, too,—the premier, who by his alleged flippancy and irreverent references in the matter of epidemics, had scandalized very "serious" people, had come to be regarded as a bulwark of the evangelical party in the church, because of his appointment to bishoprics, of men of that tendency. The appeal to the country was a triumph. Cobden, Bright, Milner Gibson, Layard, W. J. Fox, and several other leading opponents, actually lost their seats. Some ugly stories were current of attempts to poison Englishmen in China—of new promises of reward for assassination, and of poisoned bread sold by Chinese bakers. Some of these rumours appear to have had a foundation of fact. At any rate Commissioner Yeh remained "an insolent barbarian," though Lord Lyndhurst had endorsed his arguments, and Lord Derby had declared that on his side there had been courtesy, forbearance, and temper, and on ours arrogance and presumption. The vote of parliament had supported Mr. Cobden in saying that injustice had had been done to "an *ingenious* and *civilized* people, who were learned when our Plantagenet kings could not write, who had logic before Aristotle, and morals before Socrates," but the country reversed the decision. Cobden, hopeless of the West Riding, was defeated at Huddersfield. Mr. Bright, who was suffering so severely from the effects of mental strain and unremitting work that he was incapable of

attending the election, lost his seat at Manchester; Sir J. Potter and Mr. J. A. Turner taking the places of him and Mr. Milner Gibson. Mr. Bright's illness had, it was said, little or no effect on the result; but perhaps it was on the whole a good thing for him that he had not at that time to resume arduous parliamentary duties, or to be compelled to neglect them. As it was, he retired with a certain sad dignity which was eloquent in the address issued to his former constituents. Here are two or three passages from it:—"I have received a telegraphic despatch informing me of the result of the election contest in which you have just been engaged. The result has not greatly surprised me, and as far as I am personally concerned—inasmuch as it liberates me from public life in a manner that involves on my part no shrinking from my duty—I cannot seriously regret it. I lament it on public grounds, because it tells the world that many among you have abandoned the opinions you professed to hold in the year 1847, and even so recently as the year 1852. I believe that slander itself has not dared to charge me with having forsaken any of the principles on the honest support of which I offered myself twice, and was twice accepted as your representative. The charge against me has rather been that I have too warmly and too faithfully defended the political views which found so much favour with you at two previous elections. . . . I have esteemed it a high honour to be one of your representatives, and have given more of mental and physical labour to your service than is just to myself. I feel it scarcely less an honour to suffer in the cause of peace, and on behalf of what I believe to be the true interests of my country, though I could have wished that the blow had come from other hands, at a time when I could have met face to face those who dealt it. In taking leave of you and of public life, let me assure you that I can never forget the many, the innumerable kindnesses I have received from my friends among you. No one will rejoice more than I shall in all that brings you prosperity and honour; and I am not without a hope that, when a calmer hour shall come, you will say of Mr. Gibson and of me, that, as

colleagues in your representation for ten years, we have not sacrificed our principles to gain popularity, or bartered our independence for the emoluments of office or the favours of the great. I feel that we have stood for the rights and interests and freedom of the people, and that we have not tarnished the honour or lessened the renown of your eminent city."

Lord John Russell maintained his seat for the city of London along with three other Liberals, Baron Rothschild, Sir James Duke, and Mr. R. W. Crawford, but he was last on the poll. Mr. Ayrton and Mr. Butler were elected for the Tower Hamlets, and Sir W. Clay rejected. Mr. Lowe was re-elected for Kidderminster, but he and his friends were savagely attacked by a mob as they were leaving a polling-booth. There were 189 new members, and it was computed that the Liberals in the new parliament were 371, the Conservatives 284—only two of Palmerston's supporters were defeated—Admiral Berkeley at Gloucester, and Mr. Frederick Peel at Bury. Parliament met on the 30th of April (1857), and Mr. John Evelyn Denison, M.P. for North Nottinghamshire, was unanimously elected speaker.

It may be mentioned that during the dissolution two officers, Major-general Stalker and Commodore Ethersey, apparently unable to bear the responsibilities which lay upon them in relation to the Persian expedition, committed suicide at Bushire. Major-general Stalker was the first to shoot himself, and three days afterwards Commodore Ethersey followed the sad example.

The proceedings in parliament had chiefly related to the prosecution of the great and the little wars, and there had consequently been little direct legislation for the promotion of social progress. Lord Elgin was soon sent as our representative to China. The principal measure which occupied the early attention of the new House of Commons was what was known as the Divorce Act—which meant not an act for permitting divorce, for divorce already existed as a possible thing for people who were wealthy enough to bring a cause before the ecclesiastical courts—but for estab-

lishing a regular court for the trial of applications for divorce and for "matrimonial causes," the decisions in which would be less cumbrous and far less costly than those of the tribunal which it was intended to supersede. In a word, the Divorce Act did not introduce the power of obtaining a divorce, it only extended it to people who had hitherto been unable to avail themselves of the means that had been provided for trying causes between husband and wife. The effect of this was to remove the discussion of divorce cases from parliament, to which they were referred before the passing of the act, when wealthy or titled suitors would move for a trial. The unedifying details of some gross or painful case would no longer be discussed in an assembly unqualified to conduct the inquiry, and often unable either to discriminate or to follow the evidence which alone could secure a reasonable verdict. Many of the reports of divorce cases at the present day are bad enough, but they are harmless as compared to those of similiar trials in the House of Lords at a date previous to the time of which we are now speaking.

"Bills will be submitted to you for improving the laws relating to the testamentary and matrimonial jurisdiction now exercised by the ecclesiastical courts, and also for checking fraudulent breaches of trust," was almost the only paragraph in the royal speech referring to domestic legislation. Parliament assembled in May. It had been determined to carry the Divorce Court Bill if possible, and Lord Palmerston was accused of hurrying it through parliament, to which he retorted that he was quite ready to sit through September, if it was desired to have a full discussion of all the details, and, much to the amusement of the house, added, "One prominent opponent of the bill said to me on one occasion, 'You never shall pass the bill.' I replied, 'Won't we!'" This opponent was perhaps Lord Redesdale, who afterwards tried to throw out the measure by a motion that it should be considered that day three months. As this was on the 21st of August, such a decision would have sealed the fate of the bill, and the decision was nearly secured. At that date most of

the Lords and several members of the government had left town, but it was thought there were a sufficient number of their adherents remaining to carry the bill. But the Conservatives hurried back to town to support Lord Redesdale's amendment, which must have been carried had not the ministerialists moved, and insisted on, an adjournment without mentioning the bill. This gave time for their forces to be recalled, and the amendment was rejected by a majority of two only, the bill being passed on the 25th. In the House of Commons the most determined opponent of the measure was Mr. Gladstone, who objected to it from conscientious motives. Doubtless the proposed act had greatly altered the position of applicants and appellants in divorce cases, but it had done more. The Bishop of Oxford had endeavoured to introduce a clause making it lawful to pass on the guilty parties, or either of them, a sentence of fine or imprisonment, as though such parties had been guilty of a misdemeanour at common law, and this was carried in committee but omitted in the third reading; while an amendment by the lord chancellor permitting a woman to marry after divorce was carried, and an addition by Lord Wensleydale against the adulterer and adulteress marrying with each other was rejected. It would appear, therefore, that the case was not completely stated by Mr. Walpole, who, in supporting the government, not only said that the relations of marriage were in no degree loosened by the bill, but that the only object of it was to substitute one good tribunal for three tribunals, one of which was a scandal and a disgrace to the country.

Mr. Gladstone, at all events, took the ground that divorce was prohibited by Scripture and was a social evil. For nearly two centuries the legislature had, from time to time, granted divorce *a vinculo* in certain cases where there was enough wealth to sustain the heavy charge necessary for the preliminary suits and for a private act of parliament; but he held that the passing of from one to half-a-dozen divorce bills per annum, and the occasional occurrence of a practical solecism through the variance of the Scotch law from our own,

did not practically affect the state either of facts or of feelings for the mass of the community in England and Ireland, with their two hundred thousand marriages a year. "It was not the law of marriage which brought itself into danger," wrote Mr. Gladstone in the *Quarterly Review* for July, 1857, "but rather it was the feeling entertained, whether justly or unjustly, about the court by which that law was administered. The disposal of a large part of the testamentary business of the country under episcopal authority was a clear anomaly, and what was much more it was one of those anomalies which most powerful bodies of men were interested in attacking, while only a feeble one was arrayed in its defence. Attention readily passed from the court to the law in its different branches; and when once that branch of it which dealt with the contract of marriage as a lifelong engagement was brought under criticism, its existence could not long remain undisturbed; it was too Spartan and severe for the relaxed tone of modern society, and the other principal Protestant countries had long ago set us the example of its surrender. A commission was accordingly appointed to inquire into the law of marriage; and in the year 1853 the commission reported in favour of a change in the law which should embody the principle of divorce *a vinculo* for adultery."

There had, as he remarked, already been a surrender of that strict view of the marriage-contract, which, it must be admitted, appears to be the divine meaning of what marriage should really become. The difference in the law in England and Scotland was a constant source of inconvenience. "Gretna Green" marriages at the little village "over the border" in Dumfriesshire, where the ceremony was, it was said, performed by a blacksmith for runaway couples—had been declared illegal only on the 1st of January in that very year (1857), but legal marriage in Scotland could be upheld by the mere fact of a woman and a man having called each other husband and wife in the presence of witnesses.

We cannot enter into Mr. Gladstone's arguments on the scriptural and historical grounds of his opposition to the bill, and it will suffice

to say that the social grounds on which he denounced it were founded on his religious—one might perhaps say his spiritual—convictions of what marriage really implied, and what was probably included by St. Paul when he spoke of it as "a great mystery."

Nor did Mr. Gladstone hesitate to condemn Milton as the advocate of easy divorce at a time when, during the Commonwealth, adultery was made a capital offence, but the marriage-contract remained indissoluble. Milton doubtless advocated separation, equivalent to divorce, for aversion or incompatibility, and even declared that to forego an unfit, ungodly, and discordant wedlock was according to perfection rather than to infirmity. "That for which he pleads," says Mr. Gladstone, "is a license of divorce for aversion or incompatibility; the wildest libertine, the veriest Mormon, could not devise words more conformable to his ideas, if indeed we are just to the Mormon sages in assuming that they alienate as freely as they acquire. And all this energetic emotion of Milton's betrays its selfish origin by the fact that it is man only whose sufferings in unhappy marriages he commiserates; the wrongs and sorrows of women seem to have been, in his view, a very secondary affair; indeed, he but faintly shows that he was even conscious of their existence." These views of Mr. Gladstone¹ were the foundation of his resistance to the bill, but he also pointed emphatically to the momentous character of the change as it regarded women. He says, "One of the noblest social achievements of the gospel has been to elevate the 'ministering angel' of the world to a position of perfect equality with a man in all that relates to the essential prerogatives of personal and spiritual being. It is the most splendid example, without exception, which history affords of the triumph on a large scale of the law of right over the law of force, and of the law of love over the law of lust. This equality, which the piercing sagacity of Aristotle could not discern, nor the ethereal imag-

¹ Republished in *Gleanings of Past Years*, vol. vi., to which the reader would do well to refer as an exhaustive essay on the subject from the point of view here indicated.

ination of Plato conceive, is now the simplest elementary conception of every Christian child; for our nurseries know no distinction between the reverence due to the one parent and to the other. Many and many a long century did it take to work out this great result, and those who reproach the English law of marriage with its having subsisted under papal guardianship, should remember that the same period, and the same tract of Christendom, which brought it down in safety, delivered to us along with it that precious legacy of customs and ideas which has established woman upon the very highest levels of our moral and spiritual existence, for man's benefit no less than for her own."

In reference to the religious rite Mr. Gladstone argued,—

"A time may come when society cannot bear the strictness of the Christian law, and will reject the drill that is necessary to make the soldier. It will then, doubtless, largely fall back upon that lower conception of marriage which treats it as a purely civil contract between individuals. It may be said that that time has already come, in a country like England, where, according to the last returns, out of one hundred and sixty thousand marriages, seven thousand six hundred, a number relatively small but absolutely considerable, were celebrated by the registrar, and therefore with no special religious authority. We are far from saying that the law offends by permitting such marriages as these to persons whose consciences do not enable them to enter into marriage by the way properly Christian. So, then, if there must be remarriage, let that too be the registrar's privilege. The day when marriage is made dissoluble by law in England will at best be noted in our calendar with charcoal, not with chalk. But if we are not strong enough to hold the lower portion of society up to Christianity, let us not be mad enough to drag the very rites of Christianity down to the lowered and lowering level of society. Let the salt of the earth still keep its savour, and the darkness of the body be illumined, so far as it may, by the eye that still wakes within it."

These then were the opinions by which Mr.

Gladstone held, during his antagonism to the bill, which soon afterwards passed into law, and in a footnote to the republication of this essay in 1878 he adds, "I record with regret, after twenty-one years, my conviction, that the general soundness of these arguments and anticipations has been too sadly illustrated by the mischievous effect of the measure on the conjugal morality of the country."

It may be noted, however, that the observations made by the distinguished essayist on the subject of marriage by registration, do not include the whole question. Such marriages have vastly increased during the twenty-one years which have elapsed, and the registrar is now, in fact, the only officer appointed by the state to perform the legal ceremony of marriage; but even before this change had taken place there were numbers of persons professing a fervent belief in religion who yet did not conceive that the "marriage service" of the Church of England was the only "way properly Christian" by which they could enter into matrimony, and many of them failing to find any ceremonial ordained in the New Testament, and yet believing somewhat in the spirit of marriage, were content to adopt the "letter" of the legal social contract, not as all that was necessary, but as all that was merely formally necessary or publicly necessary. Of course Mr. Gladstone never would have denied that Christians not conforming to the rites and to some of the doctrines of the Church of England, and conscientiously dissenting from the "Establishment," were yet capable of a truly Christian marriage in the high interpretation which he claims for it; but it may seem to some readers that he had overlooked the objection that the religious authority which he claims for marriage itself need not be confined to the authority of the "Church of England," or of any one Christian Church, but the authority of the Christian spirit in the hearts of those who regard the marriage as in the highest sense binding, in whatever way it may be formally and legally celebrated.

It is not necessary to do more than refer to Mr. Gladstone's well-known scholarship as being conspicuous in the essay to which we have just referred. It had long been as well

known to his friends, and to all those who were able to form an estimate of such attainments, as his intense earnestness in upholding, what he regarded as essential principles of conduct or of policy, was known to those who acted with him in public affairs. In a somewhat remarkable manner these two qualities led to his being selected to fulfil a mission to which we shall have to refer in another chapter. By the Treaty of Vienna the Ionian Islands, the inhabitants of which had a restless desire to be made a portion of the Kingdom of Greece, were constituted a kind of commonwealth under British protection, with a senate of six and a legislative assembly of forty members, who probably exercised less power than one of our colonial assemblies and not much more than a provincial corporation or board of works. They were placed under the control of a British lord high commissioner, and we had the right to maintain garrisons in the islands, of which he therefore would almost necessarily become civil governor and, in case of urgency, military commander. This was, of course, a very different thing to self-government, and the name of republic was not so satisfactory to the Ionians as the hope of becoming a part of the Greek kingdom and sharing in the Greek independent nationality.

For some time before Lord Palmerston's vic-

VOL. III.

tory on the Chinese question there had been great excitement on this subject, and it was not destined to be allayed until some time afterwards, when far graver matters had been settled, arising out of the condition of our possessions in India. The government of India had already undergone some important changes by the operation of the ministerial measure brought in by Sir Charles Wood in 1853, which considerably modified the relative positions of the government and the East India Company. The relations between the directors and the Board of Control were not altered, but the constitution of the former was considerably changed and its patronage curtailed. The number of the members of the court was reduced from twenty-four to eighteen, of whom twelve were to be elected as before, and six nominated by the crown from Indian servants who had been ten years in the service of the crown or the company. One-third of this number was to go out every second year, but to be eligible for reappointment. Nominations by favour were abolished. The governorship of Bengal was separated from the office of governor-general, and the legislative council was improved and its number enlarged to twelve. This was the scheme of government, when sudden and startling events to which we shall presently refer called attention to India.

CHAPTER IX.

REVOLT AND CHANGE—THE YEARS OF NEW DEVELOPMENTS.

Condition of the Country after the Crimean War—Distress—Bread Riots—Education—Crime—The Indian Mutiny—State of Public Feeling—Attempts to assassinate Napoleon III.—The French Colonels and England—"Conspiracy to Murder" Bill—Defeat of Palmerston—Derby Government—Mr. Gladstone—Competitive Examinations—Sanitary Matters—The Atlantic Cable—Derby Reform Bill—Disraeli—Return of Palmerston to Office—Financial Reform—Overtures to Cobden—Gladstone's Budget—French Commercial Treaty.

DURING the Crimean war Mr. Cobden in one of his pamphlets had pointed out that if the conflict were much prolonged, and carried out "with vigour," the disturbances in the currency through financial demands would ultimately affect the working population to an extent and with an intensity of which past experience of their sufferings would afford no example; for the evil would be in proportion to the numbers and density of our manufacturing community, which had attained dimensions that had no parallel in history. He forebore to speculate on all the consequences which might follow from the disorganization of this industrial population, and the more so as they would be the last to suffer from loss of occupation. He would not abandon the hope that the war might terminate before its calamities fell upon them. Happily the vast social machinery was not without its safety-valve for the assurance of those timid persons who lived in dread of its explosive energies. It was the interest of employers, having large amounts invested in fixed capitals, to continue to employ their work-people long after these investments ceased to be profitable. He knew instances where mill-owners, whilst hoping for better times, had preferred to work on at a loss of several thousand pounds a year of their floating capital rather than by closing their establishments to incur far greater sacrifices from the total unproductiveness of their buildings, machinery, labourers' cottages, and all that constituted their fixed capital; to say nothing of

the disadvantage of withdrawing from the market, and losing their connections and customers. There was an honourable pride too amongst the tall chimneys not without its use, which disinclined them to be the first to cease to smoke. It followed, however, that mischief might be insidiously working when all was apparent prosperity; and that very disposition to prolong the struggle might, under a continued pressure of adverse circumstances, render the ultimate catastrophe only the more sudden and calamitous. Hitherto the effects of the war had been felt by the working-classes, not in the form of loss of employment, but through the high price of food, which had told with great severity on the unskilled labourer receiving the lowest rate of wages. The most numerous of that class, the agricultural labourers—that mute and helpless multitude who had never made their voice heard in the din of politics or their presence felt in any social movement—were the greatest sufferers. We had a school of sentimentalists who told us that war was to elevate man in his native dignity, to depress the money power, to put down mammon worship, and the like. Let them take a rural walk (they required bracing) on the downs, or the weald, or the fens, in any part of this island south of the Trent, and they would find the wages of agricultural labourers averaging at that moment under twelve shillings a week; let them ask how a family of five persons, which was below *their* average, could live with bread at $2\frac{1}{2}d.$

a pound. Nobody could tell. But follow the labourer as he laid down his spade or mattock and settled to his dinner in the nearest barn or shed, and peep into his wallet; or drop into his cottage at 12 o'clock and inquire what the family dinner consists of;—bread, rarely anything better and not always enough of that, with nothing left out of his earnings for tea, or sugar, or soap, or candles, or clothes, or the schooling of his children; and with his next year's harvest-money already mortgaged for shoes. Never within the recollection of living man was the farm-labourer's condition so bad as at that time. During the former great war he went straight to the parish-board for the "allowance" of 2s. 6d. a head for each child exceeding two; so that with his wages at fourteen shillings, if he had five children, his income was raised to upwards of a guinea a week. That might have been unsound political economy, but it stood between the labourer and starvation during the long French war.

Cobden's indictment against war was that it brutalized the masses, and made the rich richer and the poor poorer; but never were those evil tendencies developing themselves with such unrelenting pressure as then, that the old poor-law and the usury laws no longer existed. The war caused a rise in the price of grain, not in our market only, but on the Continent and over a great part of the world. The blockade of the Don, the Dnieper, and the other outlets for that region of "Black Earth" whose fertility had excited the amazement of geologists, and from which the sustenance of half Europe might, with proportionate labour and capital, be drawn, had caused the sudden cessation of an export of grain to Western Europe which, in 1853, the year before the war, had amounted to between five and six millions of quarters. The average price of wheat had been higher during the last year than for the last thirty years, higher even than in 1847, the year of the Irish famine, and that although the last year's crop in this country had been unprecedentedly large and the recent harvest had been considered to have been almost equal to an average. These were Cobden's arguments, and although many of his statements were of course

called in question, there were too many signs that the effects which he prognosticated were already appearing. Happily, however, the war was not prolonged. Peace came, and not before a large proportion of the people, who had already begun to suffer, were ready to call out for it. Unpopular as the apostles of peace were at the time, their arguments had an after effect, and Cobden himself lived long enough to note that the war fever did not recur when at a later period there were some symptoms of its reappearance.

That there had been great scarcity of food was evident enough, but the advocates of the war had attributed it to deficient harvests at home, and their assertions were not easily answered by an appeal to figures, because, although the supplies which we obtained from abroad were correctly known, there were no accurate returns of the agricultural produce grown in our own island. It was quite certain, however, that the complaints of the labouring classes were urgent, and they were emphasized by various attempts to make them the cause of public disturbance.

The real distress, for the most part occasioned by the depression of industry and the severe weather—which not only added to the sufferings of the poor but greatly interfered with outdoor labour, was not the only cause of violent demonstrations. There are always gangs of disorderly ruffians ready to take advantage of a period of want, to forestall public charity and act the part of starving or frozen-out workmen. In London many outrages were committed by vagabonds of this description. In Liverpool, however, depredations known as "the bread riots" became still more serious. A vast number of dock and river-side labourers were thrown out of employment, and it was estimated that 15,000 persons, with their families and all who were dependent on them, were reduced to great destitution. It was known that the provisions made by the poor-law out of the rates would be totally inadequate to meet the widely spread need, and large subscriptions were made for the relief of suffering families by distribution of food, coals, and clothing. Enforced idleness and continued want, how-

ever, produced persistent complaint, and in most large towns a part of the population consists of people who live by casual labour alternating with parochial relief or with petty crime. There are usually enough of this class to make a very dangerous element if they throw in their lot with the actual criminals—and therefore in Liverpool, when a gang of desperadoes came forward to lead on the idle and the vicious who were also among the starving, social order was disregarded. While the really industrious and honest poor mostly held back, the undeserving were organized into gangs, who went through the streets demanding bread, money, and provisions, and when both were refused or withheld, breaking into bakers' shops and food stores, emptying them of all that they contained and wrecking the furniture in revenge, or even entering private houses of the humbler sort and terrifying the poor tenants by threats of violence unless safety were purchased by the immediate payment of a small sum of money. Many shopkeepers escaped the ruin of their premises by throwing out loaves, bacon, sugar, cheese, and other articles; while others could not prevent the seizure of their entire stocks either by bold ruffians who forced their way in, lads who entered and pilfered right and left, or abandoned women who accompanied the mob and encouraged depredation by their cheers and laughter. The industrious poor took no part in these outrages, and eventually the police captured about sixty of the leaders, and the mobs dispersed. Unfortunately, the evil example of the Liverpool gangs was afterwards followed in the poverty-stricken neighbourhoods of London, and in Stepney, Bethnal Green, Shoreditch, and Bermondsey bread riots were organized under the direction of stalwart ruffians, those of the southern quarter being mostly Irish. They contrived to do a great deal of mischief for two or three days; but the police force of London, when its members were concentrated upon a disturbed district, proved to be too strong for them, and the mobs were soon dispersed, their leaders being promptly arrested and imprisoned.

At the same time it is necessary to observe

that amidst much distress efforts were not wanting to promote the well-being of the lower classes of the community; and while philanthropic endeavours were numerous and unremitting, attention was directed to the extension of education, not only for the "respectable" portion of the community, but among the neglected children of London and in the large manufacturing centres of the kingdom.

These efforts were greatly increased when the war was over, and the relief of distress went hand-in-hand with plans for establishing schools and providing means for regular instruction.

"The Ragged School movement," under the energetic direction of Lord Ashley (the Earl of Shaftesbury), had already become the most prominent, and in one sense the most important of these organizations; for it was designed to reach the very lowest class of the community, and to provide not only a degree of secular education but moral and religious training for the waifs and strays of the juvenile population. The very title, "ragged schools," had been adopted in order that there might be no mistake as to the class of children who were to be benefited; and happily there were found a number of devoted men and women who entered into the scheme with an enthusiasm which produced very remarkable results. Rooms were engaged in the lowest neighbourhoods; a regular society was established under the name of "The Ragged School Union;" and on Sundays as well as on week-days a multitude of destitute, ignorant, and often friendless boys and girls assembled in places to which they were attracted not only by many opportunities for instruction but by provisions for their physical wants. School treats in the shape of interesting lectures, illustrated by the magic lantern and preceded by substantial meals, were frequent attractions; various methods for relieving the little "Arabs" of the London streets were adopted; and eventually arrangements were made for finding employment for those who were old enough to become shoe-blacks, errand-boys, and street-sweepers. This beneficent system had begun to operate with happy effect before the time

of which we are now speaking. As early as 1842 the movement had been accelerated by an earnest band of young men and women, who saw that the only way to achieve an improvement in the condition of the most debased part of the community was to obtain a direct and immediate influence over children who were either utterly neglected or had been abandoned by their natural protectors, and were living in want, misery, and vice. The Ragged School Union had begun, in fact, to exercise a paternal interest in these little waifs and strays of society, and one of the earliest of these associations carried on its work in Field Lane, near Smithfield, once the known haunt of thieves and the receivers of stolen goods—a district historically notorious for the evil exploits of desperadoes whose fate was written in the Newgate Calendar. At the eighth annual meeting of the supporters of this school in 1850 the report stated that 320 children had been received into the school during the preceding twelve months; that the girls were well instructed in knitting and needlework, and that the boys would shortly be able to furnish shoes to the school at the cost price of the material. The collection and donations at the meeting amounted to £40. The sixth annual meeting of the Ragged School Union was held a fortnight afterwards at Exeter Hall, when Lord Ashley took the chair; and it was then stated that there were 94 schools in operation in London and the large towns, with 1350 teachers, the number of children in attendance being on week-days 5174, on week-evenings 5093, and on Sunday evenings 10,366. There were 156 paid teachers and 1200 scholars in industrial classes. The subscriptions had increased to £520, from £338 in the previous year, and the donations, without including an "emigration fund" and a legacy of £1000, amounted to £1631.

There had been no more decided proofs of the great social advances of the nation than the number, variety, and extent of the charitable and benevolent efforts which had grown into established institutions. These, though they were necessarily impoverished by some diminution of their funds during the time of war and consequent depression, were still well

supported, as we have seen, and other beneficent organizations were temporarily formed to relieve the distress occasioned by the calamities of the war itself. Directly the pressure of the time was removed by the declaration of peace, much of the public rejoicing seemed to take the form of thank-offerings for the support of those charities which were directed to the alleviation of the condition of the poorest and most ignorant portion of the community, and various societies were formed for meeting the wants of those who were friendless and neglected. To date forward a little for the purpose of showing the rapid growth and influence of the Ragged School movement alone, we may notice as a comparison with the figures just given, that by the end of 1858 the committee of the Ragged School Union had in connection with them 137 Sunday-schools with 21,051 scholars, 110 day-schools with 14,827 scholars, 130 week-evening schools with 8662, making 377 schools with 44,540 scholars; but as most of the Sunday-scholars attended during the week, only the latter were reckoned as the real numbers, and the returns were therefore 23,000 children under week day and evening instruction. Lord Ashley, who had then become the Earl of Shaftesbury, was still at the head of the organization, and the working of the scheme was complete; arrangements having been made for the proper inspection and control of the schools, the provision of instructors for the day-schools,—the Sunday and some of the evening schools being conducted by voluntary teachers,—and even for assisting in getting employment for the older children, and for helping the parents by mothers' meetings, tea-meetings, Christmas treats, penny-banks, and other auxiliaries. The schools were for the "gutter children." No qualification was required but that of need, and when once the school had hold of these children it kept hold, unless the boy or girl wilfully broke away. In 1857 and 1858 nearly 4000 of these young fledglings had been reared and placed in situations; nine shoeblack brigades had been formed, and the three principal brigades, the Red, Yellow, and Blue, consisting of 190 lads, had in 1858 earned £3227, or about £17 each per annum. Other crossing-

sweeping brigades were afterwards formed; a class of boys who are now known as street orderlies, and employed in sweeping the roads. As numbers of these children were both houseless and destitute, fifteen refuges had been established, containing 538 inmates—boys or girls who had been wanderers, sleeping in the markets or under railway arches, and pilfering or begging to keep themselves from starvation. By one refuge, twenty-one boys (in one year) were saved from crime, and were started fairly in life; some entered the army, others the navy; others became servants, or obtained employment in city shops and warehouses. A boy, who, as early as 1848 went to Australia from one of the first refuges, sent £5 to the ragged school of which he had been a member, and in 1858, when a regular emigration scheme had been established, the matron took ten girls to Canada, placed them in service, returned and took twenty-five more. The clergy of all denominations took up the movement, for it was above and beyond sectarianism. The Rev. William Tyler of Mile End, a well-known Congregationalist minister, and the Rev. Hugh Allen, incumbent of St. Jude's, Whitechapel, were at that time among the foremost in the good work in the midst of that part of London where the dense mass of misery and ignorance demanded hearty unremitting effort; and they were well supported by an army of earnest helpers, who gave their time, and many of them their money, to the cause.

It may be said with truth that the Ragged School movement, then the supreme effort of "the Voluntary principle" in education, averted incalculable evils during the time that the people, or at all events the children of the people, were perishing for lack of knowledge, while a national scheme of instruction was prevented by the irreconcilable hostility of the various religious bodies; but it also rendered a national system of education eventually possible by showing that sectarian differences could be merged in the contest of a great work, and that even religious instruction could be imparted on a broad and recognized basis to children whose moral and intellectual needs, like their physical hunger, demanded bread

upon which all could feed. To them those doctrinal distinctions which were the causes of contention that had so long kept their souls hungry, were evidently inapplicable, and in relation to ragged schools the sects for the most part tacitly agreed to be unsectarian.

The Ragged School movement, as it was called, was not alone in the effort to provide the means of education and moral and religious instruction for poor and abandoned children. Other agencies were also at work, and it may very well be understood that earnest men of all shades of political opinion were deeply interested in their success. Mrs. Gladstone had long been associated with charitable efforts of a distinctly practical kind for the relief of distress and for the rescue and protection of friendless and homeless boys and girls; and Mr. Gladstone gave such institutions his aid, and was ready to advocate their claims when his onerous parliamentary duties permitted. It would take us beyond these limits to give a list, or a description, of the special objects of the large number of societies and organizations for relieving ignorance and distress which sprung up during the period. Numbers of them still exist, and successfully carry on largely increased work. We may, however, refer to one local effort to advance education which was afterwards destined to secure good results, and to lead to wider and more organized systems of instruction. The district lying between Saint Luke's and Barbican, including Whitecross Street, Golden Lane, and Chequer Alley, was, and is still in many respects, one of the worst and most poverty-stricken in London—a congeries of lanes, courts, and blind alleys, a puzzle map of crime and destitution, consisting of a large number of foul and wretched tenements inhabited by a dense population. Some efforts had been previously made by a few good women belonging to the Wesleyan Methodists to improve the moral condition of the people of the neighbourhood by holding religious meetings and endeavouring to establish schools and missions; but in 1854 the incumbent of the parish (St. Thomas Charterhouse), the Rev. William Rogers, ascertaining that there were in his district 2386 children of the lowest

class between the ages of 10 and 14 who did not attend any school whatever, addressed a letter to Lord John Russell, then president of the council, calling his attention to their wild condition and the unmixed poverty of the district. The result was that the Committee of Council on Education voted a grant of two-thirds of the expenses of erecting a new school for the special benefit of the poorest children in the district. In reliance upon this support a freehold site in Golden Lane was procured, and plans were prepared for a building containing three school-rooms, and capable of accommodating 1000 children. To obtain the remaining third part of the expense, viz. £2817, an appeal was made to the various public bodies and the friends of education in general. The stone of the building was laid by Mr. Gladstone in May, 1856, and his address on the occasion was significant, as showing how the subject should be regarded. Adverting to an observation made in the course of the proceedings by the Rev. Mr. Rogers, in reference to the relations between the west and east of London, he said he heartily wished that the great mine which that topic opened up was now, or ever had been, thoroughly worked, and that those who inhabited the western portion of the metropolis were alive to the immense responsibility which attached to them in reference to vast masses of the population of this city, who were as completely unknown to the inhabitants of the magnificent squares and streets of London as if they were not fellow-countrymen, or even fellow-Christians, and who might be better known if they inhabited the remotest quarters of the globe. He did not think it was recollected, but he took it to be undeniably true, that he who built a square or a street of palaces at the west end of London, not only virtually brought a class into existence, and adjacent streets filled with the dwellings of tradesmen, and other streets, more remote and more humble, filled with the dwellings of labourers, who waited upon those tradesmen, but likewise that the quarter of Belgravia filled the quarter of Bethnal Green; and that in the east of London the constant growth and progress of the population were

continually going on, not only contemporaneously with, but directly referable to and springing from the wealth of the population of the west, and all the numerous demands which that wealth created, fostered, and multiplied. They had sung, during the ceremony of that day, a psalm, in which it was said that "children and the fruit of the womb are an heritage and gift that cometh of the Lord." They knew those words were founded deep in the truths of the Divine Word. But there was no man who walked through the streets of London, and especially the more wretched parts of it, who did not feel that those words were a trial of his faith. When they considered what human nature was, and at what cost it had been redeemed—when they reflected what destinies were open to it—how many and great were its vicissitudes—and how severe were its temptations and its trials, it was terrible to think of the amount of labour that remained undischarged. And yet "children and the fruit of the womb are an heritage and gift that cometh of the Lord;" and, difficult though it might be, yet it was not impossible to carry home to the hearts and minds of men, and into the houses of every class of the community, the blessed and comforting consciousness of that truth, so that, instead of a trial of faith, it should, on the contrary, become the daily food and support of fathers and mothers, who, though it might be their lot to earn their bread—and perhaps scanty bread—by the labour of their hands and the sweat of their brows, might see their offspring growing up in the faith, fear, and love of God. He believed those who, with him, adhered to the principle that it was wise to draw payment from the labouring classes, so called, for the education of their children, were yet prepared to go along with the founders of this school when they were dealing with a class who were not called the labouring class,—by whom he meant, independent of their vocation, persons who had fixed abodes,—but with a floating sea of human life, in which were tossed up and down a huge mass of less fortunate beings, not inaptly termed "the Arabs of modern civilization"—great masses of energy and animal and mental life, but untamed and unreclaimed;

and he did not for a moment question the wisdom of the principle with which they threw open the doors of their school to that class of the population, and bade them come and receive freely the knowledge which they offered them. Mr. Rogers had in a jocular way observed that among other inducements to his undertaking this work, was the belief that he was to some extent laying the foundation of Christian eloquence in London, seeing that, dealing, as he would do, chiefly with the children of costermongers, he might go far to put an end to that coarse clamour which in this metropolis distracted the minds of those who had sermons to prepare, and prevented them producing efforts worthy of their theme. He (Mr. Gladstone) ventured to go one step beyond that, and say that he knew not why those schools should not lay the foundation of a great deal of other eloquence. He knew not why those ragged boys whom they caught in the street and sought to educate, should not themselves, under the hands of skilful workmen, become contributors to that Christian eloquence the extension of which they all desired. Mr. Rogers, in a pamphlet he had written, had referred to a day when it might fairly be proposed to connect this school with the hierarchy of schools above it, and had well remarked that "a child of this district would have an opportunity of acquiring a good sound practical education, without being a burden to his parents; and, if found worthy to be draughted off to Dulwich College, in accordance with the will and intentions of Alleyn, the universities would be open to him; and who knows whether, at some future time, a denizen of this poor, despised, and degraded district of St. Thomas Charterhouse might not mount the woolsack or fill the see of Canterbury?" Such things had happened before now, and might occur again. In this free country the paths of preferment were open to all. It might be said that every man had "a clear stage and no favour." Many of those who had filled the see of Canterbury had been enabled to point to the lowliness of their origin. The church, even in the worst possible times, had been ever ready to befriend the virtuous and the learned. There was no period when

it had not been the privilege and the hope of the poor to rise to eminence by meritorious labours in her service. He hoped that it would never be otherwise, and that the path of the priesthood, adorned at that moment by so many conspicuous examples of piety and learning, would ever be the path in which man might gratify his natural tendency to expand his energies and bestow benefits on his fellow-creatures.

It may be mentioned here that the Rev. William Rogers, who afterwards became, and while these words are being written is still, the rector of Bishopsgate, made no mere fanciful allusion when he spoke of the connection of such schools with the higher educational institutions of the country. He has lived not only to see scholarships for the higher institutions become a recognized distinction for the poorest class of children who receive primary instruction in board schools, but has assisted, by his personal influence and indefatigable exertions, in the cause of popular education, both to extend the advantages of Dulwich College, and to establish several schools of a high character for the value of their teaching, perhaps the most important being that of the Middle Class Schools Corporation, occupying a large building in Cowper Street, City Road (near his old district), where from 1000 to 1200 boys receive a sound and complete education under the direction of competent masters.

In all the efforts which were made for the improvement of the condition of the people Prince Albert took an earnest and active part. Not only was he occupied in the endeavour to establish schools and museums of science and art, that the mechanic and the labourer might acquire a knowledge both of things outside their daily occupation and of the principles and construction of the machinery amidst which so much of their time was passed; but he took a genuine interest in the humble efforts of his Windsor labourers to master the art of writing, and himself examined their copy-books. He early saw that the rapid overgrowth of our great cities, where the want of home comforts and of wholesome recreation for the labouring classes was rapidly developing vice, disease,

and discontent to an alarming extent, was a problem which, if not effectively dealt with, must in the end become fatal to the habits and physical development of the people, and even dangerous to the state. The magnitude of the difficulties which surrounded this subject was not with him, as it is with many, a reason for doing nothing. He was among the first to show what could be effected in the way of improving the dwellings of the working-classes, not only by the cottages built upon the royal estates at Osborne and Balmoral, but by model lodging-houses erected in the metropolis itself. It was his conviction that, under a proper system, these would pay, and indeed that they must be made to pay, otherwise no permanent improvement could be established anywhere, and still less could any wide measure of progressive amelioration be hoped for. On mere philanthropy the prince was not disposed to lean; but he believed that a mighty change would be initiated if men of kind hearts and sound business heads could be persuaded to invest their capital in providing on reasonable terms homes for the sons of labour, in which the decencies, at least, and the main comforts of domestic life might be within their reach. His views on this subject, regarded at first as somewhat Utopian, have since become accepted truisms. Many of the great employers of labour throughout the country have proved to their own satisfaction the prince's favourite axiom, that the capital sunk in good houses for those who work for them would prove an excellent investment in itself, while at the same time it secured them better workmen and better work. And the success which has attended the building of some of the "model dwellings" and houses for the working-classes in London and other large cities has at all events kept the subject alive, and still calls attention to the necessity for finding remedies for the want of sanitary arrangements in overcrowded neighbourhoods, and the necessity for providing for tenants evicted in order to carry on what are called metropolitan improvements.

Another subject of the greatest interest to the prince was the everyday amusements of the people. That in this country these are

too often of a debasing kind is obviously less the fault of the people themselves than of the fact that they are driven to seek in the public-house and the tavern the light, the warmth, the companionship, and the recreation which are not readily to be found elsewhere. How to enable the labourer to dispose of his leisure pleasantly and rationally is a problem of which even now people generally are little more than beginning to seek the solution. Mechanics' institutes, reading-rooms, and public libraries go but a small way to meet the exigencies of the case, and these indeed are only possible in the great centres of population. Something of a much simpler kind the prince felt to be required; some place where the cheerfulness of the public-house could be provided without its drawbacks. The idea has recently been developed into those working-men's clubs and coffee palaces which have been established in many quarters with excellent effect. But so far back as 1857 the idea had been started, and advocated by several philanthropically-minded men, and it was then designed to provide places in which the labouring classes might spend their leisure, men and women meeting together for sober social enjoyment. In discussing the possible establishment of such a place the prince said it should be a reformed public-house. He quite agreed that there should be smoking, but did not agree that it need be in a separate room. He said that it was most important that *the wife and family should come there*, as well as the labourer himself. The women of England were excellent wives and mothers. Now they had to do their best to keep their husbands from the public-houses; with such an institution they might encourage them to go there and go with them. As to the mingling of class with class, he doubted whether it could be carried out. The lower classes would always feel a restraint in the presence of the higher classes.

The part taken by Prince Albert in the opening ceremony of the Manchester Exhibition in 1857 was another opportunity for expressing his deep interest in everything calculated to raise and elevate the nation, and the same desire was manifested by the part he took in an educational conference held

at Willis' Rooms, over the deliberations of which he presided, and by doing so obtained for the important subject which the conference assembled to discuss, a degree of attention that it would not otherwise have secured.

"We find," said the prince, "on the one hand the wish to see secular and religious instruction separated, and the former recognized as an intimate and inherent right to which each member of society has a claim, and which ought not to be denied to him if he refuses to take along with it the inculcation of a particular dogma, to which he objects as unsound; while we see on the other hand the doctrine asserted that no education can be sound which does not rest on religious instruction, and that religious truth is too sacred to be modified and tampered with, even in its minutest deductions, for the sake of procuring a general agreement."

A burst of loud assenting cheers here showed that the latter part of this statement expressed the views and opinions of the great majority of those present.

"Gentlemen," proceeded the prince, "if these differences were to have been discussed here to-day I should not have been able to respond to your invitation to take the chair, as I should have thought it inconsistent with the position which I occupy, and with the duty I owe to the queen and the country at large. I see those here before me who have taken a leading part in these important discussions; and I am happy to meet them on a neutral ground, happy to find that there is a neutral ground on which their varied talents and abilities can be brought to bear in communion upon the common object, and proud and grateful to them that they should have allowed me to preside over them, for the purpose of working together in the common vineyard. I feel that the greatest benefit must arise to the cause we have all so much at heart by the mere free exchange of your thoughts and various experience. You may well be proud, gentlemen, of the results achieved by your rival efforts, and may point to the fact that since the beginning of the century, while the population has doubled itself, the number of schools, both public and private, has been

multiplied fourteen times. In 1801 there were in England and Wales of public schools, 2876; of private schools, 487; total, 3363. In 1851, the year of the census, there were in England and Wales of public schools, 15,518; of private schools, 30,524; total, 46,042. Giving instruction in all to 2,144,378 scholars, of whom 1,422,982 belong to public schools. The rate of progress is farther illustrated by statistics, which show that in 1818 the proportion of day-scholars to the population was one in seventeen, in 1833 one in eleven, and in 1851 one in eight. These are great results, although I hope that they may be received as instalments of what has yet to be done. But what must be your feelings when you reflect on the fact, the inquiry into which has brought us together, that this great boon thus obtained for the mass of the people, and which is freely offered to them, should have been only partially accepted, and upon the whole so insufficiently applied as to render it almost valueless? We are told that the total population in England and Wales of children between the ages of three and fifteen being estimated at 4,908,696, only 2,046,848 attend school at all, while 2,861,848 receive no instruction whatever. At the same time, an analysis of the scholars with reference to the length of time allowed for their school tuition shows that 45 per cent of them have been at school less than one year, 22 per cent during one year, 15 per cent during two years, 9 per cent during three years, 5 per cent during four years, and 4 per cent during five years. Therefore out of the 2,046,848 scholars alluded to, about 1,500,000 remain only two years at school. I leave it to you to judge what the results of such an education can be. I find farther, that of these 2,000,000 children who attend school, only about 600,000 are of the age of nine. Gentlemen, these are startling facts, which render it evident that no extension of the means of education will be of any avail unless this evil, which lies at the root of the whole question, be removed, and that it is high time that the country should become thoroughly awake to its existence, and prepared to meet it energetically. To impress this upon the public mind is the object of our conference. Public

opinion is the powerful lever which in these days moves a people for good and for evil; and to public opinion we must therefore appeal if we would achieve any lasting or beneficial result. You, gentlemen, will greatly add to the services which you have already rendered to this noble cause if you will prepare public opinion by your inquiry into this state of things, and by your discussing in your sections the causes of it as well as the remedies that may lie within your reach. This will be no easy matter; but even if your labours should not result in the adoption of any immediate practical steps, you will have done great good in preparing for them. It will probably happen that in this instance, as in most others, the cause that produces the evil will be more easily detected than its remedy; and yet a just appreciation of the former must ever be the first and essential condition of the discovery of the latter. You will probably trace the cause of our social condition to a state of ignorance and lethargic indifference on the subject among the parents generally; but the root of the evil will, I suspect, also be found to extend into that field upon which the political economist exercises his activity—I mean the labour market, demand and supply. To dissipate that ignorance and rouse from that lethargy may be difficult; but with the united and earnest efforts of all who are the friends of the working-classes it ought, after all, to be only a question of time. What measures can be brought to bear on the other root of the evil is a more delicate question, and will require the nicest care in handling; for there you cut into the very quick of the working-man's condition. His children are not only his offspring, to be reared for a future independent position, but they constitute a part of his productive power, and work with him for the staff of life. The daughters especially are the handmaids of the house, the assistants of the mother, the nurses of the younger children, the aged, the sick. To deprive the labouring family of their help would be almost to paralyse its domestic existence. On the other hand, carefully collected statistics reveal to us the fact, that while 600,000 children between the ages of three and fifteen are

absent from school, but known to be employed, no less than 2,200,000 are not at school whose absence cannot be traced to any ascertained employment or other legitimate cause. You will have to work, then, on the minds and hearts of the parents; to place before them the irreparable mischief which they inflict on those who are intrusted to their care by keeping them from the light of knowledge; to bring home to their convictions that it is their duty to exert themselves for their children's education; bearing in mind, at the same time that it is not only their most sacred duty, but also their highest privilege. Unless they work with you, your work, our work, will be vain; but you will not fail, I feel sure, in obtaining their co-operation if you remind them of their duty to their God and Creator."

The business of the meeting having been thus inaugurated was distributed amongst five sections, by which different departments of the general subject of education were discussed.

Cobden's warnings were not altogether realized, for peace was proclaimed before the distress which had begun to spread through the country had become unendurable; but at the same time there was much want, and trade in general was in a very depressed condition. The budget had, it is true, made immediate provision for the reduction of the income-tax from 16*d.* to 7*d.*, the amount at which it had first been placed by Sir Robert Peel, and at which it was now intended that it should remain for only three years, in an effort to carry out Mr. Gladstone's policy, when he was chancellor of the exchequer and had decreed its abolition by the end of 1860. The total revenue was estimated at £66,365,000, leaving a surplus over expenditure of £891,000; the total amount of remission of taxation was £11,971,000, and it was calculated that the entire debt of £40,000,000, arising out of the Crimean war, would be extinguished in twenty years. This was the budget which had been brought forward by Sir G. C. Lewis before the dissolution on the Chinese question, and on the whole it was a proof of the increasing prosperity of the country in spite of periods of depression and the distress and gnawing

discontent which had been as usual the reaction after the war-fever. Mr. Disraeli, who spoke of Mr. Gladstone's "wise" proposals for the abolition of the income-tax, moved that it would be expedient, before sanctioning the financial arrangements for the ensuing year, to adjust the estimated income and expenditure in a manner best calculated to secure the country against a deficiency in the years 1858-59 and 1859-60, and to provide for such a balance of revenue and charge respectively, in the year 1860 as might place it in the power of parliament at that period, without embarrassment to the finances, altogether to remit the income-tax. This motion was energetically supported by Mr. Gladstone, who declared that no man could be more deeply interested in the budget scheme than himself, for it concerned a plan in every part contradictory to that which he had proposed, and which had been adopted by the present House of Commons. Successive administrations had aimed at the consolidation and simplification of the financial laws, but the chancellor of the exchequer had condemned the labours of parliament for the last fifteen years. The income-tax, though grievous and inquisitorial, had been introduced to purchase blessings to be wrought out for the mass of the people through its instrumentality. But with what beneficial changes was it proposed now to associate this tax? There was an idea that this year there would be a remission of taxation to the extent of £11,970,000; but omitting war taxes to the amount of £4,470,000—with the cessation of which the government could not be credited—the remission of the income-tax in 1857-58 would be only £4,600,000. Against this sum was to be set £1,400,000 to be laid upon tea and sugar; so that the real amount of taxes remitted in 1857-58 would be only a little over £3,000,000; nor was he satisfied that the supposed surplus of £891,000 would be *bonâ fide* applicable. Mr. Gladstone insisted upon the obligation of parliament to adhere to the stipulation entered into with the country respecting the income-tax. The first grave and main defect in the proposed budget was that it was based upon an excessive expenditure, and at the proper time he should move that the estimates of

expenditure be revised and further reduced. Six millions had been added to the expenditure of the country in four years, quite apart from the war—a fact which suggested most serious reflections. The chancellor of the exchequer had taken the expenditure of 1853-54 as that of 1858-59, which Mr. Gladstone treated as a pure delusion, calculating that the expenditure of the latter year would exceed that of 1857-58, and that the real wants of the public service were likely to increase.

Mr. Gladstone urgently denounced the increase of duties on tea and sugar, and said, "In Sir Robert Peel's time you were called upon to remit £1,400,000 of indirect taxes, now you are called on to impose indirect taxes to that amount; then you were called on to fill up a deficiency at your own cost, now you are called on to create a deficiency at the cost of others; you were then called upon to take a burden on yourselves to relieve the great mass of your fellow-countrymen, now you are called upon to take a burden off the shoulders of the wealthier classes in order that you may impose indirect taxes upon the tea and sugar which are consumed by every labouring family in the country. I can only say that, for my own part, I entertain on this subject a most decided opinion, and nothing shall induce me to refrain from giving every constitutional opposition in my power to such a proposition."

Mr. Disraeli's resolution was lost, and it is a significant indication of the confusion of parties at that time, that Messrs. Milner Gibson, Cobden, and Sidney Herbert supported the ministry, Sir James Graham voting with Mr. Gladstone.

Subsequently the subject of the duty on tea and sugar was again brought forward, and some modification of the proposed tax was effected; and though Mr. Gladstone, on the debate on the estimates, brought forward a resolution in favour of the reduction of expenditure, he did not carry it to a division.

That the country was in a condition of commercial depression soon became evident. In the month of November, 1857, the pressure became so severe that there was a crisis in which failures of banking companies and large private undertakings followed each other with

alarming rapidity. Among these were the Liverpool Borough Bank, with liabilities of £5,000,000. The Northumberland and Durham £3,000,000, and the Wolverhampton £1,000,000; while two of the largest private failures were: Sanderson, Sandeman, and Co. for £5,298,997, and Dennistoun and Co. for £2,143,701. From the statement of affairs made by 146 firms and five banks, the total liabilities were something like $41\frac{1}{2}$ millions, and the deficiency at $7\frac{3}{4}$ millions. On the 8th of October the bank rate of discount had stood at $5\frac{1}{2}$ per cent and was then raised to 6, on the 12th it rose again to 7 and the funds fell $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent, on the 19th, discount was 8 per cent, and on the 4th of November had advanced to the unprecedented figure of 9 per cent. On the 11th the bullion in the Bank had diminished to £7,171,000; while the notes in circulation, and the liabilities of the Bank on private deposits and securities, amounted to £60,000,000, the applications for discount being greater than at any former period, and the demand for gold for county banks large and continuous. On November the 18th, when the accounts were made up, there were in the Bank, notes and gold to the value of £1,462,153; while the deposits that might at any time be drawn out amounted to £18,248,003. On the following day the liabilities of the Bank were upwards of £4,000,000 more than they had been in the preceding July, while its available resources were above £4,000,000 less than they had been at that time. This state of affairs, combined with the failures of private banks and large firms principally connected with the American trade, made some immediate measure necessary, and it was determined to suspend the Bank Charter Act of 1844 by which the issue of notes was restricted. It was overriding an act of the legislature, and the government called a short extra session of parliament that they might be indemnified for their action, but it was a necessary exercise of illegality, and achieved the desired result. The issue department of the Bank issued to the banking department £2,000,000 in excess of the amount permitted by the statute, and the latter department issued to the public only £928,000 in excess, that being found sufficient. On the 1st

of December the over-issue was entirely returned, and public confidence was greatly restored by the relief granted, and by the announcement that parliament would meet at an early date to consider the financial condition of the country.

The commercial condition of the country was disturbed, and had become alarming. Industrial prospects had not for some time been such as to reassure those who were engaged in them. There had been much distress among the labouring population, and as we have seen there were some attempts on the part of a few lawless fellows, who themselves did not belong to the industrious class, to instigate riots, which were quickly suppressed. There were few political disturbances, however. Chartism, and much that belonged to it, appeared to have been merged in more constitutional and legal endeavours to obtain reforms in parliament, and in the laws affecting the social condition of the people. Political meetings were held, and they were sometimes turbulent, but they were no longer attended with public disturbances of a political character. Two years earlier, many changes had taken place in regard to those demonstrations to which reference has been made in a previous page. These changes had been signalized by the confession of Charles Kingsley, who, in a letter to his friend Mr. Ludlow, spoke in his frank, earnest, characteristic way of his own unfitness for a reforming leader at the time that he was so prominent,—but we may venture to think not practically and permanently influential—in that Christian socialist movement of which the theories are somewhat vaguely indicated in *Alton Locke*, *Yeast*, and *Parson Lot*.

“For myself,” he says, “on looking back, I see clearly with shame and sorrow that the obloquy which I have brought often on myself and on the good cause has been almost all of it my own fault—that I have given the devil and bad men a handle, not by caring what people would say, but by *not caring*; by fancying that I was a very grand fellow, who was going to speak what I knew to be true, in spite of all fools (and really did and do intend so to do), while all the while I was deceiving myself, and unaware of a canker at

the heart the very opposite to the one against which you warn me—I mean the proud, self-willed, self-conceited spirit which made no allowance for other men's weakness or ignorance; nor, again, for their superior experience and wisdom on points which I had never considered—which took a pride in shocking, and startling, and defying, and hitting as hard as I could, and fancied, blasphemously, as I think, that the Word of God had come to me only, and went out from me only. God forgive me for these sins, as well as for my sins in the opposite direction; but for these sins especially, because I see them to be darker and more dangerous than the others."

This was in 1855, and he was perhaps harder upon himself than he need have been, in consequence of seeing how little he had directly effected in relation to the result, to which he had at one time looked forward with some eagerness. But he appears not to have estimated the indirect effect which his books and speaking, as well as the utterances of some others of the school of Mr. Maurice, had produced upon the general "view" of those outside political Chartism and Socialism, but well within the influences which tend to foster the recognition of a common brotherhood among men, to promote principles calculated to increase manly independence among the labouring classes, and to lead them into a higher and purer atmosphere of thought and brotherhood. Kingsley's Christian socialism had some resemblance to its precursor, the Young Englandism of which Mr. Disraeli was an exponent in earlier days, but it had this essential difference—that instead of its being founded on the union of the agricultural population and a condescending aristocracy, it was to rest on the union of the working-classes with the church, and this made all the world of difference when we remember that by the church, Kingsley meant "the Christian ideal of the church," which, whatever may have been his conception of it in some minor respects, undoubtedly meant infinitely more than the Church of England merely "as by law established." Even in the hot political period Kingsley could not refrain from declaring that the Charter was founded on "the mistake of fancying that legislative

reform is social reform, or that men's hearts can be changed by act of parliament." In fact Kingsley's books and many of his sermons had an immediate and also a lasting influence, but that influence appears not to have been in the direction which he at the time expected. They set men thinking of truths related to the social questions which they professed to discuss, but did not lead to the political solutions of the social puzzles of the day. His deep and noble moral and spiritual convictions were uttered to the hearts of his readers, and were weighty enough to overbear and make comparatively harmless the errors of his political judgment, as many people may experience who open *Alton Locke* and read it, now that the tumult and the conflict of the period to which it refers have passed away and are almost forgotten.

There had been, it is true, a semi-political demonstration in 1855, which was known as the Hyde Park Riot, but this was a rough protest against a bill proposed by Lord R. Grosvenor for the purpose of suppressing Sunday trading, a measure containing clauses which would altogether have prohibited the poorer portion of the community from obtaining articles of necessary consumption during Sunday, while it of course did nothing to put an end to every kind of indulgence by the more wealthy class. The introduction of a bill which would at once prevent the costermonger, the tobacconist, the publican, and the itinerant vendor of fish or fruit from selling their wares during any part of the Sunday, would in itself have met with strenuous opposition, for it was customary for the lower section of the people to purchase much of the provision for the day on the morning of the day itself; and this was too often made necessary because of the late hour at which wages were usually paid on the Saturday, before the establishment of the Saturday half-holiday. But in addition to this, the clauses of the bill were particularly irritating, as they inevitably provoked comparison between the condition of those who, though they possessed ample larders and well-stocked cellars, were not prohibited on Sundays from attending their clubs, where they could obtain all

kinds of refreshment, and summon attendants at their will; and that of the labouring population, who, after a week's hard work, were to be precluded from indulging in their small Sunday luxuries, unless they had purchased them on the previous day. The bill, as it was proposed, provoked wide-spread and bitter opposition, and in London "the masses,"—as it had some time past become the fashion to call the labouring population,—took a remarkable method of showing their displeasure. The demonstration took place on Sunday, the 24th of June, 1855.

A few days previously, placards had been displayed throughout the metropolis, inviting the working-classes and others to attend in Hyde Park on Sunday afternoon to see "how the aristocracy observed the Sabbath." In obedience to this call several thousand persons had assembled in the park between two and three o'clock on Sunday. A great number of policemen were distributed throughout the park, but did not interfere with the free movement of the persons assembled, a large majority of whom appeared to be of the better class of artisans, accompanied, in numberless instances, by their wives and families. The equestrian ride in Rotten Row was totally deserted, but soon after three o'clock a variety of carriages began to make their appearance in the drive running along the right bank of the Serpentine. The vast crowd at once took up a position on each side of the road, extending from the Achilles statue to the Serpentine Bridge; and as each carriage passed along, indulged in loud hissing and groaning, accompanied by deafening cries of "Go to church!" "Why do you allow your servants to work on Sunday?" "Shame on you!" "Down with the Sabbatarians!" "Away with the Sunday Bill." In one carriage a lady stood up and held in her hand a prayer-book, but the only effect it had on the crowd was to make them shout out, "Walk, walk, and let your horses rest and your coachman go to church!" Lord and Lady Wilton, Lady Granville, and several others of the nobility and gentry, were obliged to leave their carriages at the demand of the multitude. In the majority of instances the occupants of the

carriages did not venture to return down the ride, but went home by another route. A great number of the members of the legislature were present looking on. The crowd remained until nearly eight o'clock, but afterwards joined other mobs in some of the fashionable squares, where, as well as in the roads leading to these quarters, they did some mischief.

The opposition to the bill was upheld by the *Times*, in which a correspondent wrote:—"After all, one cannot wonder at such popular ebullitions and demonstrations—nor can we prevent this ratiocinative process of 'the million'—hasty, harsh, and presumptuous though it may be—when we witness, on one hand, the perpetual attempts of the legislature to torture the poor into an observance of the Sabbath, and notice, on the other hand, the unfettered enjoyment by the rich, of comforts and liberties, on the very same day. Thus, for instance, after leaving the park I called at my club, and, at a time when not a poor wretch in the metropolis might purchase a drop of beer, I obtained for myself whatever liquid refreshment I fancied, and found other gentlemen similarly engaged and similarly privileged. Two minutes afterwards a bishop's carriage, drawn by a pair of well-groomed horses, driven and guarded by coachman and footmen in elegant liveries, and conveying two reverend gentlemen (who might, for aught I know, have this very day preached from the text 'Thou shalt keep holy the Sabbath-day'), dashed by the door of the club, and I really could not help feeling that, after all, the park demonstration was neither unaccountable nor unnatural, seeing that both Sunday trading and Sunday labour are practised with impunity by the bishops themselves, and that Lord Robert Grosvenor's bill does not contain a clause which will, in the remotest degree, interfere with the Sabbath enjoyments of the rich."

On the following Sunday the police mustered in force, but were distributed, and, to a great extent, were concealed from the immense crowd which again assembled. It had been decided to endeavour to quell the demonstrations by force, and there was ample oppor-

tunity. Those who were responsible for the attempt appeared either not to perceive, or not to care, that they were thus emphasizing the injustice of class legislation contemplated by the bill. Again to quote from the *Times*:—"Carriages were admitted to the drive; and when the hooting began the police rushed out from their ambuscades, and made unsparing use of their truncheons on every person within their reach. So vigorous was their onset that the people were driven about in all directions, the constables pursuing and hitting away right and left. By a very clever manœuvre, for which the very highest credit is due to the gallant constable in command at that particular point, a portion of the crowd was driven into the Serpentine. To avoid the truncheons, some of the baffled foe, as is reported to us, absolutely took to the water, and endeavoured by swimming to gain the opposite bank. But no resource is unknown to British valour. The police had boats at their service, and the fierce creatures were brought back in triumph to the shore. Need we say that the police were victorious in this hotly-contested affair?"

Of course the conduct of the mob cannot be defended, but the whole proceedings showed that a grave error had been committed, and the conduct of the police on the side of aristocracy, as well as on that of "law and order," was seriously condemned, and led to a hot discussion in parliament. But the mover and supporter of the bill, alarmed at the storm they had raised, or tardily convinced of the just unpopularity of the measure, hurriedly withdrew it, though not in time to prevent a repetition of the riots on the following Sunday. It was well that the bill had been withdrawn before defiance was provoked still further by some words which were used during the debate by Mr. Dundas, who declared that he had never seen greater forbearance or moderation exercised on any occasion than that exercised by the police. This was in face of a demand for a committee of inquiry into the alleged outrages on the people. Petitions for this inquiry were presented to the House by Mr. Duncombe, who was still a popular "tribune." He said he had been requested to present those petitions, and to make those

statements, all of which could be proved before a select committee, for which he would move, for the sake of the peace and tranquillity of the town on the following Sunday. If the statements he had made were incorrect, the home secretary could refute them; but he was prepared to prove them. Having read some letters from parties describing the violence of the police, the hon. gentleman repeated that something must be done before Sunday if the government wished the peace to be preserved. The people would be satisfied with a committee of inquiry, but they certainly would not remain content if the matter were to be hushed up. The bill had been withdrawn; but who was compromised by that proceeding? Why, the House of Commons. He was told that the people were determined to go to Hyde Park on the following Sunday, unless inquiry were granted, in great numbers, and to go armed. If they had been armed on the previous Sunday there would certainly have been loss of life. In conclusion, he asserted that either inquiry must be granted or the park must be closed on Sunday.

The action of the authorities had in fact aroused a riotous temper, which it would be exceedingly difficult to quell; but on the other hand inflammatory speeches and articles levelled against the Sunday Bill, and defending the position assumed by the populace, had the effect of promoting further acts of hostility.

A dense crowd of persons assembled before the police court, Marlborough Street, at an early hour on the Monday morning, to learn the result of the complaints against about seventy persons taken into custody on the Sunday. When Mr. Hardwick, the sitting magistrate, made his appearance in the street, for the purpose of taking his seat on the bench, the mob began some to cheer and some to hoot. Several persons cried out, "Act with justice!" and one person flung a stone, which, however, missed the magistrate, and struck a person near him. Mr. Hardwick having entered the court was in the act of passing one of the windows, when a stone was flung from the street which broke a pane of glass, but did no further damage. The magistrate, who bore

these attacks with unruffled temper, intimated to the inspector that if the persons outside persevered in their disorderly conduct he would procure the assistance of a sufficient civil force, and cause the street and avenues of the court to be cleared. A pause of three hours took place in consequence of the doubt which existed as to the home office allowing the charges to be heard at that court, power being vested in the government of removing charges to Bow Street, to be heard there. This power had been several times exercised with reference to cases arising within the jurisdiction of the court, and always with great inconvenience to all parties—prosecutors, witnesses, and prisoners. About two o'clock a serious conflict happened between the police and the continually-increasing crowd outside. A newly macadamized road offered facilities to the mob to revenge themselves on the police, and of this they availed themselves when the information was conveyed to them that the prisoners were still locked up. The constables drew their truncheons upon their assailants, and drove them back with tremendous force into the narrow streets and lanes in the neighbourhood of the court. The conflict was short, sharp, and decisive. The police were the victors; and after a short time succeeded in conveying several of their opponents to the station-house to be added to the number with whom the magistrate had to deal. An additional body of police then made their appearance in front of the court, and began to clear away the mob that had assembled, when they were received with yells, groans, and other marks of disapprobation. The constables again freely used their truncheons, and at last drove the people back, none being allowed to remain in front of the court. Another long delay took place, during which there were several communications between the treasury and the magistrate, while a continual series of conflicts was kept up between the police and the crowd. After a good deal of discussion between Mr. Hardwick and Mr. Ballantine, who appeared on behalf of a number of the prisoners, they were nearly all allowed to go out on their own recognizances to appear next day. On Tuesday the cases were resumed.

The offences were thus stated: eleven for being riotous; twenty-one for throwing stones; ten for assaults upon the police; five for being riotous and obstructing the police; three for attempting to pick pockets. The other prisoners were unconditionally discharged at a late hour on Tuesday night. Mr. Clarkson, on the part of the government, intimated the withdrawal of the charges against persons charged simply with riot. The others were dealt with simply as police cases. Preston, the first prisoner, a gentlemanly young man, was charged with throwing a stone at the police, which he denied. The magistrates sentenced him to a fine of ten shillings or a week's imprisonment. This was a sample of the whole of the cases, all of which were visited with similar punishment. Some of the prisoners acknowledged the charges against them, but pleaded the great excitement.

The police of course acted under orders, and though they probably exceeded their duty, their position was a difficult one. Public sympathy with the rioters was mainly occasioned by the violent language as well as the riotous proceedings employed by some of the supporters of the bill, who saw an opportunity to pronounce in favour of measures of suppression. The disturbances might have become very serious, especially as an attempt was made to concentrate a large mob upon Grosvenor House and the adjoining gardens. A large number of windows were broken, and valuable articles of furniture destroyed or injured by the stones flung by the crowd; the police-constables who attempted to interfere were assaulted, and there were symptoms of a serious outbreak. Among those who, with some difficulty, got clear of the crowd, was Lord Palmerston, who was on horseback, and who mistook, or affected to mistake, the cries of the mob for cheering, and raised his hat. He rode down a side street and so got clear, but his groom, whose horse was more easily frightened, had much trouble to escape. Lord Brougham also sat in his carriage calmly smiling, but the coachman had hard work to control the restive horses. The whole mutual attitude was a mistake, since the frequenters of the Drive and Rotten Row were not for the

most part persons who desired to abridge the comforts or the conveniences of the labouring classes, or who supported the proposed bill against all Sunday trading. On the other hand it is exceedingly doubtful whether the great majority of those who, after the first demonstration, assembled to perpetrate outrages, really represented the people who would have been most affected by the inconveniences attending such a measure. Mr. Dundas, however, used language which may be said to have represented to excess that hard, irritating protest which is always potent to arouse popular indignation. He declared that the mob consisted chiefly of boys and young men under twenty, who leaned over the iron rails and screeched at every carriage which went past, and showed intense delight when they frightened a spirited horse and endangered the lives of those in the carriage. He said he saw the police endeavour to drive back "this *canaille*" with "the greatest moderation," and that "these rascally boys ought to have been more severely dealt with." Mr. Dundas seemed to grow into indignation as he proceeded, and in reply to Mr. Duncombe's suggestion said, "So we are threatened with another disturbance next Sunday, and it is said that men will come armed to oppose the police. I hope the honourable gentleman, the secretary of state for the home office, will take the strongest measures to prevent such a collision. Prevention is at all times better than cure, and I would remind the right honourable baronet that nothing will frighten a mob more than the crash on the pavement of the trail of a six-pounder." It was a foolish speech, not having the merit of being quite original, and was also an anachronism. The rumour of a similar remark in the old turbulent days when Wellington was opposed to the riotous demonstrations made under the name of reform, aroused furious passions and embittered the contest; but this later rendering was received with no more indignation than contempt. The time had gone by for six-pounders. The bill was withdrawn, and the promised commission of inquiry came to nothing. If the promoters of the Hyde Park outrages had continued to assemble and to

repeat the disorders, public feeling would at once have turned against them. The Sunday Trading Bill was abandoned, and the "Sunday Beer Bill," as it was called, which ordained the refusal of publicans to serve refreshments on Sunday mornings to any persons who were not "*bona fide* travellers" at a distance from their homes, soon occupied attention. The decision of what constituted a *bona fide* traveller having become a standing jest, led to the discussion of the bill itself with a certain amount of good humour, which was increased by the perception that an honest endeavour to diminish the sale of liquor, and during a large part of the Sunday to close the places where it was obtained, was intended as an effort on behalf of public decency and sobriety.

It will not be out of place in direct relation to these topics, to consider what was still the condition (and it would be well if we could add, that it has now entirely ceased to be the condition) of some of the districts in which the people of London were compelled to live; and what were the provisions made for securing them against fraudulent tampering with their food and drink by unscrupulous adulteration.

The name of Dr. Letheby must be familiar to numbers of readers, for at the time which we are now considering, it was identified with those important decisions depending on the skilful analyst and the possessor of medical knowledge which can be immediately made available for the public service.

The homes and physical condition of the poor in some of the worst neighbourhoods had of necessity excited public comment when sanitary matters had occupied the attention of parliament, and for the sake of the general health and safety it was deemed necessary that some detailed inquiry should be made into the best means of dealing with the filthy slums which were the disgrace of London and some of the large manufacturing towns of the kingdom. During the cholera epidemic, and on many occasions when the increase of fever, small-pox, and other infectious diseases caused a temporary panic, the subject had been ur-

gently brought forward, and, as we have seen, the legislature had passed measures authorizing inspection and ordering certain provisions to be made for remedying some of the evils complained of. But more stringent regulations were needed. It was known that in the eastern district of the metropolis whole neighbourhoods of filthy tenements remained without the most ordinary means for securing decency and cleanliness, and that in other parts of London similar places were to be found which became dangerous centres of disease and demoralization. It was to Dr. Letheby that the task of inquiring into the state of the foul neighbourhoods eastward was entrusted, and his report disclosed a condition so horrible that people began to wonder why the question had never been thoroughly investigated before. To a large majority of the inhabitants of the west-end, and to many persons who lived not far from the infected places, their existence was almost unknown, and demands for sanitary reform had been but faint and ineffectual. There were not sufficient means to enforce the provisions of the Acts of Parliament which related to sanitary improvements, in cases where the officials whose duty it was to apply them were ready to make things pleasant for the owners of such property. In many instances these infected overcrowded tenements belonged to the parochial representatives of that or a neighbouring district, against whom subordinate paid officers of health were unwilling to raise complaints.

The revelations made by Dr. Letheby were bad enough to arouse greater attention to the subject, for he gave the kind of details which were most likely to arrest attention. Of 2208 rooms which he visited, and which were the abodes of beggars, vagrants, thieves, and the class that comprises the criminals, the vicious, the idle, and the casual underpaid workers at miserable callings,—1989 contained 5791 inmates belonging to 1576 families. The members of various families were in many instances occupying the same room, regardless of all the common decencies of life, and where from three to five adults, men and women, besides a train of children, were accustomed to herd together like brute beasts or savages; where

all the offices of nature were performed in the most public and offensive manner, and where every human instinct of propriety and decency was smothered.

“Like my predecessor,” said Dr. Letheby, “I have seen grown persons of both sexes sleeping in common with their parents; brothers and sisters and cousins, and even the casual acquaintance of a day’s tramp, occupying the same bed of filthy rags or straw; a woman suffering in travail in the midst of males and females of different families that tenant the same room—where birth and death go hand in hand, where the child but newly born, the patient cast down with fever, and the corpse waiting for interment, have no separation from each other and from the rest of the inmates.” In one alley near Houndsditch he found a row of filthy and ruinous houses containing in all seventy-six rooms, letting at weekly rents of from fifteen pence to one and ninepence each, and inhabited by sixty-three families comprising 252 persons. In one room there were a man, two women, and two children, and the corpse of a girl who had died in child-birth a few days before still lay upon the bare ground without shroud or coffin. The place was a hotbed of horrible disease, and every adult male in the place had shortly before been attacked with fever.

Dr. Letheby determined to attempt a chemical analysis of the air, that he might see whether it contained some peculiar product of decomposition which rendered it so pestilential, and he found it not only deficient in oxygen, but with three times the usual proportion of carbonic acid, besides a quantity of aqueous vapour charged with alkaline matter having a loathsome stench, the product of putrefaction and of fetid exhalations. Such conditions were not peculiar to this one place. In the district near Whitecross Street, already referred to, similar abominations were to be found, and there were other areas of disease and filth in Shoreditch, Bethnal Green, Westminster, and Bloomsbury, while St. Giles’ and Seven Dials were partly destroyed, but the remnants of neither of them had been cleansed and purified. Not only the physical but the social and moral pestilence and degradation

arising from such dens were earnestly pointed out by Dr. Letheby; and in order to remedy them it was suggested that the registration of common lodging-houses should be enforced, and that the condition and number of their inmates should be under the control of the officers of health. It was also suggested that the metropolis should be brought under the authority of a single municipality elected by the ratepayers of the various districts. The first part of the proposed plan was adopted, and has since been enlarged; but for some years afterwards foul, ruinous, and pestilential tenements in the same districts continued to be crowded with human beings, nor has the operation of the legislature even yet been able to put an end to all the horrible abuses that were then disclosed. Something, but comparatively little, was done, until another fever epidemic some years afterwards once more emphatically called alarmed attention to the subject. Then, as we shall see, it again took a foremost place in the public regard, but with no commensurate result. Not in London alone, but in Manchester, Liverpool, Birmingham, Glasgow, Edinburgh, Dublin, and in most of the important towns of the kingdom, the same story had to be told in more or less revolting detail; and though London perhaps maintains an evil pre-eminence for the preservation of condemned districts, the wretched inhabitants of which, if evicted, could find no adequate provision for their shelter, and would endeavour to crowd as closely into the adjacent houses, it is one of the unhappy contingencies of so vast a capital, the local jurisdiction of which is divided among numerous incomplete if not incompetent bodies, that private or corporate interests should be found to have become so concentered as to take a very long time to demolish, even by the application of special laws and under the stimulus of repeated outcries for reasonable supplies of light and air and water, and the means of preserving ordinary decency.

In the following year, though comparatively little was done with regard to cleansing the foul places of the metropolis, where vice and misery assorted with pestilence and famine, another great work was undertaken. The Thames was no longer to be an open sewer. The almost tro-

pical heat of the summer of 1858 had caused sufficient evidence of the accumulating evils of the drainage of London into the river to reach the Houses of Parliament in a very practical form. The stench from the stream as it flowed past the palace of the legislature at Westminster was so abominable and alarming that it told the story in terms not to be lightly disregarded, and the result was the more prompt acceptance of Mr. Disraeli's proposal to bring in a bill for the main drainage of London. The work would cost at least £3,000,000, and it was to be provided for by the imposition of a special rate on the metropolis for the purpose of purifying the river and completing the system of main drainage, the money to be borrowed on the guarantee of the government, and repaid in forty years by annual instalments by means of a special rate of threepence in the pound, to be called the sewage rate. The work was to be completed in five years and a half, and the whole expenditure of the money and the completion of the scheme was intrusted to the Metropolitan Board of Works, which had been constituted under the Metropolitan Management Act of 1855.

An act ordering that the vaccination of children should be compulsory had passed in 1853 for England, though its provisions were not extended to Scotland till 1863; and doubtless it had been effectual in diminishing the dangers to be apprehended from epidemics of small-pox, which in former times had often been so fatal in their consequences. Unfortunately no adequate provision for enabling public vaccinators or private practitioners to obtain a proper supply of pure vaccine or lymph, accompanied the act, which has, therefore, continued to be less valuable than it might otherwise have become, especially as the assertion that the virus of diseases of a loathsome and dangerous type may be communicated by the use of vaccine matter taken from an impure source, has never been refuted.

The Society for Improving the Dwellings of the Industrial Classes, in which Lord Radstock, Lord Robert Grosvenor, Lord Ebrington, and other noblemen and gentlemen took an active part, and in relation to which Dr.

Southwood Smith had successfully investigated the condition of the poorer neighbourhoods, had already achieved much good work by the erection of dwellings with a good water supply and efficient drainage, and by promoting the enforcement of the Common Lodging-houses Act, which forbade overcrowding in lodging-houses, and directed the police to enforce the law; but nothing seemed effectual against the constant letting and sub-letting of dilapidated tenements, the owners of which kept in the background. The gin-shops in such neighbourhoods flourish, for they drive a roaring trade amidst a people who are glad to escape from the horrors of the places in which they live, that they may seek temporary forgetfulness amidst the brilliant lights and showy attractions of the tavern or the “palace” bar, where their scanty and ill-prepared food may be supplemented by ardent spirits or heavy beer. But at that time the food and drink consumed by them and their neighbours was found to be often grossly adulterated. This was generally understood, but people were not quite prepared for the revelations made by the *Lancet*, the leading medical and surgical paper, of which the well known Thomas Wakley, surgeon, member of parliament for Finsbury, and coroner for Middlesex, was editor. Both as member and as coroner Mr. Wakley had become famous for his bluntly outspoken opinions, and though he was a good deal disliked in some quarters, and often ridiculed in others, he was strong and determined enough to hold his own, and to make his voice heard on the subject of several abuses which he set himself to correct. The institution of an “Analytic Sanitary Commission” by the *Lancet* was one of the methods by which he attacked the system of adulteration, and the results of the investigation of this commission, which was under the superintendence of Dr. Arthur Hill Hassall, were rather startling. Week by week the public learned that almost every article of food and drink consumed at ordinary meals was probably subjected to adulteration before it reached them; and that the substances used were frequently in large proportions, and of a kind exceedingly injurious to health.

Not since 1820, when the famous book entitled *There's Death in the Pot*, by Frederick Accum, gave a shock to the public, had such disclosures been made, and the *Lancet* commission took a ready way to call the attention both of the sufferers and of the culprits themselves to the results of its inquiries. Dr. Hassall not only went out and about, purchasing samples of all kinds of produce in different neighbourhoods, and afterwards subjecting them to analyses and to searching investigation by the microscope, but the details of his discoveries were published week by week along with the names and addresses of the dealers from whom the articles had been obtained.

There can be little doubt that many of the requisites of our daily consumption are still frequently adulterated, although we are now protected by the operation of an act of parliament specially directed to the detection and punishment of dealers who fraudulently mix foreign ingredients with substances sold under the name of pure commodities, but the extent and unscrupulousness of the system of adulteration laid bare by this commission were alarming. The mere admixture of inferior with superior qualities of the same commodity, or the substitution of substances with similar properties for the genuine article, were comparatively unimportant frauds, in face of the fact that actively poisonous ingredients were introduced in large quantities into food and drink for daily consumption, for the purpose either of increasing weight, improving appearance, or enhancing profits by the substitution of a cheaper material.

Coffee was mixed with mahogany sawdust, mustard with flour and turmeric, vinegar with sulphuric acid, pepper with dust, ground rice, or linseed-meal; cayenne pepper and curry powder with white mustard seed, ground rice, deal sawdust, salt, and brick dust, while red lead (often in poisonous quantities) gave it colour. Bread bought in cheap neighbourhoods contained alum and salt for the purpose of correcting the sourness and dark colour of the dough made from inferior or damaged wheat. The largely adulterated bread was found in the low-priced loaves of poor neigh-

bourhoods, but other articles were adulterated without relation to the localities in which they were purchased, and the spurious substitutes were amply present in a very large majority of cases. The presence of alum in bread was almost universal, and it is still often asserted that its use is necessary while people demand a white loaf; but out of twenty-eight loaves bought in every quarter of London Dr. Hassall found alum, and in many instances it was present in considerable quantities in high-priced loaves, a fact afterwards explained (in consequence of the indignant remonstrances of the "Pure Bread Company") to proceed from the adulteration of the flour itself with alum before it was purchased by the baker. Tea was proved to be frequently a deadly poison prepared in China, where the desired colour was given to it by the use of gypsum and Prussian blue, while adulteration was effected by a compound of sand, dirt, tea-dust, and broken leaves worked up with gum into small nodules, and containing 45 per cent of earthy matter. These nodules were "faced" with black-lead, Prussian blue, or turmeric, according to the kind of tea to be sophisticated, while French chalk gave the fictitious leaf its spurious bloom. Curiously enough the lower-priced teas were found to be the more genuine; but a good deal was done in the way of redrying tea-leaves which had been used at hotels, clubs, and coffee-houses, and mixing them with bay leaves, sloe leaves, and other substitutes; gum and a solution of copperas being used to give consistency and colour.

Coffee, even when sold as *genuine*, was mixed with chicory. This mixture in certain proportions had been permitted by a Treasury minute of 1840, and the quantity of chicory had increased till Mr. Gladstone brought in a resolution that the words "mixture of chicory and coffee" should be placed on any package containing both ingredients. But the worst of it was that chicory itself was adulterated with roasted acorns and other vegetable substances, dogs' biscuits, burnt sugar, red earth, and baked horses' and bullocks' livers. In fact it was discovered that the articles used to adulterate, were themselves

adulterated, and that thus the inquiry would "horrors on horror's head accumulate." The milk of the nursery was mixed not alone with water, but with annatto, flour, starch, and treacle, if with nothing worse; butter was derived from lard and fat; fresh butter from the common salted article; orange marmalade from turnips, apples, and carrots; pickles and preserved fruits were green with verdigris; and the ornamental sweetmeats with which infancy was delighted or pacified, contained Prussian blue, Antwerp blue, gamboge, ultramarine, chromate of lead, red oxide of lead, Brunswick green, and arsenite of copper, while plaster of Paris entered largely into the composition of many of them.

We so often hear now of salesmen or others being summoned and fined for attempting to dispose of meat or the carcasses of animals unfit for human consumption, that we may readily believe some forms of flesh food were pretty largely adulterated both with inferior meat and other substances. Happily Smithfield market had been abolished, and some of its evils had been abated. One of the witnesses examined before the commissioners who decreed its fall, had declared that quantities of diseased meat were bought by soup shops, sausage-makers, alamo-de beef and meat pie shops, &c. One soup shop (a firm which had a large *foreign* trade), were doing five hundred pounds a week in diseased meat. Anything in the shape of flesh could be sold at a penny a pound, or eightpence a stone. He was certain that if one hundred carcasses of cows were lying dead in the neighbourhood of London he could get them all sold in twenty-four hours. It wouldn't matter what they died of. The London market was very extensively supplied with diseased meat from the country, he said; and he also declared that an insurance office in London in which graziers could insure their beasts from disease, made it a practice to send the unsound animals dying from disease to their own slaughter-houses a hundred and sixty miles from London, to be dressed and sent to the London market. Cattle, sheep, &c., were insured by this office against all kinds of diseases, one of the conditions being that the diseased animals

when dead became the property of the insurance company, the party insuring receiving two-thirds of the value of the animal, and one third of the salvage; or in other words, one third of the amount the beast sold for when dead. They were, he said, consigned to a salesman in Newgate Market. This evidence was sickeningly significant, and it is not to be supposed that the sale of diseased and putrid meat had ceased immediately after the condemnation of Smithfield Market, and while the butchers' shambles about Newgate Street, and the slaughter-houses, lanes, and alleys of Cowcross and its neighbourhood were scarcely abolished, especially as we know that in London as well as in other great centres of population continual vigilance on the part of inspectors and officers of the law is still necessary to prevent large quantities of diseased or putrid meat from being quickly disposed of. At the same time it scarcely needs to be mentioned that the descriptions of food into which such meat is converted are found in largest quantities in neighbourhoods inhabited by the poorest part of the population.

We may see from what has been already indicated, that the period succeeding the close of the Crimean war was one of considerable excitement, but one also of great social development. Immense efforts were made for the extension of education in the direction of some general system separable from the sectarian difficulty, and yet preserving the means of religious instruction, while, at the same time, schools were established and supported on a basis of merely secular and moral teaching. On the whole, the large balance of opinion was in favour of retaining the reading of Scripture in schools, whether they were professedly founded on an unsectarian or a "secular" basis, the word secular being often interpreted to mean much the same thing as unsectarian, as distinguished from doctrinal religious teaching; and the parents generally concurring in a desire that their children should be taught to regard the authority of the Scriptures as conveying the highest sanction for religion and morals. Several schools, not only for ordinary instruction, but for the maintenance

and industrial training of destitute boys and girls, were opened, and were among the most significant institutions of the time.

Advances were also to be observed in much of the popular literature. Not only were more periodicals and magazines of the higher class, like the *Saturday Review* and others, commenced, but a larger number of cheap newspapers and other publications were issued, many of them of an educational and domestic character. The abolition of the newspaper stamp duty in June, 1855, greatly contributed to this movement. This tax had been originally imposed for the purpose of checking the issue of seditious publications. It underwent several changes as to the amount charged, and in the beginning of the present century had stood at fourpence. In 1836, as we have seen, it was reduced to a penny, and at that sum it remained as represented by a red stamp impressed upon every copy of a newspaper. In addition to this there was a heavy duty on each advertisement appearing in a paper, and all these charges combined to make such publications dear, and the knowledge of public events limited and uncertain. No important daily newspaper was published at a less price than sixpence before the abolition of the advertisement duty, but the remission of that tax enabled the proprietors to reduce the price, while many new publications came into existence. The abolition of the stamp duty gave the further relief that was needed to enable enterprising persons to start that great engine of public opinion and public information—the penny newspaper, and both in London and the provinces many influential papers were either originated or considerably enlarged or improved. At first the red stamp was either removed altogether or allowed to stand in lieu of postage, but papers started which needed no stamp, and could be sent through the post. The *Morning Star* was brought out under the new auspices, the *Daily Telegraph*, the *Daily News* soon followed; and eventually the *Standard* and other high-priced papers were issued at the popular penny, but that was not till after a further remission of charges by the reduction and ultimate abolition of the duty on paper.

The period of which we are speaking was a time of transition, and a time, therefore, when many evils that needed remedying were exposed. The aggressive temper which had been exhibited for some months seemed to be strangely emphasized by crimes of violence and cruelty, while commercial laxity and financial disasters were accompanied on the criminal side by extensive and sometimes remarkable frauds and robberies. Among the most prominent of these was the appropriation of trust money by one of the oldest and most respected firms of private bankers in London—the house of Sir John Dean Paul, Strahan, & Bates. The discovery was a great shock to a large number of estimable people, for the head of the firm was associated with many religious societies, and subscribed to numerous charities. Criminal proceedings were taken against the firm, and they were tried in the Central Criminal Court on the 26th of October, 1855, for fraudulently appropriating to their own use certain Danish bonds of the value of £5000 committed to their keeping as bankers by Dr. Griffith, prebendary of Rochester. The case for the prosecution was stated by the attorney-general. It was proved that Sir John Dean Paul instructed the secretary of the National Insurance Company to sell Dr. Griffith's bonds; and Dr. Griffith deposed to conversations subsequent to the bankruptcy, from which it appeared that Mr. Strahan and Mr. Bates were accessory to the transaction. Sir F. Thesiger, who appeared for Mr. Strahan, defended him on the ground that the sale of the Danish bonds was effected solely by Sir John Paul; that he received the proceeds; and that there was no proof that Mr. Strahan was privy to the transaction; and further, that Mr. Strahan, having made a disclosure of the circumstances before the Court of Bankruptcy, was not (according to the Act of 7 and 8 Geo. IV.) liable to be indicted on account of such circumstances. Mr. Serjeant Byles, for Sir John Paul, admitted the facts as stated by Dr. Griffith, but said that it was his intention to replace the bonds, as was shown by his subsequently purchasing others to a similar amount. He also maintained that Sir J. Paul, having made a full disclosure in

the Bankruptcy Court, was no longer liable to criminal proceedings. Mr. James, for Mr. Bates, rested his case upon his total ignorance of the transaction in question. The court then adjourned to the following morning, when Baron Alderson, having charged the jury, after an absence of half an hour they returned a verdict of guilty against all the prisoners. The judge proceeded to pass sentence. Commenting on the heinous nature of the offence, he observed that all the prisoners had been well educated, and moved in a high position of society. The punishment which was about to fall on them, therefore, would be far more heavy and more keenly felt than by persons in a lower condition of life. It would also, he regretted to say, afflict those who were connected with them. These, however, were not considerations for him at that moment: all he had to do was to say that he could not conceive any worse case of the sort that could arise under the statute upon which they had been convicted, and that being the case, he had no alternative but to pass upon them the sentence which the act of parliament provided for the worst class of offences arising under it, that was, that they be severally transported for the term of fourteen years.

Another case which caused great excitement was that of John Sadleir, M.P. for Sligo borough, who in February, 1856, committed suicide on Hampstead Heath, by swallowing a quantity of essential oil of almonds. His body was found early in the morning on the rise of a small mound at the back of Jack Straw's Castle, the head close to a furze bush, the clothes undisturbed, and the hat at a distance. It was taken to Hampstead workhouse. In the course of the inquest the evidence showed that the deceased had been concerned in a series of gigantic embezzlements and forgeries. Two letters written by him before he left the house were laid before the jury. In one of them, addressed to Mr. Keating, M.P. for Waterford, were the words:—"No one has been privy to my crimes; they sprung from my own cursed brain alone; I have swindled and deceived without the knowledge of any one. . . . It was a sad day for all when I came to London; I can give but little aid to

unravel accounts and transactions." The full extent of Sadleir's embezzlements and forgeries was never exactly known. One fraudulent transaction in respect to the Royal Swedish Railway consisted of an over-issue of shares and obligations to the amount of at least £150,000. In respect of the Tipperary Bank, the manager, his brother, had permitted him to overdraw more than £200,000, and, with other fraudulent mismanagement, the deficit of the bank exceeded £400,000. The assets were stated to be little more than £30,000. The misery caused by this infamous confederacy was unspeakable. Not only were the depositors in the south of Ireland—chiefly small farmers and tradesmen—defrauded of their savings, but the shareholders were stripped, for the most part, of everything they possessed. The means taken to entrap the last-named class were unusually nefarious. On the first of February—one month before the crash—the Sadleirs published a balance-sheet and report, in which the concern was represented as most flourishing. A dividend at the rate of £6 per cent with a bonus of £3 per cent was declared, and £3000 was carried to the reserve fund, raising it to £17,000. By means of this fabrication a considerable number of persons, most of them widows, spinsters, and half-pay officers, were induced to become shareholders, and lost their all. Endless suits were brought by attorneys who had purchased debts due by the company, against these unhappy people. Some declared themselves insolvent, while others fled to the United States with as much of their property as they could hastily secure. James Sadleir had absconded under circumstances which gave rise to much discussion, and many large financial businesses in London suffered considerably from his frauds.

The failure of the Royal British Bank in August, 1856, was also the cause of widely-spread misery and confusion, since a large number of shares were held by persons of comparatively small means. The share capital in this country was stated to be £300,000, of which £150,000 was stated to have been paid up. The debts due to depositors amounted to £500,000, the assets were found to be dis-

counted bills and other securities which were mostly worthless, and above £100,000 had been advanced to a Welsh coal mine which was not worth one-third of the value. Everybody in the management had been helping himself to the money. A Mr. Gwynne, a retired director, owed £13,600; Mr. John M'Gregor, M.P., the founder of the bank, £7000; Mr. Humphrey Brown, M.P., above £70,000; and a Mr. Cameron, the manager, about £30,000. The unfortunate shareholders were called upon by the Bankruptcy Court to pay £50 on each of their shares; some of them fled to Boulogne and elsewhere, many were ruined, and public confidence was so shaken that for a long time such investments were looked at with much suspicion. The government instituted criminal proceedings against the manager and the most obviously dishonest directors, and in February, 1858, some of them were sentenced to a year's imprisonment.

Crimes of violence and murderous assaults were numerous and were attended with great brutality. Street outrages and robbery were also connected with a new method of attack named after the Spanish instrument of execution, the "garotte" or "garota." The assailant, coming suddenly from behind, placed his arm round the neck of his victim, so that by a sudden constriction of his muscles great pressure was exerted on the throat and the head was forced back, while an accomplice robbed the half-strangled sufferer of watch, money, and other valuables. There was seldom time to cry out, for the attack was entirely unexpected, and the person robbed was mostly left in a half-insensible condition. Assaults of this kind became so frequent that something like a panic was the result, until fear was succeeded by indignation, and heavy sentences were demanded against some of the "garotters" who had been arrested. Many of the London shops exposed "anti-garotters" for sale, in the shape of short sharp daggers, loaded canes, life-preservers, and "knuckle-dusters" or thick leather gloves, covering part of the hand and fitted with projecting iron spikes or plates cut into facets,—a modern reproduction, in fact, of the old Roman cestus. Swordsticks and revolvers were commonly carried by men who lived

in the suburbs, and whose business or pleasure called them out at night. People armed themselves, more to the danger of themselves and their friends than to that of the robbers; but some of the latter had severe handlings, for the blood of the braver portion of the population was up, and a dead-set was made against cowardly footpads who selected old and weak men or helpless women for their murderous assaults. In some neighbourhoods stout fellows well armed with cudgels were on the alert, and the garotters themselves made one or two awkward mistakes. In one instance an attack was made on a pedestrian who was passing over Waterloo Bridge at midnight. The ruffians followed and pounced on their prey. They had mistaken their man, however. The belated passenger was a famous pugilist. The conflict was short and decisive. One of the garotters was found an hour or two afterwards lying insensible, and the other had fled. But the most effectual remedy was the infliction of flogging as a part of the sentence on prisoners convicted of garotting. Mere imprisonment with hard labour was tried until the end of the year 1861 and seemed to have little result in checking the evil, but directly a dozen or two of strokes with the "cat," laid on by a strong-armed warder in the presence of witnesses who afterwards reported some of the details, became a recognized punishment for this offence, the cowardly ruffians abandoned a form of crime which exposed them to a retribution involving severe physical suffering. Probably, however, they became alarmed at the resentment everywhere expressed against them, and at an apparent intention on the part of a number of determined men in various districts to show no quarter to a garotter, but to shoot him down, or in some way to disable him at once. It will easily be seen to what constant perils resulting from mistakes, from accidents, and from the too prompt aggressiveness of timid persons unaccustomed to the use of weapons, this panic had given rise.

There is no need to refer particularly to the crimes of more than ordinary atrocity which were committed during a time of public excitement, after so many months during which

daily talk was of war. In surveying the aspects of that period it appears as though, at the very time that great and strenuous efforts were being made to establish all kinds of agencies for bringing instruction to the lower classes of the population, ameliorating the condition of the poor and the abandoned, and redeeming the depraved and the vicious, misery, poverty, and crime stood forth in more appalling shapes, as if to show the urgent need of powerful and immediate influences for their transformation, or to test the faith and the sincerity of those who professed to believe that earnest and unremitting effort would effect the desired improvement.

Among the most terrible crimes were several cases of poisoning. In that which excited most horror the murderer was William Palmer, a surgeon of Rugeley, in Staffordshire, who was not of very reputable character, but was well known among his neighbours, had for some time kept race-horses and been mixed up with transactions on "the turf," and had, in fact given up his practice and made it over to a former assistant, except in the case of two or three old patients. In the course of his pursuits as a sportsman Palmer became intimately acquainted with John Parsons Cook, a young man of respectable family, who had inherited some £12,000 or £15,000, and become a frequenter of races and a betting man. For two or three years Palmer had been in pecuniary difficulties, and had to raise money on bills. It appeared from the charge made against him on his trial that his circumstances became hopeless, that he owed various persons large sums of money, and that he had had recourse to forgery. One bill for £2000 bore the forged acceptance of Sarah Palmer, his mother, a woman of considerable wealth, and on whose security money would therefore be advanced without hesitation. This bill was discounted, but other pressing claims coming on, he did not meet it when it became due, and had to continue paying upon it. Then his wife died, and as he had effected an insurance on her life for £13,000, and the amount was realized, he was able to discharge some of his more immediate liabilities. He afterwards induced his brother to effect an insur-

ance for £13,000 and to assign the policy to him. He had, to the amount of £11,500, bills in the hands of a bill-discounter, and every one of them bore the forged acceptance of his mother. His brother died and the amount of the insurance on his life was applied for, but the insurance office declined to pay it. Palmer was being pressed with demands from his creditors; he had for some months been acquainted with Cook in betting transactions, and induced him to assign two horses as security for an advance of money which would more than cover the sum instantly required. The person who made the advance sent it in the shape of some warrants and a cheque made payable to Cook's order. To this cheque Palmer forged Cook's endorsement, and it went to enable him to take up a forged bill, and so to escape detection.

The intimacy between Palmer and Cook continued, and it was necessary to prevent discovery of the forgery. But in addition to this, it appeared that Cook had won a considerable sum of money, amounting to above £2000, at Shrewsbury, and £700 or £800 at Worcester races, and the latter sum he was known to have had in his possession when he was with Palmer and another person at Shrewsbury, and afterwards with Palmer at the Talbot Hotel at Rugeley, nearly opposite Palmer's house. Cook had been suddenly taken ill at Shrewsbury, after swallowing some brandy and water which Palmer had urged him to drink. At Rugeley the same symptoms were repeated, and Palmer was sent for, soon after he had parted with him for the night. After everything that Palmer had administered the patient was violently sick, and though other practitioners were called in they seem to have had no suspicion of anything wrong, though one of them could not agree with Palmer that Cook was suffering from a bilious attack, and that it was that which caused the vomiting. All this time Palmer was acting in the most cold-blooded, indifferent, and composed manner; but he was really administering antimony in broth, coffee, and other liquids. This did not prove fatal, and he afterwards prescribed strychnine in pills as a remedy. There were several witnesses of Cook's sufferings, and an

elderly medical man gave a certificate of death from apoplexy. While this gentleman had given Cook medicine the effects of the antimony had been to some extent obviated; but neither he nor other people seem to have understood the convulsions and rigid contraction of the muscles of the chest and neck, caused by strychnine. Palmer might have evaded serious inquiry but for the fact that the stepfather of the murdered man went at once to Rugeley, and there made some keen observations, and acted with remarkable promptitude. Palmer continued to preserve a cool and unconcerned demeanour even during the ensuing post-mortem examination, for he had counted on there being no probability of detecting the presence of strychnine. But if strychnine left little or no trace, the symptoms which had been seen and noted by competent judges at two examinations, as well as by those present before the death, could, it was believed, have been caused only by the administration of that poison, and the traces of antimony were in themselves sufficient to prove that the first symptoms which had been observed were attributable to the broth and other liquids administered by Palmer. With all his coolness he was tying the noose for himself. He induced the postmaster at Rugeley to open a letter from the chemist to whom the contents of the stomach of the murdered man had been sent for analysis. He had previously endeavoured to bribe the post-boy, who was to convey the sealed jars in which they were deposited, either to upset the fly or to contrive somehow to break the jars and spill the contents; and he sent a present of game to the coroner, along with a letter, suggesting that an experienced physician had certified to the death, which was obviously from natural causes. We will not dwell on the particulars of the trial or of the details of the evidence in this dreadful case, which lasted several days, the medical witnesses being numerous, as they consisted of the most famous analysts and physiologists of the day. The suspicions that gathered round this deliberate poisoner were terrible. The bodies of his wife and his brother were exhumed. There was no doubt that they, too, had been murdered, and a

verdict was brought in accordingly. Society stood aghast. There was no telling how many of his acquaintances he had destroyed. The poison itself, too, was deadly; its effects were new and strange. Its operation had been but little known. It was thought that it might be used and leave no actual trace. The very name strychnine became a word of fear. Few people could be found who would have respited or reprieved William Palmer, though he went to the scaffold declaring that he was not guilty, and that he himself was a murdered man. While he was on his trial, the person who had discounted a bill purporting to have been accepted by the prisoner's mother brought an action against her to recover the money. The defence was that the acceptance was a forgery, and Palmer was brought from prison to give evidence. When asked who wrote the name "Sarah Palmer" upon the bill, he answered, "Ann Palmer." "Your wife?" was the next inquiry. "Yes." "Now dead?" "Yes." "Did you see her do it?" "Yes." He had caused his wife to forge his mother's signature, and had afterwards poisoned her for the sake of realizing the large sum for which he had not long before insured her life.

It was the Palmer case which drew immediate attention to the necessity for a law regulating the sale of poisons. Lord Campbell, who had been the judge at the trial, inquired whether the government intended legislating on the subject, and was told that a bill was in course of preparation by the home secretary.

The Redpath frauds were also illustrative of the reckless criminality which appeared to prevail among a certain class of men who had entered on a career of extravagance, and were anxious only to maintain a position in the world of fashion.

Redpath was the name of the official who had the care of the stock-register books of the Great Northern Railway Company. To support his assumption of being a person of considerable means, with a town residence in Chester Terrace and a villa at Weybridge, he altered the sums standing in the names of the stockholders to much larger amounts, and sold the fictitious stock on the market, forged

the name of the supposed transferrer, and passed the sum to the account of the supposed transferee in the register, either attesting it himself or causing it to be attested by a young man, who, it appeared, was not aware of the fraud. Of course such transactions were certain to be discovered, but it was not till the directors began to notice an extraordinary disproportion between the amount paid for dividends and the rateable capital stock that a committee of investigation was appointed, and the fraud was detected. The amount appropriated reached about a quarter of a million sterling. Redpath fled to Paris, but afterwards returned to London, and was arrested.

It may easily be understood that the public excitement was very great when crimes against person and property were so frequent, and their details were so rapidly and completely made known, by means of cheap newspapers, which circulated amongst a number of people who had previously been accustomed to learn only the occurrences of the week instead of the events of each day. It happened, too, as it usually does happen, that many strange stories and some really extraordinary circumstances kept the popular imagination in a feverish condition. "The Waterloo Bridge mystery," as it was called, happened at a date a little later, in 1857, and it will perhaps be worth while to glance at it as an illustration of the peculiar kind of stimulus which seemed to be constantly presented to an already overheated fancy for a combination of the horrible and the grotesque.

A little after daybreak on the 9th of September, 1857, two boys rowing up the river saw a carpet-bag tied round with a cord on one of the abutments of Waterloo Bridge. From the bag a cord hung down into the water, and from this it was to be inferred that it had been lowered from above. The boys rowed off with their prize, and though the bag was locked, contrived to force or cut it open, when, to their dismay, they found that it contained the mutilated remains of a human body hacked and sawn into twenty pieces, and packed with a quantity of clothing soaked with

blood, and pierced with cuts which appeared to have been made with a sharp-pointed knife or dagger. The lads hastened to be rid of their dreadful burden, and communicated with the police. The bag with its contents was removed to Bow Street police station, where a more complete examination was made. The head and the viscera were wanting, and there was no mark on the clothing which could lead to identification.

Subjected to the acute scientific examination of Professor Taylor, the eminent physiologist and anatomist, the remains, which had been partly boiled and salted, were pronounced to be those of an adult male, about 5 feet 9 inches high, and probably of dark complexion. There was no evidence of any peculiarity, no mark of disease or of violent injury inflicted during life except (and the exception was significant) one stab between the third and fourth ribs on the left side,—such a stab as would probably penetrate the heart,—and presenting the character of a wound inflicted before or soon after death. The blood which stained the clothes, it was said, must have flowed from a body while still alive. The body had become rigid before the clothes were removed, and the clothes themselves were probably those belonging to the man whose remains were under examination, and who must have been subjected to great violence while alive. Public opinion was divided, popular speculation was active, and often extravagant. Weak-nerved and timid people felt a thrill of terror. It was remembered that there had been more than one undiscovered assassination, that rewards had been offered for still undetected murders, that more than one person had mysteriously disappeared. On the other hand there were matter-of-fact sceptical people, who, till the examination refuted it, held to the assumption that the remains were those of some animal. Then a very general opinion gained ground that it was a disgusting practical joke,—a hoax perpetrated by medical students who had placed in the bag the portions of a subject from the anatomical theatre of one of the hospitals. This was refuted also. Professor Taylor emphatically declared that the body had not been dissected or used

for the purpose of anatomy, that the parts useful to the anatomist had been roughly severed and destroyed, that the corpse had been hacked and sawn to pieces within eighteen or twenty-four hours after death, and by some one ignorant of the anatomical relation of the parts. This was the deduction from all the appearances, and it left the mystery unsolved. It has never since been explained, and though a reward of £300 was offered by the government for the discovery of the supposed murderer, no information was ever obtained. Many people who weighed the probabilities of the case came to the conclusion that the "Waterloo Mystery" was associated with an act of vengeance or of precaution perpetrated by the agent or agents of some foreign secret society, who had assassinated either a political spy, or one of their own number whom they had suspected of treachery.

In relation to serious criminal offences we may here glance for a moment at the change which had been made in the punishment of convicts sentenced to heavy penalties. We have already seen that the old system of transportation practically came to an end with the growth and development of our colonies. The free and honest colonists would no longer submit to be invaded by successive detachments of convicts, the worst of whom had to be sent to perpetuate the hideous depravity of Norfolk Island, while a large number became servants and labourers requiring martial law to keep them in subjection, and only a few obtained that ticket-of-leave which left them at liberty to work successfully and to accumulate property, or to lead lives which at last would reinstate their children in the ranks of "respectability." It could not be denied that the frequent deportation of convicts, and their release under necessary restrictions, which kept them in servitude where there was at the same time a native population ignorant of morals, and debased even from savagery by the vices which they had learned from the worse than savage white man, who came direct from the jail or the hulks, was a crying evil. To this contamination the Aus-

tralian farmers and townspeople would no longer submit, and to its injustice the Cape Colonists, as we have already seen, offered an armed resistance.

Practically the transportation system was at an end. Many of the convicts themselves liked New South Wales well enough. The idle ruffians, who were little better, nay, were much worse than brutes, could take alternate spells of low debauchery and the corporal punishment that would never be inflicted even on a beast in a truly moral community. Criminals in England who fancied they could turn over a new leaf if they had a chance, deplored that they could not be sent to "a new world." A lingering notion for some time prevailed that to Western Australia, where there was no such rooted objection, some might still be sent, but they would have been too few to delay a complete revision of the methods of dealing with our worst criminals. Those who were retained in prison or sent to the hulks because their sentence was for less than ten years, had become brutalized and degraded under the existing system. The hulks were a remnant of barbarism. They were a national disgrace and must be abolished, unless we meant by punishment to perpetuate and indelibly to brand, instead of to efface the mark of lowest evil. The bill, introduced into the House of Lords in 1853 by Lord Chancellor Cranworth, had proposed to retain the punishment of transportation only for convicts who had been sentenced to long terms of punishment:—receivers of stolen goods, housebreakers, burglars, cattle-stealers, and those guilty of violent assaults, attempts to do grievous bodily harm, or the perpetrators of outrages of an atrocious character. Those whose punishment was to last only seven years were to be kept in penal servitude, and were, in case of good conduct, to receive a remission of their punishment under the ticket-of-leave system. This bill had been found inadequate to provide for the altered conditions by which transportation was virtually abolished, and in the first session of parliament in 1857 Sir George Grey proposed changes which were to lengthen the terms of sentences of penal servitude to an equal duration with those of the periods of transportation

for which they were substituted—to give the judges a discretionary power to pass sentences of intermediate severity between those of ordinary imprisonment and the minimum of transportation—to allow prisoners sentenced to penal servitude to be removed to certain colonies—and to continue the practice of mitigating sentences as a reward for good conduct in prison, but to restrict the range of their remission within much narrower limits, while rendering the discharges, generally speaking, unconditional.

These new regulations had the effect of abolishing transportation, while retaining the power to send criminals to any penal settlement in the colonies; and it was time that some such change should be made as that which was effected by limiting the operation of the ticket of leave. It was only in Ireland that the real meaning of such a conditional and partial remission of the sentence was properly understood and acted upon. Sir Walter Crofton, who was the chairman of the board of prison directors for Ireland, understood the principle and successfully adopted it. If a man there was discharged from custody because his conduct had led to the belief that he was worthy to be intrusted with a certain degree of liberty, he was still under the observation of the police. He had been through a term of hard labour, during which he might hope by industry and good conduct to obtain a remission of some part of his term, and eventually to receive some small gratuities or rewards. Conditional freedom was granted when the prisoner had passed through a certain amount of discipline and gave some evidences of a desire to amend. But the ticket of leave did not include absolute freedom. The holders of those tickets were not only known to the police, but were required to report themselves periodically, and were liable at any time to be sent back to penal servitude if they lapsed into crime or were seen to be resuming their former habits and companionships. This worked well in enabling the ticket-of-leave men to obtain employment without concealing their condition. It became known that to have obtained this conditional liberty they must have displayed

an energetic determination, not only to work, but to retrieve their character; and employers of labour were satisfied to recognize in the system a reformatory influence which was found to be on the whole successful and encouraging.

In England, however, the ticket of leave was quite a different thing. Since that time an attempt has been made to modify its operation here, so that it may be assimilated to what it had then become in Ireland under the direction of Sir Walter Crofton; but either the working of the plan is impossible in London or other large towns in England, or it has for some other reason failed. All that we have at present attained is the burden of a ticket-of-leave part of the population, who too often drift downward into the class of "habitual criminals," and who, under any circumstances, do not find it easy to obtain honest employment. They are expected to report themselves, it is true, and are theoretically under police surveillance; but it is to be feared that they are seldom regarded with anything but suspicion and dismay. Neither the prison authorities nor the police look upon them frankly as probably reformed characters, and therefore the public and employers of labour suspect them, and refuse to give them the only opportunity by which they can complete the achievement of a new character. This is partly the result of the condition of things in 1857 before Sir George Grey introduced his amendments of the working of the system. The ticket of leave then meant (in England) little less than the complete discharge of a number of prisoners who had for a certain time given assiduous attention to their prison tasks, and had contrived to persuade the chaplain and the authorities that they were reformed characters. Of course there *were* some among them who had determined to begin afresh with a new chance; but there were, it was feared, many more who took up their old trade under new advantages. Amidst reports of crime, and alarms caused by many acts of lawlessness and outrage, a new terror was ever present, in the thought that a number of hardened and abandoned ruffians had been let loose from prison to prey on society under the license of a ticket of leave.

But we can scarcely change this subject without taking into account another complication connected with the punishment of crime. While statesmen were puzzled, and the public were alarmed at the problem presented by the questions of transportation and penal servitude, a feeling of compassion not un-mixed with indignation against the authorities was aroused in consequence of some revelations of the manner in which prisoners were punished—or, as many people said, cruelly tortured—in some of the jails to which culprits were committed for long terms of imprisonment. It was in 1855 that the governor of Birmingham borough jail was tried at the Warwick assizes for cruelties perpetrated on a youth named Edward Andrews, who was "done to death," or in other words was so persecuted and oppressed that he committed suicide in the prison in April, 1853. The chaplain gave the poor boy a good character so far as it went. He said "he appeared to be of a mild disposition." He (the chaplain) went into the lad's cell and found him crying as a person cries who is in much pain. The word "murder" was used frequently. He was strapped to the wall in such a way that his limbs were compressed, and one of the straps was a tight collar round his neck. The chaplain could not get his finger within the collar. The punishment was for not accomplishing an amount of labour on a crank, which he was too weak to turn for any length of time as it was overweighted for punishment. He was continually under punishment, drenched with water for "shamming," placed in the strait-waistcoat, strangled with the collar, hung up by the hands to hooks or nails. Inhuman cruelty turned dislike into spite, and suspicion into diabolical persecution. The details were sickening. The governor, who had been a lieutenant in the army, was found guilty; the surgeon of the jail was implicated in an assault on another prisoner; but both he and the governor were acquitted on that particular count, though they were convicted of omitting to make entries in the jail books as ordered by act of parliament. The governor was sentenced to *three months' imprisonment*. There is no need to dwell on the details of the trial.

A well known writer, Mr. Charles Reade, afterwards made the persecutions of the boy Andrews, and the whole of the disclosures, into a powerful and of course a highly-coloured episode in his exciting novel entitled, *It is Never too Late to Mend*. This adaptation of the evidence of the cruelties practised in the Birmingham county jail, which was accepted as an indication of the illegal and monstrous treatment too often inflicted on a certain class of prisoners, continued to be read with resentment long after it had ceased to belong to reality, and it was reproduced on the stage, where it has recently been revived, though it has certainly become an anachronism.

Amidst the comparatively small excitements and anxieties of the year successive reports had arrived which may be said to have temporarily excluded the ordinary news and topics of the day from prolonged discussion. By about the middle of June, 1857, it became known that a serious revolt had occurred among the Sepoys in our army in India, and it was feared that the whole of the native troops would join in a general mutiny, and, aided by a large proportion of the population, would endeavour to overthrow British rule in Hindostan.

It is usually represented that the intelligence of the mutiny came upon the government here with the suddenness of a surprise; but if this was really the case, the government must have been more careless and less informed than a good many other people who had long regarded the rumours from India with some anxiety. Probably the chief surprise was at the rapid and wide-spreading growth of a disaffection, which had in a few days apparently attained such proportions that our force there was unable at once to cope with it.

Nobody has been able to pronounce with certainty on the actual causes, or to fix the time of the original conspiracy, which produced the Indian mutiny. The episode of the "greased cartridges," the distribution from village to village of the *chupatties* or cakes of unleavened bread, have been declared to be mere accessories; the complaint of the "greased cartridges"

to have been a fictitious excuse for an insurrection which had long before been decided on, and for which the incident of the introduction of the Enfield rifle among the Sepoys seemed to give an opportunity. It was evident that the mutiny had been planned and prepared for some time before the first outbreak at Meerut, but people in England found it difficult to believe that a mere revolt could be so serious as to call for immediate reinforcements, and to produce even more anxiety than had been felt during the actual wars which had made us masters of Hindostan. It was true that fifty years before, in 1806, there had been as general and as threatening a revolt at Vellore, when the family of Tippoo Sahib thought to turn the outbreak to account, and to restore the power of their house by joining the mutineers. That also was an event which required us to put forth our strength as though to engage in a war; but since that time much had been achieved. We had grown stronger and held India with a firmer, though not with so harsh a grasp. The glove upon the hand by which we kept our hold was of leather rather than of steel. The power of English rule to encourage or to restrain had been so long felt, that even a serious outbreak was looked upon as a temporary disturbance to be promptly, and if necessary, sternly, repressed, that a progressive government might be resumed. By a progressive government of course was meant continued annexation of provinces under native princes, who relinquished their territory, became our willing tributaries, or rather nominal subordinate rulers, and who, in return for these concessions, were mostly led to expect large or moderate pensions which they did not always receive.

That several of these princes came to the conclusion that they had been cajoled and hardly used was not unnatural, and that some of them should have cherished the idea of making reprisals, or of seeking an opportunity for revenge, was not surprising to those who understood the native character, which in this respect did not greatly differ (except, perhaps, in patient intensity of hatred), from that of many other people. That these princes and chiefs should, under any circumstances,

even by the aid of a mutiny, be able to overthrow us nobody believed, even during the darkest hour and the most terrible tidings of the conflict. At the worst we were bound to trample down the insurgents, if only for the sake of their own countrymen. "We must hold our own in India at any cost," was the determination come to by everybody in England, and it was done; but there was perhaps nobody who dreamed what that cost would be, nor how at last the fiendish atrocities of the mutineers so steeled the hearts and nerved the arms of our soldiers and officers that, but for the wise restraints imposed by the policy of the calm and able governor, who was at the time nicknamed "Clemency Canning" in angry scorn of his just humanity, a war not of repression alone, but of extermination, might have raged in the land of which we were already masters.

The mutiny of 1857 differed from merely military revolts, one of which had happened in a Bengal regiment at Lahore in 1849, and against which the higher military commanders in India had more than once warned the government. Both Sir Charles Napier and Colonel Hodgson had called attention to the probabilities of an outbreak, and the latter had pointed out that the admission of the higher caste of Hindoos too freely into the Bengal army was a dangerous means of fomenting sedition, but none of those who saw a probable danger seemed to contemplate any such explosion as that which actually took place.

It should be remembered that the condition of India had greatly changed during a comparatively short period. The inventions and discoveries of science had been taken thither, railways had been established, the electric telegraph was in operation, the old slow processes of agriculture, even if they had not been superseded by modern methods and appliances, had been vastly improved by a new system of irrigation for the rice-fields and plantations. Broad roads had been formed, and places formerly distant, because of the difficulties of transit, were brought near together. A material revolution had taken place, but it was a revolution which, while it conferred immeasurable advantages on the

country, and was designed to benefit the people, was all in favour of the permanency of British rule, and was in fact accompanied by the introduction of a system of native education, which included special provision for the instruction of native girls, calculated entirely to abolish some of the oldest and most obstinate superstitious customs, and to substitute, for the dark and cruel observances of the Hindu tradition, the reasonable and humanizing influences of European society and of the Christian religion.

But it must not be supposed that the conduct and demeanour of English subaltern officers, or of official civilians, always tended to commend British authority by promoting the moral influence which is enforced by example. While many superior officers and civilians of high standing conscientiously endeavoured to introduce to India a system which should gradually bring about a change in the moral and social condition of the people, abolish the tyranny and oppression by which the natives had suffered under the rule of their own princes, and inspire them with confidence in English institutions and English administration of the laws; the British manner of regarding native races over whom conquest or treaty had given us authority, had not been corrected. The ordinary British officer usually seemed to be imbued with the notion which prevailed in some higher quarters, that the oriental mind can only be influenced by fear, and though he did not apparently act with deliberate cruelty, he was too often ready to visit small offences or negligences with angry severity, occasionally accompanied by unjustifiable acts of physical violence. He became a bully from the mistaken notion that in that way alone he could exercise immediate control. The natives to him were a "set of niggers," over whom he thought he should exercise almost absolute authority. His common attitude towards them was that of contemptuous toleration, sometimes good-humoured, but seldom either conciliatory or considerate. Without much ability or inclination to understand their peculiarities, or to look into the meaning or obligation of their customs, he almost entirely disregarded many things, a recognition

of the importance of which was a part of their religion. Some of their sacred observances, the neglect of which they believed would entail dreadful penalties, he regarded as "a parcel of rubbish," not worth the attention of any sensible person, and he did not fail to treat them with marked indifference, if not with open derision. His business was to help "to hold India," and he troubled himself very little about the way in which it was to be held, except that while the natives were quiet and submissive they were to be tolerated, and even their fantastic ceremonies might be permitted; but that the way to keep them in a condition of subordination was to show them the clenched fist or the raised stick whenever there was a reasonable pretext for threatening.

There had been more than one warning, which might have prepared the government at home as well as the authorities in India for some attempt at mutiny among the troops, or for a sudden outbreak of a fanatic no less than a military character. As early as 1851, at Meerut, the very place where the revolt subsequently commenced, Colonel Hodgson published a pamphlet in which he called attention to the admission of men of the Brahmin or priestly caste to the ranks of the Indian army, in spite of certain prohibitions, and this he declared was the source of disaffection and sedition among the troops. In this respect Colonel Hodgson's explanation differed from that of some other persons. Instead of regarding the selection of British officers to take exclusive command of native troops as a grievance which provoked the men, who could feel no personal confidence in superiors possessing no sympathy with their religion, customs, or mode of thinking,—he declared that the promotion of native officers failed to encourage the men to fulfil their duties to the state. He said, "On all occasions of discontent and insubordinate caballing, how very rare it is to see a native officer come forward in a firm and unequivocal manner to disclose what has come to his knowledge, and thereby to evince a becoming consciousness of the duty he owes to his own rank and to the government which conferred it! It would be the height of credulity to imagine the possibility

of evil intention existing in the lines without his most entire cognition; and therefore by failing in moral energy he virtually becomes an accomplice, shrinking from the manly performance of his duty as a commissioned officer, which imperatively requires a prompt disclosure of such seditious designs. It is lamentable to know that, with his increased rank, he acquires not the slightest perception of his increased responsibility. He still remains in all his feelings and sentiments a common soldier, and seldom assumes the moral tone of a commissioned officer."

There was weight in these representations, especially when it is considered that in the native regiments the observance of distinctions of caste must have had enormous influence, and that whatever may have been the results of discipline in securing the professional obedience of the private soldier to his officer while on duty, it was always possible that the private might be a Brahmin, and the officer (promoted only for military efficiency or for some other reason) might be of a caste so inferior that he was compelled secretly to regard his subordinate with veneration. But, as we have noticed, an equal source of danger was perhaps to be found in the inferior character and low tone of many of the English officers commanding native regiments. General Sir Charles Napier, the conqueror of Scinde, had strongly but ineffectually remonstrated against this defect, and Colonel Hodgson endorsed his representations by writing: "It is chiefly upon the zeal, loyalty, competency, and conciliatory deportment of the European officers that the efficiency and allegiance of the Sepahees must depend. The British officer of the native army must always look upon himself as a very closely connected part of it; should he in the smallest degree alienate himself from the men, or in any way evince by his demeanour that their interests and professional honour are something distinct from his, or superciliously neglect to become acquainted with all the circumstances of those under his command, he is deficient in a most essential portion of his official qualifications. Unless he is familiar with all their habits and peculiarities, and properly mindful of their

just rights and requirements, it is impossible that he can exercise any personal influence amidst trials and dangers, or prove capable of animating them during the arduous and trying scenes of war. . . . The European subaltern officer of the native army, too, generally looks upon the performance of regimental duties as a task, irksome if not humiliating. He has very little ambition to acquire the character of a good regimental officer. He has scarcely joined the corps when his every effort is strained to quit it, so as to escape from what he is apt to pronounce drudgery and thralldom. . . . A wide chasm separates the European officer from his native comrade—a gulf in which the dearest interests of the army may be entombed, unless a radical change of relations between the parties is introduced.” This was written in 1851, and the colonel went on to say that the great secret of the success of the British in India had been a most judicious and careful avoidance of every act that would greatly alarm the religious and conventional prejudices of the natives, or call in question our national good faith. This may in general terms have been the principle on which the chief authorities had theoretically proceeded, and even before the rule of the East India Company had been practically superseded by that of the British government, operations for the complete subjugation of the country had been conspicuously allied to the profession of a more imperial policy of combined firmness and conciliation. We have already noticed that remarkable changes had been introduced by the extension of roads and railways, the adoption of a cheap postage system, the increase of public works, and the establishment of schools; and these improvements had been chiefly effected within ten years, under the administration of Lord Dalhousie, who succeeded Lord Hardinge as governor-general in 1847. Such changes could not be made without exciting the antagonism of the more fanatic portion of the native population, and the opposition of the devotees of the old cruel and immoral superstitions. Suttee was abolished, and widows were no longer burned at the funeral pyres on which the bodies of their husbands were

consumed. Thuggism, or the system which founded a kind of religion on assassination, was, if not entirely stamped out, at least made an offence the perpetrators of which were pursued and condemned to death or to heavy punishment. Lord Dalhousie effected many changes which preceded the bill introduced by Sir Charles Wood in 1853, abridging the power of the East India Company. Sir Charles Wood, in his speech on that occasion, referred to the existing evils of the mixed government, the maladministration of justice, the want of public works, and the laws for the tenure of lands. Much had been already accomplished for India, but still it did not follow that it possessed the best government that could be devised. The question was whether that rule should continue in a double character of a home government and a government in India, or whether it should be administered singly by a secretary of state. The proposed measure was to continue it in the latter character, but to diminish the patronage of the court of directors, and to extinguish their power of nomination to office, so that civil and scientific appointments should depend on merit alone. The bill was opposed by Joseph Hume as premature and unstatesmanlike, and the debate became involved in a tangle which nothing but a real and almost personal knowledge of Indian affairs could unravel. Lord Macaulay, however, supported the proposed measure, because it would introduce present improvements and leave a scope for further improvements when required. In some shape or other a double government was most suitable for India, and he thought that the changes proposed in the machinery at home,—which absorbed too much attention, would impart to it a greater amount of vigour and ability. But India must be governed *in* India. Whatever might be the instructions from home, the local authorities must exercise a discretion. As to patronage, if the governor-general were allowed to nominate the civil servants, the most monstrous age of jobbing the world had ever seen would commence. Because the plan proposed by the bill would fill the service with fit and superior men by the plan of competition, he was

earnestly desirous it should pass without delay. Another advantage which he saw in the bill was the opportunity it gave of admitting into office natives who could successfully compete with European candidates. "We shall not," he said, "secure or prolong our dominion in India by attempting to exclude the natives of that country from a share in its government, or by attempting to discourage their study of western learning; and I will only say, further, that however that may be, I will never consent to keep them ignorant in order to keep them manageable, or to govern them in ignorance in order to govern them long."

Lord Dalhousie was just the man to carry out in an energetic and comprehensive manner the provisions made in the bill for material and educational improvements, but he also established a widely embracing scheme for the permanency of British rule. India was to be governed, and therefore the more of India we had to govern the better, and the sooner we could acquire the power to control territories which were under the evil administration of native rulers, the sooner the interests of all parties would be secured. That was the principle on which he seemed to act, and he carried it out with consummate boldness and ability, but never apparently without sufficient reason. In less than ten years he annexed the Punjaub, Nagpore, Jattara, Jhansi, and Oudh. In each instance he took what appeared to be necessary, or at least highly expedient action; and in some cases he exhibited a reluctance to proceed to extremities, until no alternative was left to him. The murder of some of our officers in the Punjaub by the consent if not at the instigation of a native prince was the cause of the occupation of the territory by a British force under Lord Gough, who, after having been unsuccessful at the battle of Chillianwallah, in a battle with the combined forces of the Sikhs and the Afghans, retrieved our position by the crushing defeat inflicted on the enemy at Goojerat, a victory so complete that the annexation of the Punjaub followed, and the despatch of the famous diamond, the Koh-i-noor, to England was a token of the submission of the Maharajah of Lahore.

The annexation of Oudh was accomplished on the strength of an existing understanding, that the East India Company had agreed to defend the sovereigns of that territory against either foreign or native foes only on condition that they should govern their subjects in such a way as to afford protection to life and property; whereas the King of Oudh was a tyrant and a robber, his government a mere abandonment of the country to a set of bandit chieftains who recognized him as their head. There were, in every case, apparently good reasons for the subjugation of the native princes, and the inclusion of their subjects and territories under the supreme protection of the British empire. The governor-general, while he set forth those reasons, did not hesitate to say that our policy was to obtain as direct dominion over the territory of the native princes as we already held over the other half of India. This policy was from his point of view beneficial to the native races, and worthy of the prestige and commanding position of England; but it need hardly be pointed out that the native rulers themselves began to exhibit signs of mingled fear and anger when they saw the rapid absorption of their authority and the annexation of their territories, and these feelings were shared by a large proportion of the population, especially in Oudh, whence we principally derived the men who composed our Sepoy regiments, and where the Brahmin caste was the most numerous and influential. Lord Dalhousie's policy was that of a man of great ability, and it was of an essentially majestic character; but it had not sufficiently taken into account the consent of the people themselves, or the power of those who were their superiors in an intricate system, by which caste was associated with the authority and the sanction of religious belief and observance. The allegiance of the Sepoys, who made the great majority of the active armies on which we had to rely for ordinary military service, could not, after all, be invariably and implicitly trusted against all the influences of nationality, when it began to be whispered not only that the authority of native rulers was to be entirely superseded, but that the sacred institutions and observances by which

the native races were distinguished were to be degraded and obliterated by the unsparing domination of the British conquerors. It should be noted, too, that many of the Sepoys were men of caste, rank, intelligence, and ambition, and that they would not be slow to take advantage of any opportunity for self-aggrandizement. The question perhaps was, Had that opportunity arrived? The English, it was known, had been engaged in an exhausting war with the other great nation of the north,—the Russia of which the Afghans, at all events, had heard much. At the same time there had been another war in Burma; a third was going on in Persia; and troops were, it was said, about to be despatched to China, where the governor had defied British authority. Was it not reasonable to suppose that the strength of so small a country as Britain would be exhausted by these repeated and continuous efforts? There were in some quarters direct intimations that this was the case, for had not an agent of Seereek Dhoondoo Punth, or as he was familiarly called Nana Sahib, of Bithoor, the adopted son and successor of Prince Bajee Rao, Peishwa of Poonah, been to London to endeavour to make good the claim to a pension which the East India Company had granted to the prince when he was dethroned, but which Lord Dalhousie had refused to continue to his son in defiance of the national customs, which conferred on the adopted child all the rights of heirship. This agent, Azimoolah Khan, had been to Constantinople, had been to the Crimea, had been the lion of London drawing-rooms, and had interpreted what he had seen and heard as signs of impending disaster to the power and authority of England. Azimoolah Khan, the quiet, insinuating, handsome young Mohammedan agent, had his tale to tell when he returned home, not only of the conquests which his manner and appearance had achieved among English ladies in fashionable assemblies, but about the wane of British influence and the coming decay of British dominion in the East. It was this smooth snake who afterwards played his part with the bloodthirsty murderers at Cawnpore, where he also mercilessly struck down helpless women and children.

When Lord Canning succeeded Lord Dalhousie as governor-general, the native armies had increased to an overweening number as compared with the European force. Each of the three presidencies, Bengal, Madras, and Bombay, had its own army, and united they amounted to 300,000 men, of whom only 43,000 were British.

The army of Bengal recruited from the people of Rajpootna and from Oudh, the annexation of which had caused much dissatisfaction and uneasiness, was the most dangerous in case of revolt, and perhaps the most likely to become disaffected. It consisted of 118,600 natives and 22,600 European soldiers. The cavalry was chiefly composed of Mohammedans, and to the instigations of bitter and bigoted Mohammedans, among other causes, the mutiny was afterwards attributed. The infantry was formed from the most warlike and high-spirited of the Hindoos, belonging, it was believed, to the pure Brahminical caste, and they were therefore more likely to regard with silent, but none the less decided, distrust the annexation of the kingdom, which they suspected might only precede the suppression, or at least the disregard, of those religious distinctions which they held to be of sacred importance. Here were enough elements of danger to make a mutiny probable at any moment. Only a spark was wanting to kindle the materials into a flame. It was not long before the spark fell, and the flame leaped up and spread into a conflagration. The abolition of *suttee*,—the influence of the European teaching, and of the doctrines of Christianity, in abolishing many of the more superstitious observances, even among those who still professed to retain their former religion,—the changes made in the laws of succession and the inheritance of landed property,—and finally, the annexation of Oudh, and the consequent abolition of the old rule of brigandage and rapine, exercised by a number of fierce and tyrannical chieftains, sufficed to produce deep dissatisfaction among the influential natives who were interested in maintaining the old order of things. The Mohammedans occupied themselves in fomenting an insurrection under the pretence that they were anxious to

re-establish the ancient rule under the King of Delhi, a feeble old man upwards of eighty years of age, whose sons were ready to assert their claims and to take an active part in the revolt.

It will, of course, be seen that the inevitable influence of better government, greater freedom, and the teachings of a higher religion in abolishing slavish customs, as well as in destroying degrading superstitions, differs essentially from the effects of that contemptuous disregard which does not scruple needlessly to outrage opinions and observances, that, however absurd they may appear to be, are yet part of a widely spread, or even a national, social, and religious organization. The main body of Sepoys of Oudh were believed to have held their allegiance to the British government, while only the legitimate influences inseparable from the new rule were in operation, and until the numerous and busy promoters of sedition succeeded in persuading them that not only was their nationality and their religion to be superseded, but that by an act of immediate outrage their caste was to be derided, and their most sacred obligations defiled.

It would be impossible to determine at what particular moment this representation wrought the mutiny; but the authors of it were not slow to seize with adroit alacrity on one particular occurrence to which they pointed as the first attempt to ruin the Brahminical caste, and to make those who held it worse than pariahs—excommunicated and accursed.

The introduction of the Enfield rifle made it necessary to use a new kind of cartridge, in the manufacture of which some kind of grease or oil had to be used in order to render it effective. How this was made known it would be useless to conjecture, but it was said that in the course of some dispute between a Mohammedan and a Brahmin, the latter referred to his caste, when the former retorted, "Your caste, indeed! the English government will soon make you bite cartridges greased with cow and pig fat, and what will become of your caste then?" Whether this was one of the inventions of the time matters little. It is certain that the report spread among the

natives that the new cartridges were to be soaked in unclean grease, and for a high-class Hindoo, or even a Mohammedan, to place in his mouth anything so defiling would have been abominable. Not a single cartridge had been issued to the troops at this time, and when it was known that so much antipathy had been expressed on account of the greasy matter used in their construction, none were supplied, though at the same time it was denied that the fat of cows or pigs had been used. Of course it may be said that those in authority should have been well acquainted with the Hindoo caste and the importance which the Brahmins attached to keeping themselves undefiled. The mistake of proposing to use cartridges which were prepared with any kind of grease, when the men were compelled to put them into their mouths that they might bite them before loading their rifles, was either inexcusable folly and ignorance, or a specimen of that indifference to which reference has been made. The greased cartridges were not issued; but unhappily the suspicious Asiatic temper was aroused, and ready to flash out on the least sign of the hated thing against which cunningly devised warnings had been circulated with extraordinary rapidity. Some cartridges made at Semapore differed slightly in the colour of the paper from those formerly used, and at Barrackpore where these were given out discontent began to manifest itself. The men were assured that the difference in colour was not the effect of grease, that not a particle of fat of any sort had been used in their manufacture, and that there was not the slightest desire to insult or to change the religion of the native soldiers. To allay suspicions a chemical examination of the cartridges was ordered in order to prove that they were in no way defiled with the unclean substance; but the emissaries of the conspiracy were still busy in the ranks, and on the 25th of February, 1857, a regiment of men on parade refused to receive their ammunition. The same night they broke open the huts where their arms were piled, took possession of the rifles and ammunition, and carried them to their lines. The colonel summoned the cavalry

and artillery, and going to the parade ground called upon the men to lay down their arms; this was done and the insurgents dispersed. The mutinous regiment was afterwards ordered to Barrackpore, whither they were taken by British cavalry and artillery, European troops having been sent for from Burmah. Two days before the regiment was finally disbanded at Barrackpore, a private Sepoy named Mungal Pandey, who seemed to have intoxicated himself to fury with a copious dose of "bhang," came suddenly on parade with a loaded musket and fired at the adjutant. He missed his aim and the lieutenant tried to seize him, but was wounded in the hand by a sword which the Sepoy brandished. The sergeant-major, who went to the assistance of the lieutenant, was also wounded, and his life was only saved by the help of another Sepoy, who was afterwards rewarded for his good conduct. Mungal Pandey was tried by court-martial and hanged, a sentence which he acknowledged to be a just punishment for his having obeyed the counsel of evil advisers. The name of Mungal Pandey was remembered from the circumstance that as he was the first actively hostile mutineer, the European soldiers bestowed the title of Pandies on those Sepoys who afterwards revolted, and the term became a common designation.

The mutiny spread with alarming rapidity. In Futtuyghur, a *chowkejdard* or village policeman had been seen to run up to another and give him two *chupatties* or little cakes of salted unleavened bread. He ordered the man to whom he gave them to make ten more and give two to each of the five nearest *chowkejdars* with the same order. In this way the cakes were distributed, the whole district was in commotion and the excitement spread to other places. It was evident that the *chupatties* were intended as mysterious signals, the meaning of which was unknown except to the initiated, and perhaps only intended to keep up excitement and expectation. All this time reports had been spread that the greased cartridges were for the purpose of debasing the Hindoos, and forcing them to abandon their religion. On the 16th of May the governor-general issued a proclamation contradicting

these rumours, and warning the natives against being led astray by false representations.

It was well that we had such a man as Lord Canning for governor-general—calm, brave, self-possessed, and ready. It was well, too, that Lord Canning himself had such administrators in the Punjaub as the two Lawrences—Sir John, afterwards Lord Lawrence, who had been from his youth in the civil service of the East India Company; and his brother, the gallant Sir Henry, who was the military member of a board of three appointed by Lord Dalhousie on the annexation of the province. Sir John Lawrence was afterwards named Chief Commissioner of the Punjaub, and he may be said by his wise and prompt action to have saved it at the very beginning of the mutiny. At the time of the outbreak there were in the presidency only three European regiments at Burmah and three at Peshawur, the eastern and western extremities of the empire. In the Punjaub, which absorbed the greater proportion of the forces, there was a regiment at Lahore, and one at Sealkote, Ferozepore, Jallundur, Umballah, and Rawul Pindee; while the greater portion of the artillery was also in the Punjaub territory with a large local army of Punjabees and Sikhs.

There were three European regiments at Simla, in the hills, and two at Meerut, a town on an affluent of the Ganges, 35 miles north-west of Delhi, with a population of about 29,000; but in Oudh, a country just forcibly annexed and swarming with a hostile population, there was only one. There was a regiment at Agra, and one at Calcutta; but Delhi, a place inhabited by bigoted Mohammedans, surrounded by strong fortifications, and containing both military stores and treasures, was left unprotected by any European regiments, though there were three regiments of native infantry and a battery of native artillery in cantonments on the high ground about two miles north of the city. On the 10th of May at Meerut, which is about 38 miles from Delhi, eighty-five men of the native cavalry were brought up on parade to be tried by court-martial for refusing to fire with the cartridges that had been sup-

plied to them, which were of the same kind as those they had been using for several months. These men were sentenced to ten years' imprisonment, and were marched off chained and handcuffed to the jail. The European troops at Meerut consisted of detachments of the 60th Rifles, 6th Dragoon Guards (carabineers), and the Bengal artillery, who were posted about 3 miles from the native camp. The court-martial was held on a Saturday, and on the next evening (that of Sunday) the native regiments suddenly rose in furious mutiny, fired upon their officers, and marched off to the jail to release the prisoners. The prison was set on fire, and above 1000 convicts set free. These with the rabble of the town joined the mutineers and committed horrible atrocities on the European residents—ladies and little children being stripped, murdered, and their bodies hacked and slashed with swords. Nearly every European house was attacked, and a great number of officers were killed. The alarm first reached the troops when they were preparing for church parade, and they immediately marched on the native lines and poured in a fire of grape and musketry. One regiment of native infantry and the cavalry which was also stationed there fled towards Delhi; and though the carabineers pursued them and cut many of them down a large number escaped. Had they been all killed the mutiny might have been less terrible and would have been sooner suppressed. But the night was dark, the insurgents set fire to the bungalows, and the women and children required immediate protection. The 11th Native Infantry took no part in the mutiny, but they remained neutral except in the matter of protecting their own officers. They neither helped to prevent the station being burned, nor interfered when women and children were being hacked to pieces or were frantically seeking for some place of concealment. On Monday morning the 11th of May, the Sepoys of the 3rd Light Cavalry who had escaped from Meerut reached the walls of Delhi, and these were but the forerunners of the great army of insurgents, which afterwards came from all quarters to the city ready for any outrage. They entered the gates of Delhi

without opposition, and immediately began to attack with swords and carbines every European whom they met. After several civil officers had been killed, notice was sent to the brigadier, and a regiment of native infantry with two guns was marched down from the cantonment. It passed through the Cashmere Gate in good order, but once in the city it met some of the mutineers, and instantly the Sepoys of which it was composed ran to the side of the road and left the officers to the fire of the enemy. All the officers were shot down, and the regiment then joined the mutinous Sepoys, who were drunk with bhang, in the work of carnage, riding up to their victims at full gallop and shooting them without mercy.

A crowd of residents in great terror made their way to the Flagstaff Tower in front of the cantonments. A company of native infantry was stationed there, and a large party of ladies and gentlemen with several officers who were well armed went up to a round tower which commanded the road. But the regiment there was also mutinous. The explosion of a magazine in the city was the signal for them to rush to arms and join the insurgents. The best chance was for the Europeans to make an effort to escape, and most of the ladies got away in conveyances escorted by the gentlemen on horseback, the larger part of them reaching Kurnaul, while others sought a refuge at Meerut. But elsewhere within the walls of Delhi, the scene was one of horror. The aged king was at the palace, and many Europeans had fled thither to claim his protection. With his knowledge and in the presence of his two sons they were brutally cut down or shot—ladies being stripped and forced to walk about naked before they were hacked to pieces, their infants having been tossed on the points of bayonets before their eyes. The mutiny had now grown to a wild frenzied lust for blood. No cruelty seemed too horrible for the Sepoys to perpetrate. The English officers who stayed with their regiments as an act of duty, and strove to restrain them from joining in the revolt, were mostly shot down or stabbed to death. In a fortified bastion near the Cashmere Gate, a number of Europeans, mostly women and children, had sought

shelter, and it was supposed that the native troops would protect them; but the wretches only waited till the place was filled with these defenceless refugees, upon whom they began firing when there were no means of escape. Some few of the poor creatures got away by dropping down into the ditch from a bastion of the tower, and with the help of two or three of the officers escaped to the bushes and the jungle, whence they were afterwards rescued by an escort of cavalry from Meerut. In a house near the great mosque of Delhi a number of Europeans had taken refuge, and as they had no water to drink, they begged to be taken to the palace. The rebels swore that if they would lay down their arms, water should be given them, and that they should be taken in safety to the king. They did so, and were immediately seized, placed in a row, and shot without mercy.

The principal magazine in Delhi was under the care of Lieutenants Willoughby, Forest, and Raynor. Directly they heard of the revolt, these officers ordered the gates to be closed and barricaded, while inside the gate leading to the barrack were placed two six-pounders, loaded with grape, beside which stood gunners with lighted matches in their hands ready to fire. The principal gate of the magazine was defended by two guns with *chevaux de frise* on the inside, and two six-pounders commanding the gate, and a small bastion in the vicinity. Within sixty yards of the gate were three more six-pounders, and a howitzer which could be so managed as to act upon any part of the magazine in its neighbourhood. Arms were given to the native troops who were inside the magazine, but they received them so reluctantly that it was evident they only wanted an opportunity to join the mutineers. These arrangements had scarcely been made when guards from the palace came and demanded possession of the magazine in the name of the King of Delhi. No answer was given to this summons, and soon afterwards scaling-ladders were placed against the wall. The troops inside immediately clambered up the sloped sheds of the magazine, and joined the insurgents by de-

scending the ladders, after which the enemy appeared in great numbers on the top of the walls, where an incessant fire was kept up on them by the two gunners, Buckley and Scully, who loaded and handled their guns with steady precision, firing round after round as long as a shot remained, though the Sepoys kept up a volley of musketry within forty or fifty yards. When the last round was fired Lieutenant Willoughby gave the order for exploding the magazine, and Scully immediately obeyed by firing the trains. A terrific explosion took place, and those who escaped from beneath the ruins rushed out through the sally-port on the river front, Lieutenant Willoughby being so seriously wounded that he died shortly afterwards, but the two other lieutenants surviving. Delhi could then only be retaken by the operations of a besieging army determined to force a way in.

On the 11th of May news of the mutiny at Meerut reached Lahore. Sir John Lawrence was away at Rawul Pindie, in the upper part of the district, but Mr. Robert Montgomery, the judicial commissioner, was a man capable of acting on an emergency. Not a moment was to be lost in keeping the mutiny out of the Punjab, which was the direction from which the insurrection must be stamped out; while the loss of it would have been more than a disaster, and might have resulted in at least the temporary paralysis of our ability to cope with the enemy, and the possible necessity for slowly reconquering a large part of India infected by the rebellion. The first thing to be done was to recapture Delhi, and with such a force as would effectually defeat and punish the insurgents. The immediate question was: Had the native soldiers at Meean Meer, a large military cantonment five or six miles from Lahore, already been tampered with till they were ready for revolt? Nobody could tell, and it was necessary to act with decision. The probabilities were that messages of sedition might have reached those regiments, and though there was a danger of driving them to rebellion by harshly assuming that they were already disaffected, there was a still greater risk in leaving them in a position to spread the revolt through the

province. There was to be a festival at Lahore on the night when the intelligence of the mutiny reached the commissioner—a grand ball and supper—and the entertainment was not postponed. It was in full swing while the leading civil and military officials held brief but earnest council. It was decided at once to disarm the native troops. A parade was ordered to be held at daybreak at Meean Meer, and when the four columns of Sepoys came on the ground, so well had the military disposition been made, that the head of the columns came in front of twelve guns charged with grape, the artillerymen standing ready to fire, and the European soldiers behind with loaded muskets. The word of command was given to the Sepoys to pile arms. There was nothing for it but to obey, or to be swept by the fire from the cannon, and shot down by a volley from the British infantry. The arms were piled and borne away in carts under the guard of European soldiers. Similar precautions were taken at Mooltan, in the lower province, and the Punjaub was saved. The great point, then, was to attack Delhi, and Lord Canning, knowing that there was not a moment to lose, boldly determined on an expedient which, though it required indemnification from the government, was the act of a man eminently capable of grasping even such a desperate situation as that in which he found himself. The termination of hostilities with Persia had fortunately released the forces from Herat, under Sir James Outram, Colonel Jacob, and Colonel Havelock, and they were hastening onward to the seat of the mutiny, but further reinforcements were needed in less time than that in which troops could arrive from England. Lord Canning knew that a force had been despatched to China to put an end to the war there: but the Chinese war could wait, while delay in India might be fatal: he therefore intercepted the troops which were on their way to Canton, and pressed them into the more imminent service of the suppression of the Indian mutiny.

At the end of May the mutiny broke out in the cantonments at Lucknow, amongst the lines of the 71st N. I., and soon became general. The Sepoys burned down some of the

buildings, and fired into the mess-room of the officers. One or two officers were afterwards shot dead; and it was not until a part of the 32nd had charged the rebels, and the artillery opened upon them, under the personal direction of Sir Henry Lawrence, that they gave way and quitted the cantonments. They retired to Moodripore, where they were joined by the 7th Light Cavalry, who murdered one of their officers on the spot.

The state of Lucknow now became threatening in the extreme; but Sir Henry Lawrence hoped by vigorous measures of repression to strike terror into the minds of the inhabitants and prevent a general rising. Numbers of men convicted of tampering with the troops were hanged on a gallows erected in front of the Mutchee Bhawn, and two members of the royal family at Delhi, and a brother of the ex-king of Oudh, were arrested and imprisoned there. The Residency itself was crowded with women and children, and every house and outhouse was occupied. Preparations for defence were continued, and thousands of Coolies employed at the batteries, stockades, and trenches, which were everywhere being constructed. The treasure and ammunition, of which, fortunately, there was a large supply, were buried, and as many guns as could be collected brought together. The Residency and Mutchee Bhawn presented most animated scenes. There were soldiers, Sepoys, prisoners in irons, men, women, and children, hundreds of servants, respectable natives in their carriages, Coolies carrying weights, heavy cannons, field-pieces, carts, elephants, camels, bullocks, horses, all moving about hither and thither, and continual bustle and noise was kept up from morning to night. There was scarcely a corner which was not in some way occupied and turned to account.

Sir Henry Lawrence was, as we have seen, governor of Oudh, to which he had removed from taking part in the government of the Punjaub in consequence of some difference of opinion between him and his brother John. Like the rest of the mutineers the irregular cavalry stationed near Lucknow had refused to bite their cartridges, and their discontent was communicated to the troops in the city

itself. Sir Henry was then suffering from severe illness, but he succeeded in disarming some of the mutineers, and fortified and provisioned the Residency at Lucknow. Directly he could place himself at the head of his troops he marched out against a body of rebels at a place called Chinhut, but they were already in such numbers that he was compelled to retire. On his return he found that the native troops at Lucknow, who had previously held aloof from the revolt, were in mutiny, and it required an immediate attack upon them by a part of the 32nd Regiment and the artillery to drive them to Moodripore, where, however, they were received by another body of mutinous Sepoys. The rebels were in such force that Sir Henry Lawrence found he could do nothing except prepare Lucknow for a siege and wait for help from without. The brave commander himself was to be one of the first victims. On the 2nd of July, he was up at day-break at work, and, suffering from fatigue and the weakness of recent illness, was lying on a sofa that he might, by the rest which it afforded, continue to give directions. His nephew and another officer were with him. Suddenly the crash of a shell was heard, the room was filled with dust and smoke, one of the officers was flung to the ground, and, in fear for his chief, called out directly he could make his voice heard, "Sir Henry, are you hurt?" "I am killed," was the faint but calm reply, and it was found that a splinter of the shell had given the general a mortal wound in the thigh. On the morning of the 4th he died, still calm and uncomplaining. He had made all the arrangements possible for the work which his successor would have to perform, and before he died, desired that the epitaph on his tomb should be—"Here lies Henry Lawrence, who tried to do his duty." The task of relieving Lucknow was to fall to another great and faithful general, Henry Havelock, but it could not be immediately accomplished.

For three months, night and day, the garrison were employed in beating back their assailants, who were able to take up positions in the mosques and other buildings outside the town, where at a short distance they could fire tremendous volleys of musketry into the

British position. It was declared that 8000 men sometimes fired at once upon the defenders; but the British held their own, made sorties and spiked the enemies' guns, worked countermines, and so harassed their assailants by repeated sallies, that at last it was a conflict between a comparative handful of brave and determined men, who would fight against any odds, and a horde of bloodthirsty wretches who, like wolves, prowled round the place but feared to approach too near, as the terrible Sahibs would rush out upon them, and in spite of numbers, drive them back with repeated loss.

But meantime a still more fearful struggle had been going on at another city about fifty miles (as the crow flies) from Lucknow. The very name of Cawnpore is still remembered as a word of horror, even though it may be hoped that it has long ceased to be associated with feelings of vengeance; but in the last months of 1857, it could not be mentioned either here or in India without exciting a passion of indignation which it was painful to witness. The atrocities perpetrated at Cawnpore roused the British troops, officers and men, to a pitch of fury that impelled them to attack almost single-handed whole companies of the mutinous Sepoys, and without a moment's hesitation to fight against numbers so overwhelming, that apparently only the frenzy of hate and a fierce determined purpose of revenge could have sustained the physical power which enabled them to break and scatter the opposing hosts, and to slay without pause, and with no more thought of fear than of mercy.

Cawnpore was one of the first-class military stations in India, for on the annexation of Oudh it had become necessary to maintain a strong military force there. It commanded the bridge over which passed the highroad to the town of Lucknow, the capital of the province. When the mutiny broke out in Meerut, there were in Cawnpore about 3000 native soldiers, consisting of two infantry and one cavalry regiment and a company of artillerymen. There were only about 300 English officers and soldiers, and the population of Europeans and the mixed race numbered about 1000, including the women and chil-

dren, officials, railway staff, merchants, shopkeepers, and their families. The native population was about 60,000. The garrison was under the command of Sir Hugh Wheeler, an old Bengal officer who had nearly reached his 75th year at the time of the breaking out of the mutiny. The whole territory represented by the surrounding stations was now in insurrection, and at all these places the rebels, many of whom at first pretended to be faithful that they might disarm suspicion, begun to murder indiscriminately all the Europeans, not sparing the ladies and children. In some cases the most solemn oaths were taken by the rebels that, if the English officers would give up their arms and cease further resistance, the lives of all in the place should be spared; but the oaths were not kept, the officers being killed, the children cut to pieces in presence of their mothers, and the women sabred one after the other with fiendish cruelty. At Allahabad the officers were shot down, and a Mohammedan moolvie having set himself up as the officer of the King of Delhi, all the Europeans who could be secured were barbarously murdered and many of them tortured. The place was taken less than a week after by Lieutenant-colonel O'Neill, who drove out the enemy and burnt the village to the ground. Where the Europeans contrived to escape to a fortified station, they were scarcely able to hold their own until the arrival of the English troops. In several cases they failed to do so and were murdered. Cawnpore was an important, but at the same time a poorly fortified place, standing on a peninsula between the Ganges and the Jumna, and built on the south bank of the Ganges, there nearly a quarter of a mile broad in the dry season, and more than a mile across when swelled by rains. Seeing the dangerous temper of the Sepoys, Sir Hugh Wheeler had begun to form an intrenched camp round the hospital barracks, between the soldiers' church and some unfinished lines for European troops. It was an ineffectual defensive position, and so far as could afterwards be judged it would have been better if he had concentrated his force at the treasury and the magazine, for his intrenchment was formed only by a mud wall

about five feet high. Before the 1st of June the European non-military residents at Cawnpore had moved into the church and other buildings near the intrenchment, within which the records and the commissariat treasure chests were placed; a quantity of ammunition had been buried under ground, though from some extraordinary oversight the magazine which had been deserted had not been blown up. Sir Hugh Wheeler's position was a desperate one, and he had sent a secret messenger more than once to Sir Henry Lawrence at Lucknow to ask for aid if he could possibly send it; but Sir Henry was obliged to reply that he could not spare a single man, for he was himself in a sore strait waiting for relief from without.

It was at this juncture that Sir Hugh Wheeler, after some hesitation, came to the fatal conclusion to ask aid of the Chief of Bithoor. He was the son of a Brahmin of the Deccan, and had been adopted by Bajee Rao, the ex-Peishwah of Poonah, whose large compensatory pension of 800 lacs of rupees he had expected to inherit. Lord Dalhousie had in his settlement of Oudh either neglected or had refused to entertain this claim, and so Doondhoo Punth, or, as he was more frequently called, Nana Sahib, had become a doubtful friend if not a concealed foe to the British government. It is not easy to say whether, when Sir Hugh Wheeler sent to him at his house at Bithoor, a small town about twelve miles up the river from Cawnpore, he was already decidedly hostile or whether he was still treacherously uncertain—waiting to see what turn affairs might take—but it soon became evident that he had no good intentions. That Nana Sahib was a crafty, cruel, and treacherous villain there can be no doubt; but he had mixed much with Europeans, and though he was unacquainted with the English language, had acquired manners of refinement which distinguished him as a native gentleman, while at the same time he was regarded as a friend to the British residents, among whom he had been so often well received. He lived in a semi-princely state, his house was fortified, and he was allowed a retinue of 200 soldiers and three field-pieces. To him Sir Hugh Wheeler applied, and he

promptly—perhaps with suspicious alacrity—came with his guns and his men to Cawnpore. This pleasant gentleman, who had so often been the host and the guest of the English military and civil officials, and whose fat unwieldy person and slow easy-natured manner were as well known in the district as his luxurious mode of living, was either a deep dissimulator waiting for an opportunity to wreak vengeance for the refusal of his claim to a pension, or his supposed wrongs flamed up when they met the spark of opportunity, and all the wild beast nature in him, long subdued by custom, grew into sudden ferocity. What happened when he reached Cawnpore seems to have been this: the mutineers demanded that he should become one of their leaders, if not their chief, and lead them on to Delhi, the centre of the revolt. The smooth Azimoolah Khan, his confidential adviser, opposed this. Why should he, who had his own cause to make good as an hereditary ruler with a grudge against the hated English, be absorbed in the pretensions of the family of Tippoo Sahib? Let him act there and then, by taking possession of the country round Cawnpore. He yielded so soon, that it must be doubted whether he had not all along reserved the notion of turning against the English, and he at once called on Sir Hugh Wheeler to surrender the intrenchments. The surrender was not made, and the mutineers were ordered to make a general assault on the mud walls behind the open space. That assault was repulsed with heroic bravery by about 400 men who could fight, out of 465 who were there within the frail defences, with about 280 married women and girls and as many children. It was then that the answer was brought back from Lucknow that Sir Henry Lawrence had not a man to spare. The beleaguered garrison at Cawnpore would have to resist to the bitter end unless assistance arrived from afar to release them. It seemed as though the intrenchments would inclose only the dead or the dying before that succour could arrive. The fire of the mutineers continued night and day, and the rebel army was reinforced by swarms of the vilest miscreants of Oudh, the slinking ruffians who had escaped from jail, or being in hiding had

crept forth like wolves or vultures to share in the carnage. But though they kept up an incessant fusillade, they never attempted an assault on the position without being driven back in a fright, or falling dead in numbers before the desperate valour of the now diminishing defenders, who were not only in constant danger from the bullets of their enemies, but were suffering the pangs of thirst. No water could be obtained except from one well, which was constantly covered by the Sepoy guns, until an expedition to replenish the water-bottles became a “forlorn hope” never accomplished except at the expense of wounds, if not of the death of one or other adventurer. In all these long weeks not a bucket, not a spongeful of water could be spared for the purpose of personal cleanliness, and that in such a climate and among a community largely consisting of English ladies and children accustomed to habits of refinement. The magazine and the treasury had been taken by the Sepoys. The 3d Oudh battery which was in the trench with the Europeans began to mutiny, and were disarmed and sent out of the place, leaving about 300 fighting men including the officers of the native regiment, and eight mounted guns. Nana Sahib was joined by a large body of Oudh natives, who had the reputation of being the best fighting men in India, and he then ordered a grand assault, but with the usual result. The indomitable garrison, daily diminishing in numbers, with only such rations of water as could be drawn at great risk at night when the fire slackened a little, and with a diminishing supply of meat, because there were no sheltered places in which to preserve the cattle, yet drove back the enemy with such effect that the rest of the Sepoys began to think it was useless to attempt to scale those puny ramparts while there were any Englishmen left behind them. Unless Nana Sahib could take Cawnpore his influence would melt away rapidly, and therefore Hindoo craft and treachery took the place of courage. He conferred with his lieutenant Tantia Topee, and with his agent Azimoolah, and the result was a message to the intrenchments that all those who were in no way connected with the acts of Lord Dalhousie, and

who were willing to lay down their arms, should receive a safe passage to Allahabad.

The mutiny broke out at Cawnpore on the forenoon of the 7th of June, and from that day to the 24th an almost incessant fire had been kept up on the intrenched camp. It was on the last-mentioned day that this message was sent by Nana Sahib, offering in effect to allow all in the camp to go to Allahabad in safety, if they would abandon the intrenchment and give up the treasures and stores. What else was to be done? Allahabad was in the hands of the English. To the offer was added a promise of food and boats to carry the garrison, the women and children. There were many sick, and several dying. Some of the women and children who had died had been thrown at night into a well outside the intrenchments. There was no possibility of giving them burial. Scarcely a corner of the buildings had escaped the shot and shell of the enemy, who at last had thrown live-hot shells and had thus set fire to the barracks, which burned so fiercely that it was difficult to remove any of the women and children, and about forty of the sick and helpless perished. All the medicines were destroyed. Tents had been struck to preserve them from the bombardment. Who would have neglected a chance of release? The proposal was assented to by General Wheeler, and for the two days following, the frightened residents in the intrenchment enjoyed comparative quiet to prepare for the journey.

"On the 26th," wrote Lieutenant Delafosse (one of only four survivors of this treacherous scheme), "a committee of officers went to the river to see that the boats were ready and serviceable; and everything being reported ready, and carriages for the wounded having arrived, we gave over our guns, &c., and marched on the morning of the 27th of June, about seven o'clock. We got down to the river and into the boats without being molested in the least, but no sooner were we in the boats, and had laid down our muskets and taken off our coats to work easier at the boats, than the cavalry gave the order to fire. Two guns that had been hidden were run out and opened on us immediately, while Sepoys came

from all directions and kept up a fire. The men jumped out of the boats, and, instead of trying to get the boats loose from their moorings, swam to the first boat they saw loose. Only three boats got safely over to the opposite side of the river, but were met there by two field-pieces, guarded by a number of cavalry and infantry. Before these boats had got a mile down the stream, half our small party were either killed or wounded, and two of our boats had been swamped. We had now only one boat, crowded with wounded, and having on board more than she could carry. The two guns followed us the whole of the day, the infantry firing on us the whole of that night." Those in the boats who were not killed by the fire of the Sepoys were seized and carried back to Cawnpore, where the men were all shot, and the women carried to a building which had been formerly used as an assembly-room, and kept close prisoners. They were not kept long in suspense as to their fate. The Nana having learned on the 15th that the British troops had carried the bridge over the Pandoo Nuddee, and that nothing could stop the irresistible march of Havelock's column, issued, through the Begum, a frightful order to slay the entire company. His instructions were but too faithfully obeyed. The Begum approached the building in which the Europeans were confined, accompanied by five men, each armed with a sabre; two of them appeared to be Hindoo peasants, two were known to be butchers, Mohammedans, and one was dressed in the red uniform of the Maharajah's body-guard. "The horrible work commenced by half-a-dozen Sepoys discharging their muskets at random through the windows upon the defenceless victims. The five men armed with sabres were then observed to enter the building quietly, and close the doors. What next took place no one was spared to relate. Shrieks and scuffling were heard at significant intervals, acquainting those outside that the hired executioners were earning their pay. The one in the red uniform was observed to come to the door twice, and obtain a new sabre in exchange for one handed out hacked and broken. The

noise gradually lessened, and at nightfall the executioners could lock the doors and retire from the building, with the feeble moans of a few half-slaughtered women ringing in their ears. Three at least survived till the morning (the 16th), when the doors of the slaughter-house were once more opened, and the naked bodies and dismembered limbs dragged ignominiously across the compound to a dry well situated behind some trees which grew near by. The three (says the writer here quoted) prayed for the sake of God that an end might be put to their suffering. Their prayer was heard. Their bodies were cast with the others into the well, and the bloody work fitly finished by the slaughter of two fair-haired children, who in some unknown manner had escaped the sword the night before, and were moving in childish terror about the well. One person was of opinion that the man who threw them in, first took the trouble to kill the children—others thought not."

"I have seen the fearful slaughter-house," writes the *Times'* correspondent, "and also one of the First Native Infantry men, according to order, wash up part of the blood which stains the floor, before burying the quantities of dresses, clogged thickly with blood; children's frocks, frills, and ladies' underclothing of all kinds; also boys' trousers, leaves of Bibles, and of one book in particular, which seemed to be strewed over the whole place, called *Preparation for Death*; also broken daguerreotype cases only, lots of them, and hair, some nearly a yard long; bonnets all bloody, and one or two shoes. I picked up a bit of paper with on it 'Ned's hair, with love,' and, opened, I found a little bit tied up with a ribbon."

An officer in Havelock's corps thus describes the appearance of the place when the avenging army entered the town on the 17th:—"I was directed to the house where all the poor miserable ladies had been murdered. It was alongside the Cawnpore Hotel, where the Nana lived. I never was more horrified. The place was one mass of blood. I am not exaggerating when I tell you that the soles of my boots were more than covered with the

blood of these poor wretched creatures. Portions of their dresses, collars, children's socks, and ladies' round hats lay about, saturated with blood; and in the sword-cuts on the wooden pillars of the room, long dark hair was carried by the edge of the weapon, and there hung their tresses—a most painful sight. I have often wished since that I had never been there, but sometimes wish that every soldier was taken there, that he might witness the barbarities our poor countrywomen suffered. Their bodies were afterwards dragged out and thrown down a well outside the building, where their limbs were to be seen sticking out in a mass of gory confusion."

A thrill of horror at these fiendish outrages, a moan of lamentation that they had occurred before help could reach the victims, a lightning flash of fury against the wretches who had committed such crimes, went through England, and had been already experienced by the Europeans and the army in India. The avenging sword was already impending over the assassins, and the footsteps of the general who directed it was on the track which they had marked with blood. Sir Colin Campbell, that stout veteran of the Crimea, had been appointed by the government in London, commander-in-chief of the Indian forces, and he it was who was sent out, to hasten, with fresh troops, to the relief of the forces already engaged. He lost no time about it. A few hours after he had received orders he embarked, and he reached Calcutta on the 14th of August, where he at once issued an address to the army—an army which, after it had been considerably reinforced, amounted to fewer than 5000 men. But another general was sternly treading on the heels of the enemy before Sir Colin arrived at the scene of action. The name of Henry Havelock was already known in India; but in a few weeks it was to sound like a stirring trumpet blast not only over the East, but throughout England, so swift and brilliant was the heroic march of the small force that he led to victory and to the execution of the sentence for which the world was waiting. There was in General Havelock something of the staid, grave Puritan type of soldier, but with much underlying

sweetness. He was more than sixty years old, and had for thirty-four years been serving in the East. He was in the Burmese war of 1824, and the Sikh war of 1845. Always of a serious temperament, Havelock had been known, even when he was a Charterhouse school-boy, by the half-endearing sobriquet of "old phlos," meaning old philosopher; and his religious training as a member of the Baptist communion had tended to deepen and intensify his earnest character by the sanctions and influences of religion. It may be said that Havelock's was a very rare, if not a unique character, among officers in the army in modern times. Not because there are not good and religiously disposed gentlemen holding her majesty's commission, but because his earnestness and example were exerted for the purpose of influencing the men under his command, and *did* influence them, so that at all events drunkenness and profane language were not tolerated in their ranks, and the observances of religion held a definite, and, as it appeared, an honoured and sacred place among their daily engagements. Perhaps never since the old Puritan or the Huguenot times had there been an entire regiment with the characteristics which distinguished "Havelock's Saints," as they were called; and they carried the resemblance still further when fighting had to be done by doing it with all their might. They seemed to go to their terrible work as Cromwell's Ironsides went to theirs, or in the manner of the French refugees at the Battle of the Boyne.

Unhappily General Havelock had not reached Calcutta in time to make an effort to avert the horrible tragedy at Cawnpore; but immediately on his arrival he went to Allahabad to organize the troops which had arrived there in small detachments from various places as quickly as the imperfect means of transport would allow. With 1200 men he pushed forward at once, half way to Cawnpore, and on the road was joined by Major Renard, who, with 800 men, had been suppressing the revolt in that neighbourhood. The whole force was about 1400 British bayonets, eight guns, and about 500 of the native troops. A force of the mutineers 3500 strong occupied Futteh-pore, a place full of garden inclosures, strong

walls, and houses of solid masonry, approached by swamps, fronted by hillocks, villages, and large groves, which were occupied by the enemy, who began to cannonade the advancing fronts of the British, and to threaten their flanks with cavalry and infantry. But Havelock, by a rapid disposition of his men, and the quickness and range of the fire from the Enfield rifles, was able to push his artillery forward, and commence a tremendous volley, under cover of which the British line advanced, and the enemy, abandoning three of their guns, fell back on the town, from which, however, they were subsequently driven and pursued when they endeavoured to make a stand, so that at length they broke in disorder and fled, leaving twelve cannon and numbers of dead upon the field. The victorious column then marched on to Cawnpore, driving out the rebels at the various places on which they encountered them, in a series of sharp engagements which lasted till they were within eight miles of the city. It was on hearing of the advance of the British column that Nana Sahib ordered the massacre of the women and children. He then took up a position at a village where the Grand Trunk road united with the road leading to the military cantonment of Cawnpore. His intrenchments rendered both roads impassable, and his guns had been drawn up all along his position, which consisted of a series of villages. It was evident that he expected the British to attack in front, but Havelock was too able a soldier to fall into such an error. He halted his troops for two or three hours in the mango groves, that they might rest from the burning heat and cook their rations. Then moving them off so that they could defile round the left, so arranged them, that the guns were at intervals ready for attack or defence. It was a difficult manœuvre, for the enemy, perceiving it, began to play shot and shell from the whole of his guns; but our men advanced in the face of the heavy fire, took the guns, drove out the mutineers, and afterwards entirely routed them. At daybreak, before our column had recommenced its march, a tremendous explosion was heard. It was the magazine at Cawnpore, which the miscreant Nana Sahib

had blown up as he quitted the place, where, it is said, he stayed long enough to order the murder of one woman, who had escaped or survived the massacre; he then fell back upon his fortress at Bithoor; but he feared to stay there, for he knew that his life was not worth a moment's purchase if the British should force it and capture him.

We have already indicated the horrible spectacle that awaited Havelock's column when the men entered Cawnpore. Among the stories current afterwards was a report that the soldiers had picked up and divided among themselves a tress severed from the head of one of the murdered girls, and had sworn that for every hair a Sepoy should die. If that vow was ever made, it was kept to the full.

General Neill, who was afterwards killed on the entry of the troops into Lucknow, soon arrived from Benares, and was left in charge at Cawnpore while General Havelock continued his march. That march was marked by a series of tremendous conflicts, which commenced immediately after crossing the Ganges and through the part of the Oudh territory towards Lucknow. The troops of Nana Sahib, that is to say, the army of the mutinous Sepoys, had occupied strong positions on the route, and had planted their artillery so that, with their vastly superior numbers, they had a tremendous advantage. But the spectacle at Cawnpore would, if anything had been needed, have fired our men to even more daring than that of attacking with the impetuosity of anger what might have seemed to be overwhelming forces. They rushed at the foe, broke through intrenchments, sprang upon the earthworks, and, with ringing cheers and unbroken spirit, drove the flying Sepoys into full retreat, capturing their guns and giving no quarter.

The column was worn out with fatigue, and had to recross the river to Cawnpore, where they joined General Neill's troops, who were being menaced from Bithoor by a strong body of rebels—a body of Nana Sahib's troops—who had occupied a plain densely covered with thickets, flanked by villages, and intersected by streams; while behind were the nar-

row streets and brick houses of Bithoor. Another battle had therefore to be fought by the weary column, and it *was* fought and won, the enemy being driven out and the guns captured, though the want of cavalry prevented pursuit.

These were the kind of battles fought in that horrible mutiny, and nine of them had been Havelock's share. His column was reduced to 700 men, and he fell back on Cawnpore for breathing time and to wait for reinforcements, which Sir James Outram was bringing from Calcutta. Sir James Outram, who was returning from the Persian war, which had been brought to a conclusion, was sent to Oudh as chief-commissioner with full civil and military power, and had he marched to Cawnpore in that capacity he would have superseded Havelock and snatched from him his well-earned laurels; but with a noble sense of justice which the general must have deeply appreciated, he wrote to tell of his coming, and concluded the letter by saying: "To you shall be left the glory of relieving Lucknow, for which you have already struggled so much. I shall accompany you only in my civil capacity as commissioner, placing my military service at your disposal, should you please, and serving under you as a volunteer."

On the 19th and 20th of September the relieving force had crossed the Ganges—in-
fantry, artillery, and a few cavalry, in all about 2500 men and with 17 guns. They had to fight their way by another series of engagements, and the troops, tired, ill-fed, and after marching in a deluge of rain, had to rest under their tents before advancing on the town.

It was not till the 25th of September that the welcome clamour of the relieving force aroused the sufferers at Lucknow, who had been besieged by the rebel Sepoys for eighty-seven days. The fighting during the day was so severe that at nightfall Sir James Outram proposed to halt till morning within the courts of the Mehal. "But," writes General Havelock, "I esteemed it to be of such importance to let the beleaguered garrison know that succour was at hand, that with his ulti-

mate sanction I directed the main body of the 78th Highlanders, and the regiment of Ferozepore, to advance. This column rushed on with a desperate gallantry, led by Sir James Outram and myself, and Lieutenants Hudson and Hargood of my staff, through streets of flat-roofed loopholed houses, from which a perpetual fire was kept up; and, overcoming every obstacle, established itself within the inclosure of the Residency. The joy of the garrison may be more easily conceived than described; but it was not till the next evening that the whole of my troops, guns, tumbrils, and sick and wounded, continually exposed to the attacks of the enemy, could be brought step by step within the enceinte and the adjacent palace of the Fureed Buksh. To form an adequate idea of the obstacles overcome reference must be made to the events that are known to have occurred at Buenos Ayres and Saragossa. Our advance was through streets of houses such as I have described, and thus each forming a separate fortress. I am filled with surprise at the success of the operation, which demanded the efforts of 10,000 good troops. The advantage gained has cost us dear. The killed, wounded, and missing—the latter being wounded soldiers, who, I much fear, some or all, have fallen into the hands of a merciless foe—amounted, up to the evening of the 26th, to 535 officers and men.”

Amongst those who were killed was General Neill, shot dead by a bullet, and surely no better or braver soldier fell in India that year. Although the beleaguered garrison at the Residency was thus nominally relieved, it was impossible to extricate the helpless mass of women and children, and non-combatants, from their perilous position by attempting to march back upon Cawnpore. The generals, therefore, determined to remain at Lucknow, strengthening the garrison by the troops they had brought, and to wait until Sir Colin Campbell, the new commander-in-chief, should come up and secure their safety. During this time the column known as Greathed's Column had been performing prodigies of valour against the rebels in various places, and it may be said that the brilliant victory at

Agra, and the exploits which were followed by the continuation of the march of the column under Brigadier Hope Grant to Cawnpore, and thence to the Alumbagh on the 8th of November, contributed largely to the rapid success of the operations which stamped out the mutiny.

By the end of September eighty ships had successively reached Calcutta from England, carrying 30,000 troops. As the regiments arrived they were sent up the country to Cawnpore as quickly as possible, but it was not till the 9th of November that Sir Colin Campbell was able to march from Cawnpore for the final relief of Lucknow, then hemmed in by overwhelming numbers of the rebels.

On the 15th of November, the march of Sir Colin Campbell to the Residency was telegraphed from the Alumbagh, and, not heeding the danger, many gallant fellows mounted the tower of the fortress to watch the onward career of that cloud of fire and smoke which marked the position of the veteran's army.

Most of us have heard the story of the Scotch nurse who was in the fortification when hope had almost left the beleaguered garrison, and who suddenly started up, declaring that she heard the sound of the pibroch of the Highland regiments, and that the British were on the march to deliver them.

The troops under Sir Colin Campbell must have been miles distant at that time; but, if the story be true, the prophecy was fulfilled, for the army of relief came in almost without stopping, and the Highland regiments swept down on the cowardly foe with irresistible force whenever they were ordered to the charge, their bagpipes sounding the notes of war, and the men answering with wild cheers.

Early on that morning the British troops advanced to attack the Secunderbagh north of the canal. By a running fight which lasted two hours, they gained a position at the Dilkhoosa and Martiniere, the former, which means "Heart's delight," being a palace of brick, in a kind of park, the latter a school, both strong positions near the canal, and on the road to the very heart of the Residency. So important were these points, that at three o'clock in the afternoon the enemy attempted to dislodge the

British forces, but after a severe struggle were repulsed heavily, and on the 16th, the commander-in-chief advanced straight across the canal, after a fierce fight, in which the rebels suffered enormous loss. On the head of the column marching up a lane to the left, fire was opened by the rebels, and a sharp fight commenced on both sides, lasting for about an hour and a half. It was then determined to carry the place by storm through a small breach which had been made. "This," wrote the commander-in-chief, "was done in the most brilliant manner by the remainder of the Highlanders, with the 53d and the 4th Punjaub Infantry, supported by a battalion of detachments under Major Barnston. There never was a bolder feat of arms, and the loss inflicted on the enemy, after the entrance of the Secunderbagh was effected, was immense. More than 2000 of the enemy were afterwards carried out. Captain Peel's royal naval siege-train then went to the front, and advanced towards the Shah Nujeef, together with the field battalion and some mortars, the village to the left having been cleared by Brigadier Hope and Lieutenant-colonel Gordon. The Shah Nujeef is a domed mosque with a garden, of which the most had been made by the enemy. The wall of the inclosure of the mosque was loopholed with great care. The entrance to it had been covered by a regular work in masonry, and the top of the building was crowned with a parapet. From this, and from the defences in the garden, an unceasing fire of musketry was kept up from the commencement of the attack. This position was defended with great resolution against a heavy cannonade for three hours. It was then stormed in the boldest manner by the 93d Highlanders, under Brigadier Hope, supported by a battalion of detachments under Major Barnston, who was, I regret to say, severely wounded; Captain Peel leading up his heavy guns with extraordinary gallantry within a few yards of the building to batter the massive stone walls. The withering fire of the Highlanders effectually covered the naval brigade from great loss. But it was an action almost unexampled in war. Captain Peel behaved very much as if he had been laying the

Shannon alongside an enemy's frigate. This brought the day's operations to a close."

Next day a building, called the mess-house, which was of considerable size and defended by a ditch and loopholed mud wall, was taken by storm; "and then," says the commander-in-chief, "the troops pressed forward with great vigour, and lined the wall separating the mess-house from the Motee Mahal, which consists of a wide inclosure and many buildings. The enemy here made a last stand, which was overcome after an hour, openings having been broken in the wall, through which the troops poured, with a body of sappers, and accomplished our communications with the Residency. I had the inexpressible satisfaction, shortly afterwards, of greeting Sir James Outram and Sir Henry Havelock, who came out to meet me before the action was at an end. The relief of the besieged garrison had been accomplished." While the commander-in-chief was thus winning his way to the Residency, by his own admirable strategy and the resistless gallantry of his troops, General Havelock and the garrison pent up within its walls were not idle. Mines were driven under the outer wall of the garden in advance of the palace, which had been already breached in several places by the rebels; and also under some buildings in the vicinity; and as soon as it became known that Sir Colin Campbell was attacking the Secunderbagh these mines were exploded. Two powerful batteries, which had been erected in the inclosure, masked by the outer wall, were then brought into play, and poured shot and shell into the palace. At last the advance sounded. "It was impossible," wrote General Havelock, "to describe the enthusiasm with which the signal was received by the troops. Pent up in inaction for upwards of six weeks, and subjected to constant attacks, they felt that the hour of retribution and glorious exertion had returned. Their cheers echoed through the courts of the palace responsive to the bugle sound, and on they rushed to assured victory. The enemy could nowhere withstand them. In a few minutes the whole of the buildings were in our possession, and have since been armed with cannon and steadily held against all

attack." Sir Colin Campbell's great object now was to effect the removal of the non-combatants from the Residency, including the sick and wounded, without exposing them to the fire of the enemy. For this purpose he formed a line of posts on the left rear of his position, which were maintained unbroken, notwithstanding many attacks and a vigorous fire kept up by the rebels.

"Having led the enemy to believe that immediate assault was contemplated, orders were issued for the retreat of the garrison through the lines of our pickets at midnight on the 22d. The ladies and families, the wounded, the treasure, the guns it was thought worth while to keep, the ordnance stores, the grain still possessed by the commissary of the garrison, and the state prisoners, had all been previously removed. Sir James Outram had received orders to burst the guns which it was thought undesirable to take away; and he was finally directed silently to evacuate the Residency of Lucknow at the hour indicated. The dispositions to cover their retreat and to resist the enemy, should he pursue, were so ably carried out that the enemy was completely deceived, and did not attempt to follow. On the contrary, he began firing on our old positions many hours after we had left them. The Dilkhoosa was reached at 4 a.m. on the 23d inst. by the whole force." Thus the relief of Lucknow was effected. The triumph was saddened by the death of Sir Henry Havelock, who, already worn out by the tremendous exertion he had undergone, had also been suffering from dysentery, which at last became incurable. He was removed to the Dilkhoosa, in the hope that a change to a more salubrious air might mitigate the disease; but he died in a few days.

We must for a moment return to Delhi—the core and centre of the mutiny. We have seen how, before the arrival of reinforcements from England, and the co-operation of forces brought together from distant stations, the mutiny had to be met by a mere handful of men, who found themselves opposed to a vast body of rebels led by a trained army with weapons, ammunition, and artillery; stimu-

lated to the wildest ferocity, and ready for any cruelties. These conditions were severely felt when our troops set out for the recapture of Delhi. General Anson, who was then commander-in-chief, had gone to Simla just before the outbreak of the mutiny at Meerut, and when tidings of the revolt reached him he hastened down to Umballah, where he collected as many troops as could be spared and proceeded toward Delhi. He only reached Kurnaul, where he died of cholera on the 27th of May, and was succeeded in command by Major-general Reed, an aged officer, whose broken health unfitted him for much active service. On the 8th of June, Reed reached the camp of Major-general Sir Henry Barnard at Alleepore, where a large number of troops had assembled; and at the same time Brigadier-general Wilson came up from Meerut with as strong a force as he could bring together, having defeated a body of insurgents on the way, and taken twenty-six guns. On the 8th of June the combined force set out after midnight, and as General Reed had fallen sick the command devolved on General Barnard. The enemy occupied a fortified position with a heavy battery before the city, but they were charged with the bayonets of the 75th Regiment and driven from their guns. Sir Henry Barnard then divided his forces, the column under General Wilson marching along the main trunk-road, while he led his men through the ruined and deserted cantonments to a ridge held by mutineers with their artillery. A short sharp fight sufficed to drive them back, for our men had already learned the fate of their countrywomen, and they smote fiercely and unsparingly. The place was carried, and at the same time Wilson's column, with the impetus of vengeance, had charged its way through high-walled gardens and climbed over obstacles, without pausing in its effort to reach the murderers, who were driven before it, and compelled to retreat in confusion into the city. The Ghoorkas, a hardy tribe of hill soldiers, aided our troops with admirable courage and loyalty, which they continued to display throughout the campaign. The two generals met at a place called Hindoo Rao's House, a

strong brick building on the top of a high hill on the north of the city, and half-way between the former cantonments and the Moree Gate of Delhi. It was near this place that the camp was afterwards pitched, and the house was chosen as the position for bombarding Delhi by means of three batteries constructed to throw shot and shell. In front of the camp was the old cantonment, in the rear a canal, on the left the river Jumna. The ground on which the troops took their position was high and rocky, so that it was well adapted for the siege, during which for months our small force had to struggle against the efforts of the enormous rebel army which had swarmed into the city. The fortifications of Delhi extended about seven miles, with an area of about three square miles, the eastern sides being defended both by the river Jumna and an irregular wall with bastions and towers, solid walls of masonry, parapets for musketry, and all the regular appliances of a great stronghold. On the western side of the city the last spurs of a range of mountains made a low ridge where a number of ravines of considerable depth formed a kind of hollow way, which was of great use in protecting the besiegers; while the large quantities of trees, brushwood, and masses of old building outside the city were also of some advantage by affording cover for the siege operations. We need not follow the details of the siege, which went on for week after week, during which the mutineers would steal out of the city under cover of the rocks and brushwood and endeavour to surprise our camp, but only to be driven back by the Guides (a corps of Sikh soldiers), or by our riflemen, who would pursue them to the very walls of Delhi, every prisoner who was taken being either shot or killed on the spot. Day by day the British lines were extended till our small besieging force reached the ridge nearest the walls, and lay near the Moree and Ajmeer Gates.

A legend had long been circulated among the disaffected natives that the hundredth anniversary of the battle of Plassy would witness the downfall of British power in India. How the prophecy originated it would be difficult to tell, but it is easy to imagine the use that

was made of it. This centenary was the 23d of June, 1857, and in London a meeting was held for the purpose of erecting a statue to Clive in his native town. There was a good deal of talk about India, and reference was made both in and out of parliament to some disturbing rumours, but nobody appeared to regard the matter as very serious; nobody was aware that a wide-spread rebellion had been growing for six weeks, that regiments were being hurriedly collected in the Punjaub and the north-west to join the small force at the siege of Delhi. Neither the anniversary nor the prophecy was forgotten at Delhi, and the mutineers made a desperate sortie, great numbers of them coming out and keeping up an attack on the English batteries, but only to be driven back with crushing defeat. But with the force at the command of the British generals it appeared impossible to storm the city, and during the heavy rains of July the troops lay in their encampment occupied chiefly in resisting the attacks of the enemy, and firing upon the city. First the health of General Barnard and then the strength of General Reed gave way, and the latter made over the command of the army to Brigadier-general Wilson. Without heavy artillery it would have been futile to attempt to storm the strong walls and great fortifications of Delhi, and on the 25th of August it was evident that the enemy was moving out of the city with the intention of crossing the canal and attacking our troops in the rear. General Nicholson was at once despatched with 3000 men to the point at which it was supposed they would cross. The mutineers were drawn up in position between the bridge and the town, but the word was given to our men to cross a broad and deep ford, and directly they had reached the other side they formed in line and charged, broke the ranks of the enemy, and utterly routed them, forcing them to run across the canal and leave all their guns. General Nicholson then blew up the bridge and returned. Not till the 4th of September did the siege train arrive from Meerut, and then not a soldier from England, for all the reinforcements which had by that time arrived were engaged between Calcutta and Cawnpore.

But Delhi must be taken, and the siege-guns were at once placed in position to silence the fire of the enemy from the walls in front of the intended line of attack, between the Water Gate and the Cashmere Gate. On the 13th the Cashmere Bastion was in ruins, the Moree Battery nearly silenced, and the magazine and works at the Water Bastion destroyed. Then out went an order to the army, declaring the general's reliance upon British pluck and determination, cautioning the men to keep together and not to straggle from their columns, reminding the troops of the murders committed on their officers and comrades, as well as on women and children; and while announcing that no quarter should be given to mutineers, calling upon the men "for the sake of humanity and the honour of the country to which they belonged, to spare all women and children who came in their way." The Cashmere Gate was to be blown up, and through the breach the army was to force its way in and storm the city. It was a desperate service which was required by the explosion party, and it was done in the face of death. The sappers and miners, covered by the fire of the 6th Rifles, advanced to the gate at double quick march; the first being those who carried the powder-bags, followed by Lieutenant Salkeld, Corporal Burgess, and the remainder of the devoted band. The advanced men of the forlorn hope reached the gateway unhurt to find that part of the draw-bridge had been destroyed; but walking like cats across the beams that remained, each laid his bag of powder at the gate, though the enemy was firing at him through a wicket. Sergeant Carmichael fell dead as he lodged his bag in its place. Havildar Mahor, of the native sappers, was severely wounded; but the work was done, and the advanced party slipped down into the ditch to make room for Lieutenant Salkeld to bring up his party to fire the charge. Before he could set light to it he was shot in the leg, and handed his slow-match to Corporal Burgess, who fell mortally wounded at the moment that he had accomplished the duty. A havildar and a Sepoy of the Sikh regiment also fell, one wounded, the other killed, and Lieutenant Salkeld after-

wards died; but the match had been set, the explosion shook the air, the bugle sounded to the assault, and amidst the crash and roar the entrance to Delhi was carried by the column under General Nicholson. The men desperately fought their way into the city, re-formed, and moved to the direction of the Cabul Gate; but their general had fallen, and their progress was checked by the tremendous fire poured on them from the guns that commanded the narrow pathway. But a second column had stormed the Water Gate and taken possession of the walls, where they turned one of the enemy's guns upon the Lahore Gate to silence the heavy fire of the mutineers. A third column followed through the breach of the Cashmere Gate, took possession of the round tower which had been the scene of the early massacre, and fought their way to the Great Mosque, which they could not force for want of artillery, its arches having been bricked up, its gates closed, and a heavy fire of musketry protecting it. Two troops of horse artillery and a cavalry brigade under Major Tombs and Brigadier Hope Grant had formed in front of the walls, desperately fought their way to the Cabul Gate, and under a terrible fire prevented the enemy from attacking our batteries. Once within the city our troops had to force their way, fighting with swarms of armed rebels, who had taken up every point of defence in streets and buildings. As the men took up their hardly-won positions the light guns were brought forward and discharged on the houses of the neighbourhood. By the 20th the Lahore Gate was in our hands, and the city was practically taken. The king had made his escape from the palace with two of his sons, the people of the city left it and went outside the walls, and at last the rebel troops fled precipitately, abandoning their camp, a great deal of their property, and their sick and wounded. Then 4000 to 5000 of them retreated across the bridge of boats into the Doab (the country between the Jumna and the Ganges), while the remainder took their way down the right bank of the river, leaving Delhi in our hands. The gate of the palace was then blown in, and the headquarters of General Wilson established there.

That building, supposed to be one of the most magnificent palaces in India, with its fine wall and splendid entrance, its hall of justice built of white marble, its royal throne inlaid with gold and mosaics, had been defiled by the mutinous rabble. The interior was filthy and disorderly beyond description, for the revolted Sepoy had revelled in its cool archways. "I went all over the state apartments and the harem," wrote an officer. "The latter is a curious place, and had a remarkable appearance: its floor covered with guitars, bangles, &c., and redolent of sandal-wood. The fair daughters of Cashmere had their swing in the centre of the room. They had left in a great hurry: dresses, silks, slippers, were lying on all sides. On leaving the place I met a doolie surrounded by some cavalry and a few natives on foot. Its inmate was a thin-faced, anxious-looking old man. This was the King of Hindostan, the descendant of the great Moguls, entering his palace in the hands of his enemies."

To this reappearance of the king at the palace hangs a tale which, at the time when it became known, caused no little excitement and some disapprobation. One of the officers who held a prominent place in the suppression of the mutiny was Lieutenant Hodson, the commander of a body of cavalry known as "Hodson's Horse." He had once been in the civil service in the Punjab, and was reported to have left it in consequence of having exhibited a high temper towards one of the native rulers which brought him under the implied censure of his superiors; but being a man of cool determined courage and considerable ability he entered on a military career, and soon became famous as the leader of a dashing troop.

At the taking of Delhi he was acting as chief of the intelligence department, and had learned that the king and his sons had escaped to a large building, the tomb of the Mogul emperor Humayoon, and there taken refuge. Hodson at once applied to General Wilson for leave to take them prisoners, and the authority was given. He had already written to say that if he got into the palace of Delhi the House of Timour would not be worth five

minutes' purchase, and it would seem as though he had deliberately made up his mind not to spare the king or the princes. General Wilson probably knew nothing of this, but had, in giving permission for the royal family to be arrested, stipulated that the life of the king should be spared. Hodson had already learned that the king had offered to surrender himself on this condition; and with a small body of horse went to the place where the old man was concealed, and promising that he should be personally protected, took him back to Delhi. His captor then went at the head of a hundred men to the immense pile known as the tomb of Humayoon, to look for the king's sons. After great difficulty they were induced to come out, were put in a carriage, and sent off towards Delhi under a small escort.

Hodson had entered the mausoleum, where some thousands of mutineers and the rabble of Delhi, armed with all sorts of weapons, had assembled. The cool daring of the lieutenant was equal to the occasion. He sternly called upon them to lay down their arms, and as his manner implied that he had a sufficient force to compel obedience, the weapons were relinquished. Having seen that they were collected and removed, Hodson returned towards Delhi, and in the city overtook the escort, which was in the midst of a disorderly crowd apparently about to attempt a rescue. Without hesitation he galloped up and exclaimed, "These are the men who have not only rebelled against the government, but ordered and witnessed the massacre and shameful exposure of innocent women and children, and thus, therefore, the government punishes such traitors taken in open resistance." He then borrowed a carbine from one of his men and shot them both on the spot. The effect is said to have been instantaneous, the Mahometans of the troop and some influential Moulvies who were among the bystanders, exclaiming, "Well and rightly done! Their crime has met with its just penalty! These were they who gave the signal for the death of helpless women and children, and now a righteous judgment has fallen on them."

This proceeding of Lieutenant Hodson was

not regarded with favour by the government, however, and met with considerable reprobation among many thoughtful men, who recognized in it another example of a high-handed way of dealing, not calculated to be of such permanent effect as a regular and legal course of procedure. It is, however, exceedingly difficult to estimate the necessities or the expediencies imposed by such a situation as that in which those who were in command found themselves during the terrible period which we have been considering, and an acquaintance with some of the details of which is necessary for a clear understanding of subsequent legislation with regard to India.

Lieutenant Hodson was himself killed shortly afterwards. That the deed—which he had done on his own responsibility—was not regarded as itself outrageous may be seen by the fact that the other sons of the king were executed almost immediately after they were captured; and probably this was the dreadful alternative to prevent further plots and conspiracies by which the mutiny might have been revived or prolonged. "In twenty-four hours I disposed of the principal members of the house of Timour the Tartar," wrote Hodson after the deed was done. "I am not cruel, but I confess that I do rejoice in the opportunity of ridding the earth of these ruffians." Shocking words, no doubt, but they found an echo not only in India but in England. The horrors of the mutiny, and especially the atrocities of Cawnpore, had aroused a fierce, nearly savage desire for retribution. Men, and even women, almost ceased to regard the bloodthirsty, cruel Sepoys of Oudh as human beings. They would have had them hunted and slain like wild beasts; and the encouragement of this feeling of revenge awoke, as it were, the wild beast nature in themselves. Amidst the dreadful scenes of carnage, and with the evidences of the cruelty and treachery of the mutineers yet before them, it can scarcely be wondered at that even the generals should have ordered no quarter to be given. With the cries of tortured and murdered women and children still in their ears, and with the probability of having yet to cope with a horde of the

perpetrators of such crimes, it is not surprising that our commanders should have felt it necessary to follow up the victories of their small forces by adopting some methods of "striking terror" among the natives. "Whenever a rebel is caught," wrote General Neill while in charge of Cawnpore after his arrival from Benares, "he is immediately tried, and unless he can prove a defence he is sentenced to be hanged at once; but the chiefs or ringleaders I make first clean up a certain portion of the pool of blood, still two inches deep, in the shed where the fearful murder and mutilation of women and children took place. To touch blood is most abhorrent to the high-caste natives; they think by doing so they doom their souls to perdition. Let them think so. My object is to inflict a fearful punishment for a revolting, cowardly, barbarous deed, and to strike terror into these rebels. The first I caught was a sabahdar, a native officer, a high-caste Brahmin, who tried to resist my order to clean up the very blood he had helped to shed; but I made the provost-marshal do his duty, and after a few lashes soon made the miscreant accomplish his task. When done he was taken out and immediately hanged, and after death buried in a ditch at the roadside. The well of mutilated bodies, alas! containing upwards of two hundred women and children, I have had decently covered in and built up as one large grave." To read this is very horrible now that the "large grave" has become "a garden and a shrine," and the great Indian mutiny of 1857 and 1858 has become only a terrible chapter in history; but these reports of retribution were very generally received with satisfaction, along with accounts of the execution of mutineers by being blown from the mouths of cannon, a mode of death which "struck terror," not only because of its public display and its awful suddenness, but because of the dismemberment and, one might say, the dispersion of the body of the criminal, and therefore, according to the native superstition, the prevention of a future state of existence. There is no need to dwell upon these details; but there can be no doubt of the truth of Mr. Cobden's assertion that the Indian mutiny and much of our

experience in India had tended to demoralize the nation, because of the feelings of fury and revenge which accompanied and succeeded the dreadful conflict. Numbers of people not only would have excused cruelty, but seriously spoke of torturing the wretches who were caught red-handed in the mutiny. Happily there were those who saw with deep distress that the encouragement of such language and the perpetuation of a craving for vindictive punishment would assimilate the people in England to the Sepoys against whom they were demanding vengeance. Mr. Disraeli, who held very pronounced opinions against the policy of Lord Canning, was among those who protested against the wild cry for torture and revenge, the raising on our altars the statue of Moloch instead of the image of Christ. He reminded his hearers that the counsels of cruelty would make Nana Sahib himself the model of a British officer.

Mr. Disraeli, in the debate on the mutiny on the 27th of July, first intimated a policy which may be said to have foreshadowed the "imperial" line of procedure of which he afterwards made so prominent a feature in relation to our government in India. He had urgently demanded further information on Indian affairs, and had denounced the policy which had been pursued. Our empire in India was, he said, founded on the principle of *Divide et impera*; but that principle was put into operation by no machiavellian devices, but by availing ourselves of the natural circumstances of the country. There were in India so many independent states, so many princes of different races, so many religions, and even so many languages, that if you honestly performed your engagements, it was totally impossible for a fatal combination to be formed against you. "Why did the Mohammedans and Mahrattas fail in India? The two principal causes of the downfall of those dynasties were: first, that they persecuted the people whom they had conquered on account of their religion; and secondly, that when their treasuries became empty they confiscated the land of the chief proprietors. England, on the contrary, always came in with a guarantee of their lands, and a solemn en-

agement not to tamper with their religion." It is not difficult to see that these remarks were levelled against the policy of Lord Dalhousie, and they were made also to tell against that of Lord Canning. The forcible destruction of native authority in India, the disturbance of the settlement of property, and the tampering with the religion of the people, were, said he, the causes to which directly, or indirectly, all our difficulties were to be traced.

But his opponents might have answered, the suppression of those robber chiefs who, by their tyrannical exactions, kept the population of the country in a state of misery, and prevented any regular form of government,—the introduction of a system of land laws, and of succession designed to put an end to the condition of slavery in which the wretched ryots and the agricultural labourers among the Hindoos had been reduced,—and the abolition of the suttee, of dacoity, and of the barbarous inflictions of a debasing superstition which had become indistinguishable from public crimes,—were the cause of the difficulties of a government which could not have continued to exist unless these things had been firmly and emphatically dealt with. The truth seems to have been that, as Disraeli afterwards indicated, there was not a sufficient impression of imperial good faith among the Hindoos. There was enough of high-handed interference: too much of a half-missionary and half-military method of converting the natives; and by no means enough regard to implied contracts with the dethroned princes, and with those who could prove, even without undue recourse to the Hindoo law of inheritance of landed property, that they were entitled to considerable indemnities or to large pensions which had either been withheld, reduced, or converted into small annuities. It would perhaps have been exceedingly difficult for Disraeli to point out how the government of India could have been upheld had the policy of non-intervention and of entire unintrusion been adopted, but he had a course to recommend. It was this: "You ought at once, whether you receive news of success or of defeat, to tell the people of India that the relations between them and their real ruler

and sovereign Queen Victoria shall be drawn nearer. You must act on the opinion of India on that subject immediately, and you can only act upon the opinions of Eastern natives through their imaginations. You ought to have a royal commission sent by the queen from this country to India immediately to inquire into the grievances of the various classes of that population. You ought to issue a royal proclamation to the people of India declaring that the Queen of England is not a sovereign who will countenance the violation of treaties—that the Queen of England is not a sovereign who will disturb the settlement of property—that the Queen of England is a sovereign who will respect their laws, their usages, their customs, and above all their religion. Do this, and do it not in a corner, but in a mode and manner which will attract universal attention and excite the general hope of Hindostan, and you will do as much as all your fleets and armies can achieve.”

Disraeli had some notion,—which he afterwards developed into the proposition that England’s empire was oriental—that we could establish an imperial rule in India on a basis of condescending conciliation, but it would have been difficult to point out how this was to be accomplished, unless the way were to be paved for it by administrative changes similar to those which had already been effected and which he opposed and condemned.

Cobden, on the other hand, was of opinion that we should never really govern India in any true or constitutional sense—that we had “attempted an impossibility in giving ourselves to the task of governing one hundred millions of Asiatics.” His reasons for this belief were characteristic. “If the plan were practicable at the great cost and risk that we *now* see to be inseparable from it,” he wrote to Mr. Ashworth, “what advantage can it confer on ourselves? We all know the motive which took the East India Company to Asia—monopoly; not merely as towards foreigners, but against the rest of their own countrymen. But now that the trade of Hindostan is thrown open to all the world on equal terms, what exclusive advantage can we derive, to compensate for all the trouble, cost, and risk

of ruling over such a people?—a people which has shown itself, after a century of contact with us, to be capable of crimes which would revolt any savage tribe of whom we read in Dr. Livingstone’s narrative, and which had never seen a Christian or European till he penetrated among them. . . . I can’t even co-operate with those who seek to ‘reform’ India, for I have no faith in the power of England to govern that country at all permanently, and though I should like to see the Company abolished—because that is a screen between the English nation and a full sight of its awful responsibilities—yet I do not believe in the possibility of the crown governing India under the control of parliament. If the House of Commons were to renounce all responsibility for domestic legislation, and give itself exclusively to the task of governing one hundred millions of Asiatics, it would fail. Hindostan must be ruled by those who live on that side of the globe. Its people will prefer to be ruled badly—*according to our notions*—by its own colour, kith, and kin, than to submit to the humiliation of being better governed by a succession of transient intruders from the antipodes.” These opinions, however, as Cobden acknowledged, were not adapted for the practical work of the day. “What is to be done now? Put down the military revolt in justice to the peaceable population, who are at the mercy of the armed mutineers. It is our duty to do so. We can do it, and I have no doubt it will be done. But then comes our difficulty. With the experience of the present year we can never trust a native force with arms again with the feelings of security which we formerly indulged. . . . Yet we cannot possibly administer the affairs of that country without a native force, and we are now actually raising an army of Sikhs, the most warlike of our subjects in all Asia, whom we disarmed when we took possession of the country, and of whom Lord Dalhousie said in a letter ten years ago, that every man was against us.” Speaking of the horrible massacres and the fiendish ferocity of the Sepoys, Cobden said in a letter to Mr. Bright, “It is clear that they (the mutineers) cannot have been inspired

with either love or respect by what they have seen of the English. There must be a fierce spirit of resentment, not unmixed with contempt for the ruling class, pervading the native mind. From the moment that I had satisfied myself that a feeling of alienation was constantly *increasing* with both the natives and the English (we had some striking evidence to this effect before our committee in 1853), I made up my mind that it must end in trouble sooner or later. It is impossible that a people can permanently be used for their own obvious and conscious degradation. The entire system of our Indian rule is that the natives will be the willing instruments of their own humiliation. Nay, so confident are we in this faith, that we offer them the light of Christianity and a free press, and still believe that they will not have wit enough to measure their rights by our own standard." It may be mentioned that as a matter of policy, and necessary policy, Lord Canning had placed restrictions on the press in India when he found it was used for spreading sedition, and he had also refused to countenance the formation of armed volunteer corps, since he mistrusted either the intention of those who had stimulated the movement, or the use that might be made of such a distribution of arms at the very time when it was becoming necessary to deprive the natives of their weapons and to disband their regiments. In these proceedings he was blamed, almost at the same time that he was also accused of undue leniency and "clemency," because he refused to become a party to the panic which would have resulted in punishing the atrocities of the Sepoys with atrocious reprisals. Doubtless Lord Canning, like his predecessor, had masterful and imperious views of the government of India; but Mr. Disraeli would have been puzzled to point out how to rule otherwise, and Mr. Cobden himself would have admitted that if we could rule at all, it must be by strong and definite government, though not by degrading and oppressing the hundred million of Asiatics. The position which was assumed by Lord Dalhousie and his successor did not necessarily involve the temper displayed by many of the subordinate

civil and military officers. Cobden declared that even the humiliation to which the native Hindoos were subjected might have been borne if the English with whom they came in contact had displayed exalted virtues and high intellectual powers. This, of course, was easy to say, but as a matter of possible government it would have been difficult to procure a large number of men of such qualities to fill the offices of subalterns in India or to enter the civil service there.

Exalted virtues and high intellectual powers are not common commodities, or they would of course cease to be conspicuous, and those who possessed them were scarcely less wanted in England than in India. But Cobden was not beside the mark when he spoke of a low morale and an absence of mental energy having been the most conspicuous faults of the British officers, so that the business of the regiments had now fallen into the hands of the natives. He saw too, what Klapka, the Hungarian general saw, and spoke of with anxious deprecation, that from the wholesale and indiscriminate slaughter and execution of the Sepoys, of whom 100,000 were said to be in the mutiny, there was a danger that the assassinations and massacres on one side, and the retributive carnage on the other, would perpetuate and deepen the feeling of alienation and promote a horrible ferocity and bloodthirst on both sides. Klapka pointed out that large numbers of the Sepoy soldiers had probably joined in the mutiny without any personal sympathy with it, but only from the habit of following their own officers and acting on their orders *en masse*. Cobden said, "Had it been a mutiny of a company or a regiment, it would have been of doubtful policy to hang or blow from the guns all the *privates* concerned. But when an entire army of 100,000 men have planted the standard of revolt it is no longer a mutiny, but a rebellion and civil war. To attempt to hang all that fall into our power can only lead to reprisals and wholesale carnage on both sides."

We may not unprofitably note these various opinions, since they at all events illustrate the declaration that the government of India must practically be carried on in that country itself.

This declaration was common to critics on both sides, and their respective objections at least went to show that it was well founded.

But whatever may have been the force and importance of these representations—and that they deserved deep attention was attested by the events preceding and following the mutiny, as well as by the ferocious counsel of people here who would have slain, tortured, and if possible have exterminated the rebellious Sepoys—the mutiny had been suppressed. The recapture of Delhi was practically the end of the insurrection.

The King of Delhi—the miserable survivor of the house of which he had been the chief, and the last of the line of Great Moguls—was tried and sentenced to exile, or to what in a less distinguished criminal would have been transportation. But transportation was at an end. The colonists at the Cape of Good Hope would not receive even an ex-sovereign who had become a convict, and he was subsequently taken to Rangoon. Nana Sahib—the arch-fiend of the massacre—had disappeared, nobody knew how or whither. It was years afterwards that a rumour came from India of the capture of the chief of Bithoor, but it was a case of mistaken identity. The fate of the monster of Cawnpore was never discovered. His lieutenant, Tantia Topce, held out for some time, but after having been repeatedly defeated, was taken prisoner, tried, and hanged. One of the boldest, most successful—or rather least unsuccessful—and most enduring of the rebel leaders was the Rhanee of Jhansi, whose territory had been annexed by Lord Dalhousie, and who, regarding the insurrection as a national rebellion, took the field with Nana Sahib. For months after the fall of Delhi she carried on her opposition, leading her troops and taking part in the fighting in the uniform of a cavalry officer. She opposed her squadrons to the forces of Sir Hugh Rose, and struggled for the possession of Gwalior, and was killed on the field after leading repeated charges. Her body was afterwards found, scarred with wounds. “The best man upon the side of the enemy,” said Sir Hugh Rose, “was the woman found dead—the Rhanee of Jhansi.”

The mutiny had lasted just twelve months before the capital of Oudh was recovered, and after repeated battles the country was restored to something like order, and the rebellion was finally put down. It was in the month of June, 1858, that Sir H. Rose issued a general order in which he said: “Soldiers, you have marched more than a thousand miles, and taken more than a hundred guns. You have forced your way through mountain passes and intricate jungles, and over rivers; you have captured the strongest forts, and beat the enemy, no matter what the odds, wherever you met them; you have restored extensive districts to the government, and peace and order now reign where before, for twelve months, were tyranny and rebellion; you have done all this and you have never had a check. I thank you with all sincerity for your bravery, your devotion, and your discipline. When you first marched I told you that you, as British soldiers, had more than enough of courage for the work which was before you, but that courage without discipline was of no avail; and I exhorted you to let discipline be your watchword. You have attended to my orders. In hardships, in temptations, and in dangers you have obeyed your general, and you have never left your ranks. You have fought against the strong and you have protected the rights of the weak and defenceless, of foes as well as friends; I have seen you in the ardour of combat preserve and place children out of harm’s way. This is the discipline of Christian soldiers, and this it is that has brought you triumphant from the shores of Western India to the waters of the Jumna, and establishes without doubt that you will find no place to equal the glory of your arms.” A telling though rather inflated declaration this, and one which serves to indicate what had been the course and the effect of the struggle. It was not till the 20th of December, 1858, that Sir Colin Campbell, who had been elevated to the peerage under the title of Lord Clyde, announced to the governor-general: “The campaign is at an end, there being no longer even the vestige of rebellion in the province of Oudh. . . . The last remnant of the mutineers and insurgents have

been hopelessly driven across the mountains which form the barrier between the kingdom of Nepal and her majesty's empire of Hindostan."

The relief to public anxiety was very great, and honours were not grudged to men who had been prominent in suppressing the revolt, as well as to those who by their sagacity of administration had prevented it from reaching still further, to proportions that might have justified Mr. Cobden's predictions. Foremost among the latter was Sir John Lawrence, who as a boy had carried off the chief prizes at Haileybury College, and in 1827 had entered the civil service of the East India Company. His experiences in the North-west Provinces had taught him what was the condition of the peasantry of India, and had enabled him satisfactorily to complete the settlement of the province of the Punjaub. He had been with Sir Henry Hardinge as a political officer during the Sikh war, and had afterwards been appointed commissioner of the ceded territory within the Sutlej, where his administrative abilities were so remarkable that he not only preserved tranquillity but recruited a brigade of troops from among the peasants, who, when the second Sikh war broke out, remained firm and opposed their own countrymen.

We have seen that he became commissioner of the Punjaub after its annexation. There he had protected the more peaceful inhabitants from the dominant military power of the Sikhs, had checked the exactions of the disbanded soldiery, who tried to carry out the old system of exacting pay from the Mohammedans. All was tyranny and oppression, and Lawrence stood between the tyrants and their victims. He abolished the barbarous Sikh laws, and introduced the "Indian criminal code." The country was surveyed for revenue purposes, and the land settled by what was believed by him to be an equitable adjustment. A local protective police force was organized, some of the old disbanded soldiers being enlisted in its ranks; and a Punjaub irregular force was instituted, comprising five regiments of cavalry, four of Sikh and six of Punjaub infantry, a corps of guides, and five batteries of artil-

lery, all practically under the immediate orders of the Board of Administration. Lawrence, who possessed a strong constitution and an indomitable energy, visited every part of the territory, which covered an area of above 50,000 square miles. The border tribes, who under the Sikh rulers would descend from the mountains and ravage the land between the Suliman range and the Indus, were permitted to trade with us, but their incursions were prevented and repelled by force. The head men were invited to conferences with the chief commissioner, and invited to settle on our districts. The border-land became peaceful, and the highway of the frontier was subsequently safe. The disarmament of the Punjaub was carried out successfully, notwithstanding the lawless condition of its inhabitants.

On the outbreak of the mutiny all eyes turned to the Punjaub. It would have been a matter for small surprise had the Sikhs taken advantage of the mutiny to rise against us. The crisis called forth the magnificent administrative abilities of Sir John Lawrence. He knew his subordinates were, like himself, men of iron, and he trusted them. Right loyally did they stand by their chief. The Sikhs likewise knew and trusted him. Chieftain after chieftain personally tendered his allegiance and offered the use of his own contingent. The offers were accepted, and names which now have become familiar as furnishing detachments during the Afghan war then first came into note as swarming down to our aid at Delhi. The Punjaub irregular force was doubled; its gallant commander, Neville Chamberlain, hurried down to the army in the field; and Lawrence set his whole energies to work to draw from the military population of the Punjaub an army which should subdue the faithless Sepoys from Oudh. He proved himself a true general, for he detected generalship in others, and he shunned no responsibility. Reference to higher authority was impossible, and though he had no more authority to grant commissions than he had to create bishoprics, he deemed the emergency so great as to admit of any stretch of authority. Major Nicholson, the district officer of Bunnoo, was made a

brigadier-general, and as such took precedence of men who held her majesty's commissions as colonels. It speaks well for the discipline of the army that such a step passed unchallenged, but it speaks volumes for the character of Lawrence that he dared to undertake it. By holding the Punjab in his iron grip, by diverting every available soldier to Delhi, by mercilessly stamping out rebellion wherever it reared its demon head, Sir John Lawrence enabled Archdale Wilson to storm the capital of the Great Mogul before a single reinforcement reached him from England. With the fall of Delhi the hopes of the mutineers were extinguished. Our power in India was reasserted, and the pacification, not the subjugation, of the country became the task for its rulers. For his share in suppressing the mutiny Sir John Lawrence was created a baronet and a Grand Cross of the Bath. But forty continuous years of active service fully entitled the saviour of India to a rest, and at the close of the mutiny he gladly handed over the Punjab to one of his most trusted lieutenants and retired to his well-earned pension in England. He was immediately elected to the Indian council at home, where his large and varied experience, his cool judgment, and firmness of purpose were soon felt.¹

The grave had closed over Havelock, whose rewards and title had come too late. Both houses of parliament (7th of December, 1857) unanimously voted him a pension of £1000 a year, after fitting tribute had been paid to his services in eloquent language by the Earl of Derby and Earl Granville in one house, and by Lord Palmerston in the other. It had also been announced that he was to be created a baronet and K.C.B. One of the first acts of parliament, when it reassembled in February, was to pass a bill settling an annuity of £1000 upon his widow and on his eldest son, Sir Henry Marshman Havelock, himself a distinguished officer, on whom the baronetcy had descended which had not been enjoyed by his father. No sooner was General Havelock's death known than a warm expression of sym-

pathy from the queen and Prince Albert was conveyed to his widow through the Duke of Cambridge. In replying to the duke, Lady Havelock said: "In the loneliness of my present position I cannot help wishing that every woman, thus bereaved, might have such a son (I might say sons) to comfort and heal her broken heart."

In the same letter (24th December, 1857) in which Lord Canning announced the death of General Havelock to the queen, he spoke of the loss of another very distinguished officer, Brigadier-general Neill. "They were," writes Lord Canning, "very different men, however. The first [Havelock] was quite of the old school—severe and precise with his men, and very cautious in his movements and plans, but in action bold as well as skilful. The second very open and impetuous, but full of resources; and to his soldiers as kind and thoughtful of their comfort as if they had been his children."

Captain Sir William Peel, K.C.B., commander of the naval brigade, the third and much-loved son of Sir Robert Peel, was another officer whose loss was greatly deplored. He died of small-pox at Cawnpore in April, 1858, after having taken a brave and distinguished part in the worst time of the campaign.

In a gazette extraordinary Lord Canning thus spoke of this distinguished man: "The loss of his daring but thoughtful courage, joined with eminent abilities, is a very heavy one to the country; but it is not more to be deplored than the loss of the influence which his earnest character, admirable temper, and gentle, kindly bearing exercised over all within his reach; an influence which was exerted unceasingly for the public good, and of which the governor-general believes that it may with truth be said there is not a man of any rank or profession who, having been associated with Sir William Peel in these times of anxiety and danger, has not felt and acknowledged it."

Colonel Inglis, the brave defender of Lucknow, was specially mentioned by the queen when her majesty was referring to the necessity of immediately promoting officers for able and distinguished services. Nor were some of our native allies forgotten.

¹ *Times*. Obituary notice of Lord Lawrence, June 23, 1870.

Lord Canning had to bide his time before votes of laudation and promises of grateful recognition reached him amidst the denunciations which were levelled against him, and were presently to be repeated on entirely opposite grounds. The demand for indiscriminate slaughter and severity, which in England had been stimulated by a feeling of indignation and revenge, had been upheld in Calcutta because of the panic not unnaturally produced by reports of the atrocities of the mutineers. Many of the residents in Calcutta and the Presidency of Bengal, finding that the governor refused to adopt a policy which would have carried persecution and injustice to the unoffending masses of the native population, had sent a petition to the queen asking for Lord Canning's recall, as he had not adopted measures to punish in sufficient numbers or with due severity those native races who could be influenced by power and fear alone. It was complained of both by the petitioners and by some violent writers in the press, that the whole of India had not been placed under martial law after the mutiny broke out, while the instructions which were issued by Lord Canning to the various civil authorities for their guidance in putting down insurrection in the disturbed districts were satirically called "clemency orders."

As we have seen the rebellion was virtually at an end by the last part of December, 1857, but there remained all kinds of prognostications, and when resolutions were proposed by the government in both houses, thanking the civil and military officers in India for the energy and ability displayed by them in suppressing the mutiny, and Lord Canning was first mentioned, Lord Derby in the Lords and Mr. Disraeli in the Commons proposed to exclude his name from the vote, on the ground that it would be premature to give him the thanks of parliament until the exceptions which had been taken to his policy by the Calcutta petition and in other quarters had been discussed and disproved. Not only would the exclusion of Lord Canning's name from a vote of thanks which did not touch questions of general policy, but only the result of the recent oper-

ations, have been equivalent to a vote of censure, but the governor-general had already in a despatch (to the court of directors of the East India Company), which had been made public, vindicated his policy and explained its necessity. In a letter to Lord Granville at the same time his position with regard to the whole question was clearly defined. He said:

"I could write a chapter in deprecation of anything being done or said in parliament by the government, which shall tend to throw cold water upon the policy that has been pursued towards the natives. Look at a map—(never think of Indian matters without looking at a map, and without bringing your mind to take in the scale of the map and the size of the country),—look at a map. With all the reinforcements you have sent (all the Bengal ones are arrived, except 800 men), Bengal is without a single European soldier more than we had at the beginning of the mutiny, Calcutta alone excepted, which is stronger. Twenty-three thousand men have moved *through* Bengal, and in Bengal we are still dependent (mainly) upon the good-will, I can't say affection, and interest, well understood by themselves, of the natives.

"Suppose (not an impossibility, although I hope not a likelihood)—suppose that hostilities train on, and that we do not make our way with Oudh and other disturbed places, that our strength becomes again a subject of doubt—will it be the part of a wise government to keep such a population as that of the three great provinces in a loyal frame of temper? Can you do so if you proscribe and scout as untrustworthy whole classes? . . .

"For God's sake raise your voice and stop this. As long as I have breath in my body I will pursue no other policy than that I have been following: not only for the reason of expediency and policy above stated, but because it is immutably just. I will not govern in anger. Justice, and that as stern and inflexible as law and might can make it, I will deal out. But I will never allow an angry and indiscriminating act or word to proceed from the government of India as long as I am responsible for it. . . .

"I don't care two straws for the abuse of

the papers, British or Indian. I am for ever wondering at myself for not doing so, but it really is the fact. Partly from want of time to care, partly because an enormous task is before me, and all other cares look small. . . .

"I don't want you to do more than defend me against unfair or mistaken attacks. But do take up and assert boldly, that whilst we are prepared, as the first duty of all, to strike down resistance without mercy, wherever it shows itself, we acknowledge that, resistance over, deliberate justice, and calm, patient reason are to resume their sway; that we are not going, either in anger or from indolence, to punish wholesale; whether by wholesale hangings or burnings, or by the less violent, but not one bit less offensive course, of refusing trust and countenance, and favour, and honour to any man *because* he is of a class or a creed. Do this, and get others to do it, and you will serve India more than you would believe.

"Had not the 'clemency' question been taken up as it has been taken up in England, I really believe that the cry would never have been heard again, even in Calcutta. . . . I have, however, great faith in parliament on this question, though by no means on all others concerning India."

Of course the vote of thanks was carried, and supported not only by the government but by independent members who knew what the work in India had been, and spoke in Lord Canning's honour.

One of the most determined opponents of the governor-general was Lord Ellenborough, who afterwards contrived to act with so much pompous indiscretion in sending a secret despatch to India, counteracting the proclamation made by Lord Canning with regard to the landowners in Oudh who had taken part in the rebellion, that the Derby ministry which had then come into office was seriously embarrassed, though Mr. Disraeli completely endorsed the despatch and upheld its representations. Lord Canning's proclamation, doubtless, was liable to be interpreted into an intention to adopt a system of confiscation of the whole land of Oudh; since, with the exception of six loyal pro-

prietors in the province, the chiefs and landowners were to surrender to the chief commissioner, when their lives would be spared provided that their hands were unstained by English blood murderously shed. As regarded any further indulgence to be granted to them, and the conditions in which they were thereafter to be placed, they must throw themselves on the mercy of the British government. Of course this proclamation was to be read by the light of Lord Canning's general policy; but he had no right to leave that interpretation of it to be taken for granted. The commissioner himself, Sir James Outram, was staggered by it; for there were scarcely a dozen landlords in the province who had not borne arms against the government, and to confiscate their property would be to turn them into bandits, and to make a long and exhausting guerrilla war necessary for their extirpation. Lord Canning called this in question; but he was ready to insert in the proclamation a clause granting a liberal indulgence to those who came promptly forward to aid the restoration of order, and generously regarding the claims which they might acquire to a restitution of their former rights. The question was, what should be done with the province whence the mutiny sprang? It had been annexed so recently before the rebellion that it could not be treated as the theatre of an insurrection against long-settled rule. What was necessary was that it should be regarded as a province held under the direct government of the British, and there must be enough of demand against the insurgents both to mark the mutiny as a revolt which must be met by punishment, and to ensure some material guarantee against its recurrence. The proclamation did not say all this. It left a good deal of authority—an almost despotic authority—in the hands of the governor-general, who was, however, not likely to exercise it. Whatever it may have been, a man like Lord Canning did not require or deserve to be rebuked in absurdly pompous language which might have been used to a subordinate by a civic official with a turn for grandiose reproof. Mr. Bright, who was on the side of the Derby government in this matter, because he objected to what he

conceived had been undue severity exercised against the Sepoys, and suspected that unjust exactions might continue, was obliged to excuse the tone of Lord Ellenborough's communication on the ground that the chiefs of the East India Company had been accustomed to send despatches of a hectoring character addressed to subordinates who were entirely dependent on the board. Through the secret committee of the court of directors the despatch had been sent to Lord Canning. The matter was taken up by Lord Shaftesbury in the House of Lords, by Mr. Cardwell in the House of Commons, and by the queen, who thought that to send such a despatch at such a juncture was injurious to the state, and that it should first have been submitted to her, as all such despatches were, in connection with the foreign office. Worse than the sending of the despatch, however, though *that* would of course be made known all over India, was the fact that Lord Ellenborough placed himself in correspondence with some of the principal native chiefs, explaining his policy.

It afterwards transpired that Lord Canning had written a letter to Mr. Vernon Smith, who had been Lord Ellenborough's predecessor at the Board of Control, stating that the proclamation about to be issued would need some further explanation which the pressure of immediate duties compelled the governor-general to defer. Mr. Vernon Smith was in Ireland when that letter arrived, and it did not reach him in time to prevent Lord Ellenborough's despatch from being sent. Probably it would have made little difference, for the pompous nobleman seemed disinclined to listen to a private letter to the same effect which Lord Granville had received from Lord Canning. The opportunity of snubbing a successor was too good to be lost. But the explanation that Mr. Vernon Smith had not been able to give the information which might have rendered the secret despatch unnecessary, had the effect of letting the government escape and baffling the authors of the motion for censure. Mr. Disraeli, speaking at Slough a few days afterwards, triumphed exceedingly at what he considered had been the utter failure of his opponents. He said "it was like a con-

vulsion of nature rather than any ordinary transaction of human life. I can only liken it to one of those earthquakes which take place in Calabria or Peru. There was a rumbling murmur, a groan, a shriek, a sound of distant thunder. No one knew whether it came from the top or the bottom of the house. There was a rent, a fissure in the ground, and then a village disappeared; then a tall tower toppled down; and the whole of the opposition benches became one great dissolving view of anarchy."

The queen, however, had been on the side of "Clemency Canning" in his protests against a policy of extermination, and she now felt deeply the injustice of counteracting his proclamation before any intelligence had been received of the conditions with which he would have to contend. The government of Lord Derby gained little by Lord Ellenborough; and Lord Canning's proclamation worked its way in the direction which he had intended—that of limiting the power of the landowners, not by creating a new proprietary right on the part of the government, but by defining and enforcing the right which already existed of making such settlements of land as would control the native landholders and protect the occupiers and cultivators of the soil. This was the system adopted in Oudh, where nearly all the large landholders almost immediately tendered their allegiance under conditions purposely made conciliatory and advantageous. The policy of Canning was effective and successful, but he did not live to see the full result of it. He returned to England in 1862, when he was succeeded by Lord Elgin, and had scarcely received the acknowledgments which were due to him for his prompt and sagacious administration, under circumstances of extreme peril and anxiety, when the results of his cares and labours were to be seen in his failing health. In a few months he died. But he had received the high honour of having been named the first viceroy of India under the entirely new conditions which had by that time been established.

For a considerable time before the Indian mutiny had emphasized the need for an entire

revision of the mode of government in that country, there had been serious thoughts of still further diminishing the power of the East India Company. Before the debate of the 27th of July, 1857, in which Mr. Disraeli had urged the policy of "drawing closer the relations between the population of India and the sovereign, Queen Victoria," Lord Palmerston had arranged with the cabinet to bring forward a measure on the subject. In the middle of October he wrote to the queen that "the inconvenience and difficulty of administering the government of a vast country on the other side of the globe by means of two cabinets, the one responsible to the crown and parliament, the other only responsible to the holders of India stock, meeting for a few hours three or four times in a year, had been shown by the events of this year to be no longer tolerable." He proposed, therefore, to prepare for the next session of parliament a measure for abolishing the existing state of things, and for placing the government of India for the future under the exclusive control of the crown and parliament, 'like any other part of her majesty's dominions.' "There would, of course," he added, "be much opposition on the part of all persons connected with the India Company, and the opposition in parliament might take up their cause; the matter, therefore, will require to be well weighed before any recommendation on the subject can be submitted for your majesty's consideration."

We have seen that by the act of 1853 the patronage of the civil service was taken from the Company, and that a system of competitive examinations was established. The last speech ever made by Macaulay in the House of Commons had been in support of this principle, and many people at that time thought the proposed changes were sufficient. Lord Ellenborough a year before, had, in his evidence before the select committee to which Cobden alluded, recommended that the government should be transferred from the Company to the crown. It was this change which was contemplated by Lord Palmerston, who, early in 1858, brought in a bill by which a council, of a president and eight members,

was to be nominated by the government, and there was much probability of its being well received by the house, when the Palmerston government was suddenly defeated on the "Conspiracy Bill," as we shall presently note, and Lord Derby came into power. One of the first acts of the new government was to bring in an India Bill of their own, which came to be called "India Bill No. 2," as the former was called "India Bill No. 1." It proved to be a *fiasco*. Nobody supported it. It was thought that Lord Ellenborough had constructed it, and had given rein to the theatrical illusions by which he had for years been influenced with regard to a court and government in India. There was to be a secretary of state with a council of eighteen members, nine of whom were to be nominated by the crown, and nine to be elected in an elaborate and fantastic fashion. Four out of the nine must have served her majesty in India for not less than ten years, or must have been engaged in trade in India for fifteen years; and they were to be elected by the votes of those in this country who had served the queen or the government of India for ten years; or by proprietors of capital stock in Indian railways or public works to the amount of £2000, or the proprietors of India stock to the amount of £1000. The other five members must have been engaged in commerce in India, or in exporting manufactured goods to that country for five years, or must have resided there for ten years, and were to be elected by the parliamentary constituencies of London, Manchester, Liverpool, Glasgow, and Belfast. The monstrous absurdities of such a bill were too obvious to need much pointing out. Its provisions were so devised that any incompetent man who had been long enough engaged in some petty traffic with India could be returned on the council, while men of real knowledge and ability were excluded. Before it went up for the second reading it was withdrawn, and Lord John Russell's proposal that a government measure should be framed in accordance with resolutions come to in a committee of the whole house, was agreed to. By these means the difficulty was surmounted, and on the 29th

of July, 1858, an "Act for the Better Government of India" was finally passed, providing that all the territories under the government of the East India Company should be vested in her majesty, and all the powers exercised by the Company should be in her name. One of her majesty's principal secretaries of state was to have the power previously exercised by the Company or by the Board of Control. The council to consist of fifteen members, of whom seven were to be elected from the then existing court of directors by that body, and eight were to be nominated by the crown. Vacancies among the nominated members were to be filled up by the crown,—and among the elected, by the remaining members of the council for a certain time, but afterwards by the secretary of state for India. The principle of competitive examinations for the civil service was extended, and its application improved. The military and naval forces of the Company were to be transferred to the crown. Except for opposing actual invasion, the Indian revenues were not, without the consent of both houses of parliament, to be applied to defray the expenses of any military operation carried on beyond the external frontiers of her majesty's Indian possessions; and by another clause, whenever an order was sent to India directing the commencement of hostilities, the fact should be communicated to parliament within three months if parliament were then sitting, or if not, within one month after its next meeting. The viceroy and governor-general was to be the supreme authority in India, and was to be assisted by a council, the nine provinces being each under its own independent civil government, but all being subordinate to the viceregal authority. Lord Canning was named viceroy, and Lord Stanley, the son of the Earl of Derby, became secretary of state for India. The queen was proclaimed throughout India in November, 1858. On the 1st of September the last court of the East India proprietors, as governors of India, had been held, and "John Company," as the natives in old time called it, had ceased to exist as a ruling power or authority.

But we must take a rapid retrospect of

other events which had occurred during 1857, and had resulted in the return of a Conservative government in 1858. The restoration of Lord Palmerston to power after the dissolution of parliament on the question of hostilities in China was an emphatic protest by the nation in favour of that "spirited policy" which he claimed to represent, but provision had to be made for maintaining some decisive action at Canton even before the result of the general elections were known. The question was, Where was the man, who at a juncture so critical, in face of an adverse vote of the House of Commons, on the chance of that vote being rescinded by the country, could be trusted with so delicate a mission; who could be relied on to conduct such an expedition against a foe alike stubborn and weak,—to go far enough, and yet not too far—to carry his point by diplomatic skill and force of character, and with the least possible infringement of the law of humanity;—a man with the ability and resolution to ensure success, and the native strength that can afford to be merciful? After "anxious deliberation" the choice fell upon Lord Elgin. Towards the end of April he left England on his mission.

Except for this trouble in China the session seemed likely to be a tolerably smooth, though an active one. The birth of the Princess Beatrice at Buckingham Palace on the 14th of April was a domestic event of importance to the royal family, and to all those who rejoiced loyally in the rapid recovery of the queen. Among the many letters of congratulation came a cordial message from the Emperor of the French, who took this opportunity of deprecating any opinions existing in England, that the approaching visit of the Russian Grand Duke Constantine to Paris meant more than an exchange of civilities. "I am grieved," wrote the emperor, "to see that the English wish to attach a significance to this visit which does not belong to it. We are gratified here by the good-will and courtesy shown to us by Russia, but this in no way weakens the interests and the feelings by which we are bound to England." It seemed obvious to Lord Palmerston and Lord Clarendon that the sudden friendly advances of Russia were prelim-

inary to a scheme for undermining the Anglo-French alliance, to which it should be remembered a party in France itself continued to be jealously opposed. Prince Albert in an able letter replied to the emperor, showing the reasons which made an alliance with the French so desirable and so acceptable to the people, since it was based upon the two nations being on the same level of civilization,—upon a mutual desire to develop as much as possible science, art, letters, commerce,—upon our close vicinity to each other, which makes a good understanding necessary,—and upon the wellbeing and the happiness of the two countries, which are bound so intimately together.

If, on the other hand, they asked what might be the basis of an alliance with Russia, they found that there was a complete dissimilitude of views, of feelings, and of ideas; that in the eyes of Russia, western civilization, far from having any title to be encouraged, was the enemy that ought above all others to be resisted; and that there existed between the two such an absence of mutual interests that, in truth, if the one ceased to exist, the other would scarcely be affected. Thus they concluded that if, notwithstanding these fundamental differences, the Russian alliance was desired or sought for, this alliance could have for its basis nothing but an external and purely political motive. Immediately all Europe set to work to reflect, and asked itself what this motive was; confidence was shaken; England naturally was the first to take the alarm, which was soon shared equally by the rest of the world.

“Your majesty will find the Grand Duke Constantine a very agreeable man,” continued the prince. “It is some years since I saw him, but he then struck me as able, intelligent, thoroughly educated, and full of zeal and ardour in everything which he undertakes. Above all, what left the deepest impression on me was his eminently and exclusively Russian characteristics. For him *Holy Russia*, its beliefs, its prejudices, its errors and its faults, the paganism of its religion, the barbarism of its populations, are objects of the most profound veneration. He adores them with a blind and ardent faith. In a word,

he appeared to me, in all the conversations which I had with him, so profoundly Oriental in all his views and aspirations, that it struck me as impossible to make him comprehend the ideas and the sentiments of the West, or to get him to appreciate and still less to like them. I should be curious to learn if he is still the same man I found him, and what impression he makes upon your majesty.”

This letter Lord Clarendon thought ought to put Napoleon III. on his guard against “that extremely well-veneered gentleman the Grand Duke Constantine;” but the emperor replied that he was only meeting civilities by civilities, and what was the use of one who was following a simple straightforward course, disquieting himself about the mistakes of public opinion, which he could not prevent if they existed, though his conduct gave no kind of warrant for them?

The allied forces of the French and English were soon engaged at Canton, Baron Gros being the representative of France as Lord Elgin was of this country. Lord Palmerston, before the dissolution in the spring of 1857, had intimated that, notwithstanding the adverse vote by Mr. Cobden’s motion, the policy of the government would be maintained by acting in conformity with negotiations which had been going on in concert with France, and he hoped, with the United States, to improve the commercial relations with China, by negotiations with the court of Peking. These negotiations, however, came to nothing till they were emphasized by gunpowder. The Indian mutiny and the Chinese hostilities practically came to an end at about the same time. On the 29th of December Canton was taken by the combined forces of France and England. From the ships lying on the side of the city, and from the Dutch Folly, a fort in the centre of the river, the defences of the place had been destroyed by shot and shell while the men were being disembarked. By nightfall on the 28th 5700 men were landed with a large quantity of stores; a fort from which the Chinese retreated was occupied. Next morning the gunboats enfiladed the city wall until the signal was given for an escalade.

After a reconnaissance scaling ladders were fixed. A temple had been seized close to one of the gates. The French went first to the foot of the walls, and the word being given the English sailors and soldiers rushed towards the scaling ladders; the blue jackets scrambled up and planted the British flag on the battlements. Division after division clambered swiftly up the ladders, formed at the top, and swept northward along the rampart. In less than half an hour the eastern half of Canton, from the north to the south gates, was in our hands, fifteen of our men having been killed and 113 wounded. In six days Commissioner Yeh was captured and taken on board the *Inflexible*, where, in fear, he emphatically denied his own identity. Probably he thought he would be hanged, till Mr. Parkes reassured him of his personal safety, and he then summoned all his dignity and acted with almost ludicrous arrogance. He refused to leave his chair, laughed at the idea of being removed or of giving up his official seals, and announced that he would sit there to receive the men Elgin and Gros. In his packages, among other papers, were found the original ratification of the treaties with England, France, and America. He was afterwards taken as a prisoner to Calcutta, and died in less than four months afterward. Lord Elgin had not sufficient force to hold the city and control the population, but the former governor, Pihkwei, was reinstated and undertook to carry on affairs under agreed conditions until peace was concluded.

The position of Napoleon III. was one which involved great uneasiness. The reforms which it had been hoped might have been accepted and inaugurated by the pope remained unfulfilled, and Rome was therefore still occupied by French troops at the very time that the emperor desired to withdraw them, and was anxious to show some sympathy with the Italian aspirations for liberty, in which he had himself borne a part in earlier days. Doubtless he had in his mind some scheme by which, for any aid that he could give to the cause of political freedom, by turning the French arms against the Austrian occupiers of Italian

soil, he might seek compensation to France in the accession of territory; but the plans, which afterwards resulted in the annexation of Savoy and Nice, had probably not been quite matured. He doubtless anticipated that to such a scheme England might oppose strong remonstrance, and with England he was desirous to maintain the best possible alliance. In carrying out that desire, he had continually to count upon the ill-will of a section of politicians in Paris, among whom were some influential leaders, and with these it was believed that Walewski was in sympathy. For a time, during the close alliance of the Crimean war, their voices were silenced, but there was now something of reaction against the cordial international sentiments which had been sung in songs and spoken in public speeches, and the voices of the Anglophobists were again heard. In Italy the emperor was suspected. The patriots had been checked, and the cause of national freedom crippled by the French bayonets, by which Rome and the papal misgovernment were sustained. There were hands ready to be lifted against "the man of December" by so-called republicans who were not Frenchmen, and by assassins who called themselves patriots, and professed to be ready to become martyrs in the cause of Italy. These adverse conditions were complicated by the fact that England, and London in particular, continued to be the refuge of political suspects, and of those who had made their native cities too hot to hold them because of their political conspiracies. Surely few men knew this better than Napoleon III., but the knowledge was not reassuring, and it added to his difficulties by supplying the enemies of England in Paris with a potent argument against his continued loyalty to the alliance which he had determined to maintain.

The first attempt on the emperor's life was, it will be remembered, by an Italian, Pianori, who, on the 28th of April, 1855, came forward from the avenue near the corner of the Rue Balzac as though he were about to present a petition, and fired twice with a double-barrelled pistol as the emperor approached on horseback. Both shots missed, and the assas-

sin was arrested and afterwards tried and executed. He was said to have been the agent of some of the lowest political refugees in London, and was an Italian escaped from prison at Genoa, where he had been sent after having been tried at Rome for a political assassination. The attempt of Bellemarre, who was a Frenchman and a lunatic, resulted only in the safe confinement of the prisoner, but frequent references were made to the knots of desperados believed to be always plotting in the purlieus of Leicester Square, and to the encouraging asylum which was provided there for avowed revolutionists and professed murderers.

But there were other influences at work which made the relations of the emperor more difficult. He had begun to play some secret game of which nobody could quite discern the intention, and probably it was only a tentative move in order that he might decide on a more determined policy. Not only was he beginning to return the civilities of Russia by the acceptance of a visit of the Grand Duke Constantine to Paris (there was nothing in that, for the queen had let it be understood that she was quite ready to receive the grand duke at Osborne, and it was said that he would visit Paris and London to obtain capital for Russian railways), but he was half holding out a hand to Austria, hinting that she might well occupy those Danubian Principalities, for the retention of which by the Ottoman Empire he had a few months before been willing to go to war.

The Emperor Napoleon had come to the conclusion that the best thing for the Principalities themselves was that they should be united under a foreign prince, who should admit the suzerainty of Turkey. Russia also advocated their union, with this difference, that it should be presided over by a native prince. This did not fall in with the views of the French emperor, who seems to have been sincerely anxious to make the Principalities strong as a barrier against Russia; whereas, with a native prince at the head of the state, he was well aware that Russia would be able to use her accustomed arts to gain a control over these provinces. Sardinia

took the same view as France, and, had there been nothing to fear from Russia in the future, that view would doubtless have commended itself to most thoughtful politicians. It became evident, however, that the emperor had ceased to care about the maintenance of the integrity of the Ottoman government with respect to the Principalities. The question was being asked, What are his motives for approaching Austria, when not long ago he was nearly as ready to conclude an alliance between France, England, and Russia, leaving out Austria, as Russia had been to form one of Russia and France, with perhaps Prussia in the back-ground, leaving out England? That Napoleon III. hated Austria was well understood, and that he had some dreams of an extension of the French frontier, may have influenced him to try whether it could be done by a tacit understanding with the power that grasped so much of Italy, and might be persuaded to stretch out a hand for the Principalities. But the scheme was futile. England recognized the loyalty of Austria during the Crimean war, and would make no party against her. Nor was Austria anxious to intermeddle with the troublous question of the Danubian territory.

In January, 1858, the Queen and Prince Albert, with the royal household, were busily occupied with the betrothal of our Princess Royal with Prince Frederick William, eldest son of the Regent, Prince William (the present Emperor of Germany), who had taken the reins of the Prussian government during the mental aberration of the king, his brother. A dowry of £40,000 and an annuity of £4000 was settled by a parliamentary vote upon the princess, with great unanimity, and many expressions of respect and affection for the queen. The French emperor by that time had apparently turned from Austria and was inclining to Russia, and in Vienna marked anxiety was felt that France was at work in Italy and on the Danube to undermine the Austrian power. Meanwhile Russia became exceedingly civil to England. Among all his advisers M. de Persigny was the most outspoken and determined in warning Napoleon III. against doing

anything to weaken the alliance with England, since all the sovereigns who were flattering or cajoling him for their own purposes looked down upon him as an adventurer, and had no belief in the stability of his throne or the duration of his dynasty; whereas the English, who never flattered or cajoled anybody, but who looked only to the interests of England, were attached to the French alliance and to the sovereign of France, because the peaceful relations with that country were of the utmost importance to England.

Amidst these conflicting elements the cordial personal relations of the emperor and empress with our royal family were maintained. The Prussian Prince Frederick William was here; the Austrian Archduke Maximilian, who was engaged to the Princess Charlotte of Belgium, daughter of King Leopold, was also on a visit; the christening of the infant Princess Beatrice was celebrated. At the lunch the archduke sat on one side of the queen, the Prussian prince on the other. "I hope," said Maximilian, "it is a good omen for the future that on this occasion England sits between Austria and Prussia." He was a lover of this country. The queen was delighted with him, and augured a happy union for her young cousin, the Princess Charlotte. Her majesty wrote to King Leopold, "He may and will do a great deal for Italy." Alas! we shall see on a future page how these bright anticipations were frustrated by the tragedy of Mexico.

Napoleon III. had also expressed to De Persigny an earnest desire to pay a visit to the queen, and this being made known by Lord Clarendon, it was appointed that the emperor and empress should arrive at Osborne, whither Prince Albert hurried home from the marriage at Brussels to receive the imperial guests on the 6th of August, when the *Reine Hortense* brought them for the desired interview. The visit was semi-political.

The future constitution of the Principalities had been left by the Treaty of Paris to be settled by the treaty powers, after receiving the report of a special commission appointed "to investigate their present state, and to propose bases for their future organization." The administration guaranteed by the Porte

to these provinces under the treaty was to be "independent and national," with "full liberty of worship, of legislation, of commerce, and of navigation." The Porte also undertook to convoke immediately in each of the two provinces, a divan, composed in such a manner as to represent most closely the interests of all classes of society, who were to be called upon to express the wishes of the people in regard to the definite organization of the Principalities.

This was all very well, and perhaps offered a good basis, but now the Emperor of the French was siding towards Russia. The emperor complained that the elections of the divan had been tampered with, not only by the Turkish government but by Austria, and that of Moldavia had resulted in the election of members known to be unfavourable to the union of the two Principalities.

The visit to Osborne was a long palaver in which the emperor and Prince Albert, Lord Palmerston, Lord Clarendon, the Duc de Persigny, and M. Walewski, took part. It embraced much, including the notions of the emperor about a revision of the treaty of 1815 which would have involved a partial redistribution of Europe. It went so far as a discussion of a distribution of Africa, to which one would think the two veteran statesmen listened with a kind of tolerant amusement. It ended in an arrangement for the abandonment by Turkey of the results of the elections, and by the emperor of his plan of uniting the Principalities. But the visit was of the utmost advantage in renewing the bond of loyal friendship for the queen and prince which Napoleon III. felt truly and deeply; and in awakening him to the real character of those overtures which were at the time influencing him to throw in his lot with Russia as against Austria, with whom, Prince Albert pointed out to him, Russia was certain to renew friendly relations at an early opportunity. It must be remarked that Napoleon III. had the rare quality of being able to listen to the plainest truths and to suffer contradiction without anger or resentment.

In August the queen and prince made a yachting excursion to Cherbourg, but only for a private visit to the place, and that journey

may be said to have been the occasion of the subsequent demand for fortifications on the English coast, which was regarded as a part of the so-called "invasion panic" of 1858.

On the 1st of January a letter came from the Emperor and Empress of the French in cordial reply to the Christmas greetings which the queen had sent them. In that letter the emperor said:—

"The 1st of January is usually a day that is anything but pleasant to me, for it is taken up with very tiresome receptions, and this year seemed to me more disagreeable than usual, for it begins on a Friday, and with a fog that might be envied on the Thames. But your majesty has contrived to dissipate all the sad impressions of the day by deigning to send me a kind word, which I have just received, and which has touched me deeply. Believe me, madam, the wishes that I form for the happiness of your majesty, and for that of the prince and of your children, are most sincere. Our thoughts, too, are full of the 25th, and we share all the emotions which your majesty must feel on this occasion."

The 25th was fixed for the wedding of the Princess Royal, an event which was celebrated with loyal enthusiasm and rejoicing on the part of the people, who had a very true admiration and regard for the princess, and much sympathy with her majesty. Before that date, however, an event had happened which might have had a serious effect on the state of Europe but for the consistent regard of the emperor for his engagement to England, and one might almost say his loyalty to the queen. As it was, it indirectly effected the sudden expulsion of the ministry, and the temporary suspension of the policy which they had pursued. On the evening of the 14th of January, 1858, another and a more desperate attempt was made to assassinate the emperor as he was on his way with the empress to the opera. While the carriage conveying their majesties was being driven along the Rue Lepelletier, three successive explosions were heard, the gaslights were extinguished by the concussion of the air, and the street was left in total darkness. This was soon found to have been occasioned by hand-grenades, of a pear shape,

filled with some explosive substance, which had been thrown under the carriage, and the fragments of which flew in all directions, and inflicted fatal injuries on ten persons, 156 being more or less severely wounded.

Neither the emperor nor the empress was seriously hurt, but General Roguet, aide-de-camp in waiting, who was sitting in the carriage, was wounded in the head, and the carriage itself was much shattered. Several of the soldiers in attendance were struck, and two of them mortally wounded. Their majesties, however, did not turn back, but entered the opera-house, where they were received with the warmest enthusiasm, and on their return to the Tuileries the streets were illuminated, and they were loudly cheered by the populace. Some arrests immediately took place, and it was soon discovered that the plot for assassinating the emperor had been concocted by an Italian refugee named Orsini, who had, in the previous year escaped from the fortress of Mantua, where he was confined as a state prisoner by the Austrian government, and that his associates in the diabolical attempt were three other conspirators named Rudio, Pierri, and Gomez. All four had been present in the Rue Lepelletier, and, with the exception of Pierri, were armed with the deadly shells, which had been manufactured by Orsini's orders in Birmingham, the assassins having set out from London.

People in England knew Felice Orsini. He had given lectures, or rather orations, in several places, describing the circumstances of his imprisonment and escape, and appealing on behalf of Italian freedom and against Austria. He was a dark, handsome man, with the deep shadowy eye, the coal-black beard and hair, the erect figure, that people regard as being typical of the true Italian. His lectures were listened to with applause and his appearance commanded attention; but there was then not sufficient enthusiasm in England to stimulate a hostile declaration against Austria. It was reserved for the man whom Orsini attempted to kill to make that declaration, and to do for Italy what probably no one else would at that time have undertaken. Orsini was warned that the English

would not be roused to do what he desired. At first he thought his orations had been applauded out of practical sympathy with his cause, but he found he was mistaken, and began to search for a reason for his want of success. Orsini attributed it to the influence of the Emperor of the French, whose visit to London occurred just at the time that the lecturer was disappointed and baffled. From that time he appears to have had a settled purpose to slay Napoleon III., and he found others ready to give him the aid he asked for. Had he known when he made his desperate attempt, that the man he sought to kill had already pledged himself to Count Cavour to follow certain plans of policy, which had led that astute statesman to conclude that the power of France would soon be exercised on behalf, not of republican, but of national, free monarchical Italy, the bomb might never have fallen from his hand. But nobody, except those immediately concerned, had that knowledge. Orsini and his accomplices only succeeded in killing and seriously injuring a number of persons against whom he could have had no animosity, and in spattering the dress of the empress with blood. She had a narrow escape. It was said that a piece of glass from the shattered window of the carriage struck her forcibly on the temple near the eye, and that another fragment had grazed the emperor's nose.

Orsini himself was wounded by a portion of one of the exploded shells, and left a track of blood by which his captors were able to follow him. He admitted that it was he who had committed the crime, and made no appeal for mercy or for a mitigation of his punishment, though he used every effort to avert the charge of complicity from a man who had been accused of being an accomplice. Singularly enough Orsini wrote from prison to Napoleon III. imploring him to support the Italian national cause. It was believed that the emperor would have spared his life but for the frightful recklessness of a crime which led to the death and injury of so many persons. During the horrible attempt both the emperor and the empress maintained their calm bearing—no one ever accused Napoleon

III. of a lack of personal courage—but it was said that after leaving the opera-house, when the imperial pair met at the cradle of the infant prince, the emperor gave way, and could not refrain from tears. This was not to be wondered at. He was beset with many difficulties, and this new attempt to assassinate him was for a short time the occasion of fresh complications. Orsini and Pierrri were executed, the former remaining unmoved to the last, and encouraging his agitated companion to be calm. The other two conspirators were imprisoned at the galleys for life.

It was to the friendly wishes of the royal family of England that the emperor's thoughts naturally reverted, and both he and the empress wrote to the queen two days afterwards. The emperor said:—"In this the first moment of excitement the French are bent on finding accomplices in the crime everywhere, and I find it hard to resist all the extreme measures which people call on me to take. But this event will not make me deviate from my habitual calm, and, while seeking to strengthen the hands of the government, I will not be guilty of any injustice. I am very sorry to intrude a subject so serious and engrossing upon your majesty at a moment when I would fain speak only of the happiness I feel in the thought that your mother's heart will soon be satisfied. I would also venture to beg your majesty to present to the Princess Royal all my congratulations on her marriage. Our warmest good wishes will be with her and with you upon the 25th."

There was a serious underlying meaning in this letter. If Napoleon III. was disposed to take the attempt of Orsini calmly when speaking of it to the Queen of England, there were a large number of Frenchmen who were ready to use indignant and even violently abusive language in relation to the crime and the English protection of political criminals. England was accused of offering hospitality to assassins. Count Walewski, as minister of foreign affairs, wrote to Count Persigny, the French ambassador in London, a despatch which, though it was of course much less emphatic than menacing messages which had been forwarded to Sardinia, Switzerland, and

Belgium, was strong enough to be taken to imply an offensive imputation against this country for affording countenance and protection to men by whose writings "assassination was elevated into a doctrine, openly preached, and carried into practice by reiterated attacks" upon the person of the French sovereign.

"It is," said the despatch, "no longer the hostility of misguided parties manifesting itself by all the excesses of the press, and every violence of language; it is no longer even the labours of factions seeking to agitate opinion and to provoke disorder; it is assassination reduced to a doctrine, preached openly, practised in repeated attempts, the most recent of which has just struck Europe with stupefaction. Ought the English legislature to contribute to the designs of men who are not mere fugitives, but assassins, and continue to shelter persons who place themselves beyond the pale of common right and under the ban of humanity? Her Britannic majesty's government can assist us in averting a repetition of such guilty enterprises by affording us a guarantee of security which no state can refuse to a neighbouring state, and which we are authorized to expect from an ally. Fully relying, moreover, on the high principle (*haute raison*) of the English cabinet, we refrain from indicating in any way the measures which it may see fit to take in order to comply with this wish. We confidently leave to it to decide the course which it shall deem best fitted to attain the end in view."

M. Persigny himself made his contribution to the strong remonstrances from France. In reply to a deputation informing him that the corporation of the city of London had voted an address to the emperor, he said:—"The true question "does not lie in the attempts at assassinations in themselves, nor even in the crime of the 14th of January, which your government would have hastened to warn us against if it could have known it beforehand; the whole question is the moral situation of France, which has become anxiously doubtful of the real sentiment of England. Reasoning by analogy, popular opinion declares that if there were in France men sufficiently infamous to recommend at their clubs, in their papers,

in their writings of every kind, the assassination of a foreign sovereign, and actually to prepare its execution, a French administration would not wait to receive the demands of a foreign government, nor to see the enterprise set on foot. . . . To act against such conspiracies, to anticipate such crimes, public notoriety would be sufficient to set our law in motion, and measures of security would be taken immediately. Well, then, France is astonished that nothing of a like nature should have taken place in England, and Frenchmen say either the English law is sufficient, as certain lawyers declare—and why, then, is it not applied? or it is insufficient, which is the opinion of other lawyers, and in this case why does not a free country, which makes its own laws, remedy this omission? In one word, France does not understand, and cannot understand, this state of things, and in that resides the harm; for she may mistake the true sentiments of her ally, and no longer believe her sincerity."

There was little to be said against this language, and it showed how much more moderate Persigny was than the foreign minister. But Persigny was more truly loyal to the English alliance, and stronger representations than his,—even those which were made by members of the French chambers, where Trolong and Morny uttered violent denunciations, could be excused by men like Lord Clarendon, who, writing to Prince Albert, said:

"Great allowance is to be made for men whose fortunes depend upon the life of the emperor, and who were speaking under the excitement and exasperation which the atrocious attempt on his life could not fail to produce. Nor is it to be expected that foreigners, who see that assassins go and come here as they please, and that conspiracies may be hatched in England with impunity, should think our laws and policy friendly to other countries, or appreciate the extreme difficulty of making any change in our system."

But what the calm deliberate judgment of a statesman might regard with equanimity, the people of England and some of those to whom they looked for the demonstration of national spirit, were not likely to pass by

without a quick answer. Unfortunately, too, the offensive tone towards England, which could only be assumed to exist in Walewski's despatch, became obvious in the congratulatory addresses which were sent to the emperor from some of the regiments of the French army. Certain colonels of these regiments appeared to revel in invective against the English, and the numerous opponents of the alliance probably took the opportunity to foment this feeling of antagonism. The terms used in some of these addresses were so extravagantly offensive that they became ludicrous. Due allowance of course was needed for the excitability of the French temperament, and for the usually exaggerated phraseology of military officers of a certain class, which at that time displayed considerable strength of self-assertion. Even the milder of these addresses deplored that powerful friends, whose brave armies had lately fought by their sides, should under the name of hospitality protect conspirators and assassins, surpassing those who had gone before them in all that was odious. Others, however, demanded "an account from the land of impurity which contains the haunts of the monsters who are sheltered by its laws." "Give us the order, sire," said this address, "and we will pursue them even to their strongholds." Another division exclaimed, "Let the miserable assassins, the subordinate agents of such crimes, receive the chastisement due to their abominable attempts, but let also the infamous haunt in which machinations so infernal are planned be destroyed for ever." Of course "the infamous haunt" meant London, and this was the strain in which several of the addresses were couched. There was no bearing that. Who was to resent the insolence of these French colonels? There was, of course, a great deal of indignation expressed, and the defiant replies made in public speeches and newspapers in England sometimes almost rivalled in absurdity the menaces which had occasioned them. *Punch* appeared with a cartoon representing a French colonel in the character of a crowing cock, and with a few contemptuous words underneath. Some wise-acre thought it would be a capital thing to send the caricature to the colonel of the

French division at Rouen, who had been one of the foremost of those who inveigled against this country, and he sent it pretending that it was from the Army and Navy Club, the committee of which, hearing of the outrage, afterwards offered fifty pounds reward for the detection of the offender. Everybody was asking what was to be done, what was the reply to be made to the demands, or what appeared to be the demands of the French foreign minister? Where was Lord Palmerston? Lord Palmerston appeared to be in some respects more firmly seated than ever. He had recently, perhaps because of attacks of gout and advancing age, exhibited rather more brusquerie, and a little less bonhomie, when he had to reply to awkward or disagreeable questions, and a few acute politicians stroked their chins as they looked somewhat askance at him, but he had lost little if anything in the opinion of the country, and his government appeared to have in it the elements of lasting strength. He and Lord Clarendon and Lord Cowley were convinced of the good faith of the French emperor toward England. They had met him at Osborne, they had marked the frank deference with which he listened even to refutations of his own opinions. It was worth while to make some concessions, and to go out of the ordinary course to preserve the *entente cordiale*. These concessions had been made, the ordinary course had, in one sense, been departed from before the publication in the *Moniteur* of the addresses from the French army had aroused public temper here. In Walewski's communication there was not, after all, anything compromising to the honour of England, if, as Lord Clarendon had hinted, due regard were had to the mode of speaking and thinking in France.

There was no denying the fact that Orsini had gone direct from England, and that he, like the active agents in previous conspiracies against the emperor's life, had also lived for some time in England. Public feeling was revolted by the way the asylum we had afforded had been abused by men of this stamp, and it was prepared to sanction any reasonable measure to prevent English soil from

being used with impunity for the concoction of plots against the life of a foreign sovereign. On the 8th of February, 1858, Lord Palmerston brought forward, not a really effective measure, but one which, while it was calculated to allay the natural irritation of the French government, and to appease the expectations of the emperor, would, if it had passed into law, have been almost inoperative, unless by some straining of its provisions. It was, in short, a bill ostensibly intended to make conspiracy to murder a felony punishable with penal servitude for five years, or imprisonment with hard labour for three years—that offence being only a misdemeanour under the existing law.

It scarcely needs to be pointed out that the punishment, whether by short imprisonment or by penal servitude, of a detected conspiracy to murder, is quite a different thing to the refusal of an asylum to political refugees on the mere suspicion that they may contemplate assassination. Conspiracy to murder was never tolerated under the English law, but we had few secret means of discovering what might be the plots of political refugees who found an asylum in this country. Few men could have known this better than Napoleon III., who had himself lived and plotted in, and carried out his schemes from, London, and was well aware that political malcontents from all countries and the protestors against all tyrannies sought safety in England, beyond the reach of the despotisms, or it might sometimes be the reasonable laws, against which they preached revolt.

Palmerston's Conspiracy to Murder Bill had passed the first reading by 299 votes to 99, and there seemed to be little reason to doubt that it would become law. The India Bill No. 1 had just before passed its first reading with a triumphant majority, and Sir Richard Bethell, who was then attorney-general, walking home with Palmerston on the night of the division, said jocularly that his lordship ought, like the Roman consuls in a triumph, to have somebody beside him to remind him that he was mortal. The remark became significant.

It had been intended at first to introduce a

measure giving power to the secretary of state to send away any foreigner who was suspected by the government to be plotting a scheme against the life of a foreign sovereign, the government being bound to state the grounds on which the person was sent away, either to a secret committee of parliament, or to a committee composed of the three chiefs of the courts of law. This, however, was abandoned, partly perhaps because it was obvious that to gain the required information it would be necessary to employ a secret political police. The same objection appears to have been overlooked in the bill which was subsequently introduced.

But before that bill could be read a second time, the tone adopted in France had aroused popular indignation here. At a great meeting in Hyde Park the threats of the French colonels were quoted, and great excitement was shown; while the arrest, in his lodgings at Bayswater, of a Dr. Simon Bernard on a charge of complicity in the Orsini plot, and his subsequent committal on a charge of murder, and as accessory before the fact, increased the feeling of suspicion that the law of England was about to be wrested in compliance with the demands of a foreign government. At the same time public indignation, after it had become less unreasonable, gave rise to one of the most important events which ever occurred in the social or political history of the nation. The militia had already been strengthened and reorganized; but now came a steady and determined renewal of former proposals, by competent men, for the formation of volunteer regiments. It is a subject to which we may have to recur at greater length hereafter, and it is enough to say here that many thousands of volunteer riflemen, whose happily chosen motto was soon declared to be "Defence, not Defiance," were rapidly enrolled under officers who had at all events plenty of energy and enthusiasm, and were not deficient in ability.

When the Conspiracy Bill came up for the second reading, it had been discovered that no actual reply had been sent to the despatch of Count Walewski, though doubtless Lord Cowley had received instructions to discuss its terms

with the French foreign minister. This might have answered the purpose if the subsequent utterances of French addresses and French journals had not given another interpretation to the despatch in the minds of its opponents. But though the French government had been told, through the official channels, that we could not pass an Alien Bill, and could only set in motion a law against conspiracy on receiving proper evidence, and though the emperor,—directly his attention was called to the outrageous language of the army addresses,—had authorized his minister to express his regret that they should have been received, or should have been allowed to appear in the *Moniteur*; a majority of the House of Commons and the country had determined to support an amendment—arranged, it was said, by Lord John Russell, and moved by Mr. Milner Gibson—against the second reading. The amendment was:—That this house cannot but regret that her majesty's government, previously to inviting the house to amend the law of conspiracy at the present time, have not felt it to be their duty to reply to the important despatch received from the French government, dated January 20th.

On the first introduction of the bill it had been opposed by Mr. Kinglake with some force; but Mr. Kinglake was not a power in the House of Commons, and was known to be a bitter opponent of the French emperor. Mr. Disraeli had seemed to be waiting on events, and employed the tactics of balancing the debate and at the same time incidentally damaging the ministry. He pointed out that in 1853, under a government of which the noble lord the member for London, who felt that this country would be so humiliated by the adoption of the bill, was the leading member of the house, we had statesmen of the greatest eminence in this country denouncing the Emperor of the French as a tyrant, usurper, and perjurer; we had a cabinet minister fresh from a cabinet council proceeding to the hustings, and amusing his constituents by depicting to them the danger of their country from the impending piratical invasion of the French people. What was now to be considered, however, was not the foolish or insulting speeches

made on either side. "What the Emperor of the French really required, I apprehend," said Mr. Disraeli, "was a plain demonstration on the part of this country, which would have dissipated the apprehensions that have unfortunately proved so considerable in France; but I cannot believe that the bill which the noble lord has proposed will at all tend to that most desirable consummation. So far as I am concerned, I consider it the most unfortunate part of the position in which we are placed, that this opportunity has been so mismanaged by her majesty's ministers as to have alarmed England without pleasing France. Still I cannot think that we ought to take a course which might lead to prolonged and mischievous misconceptions, because we disapprove of the clumsy and feeble manner in which the government has attempted to deal with this difficulty."

Lord Palmerston attempted to carry the house with him against Mr. Milner Gibson's motion, by treating the language of the French colonels as a trumpety reason for refusing an important measure. It would be unworthy of the nation to be turned from a course otherwise proper "upon any paltry feelings of offended dignity or of irritation at the expressions of three or four colonels of French regiments." But if the propriety of the proposed measure was not denied, its timeliness was strongly disputed. The temper of the nation would have refused even the most desirable measure of legislation to the demand of a foreign government, and the very fact that Palmerston had apparently submitted to dictation, at once created suspicion that there was unworthy truckling to the French emperor for some state purpose. The country was jealous and disappointed, and it soon became evident that the premier and the ministry had taken a step from which they would not be able to recover their former footing. The amendment was supported not only by the Radicals who had opposed the first reading of the bill, but also by Mr. Gladstone and the Peelites, as well as by the chiefs of the opposition. "What satisfaction," said Mr. Disraeli, "was it to the country that some indefinite words were dropped in a conversation? The government

had acted in a perplexed, timid, and confused manner, deficient in dignity and self-respect. The despatch ought to have been answered in a spirit worthy of the occasion. A great opportunity had been lost of asserting the principles of public law."

Mr. Disraeli had voted with the government for the introduction of the bill, though he had by his comments endeavoured to injure the ministry. He now opposed it. But its fate was already fixed. Mr. Gibson, returned to parliament by another constituency after he had been rejected by his former supporters, was the representative of a body which, though it had been depressed during the Crimean war, was again rising to influence, and Palmerston had lost some popularity before the promotion of this measure. His appointment, to the office of lord privy-seal, of the Marquis of Clanricarde, whose reputation was by no means a good one, and who had recently been exposed in a trial in the Dublin Court of Chancery, had caused some scandal, and a very obvious element of public distrust appeared to be mingled with the former admiration for the noble lord, who was presently to discover that he was the subject of general abuse and of accusations of subserviency to France and nobody knew what other crimes against the state. Among the most favourable expressions of opinion at that time it was said, "Palmerston is growing old and childish, his day is over; and though he was once the representative of English power and influence in Europe, his head has been turned by the civilities of the Tuileries and a personal friendship for the French emperor."

But there were statesmen who, setting party considerations aside, were still strongly opposed to the introduction of the bill without a formal answer having been given to the French despatch explaining the state of our law. Not only had this been neglected, but they were asked to pass the present bill as an answer to Count Walewski's despatch. "If there is any feeling in this house for the honour of England," said Mr. Gladstone, "don't let us be led away by some vague statement about the necessity of reforming the criminal law. Let us insist upon the necessity of vin-

dicating that law. As far as justice requires, let us have the existing law vindicated, and then let us proceed to amend it if it be found necessary. But do not let us allow it to lie under a cloud of accusations of which we are convinced that it is totally innocent. These times are grave for liberty. We live in the nineteenth century; we talk of progress; we believe that we are advancing; but can any man of observation who has watched the events of the last few years in Europe have failed to perceive that there is a movement indeed, but a downward and backward movement? There are a few spots in which institutions that claim our sympathy still exist and flourish. They are secondary places—nay, they are almost the holes and corners of Europe so far as mere material greatness is concerned, although their moral greatness will, I trust, ensure them long prosperity and happiness. But in these times more than ever does responsibility centre upon the institutions of England; and if it does centre upon England, upon her principles, upon her laws, and upon her governors, then I say that a measure passed by this House of Commons—the chief hope of freedom—which attempts to establish a moral complicity between us and those who seek safety in repressive measures, will be a blow and a discouragement to that sacred cause in every country in the world."

These words were full of meaning in relation to coming events in Italy, the shadows of which were even then being thrown forward with unmistakable distinctness, though only a few could discern their shape and relative proportions.

Lord Palmerston could always take defeat with cheerful equanimity, but he seldom allowed that he would be defeated until the battle was really over. He usually fought to the last with courage and address. He fought now, but *not* with his usual address. He lost his temper, and became as abusive to Mr. Milner Gibson as he had on former occasions been to Mr. Bright and Mr. Cobden, and in much the same style. It was, he said, the first time in his life that he had seen Mr. Gibson stand forth in the character of champion of the honour of England and vindicator

of the rights of the country against foreign nations. The policy which that gentleman had invariably advocated had been one of submission—of crouching to every foreign power with which we had any differences to discuss. The right honourable gentleman belonged to a small party who said, "What care we if this country should be conquered by a foreign force? If we are conquered by a foreign power, they would allow us to work our mills." This might have "fetched" the house two years before, but the spell which gave such animus to any attack on the "Manchester school," and the "Peace-at-any-price" party, had been weakened. Neither Cobden nor Bright were in parliament, but they had not been altogether silent, and there had been a peculiar fusion of parties on some leading questions. His attack on Mr. Gibson was as ill-timed as the bill which it was intended to defend. He seemed to forget that the indignant rejection by men with Mr. Milner Gibson's views, of a foreign despatch which he had been ready to accept and to act upon, was a startling evidence of the national dislike to the position which he had been ready to assume towards the French government. His retorts were received with murmurs and exclamations of dissent, and he was too good a tactician not to feel that he was on a wrong course. He ended by appealing to the house not to support an amendment which would have an entirely contrary effect to that which had been anticipated; but the house did not respond to his appeal, and the government was defeated by a majority of 19 on a division in which 459 members voted—that majority being composed of 146 Conservatives, 84 Liberals, and 4 of those who were still called Peelites, viz. Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Cardwell, Mr. Sidney Herbert, and Sir James Graham.

Palmerston could scarcely have expected such a result, and it is very doubtful whether those who made the majority were quite prepared for it, or were delighted with the prospect of a Conservative government. Had Palmerston chosen to drop the bill, and to appeal to the house for a vote of confidence, he would very likely have gained the point, but he preferred to resign at once. The queen

would not at first accept his resignation, but he had no desire to retain office under the circumstances. Lord Derby was sent for to undertake the difficult task of forming a government, and the ex-premier resumed, with cheerful ardour, occupations which still gave him a large share of public business, until the following November, when he went gaily off to Compiègne on a visit to the Emperor Napoleon, to join in shooting pheasants and hunting stags in the imperial forest, and to talk philosophical politics with his host in the intervals of festivity.

Lord Derby had little confidence in being able to maintain a Conservative government, and it was generally understood that the new ministry would only keep office as it were by sufferance. There were few new names in the administration. Mr. Disraeli was of course chancellor of the exchequer; Lord Malmesbury, foreign secretary; Mr. Walpole, home secretary; Sir J. Pakington, first lord of the admiralty. It is to be remarked that Lord Derby offered the appointment of secretary for the colonies to Mr. Gladstone, who declined it, and that it was then conferred on Lord Stanley, in whom the Conservatives had begun to look with no little expectation, because of his solid acquirements and a certain appearance of calm deliberation which peculiarly distinguished him from his father. It was both significant and important that Lord Cowley was retained as our representative in Paris. In fact after Lord Derby had made his ministerial statement on assuming office, Lord Clarendon had given such an explanation of the course adopted by the late government, that the new prime minister, in reporting to the queen the proceedings of the evening, wrote, "Lord Clarendon made an admirable speech in explanation of the course which the late government pursued, and which, had it been delivered in the House of Commons on the subject of the amendment, would probably have deprived Lord Derby of the honour of addressing your majesty on the present occasion."

It was well that a man so fully trusted by the Emperor of the French as Lord Cowley was to be retained at Paris, for it required

some one in a confidential relation to explain the necessity for dropping the Conspiracy Bill and sending a definite answer to Count Walewski's despatch.

When the Emperor of the French learned from Lord Derby's speech that the Conspiracy Bill would not be proceeded with, his vexation and disappointment were at first great. The passing of the bill would have helped to appease the angry spirit which his own indiscretion had helped to foment among a certain section of his followers, and which had been made the most of, for their own purpose, by the plotters against the Anglo-French alliance. Once persuaded that the measure was one which no ministry could carry, he was certain to see the wisdom of letting the subject drop. To satisfy him on this head, therefore, became the first object of the government, and they were materially assisted in this by the confidence which the emperor felt in Lord Cowley, and by the frankness with which he discussed this subject with his lordship, as, indeed, he was in the habit of discussing with him all questions that affected the interests of the two countries. Lord Cowley had even the courage to suggest that as such a measure, unless carried by what was clearly not to be hoped for, the almost unanimous consent of parliament, could be no satisfaction to France, the emperor would place himself in a far better position with England were he himself to request that all further discussion on the subject should drop. An intimation to this effect was subsequently conveyed from the emperor to the French ambassador here.

A friendly adjustment was in fact soon arrived at. Walewski's obnoxious despatch of the 20th of January was answered in a despatch by Lord Malmesbury to Lord Cowley, written to be communicated to Count Walewski. In this answer Count Walewski's attention was called to the imputations which seemed to be conveyed by the language of his despatch. A conviction was expressed that, whatever the words might import, it could not have been Count Walewski's intention to convey an imputation, "injurious alike to the morality and honour of the British nation," and that he would not hesitate, "with that

frankness which has characterized his conduct, to offer an explanation which cannot fail to remove any existing misconception."

The strongest assurances were given orally by Count Walewski to Lord Cowley, when this despatch was read to him, that he had never intended to do more than to call attention to the acts of certain conspirators against the emperor's life, who had used England as the base for their machinations, but that he had never pointed out, "or intended to point out, a remedy for them. It was for the English government and the English nation alone to determine in what manner, and in what measure, a remedy could be applied."—Count de Persigny was also instructed, in a despatch from Count Walewski, to reiterate these assurances in unqualified terms, and the following paragraph of the despatch brought the differences between the governments to an honourable close:—

"In giving these assurances to the principal secretary of state you will add, that the emperor's intentions having been misunderstood, his majesty's government will abstain from continuing a discussion, which, if prolonged, might injuriously affect the dignity and good understanding of the two countries, and will place its reliance purely and simply on the loyalty of the English people."

This was satisfactory, the honour of both countries was vindicated, and when Mr. Disraeli was able to announce the happy termination of the difference, it was felt to be a favourable introduction to the new administration. That administration had, as we have seen, to take up the question of an India Bill, and the programme which had been announced also included parliamentary reform. Nobody expected that the government could last long, nobody looked forward with very great excitement to its operations after the India Bill had passed. One or two of the measures which were adopted we have already noted. Some of the events we shall place hereafter in their relation to their results. The two features of the session now to be considered were the budget and the proposal of a measure of reform which had been promised in the ministerial programme. The budget was not cal-

culated to arouse either great admiration or sustained opposition. It was framed to meet peculiar difficulties. There was an increased expenditure, and yet commercial failures had diminished revenue. The financial statement was felt to be a critical point, but it was well received, chiefly because it proposed no violent changes. There was a deficit of £3,990,000, and Mr. Disraeli had determined to postpone the engagement to pay off £2,000,000 of exchequer bonds and £1,500,000 of the war sinking-fund. The introduction of a stamp on bankers' cheques was a new feature which would produce £300,000, and it was hoped that £500,000 would be obtained by an equalization of the spirit duties. Mr. Disraeli said he hoped it would still be possible, in the year anticipated, to carry into effect Mr. Gladstone's wise arrangements for the extinction of the income-tax; and Mr. Gladstone, who was, as we may remember, soon about to depart for Corfu as Lord Commissioner Extraordinary to the Ionian Islands, expressed general approval of the scheme, thanked the chancellor of the exchequer for equalizing the spirit duties, and hoped there would be some prospect of keeping down the scale of national expenditure, and of conferring upon the country, at an early date, an actual and positive realization of its wishes.

The budget passed without difficulty, and the government had enough on its hands to last till the end of the session, when it had to consider what should be the measure of reform which would satisfy the country. The subject had not been sleeping during the past twelve-months. Had Palmerston's ministry continued to hold office, they were pledged to introduce a new reform bill. Several large and important meetings had been held at Birmingham, Manchester, and Glasgow, at which Mr. Bright had spoken, for he had recovered from the serious illness which had affected him for nearly two years, and was again actively engaged in political work. To him the promoters of a wide measure of reform had applied to prepare the outlines of a bill, and he somewhat reluctantly consented. He would have given the borough franchise to all persons rated for the relief of the poor, and

to all lodgers who paid ten pounds a year rental, and would have reduced the franchise in counties to a ten-pound rental, laying the expenses of the returning officer on the county or borough rate, prescribing that votes should be taken by ballot, wholly disfranchising eighty-six boroughs, taking away one member from each of thirty-four other boroughs, and transferring the seats thus obtained to the larger towns, counties, and divisions of counties.

It could scarcely be expected that the Conservative ministry would introduce such a bill as this; and there was some anxiety to discover what would be their plan. Practically they had no definite scheme, and were so long in framing one that there were fears lest they might break down altogether. On the 28th of February, 1859, however, Mr. Disraeli was ready to explain the measure which had been framed by the government. It was a remarkable proposal, reminding one somewhat, in its curiously fanciful provisions, of the India bill proposed by Lord Ellenborough. It was not intended, its introducer said, to alter the limits of the franchise, but to introduce into the borough a new kind of franchise, founded upon personal property. It was to give a vote in boroughs to persons with £10 a year in the funds, bank stock, or East India stock, to persons having £60 in a savings-bank, to pensioners of £20 a year in the naval, military, or civil services; to the inhabitants of a portion of any house whose aggregate rental was £20 per annum; to graduates, ministers of religion, members of the legal and medical professions, and under certain circumstances to schoolmasters. It proposed to remedy the working of the famous Chandos Clause of the Reform Bill of 1832, by extending the £10 household franchise to the counties, an arrangement which, it was calculated, would add 200,000 to the number of county electors.

The bill was brought in without opposition, but it pleased neither side. The charge brought against it by the opposition was that it aimed to increase the number of voters in such a way as to secure a Conservative majority. Mr. Walpole and Mr. Henley, on the

other hand, were afraid of its too great extension, and did not support it; and the majority of the Conservatives seemed to be doubtful whether it would secure any such end. Of course Mr. Bright, who had then been returned to represent Birmingham, opposed the measure, which he truly said excluded the working-classes, and as was afterwards seen by a remark of Sir E. L. Bulwer, who warmly supported it in a long and remarkable speech, it was not intended materially to extend the franchise in that direction. Quoting Cicero's axiom: "*Semper in re publicâ tendendum est, ne plurimum valeant plurimi,*" he explained it to mean, "The one point that must never be yielded in a state is, that the greatest powers shall not be in the hands of the greatest numbers."

On the 21st of March Lord John Russell proposed as an amendment "that it is neither just nor politic to interfere in the manner proposed in the government bill with the freehold franchise as hitherto exercised in the counties of England and Wales; and that no rearrangement of the franchise will satisfy the house or the country which does not provide for a greater extension of the suffrage in cities and boroughs than is contemplated in the present measure." "With regard to this great question of reform," said Lord John after an able speech, "I may say that I defended it when I was young, and I will not desert it now that I am old."

Mr. Sidney Herbert, disclaiming any party feeling, opposed the amendment. Mr. Gladstone on the same ground gave the government a modified support. As there was no controversy traceable to differences between political parties, he regretted that the house was now in hostile conflict, with a division before them which would estrange those by whose united efforts alone a satisfactory settlement could be come to. He objected to the form of the resolution, but confessed that if they could have had a strong government he should have been induced to vote for it. He saw, however, that after carrying the resolution the opposition would pursue separate courses, but he thought that the government had a claim upon members. In support of

the argument that advantage should be taken of any opportunity to advance the question, he referred to the successive promises and failures of recent years with regard to a measure of reform. "In 1851 my noble friend, then the first minister of the crown, approached the question of reform, and commenced with a promise of what was to be done twelve months afterwards. In 1852 he brought in a bill, and it disappeared together with the ministry. In 1853 we had the ministry of Lord Aberdeen, which commenced with a promise of reform in twelve months' time. Well, 1854 arrived; with it arrived the bill, but with it also arrived the war, and in the war was a reason, and I believe a good reason, for abandoning the bill. Then came the government of my noble friend the member for Tiverton, which was not less unfortunate in the circumstances that prevented the redemption of those pledges which had been given to the people from the mouth of the sovereign on the throne. In 1855 my noble friend escaped all responsibility for a Reform Bill on account of the war; in 1856 he escaped all responsibility for reform on account of the peace; in 1857 he escaped that inconvenient responsibility by the dissolution of parliament; and in 1858 he escaped again by the dissolution of his government." Mr. Gladstone contended that these failures strengthened the misgivings of the people as to the reluctance of the house to deal with this question, made it more hazardous to interpose obstacles, and required the progress of the government bill to completion. He announced that he could not be a party to the disfranchisement of the county freeholders in boroughs; he could not be a party to the uniformity of the franchise; he could not be a party to a reform bill which did not lower the suffrage in boroughs. Unless they could have a lowering of the suffrage it would be better not to waste time upon the subject. He approved that portion of the bill relating to the redistribution of seats, but put in a strong plea on behalf of the small boroughs, which were the nursery ground of men who were destined to lead the house and be an ornament to their country; and he maintained that the extension and the durability of our

liberty were to be attributed, under providence, to distinguished statesmen introduced to the house at an early age. These were reasons for going into committee. If they passed the amendment, it could have no other effect than that of retarding a settlement of the question: it was not the question of the government, but of reform. He urged the house not to let slip its golden opportunity. For himself he should be governed by no other consideration than the simple one—what course would most tend to settle the question? When he voted to negative the resolution of Lord John Russell, he should give his vote neither to the government nor to party.

The debates were long and spirited, and on the second night were graced with the peculiar oratory of Sir Edward Bulwer Lytton, who on that occasion rose to an oratorical display which he had never before exhibited; while Sir Hugh Cairns, who as Mr. Cairns had made a great impression during the discussions on the India bill, took the position of a skilful and able debater.

“A night of immense power and excitement,” wrote Disraeli in his report to the queen of the progress of that debate. “Two of the greatest speeches ever delivered in parliament—by Sir Edward Lytton and the solicitor-general. . . . Both spoke in a crowded house: one before dinner, the other concluding, just down. Never was a greater contrast between two orators, resembling each other in nothing but their excellence.

“Deaf, fantastic, modulating his voice with difficulty, sometimes painful—at first almost an object of ridicule to the superficial—Lytton occasionally reached even the sublime, and perfectly enchained his audience. His description of the English constitution, his analysis of democracy,—as rich and more powerful than Burke.

“Sir Hugh Cairns devoted an hour to a reply to Lord John’s resolution, and to a vindication of the government bill, which charmed every one by its lucidity and controlled every one by its logic. When he had, in the most masterly manner, and with a concinnity which none can equal, closed the business part of his

address, he directed himself to the political portion of the theme, and having literally demolished the mover of the amendment, sat down amid universal cheers.”

But oratory could not save the bill from the effects of the amendment. By the 25th Lord Palmerston seems to have seen his way.

“There is no doubt,” he said, “the amendment will be carried, and then what is the government to do? We are told various things. Some persons say the ministry will resign. Sir, I believe no such thing. I think it will be a dereliction of duty on their part if they do resign. I do not want them to resign. I say to them, as I think Voltaire said of some minister who had incurred his displeasure, ‘I won’t punish him; I won’t send him to prison; I condemn him to keep his place.’ They took the government with its engagements. They undertook a measure of reform, and they will be flinching from their duty to the crown and the country if, in consequence of such a vote as that proposed by my noble friend, they fling up their places and throw upon us the difficulty of dealing with this subject. . . . But then it is said they may dissolve. I have no greater faith in their dissolving than in their resignation. I am of this opinion, because to dissolve parliament at the present moment implies more than the single will of the government. The concurrence of this house is necessary to its own dissolution. Before the government dissolves it must take another vote in supply, pass the Appropriation Act, the Ways and Means Act, and make provision for exchequer bills which will fall due in May. Now all these operations require the hearty concurrence of the house, and are the government, I should like to know, sure of obtaining that concurrence?”

The amendment was carried by a majority of 39 and parliament *was* dissolved. The elections brought a gain to the government of about 20 seats, but they were still in a minority. The new parliament consisted of about 302 Conservatives and 350 Liberals. The Marquis of Hartington moved an addition to the speech from the throne, which being carried was equivalent to a vote of want of

confidence in the ministers, which being carried by a majority of 13 led to the immediate resignation of the government. Then arose another difficulty. The queen had to consider the respective claims of Lord Palmerston and Lord John Russell, between whom a coolness was believed to exist. Her majesty took an alternative course and sent for Lord Granville, then the acknowledged leader of the Liberal party in the House of Lords. Lord John, however, declined to serve under Lord Granville, though he had no objection to take office under Lord Palmerston. This prevented Lord Granville from forming a ministry, and again Lord Palmerston rode triumphantly into power, and not to the dissatisfaction of the nation, who had already forgotten, or had more completely "got at the rights" of his supposed want of consistency in the affairs of the French despatch.

Lord Palmerston was again prime minister with a government in which Lord John Russell was foreign minister, and Mr. Gladstone, chancellor of the exchequer; and it was a period when both those offices would have to be administered with skill and sagacity. But Lord Palmerston, people must have thought, had learnt something or forgotten a great deal on his side also, for no appointment was made to the presidency of the Board of Trade, and it was discovered that the place was kept vacant in the hope that it would be accepted by Mr. Cobden, who was then on his way from a visit to the United States.

It must have been rather amusing to some of Cobden's friends when they heard of this intention, knowing as they did what had been his opinion of the former government under Lord Palmerston as compared to that of Lord Derby.

In a letter to Mr. Lindsay, Cobden had written of the Derby administration: "The present men are most honest, and they are certainly more obliging than the last. In this I agree with you, and it might have been said of any Tory government as compared with any Whig one since I have been in the political ring. I remember when I came into the house in 1841, after the general election which gave

Peel a majority of ninety, I found the Tories more civil in the intercourse of the lobbies and the refreshment-rooms than the Whigs. It runs through all departments. It seems as if the Whig leaders always thought it necessary to snub the Radicals to satisfy the Tories they were not dangerous politicians. But I do not blame them, for they live by it. I do blame those advanced Liberals who allow themselves to be thus used and abused. There is no remedy but in the greater self-respect of the middle class. I fear we have been going the other way for the last ten years. The great prosperity of the country made Tories of us all. . . . During my experience the higher classes never stood so high in relative, social, and political rank, as compared with other classes, as at present. The middle class have been content with the very crumbs from their table. The more contempt a man like Palmerston (as intense an aristocrat at heart as any of them) heaped on them, the louder they cheered him. Twenty years ago, when a hundred members of the house used to muster at the call of Hume or Warburton to compel the Whigs to move on under threats of desertion, there seemed some hope of the middle class setting up for themselves; but now there is no such sign. . . .

"You ask me my view of the political situation. It is hard fate for me to be obliged to choose between Derby and Palmerston, but if compelled to do so, I should certainly prefer the former. Nothing can be so humiliating to us as a party or a nation as to see that venerable political impostor at the head of affairs. But how will you prevent his return to power? . . . Half-a-dozen great families meet at Walmer and dispose of the rank and file of the party, just as I do the lambs that I am now selling for your aldermen's table. And I very much doubt whether you can put an end to this ignominious state of things. Until you can, I don't think you are playing a part in any noble drama."

Mr. Cobden had been to America to inquire into the affairs of the Illinois Railway, in which, with some imprudence, as his friends not unnaturally believed, he had invested the

greater part of his money. Cobden, in fact, though an able political economist, does not appear to have possessed the qualities necessary for a successful man of business, and his personal affairs were often in a precarious condition. But there were those who did not hesitate to help him in a direct and yet in a delicate manner, for he was, as it were, the property of a cause and a political faith, and his was such a sweet and cordial nature that personal regard was added to esteem and admiration for his public and private character.

During his absence not only had the events which we have described taken place, but during the elections the men of Rochdale had met and decided to choose him as the Liberal candidate, much to the delight of Mr. Bright, who attended their meeting and recommended to them "his political associate, his political brother." Cobden was well pleased, for he admired Rochdale Liberalism. He was eventually returned without a contest.

The following is the letter which was despatched by Lord Palmerston (the new prime minister) to Cobden on his landing at Liverpool. It was dated "94 Piccadilly, 27th June, 1859.

"My dear Sir,—I understand that it is likely that you may arrive at Liverpool tomorrow, and I therefore wish that this letter should be placed in your hand upon your landing.

"I have been commissioned by the queen to form an administration, and I have endeavoured so to frame it that it should contain representatives of all sections of the Liberal party, convinced as I am that no government constructed upon any other basis could have sufficient prospect of duration, or would be sufficiently satisfactory to the country.

"Mr. Milner Gibson has most handsomely consented to waive all former difficulties, and to become a member of the new cabinet. I am most exceedingly anxious that you should consent to adopt the same line, and I have kept open for you the office of president of the Board of Trade, which appeared to me to be the one best suited to your views, and to the distinguished part which you have taken in public life. I shall be very glad to

see you and to have personal communication with you as soon as may be convenient to you on your arrival in London."

The invitation was seconded by another letter from Lord John Russell, who said: "An attempt has been made, more or less wisely, to form a government from various sections of Liberals. Recent speeches have prevented the offer of a cabinet office to Mr. Bright. This is much to be regretted; but if you accept, his accession may take place hereafter. If you refuse, I do not see a prospect of amalgamating the Liberal party during my lifetime. In these circumstances, I confess, I think it is a duty for you to accept the office of president of the Board of Trade."

Cobden's own account of the receipt of these letters, and the interviews to which they led, is characteristic and amusing.

"As I came up the Mersey," he says, "I little dreamed of the reception which awaited me. Crowds of friends were ready to greet and cheer me; and before I left the ship a packet of letters was put in my hand, containing one from Lord Palmerston, offering me a seat in the cabinet as president of the Board of Trade; and another from Lord John Russell, urging me in the very strongest terms to accept it. There were letters from Moffat, Gilpin, and a great many others, advising me not to refuse the offer.

"I was completely taken by surprise by all this, for I had heard nothing of the change of government, and was twenty-five days without having seen the latest news from England, namely eleven days' passage, and fourteen days which we were behind the news when I left Quebec.

"I went on shore and proceeded to the hotel, where my troubles began. More than a hundred of the leading men of Liverpool assembled in the large room to present me with an address, which was put into my hand by Mr. William Brown. . . . Afterwards Mr. Robertson Gladstone from the Financial Reform Association, Mr. Rathbone from the American Chamber of Commerce, and the president of the Peace Society, all presented addresses, to which I was obliged, without a moment's notice, and with my head still

swimming with the motion of the sea, to deliver replies. It was really like killing one one with kindness. I have come on here [to Manchester] to see my friends, and hear what they have to say. A deputation from Rochdale is over also. And I have an address from a number of persons, including Bazley and H. Ashworth, wishing me to accept the offer of a seat in the cabinet. Indeed, almost without exception, everybody, Radicals, peacemen, and all, are trying to persuade me to it.

“Now it really seems to me that they must all have gone mad, for with my recorded opinions of Lord Palmerston’s public conduct during the last dozen years, *in which opinions I have experienced no change*, were I suddenly to jump at the offer of a place under him I should ruin myself in my own self-respect, and ultimately lose the confidence of the very men who are in this moment of excitement urging me to enter his cabinet. So great is the pressure put on me, that if it were Lord Granville, or even Lord John, at the head of affairs, I should be obliged, greatly against my will, to be a right honourable. But to take office now, without a single declaration of change of view regarding his public conduct, would be so monstrous a course, that nothing on earth shall induce me to do it. I am going to town this afternoon, and shall forward him my answer on my arrival. I listen to all my friends and say nothing, but my mind is made up.”

On arriving a day or two later in London, Cobden lost no time in calling upon Lord Palmerston. He wrote a full account of all that passed between them to Mr. Sale, his brother-in-law in Manchester.

“*London, 4th July, 1859.*—I thought it best on my arrival in town to go *first* to Palmerston, and explain plainly and frankly everything. On calling on him I was most pleasantly welcomed, and we talked as usual for a few minutes on everything but what I went about. At length I broke the ice in this way: ‘You have acted in so manly and magnanimous a manner in pressing me to take office in your cabinet, that I feel bound to come and talk to you without reserve upon the subject. My case is this. For the last twelve

years I have been the systematic and constant assailant of the principle on which your foreign policy has been carried on. I believed you to be warlike, intermeddling, and quarrelsome, and that your policy was calculated to embroil us with foreign nations. At the same time I have expressed a general want of confidence in your domestic politics. Now I may have been altogether wrong in my views; it is possible I may have been; but I put it candidly to you whether it ought to be in your cabinet, whilst holding a post of high honour and emolument derived from you, that I should make the first avowal of a change of opinion respecting your public policy? Should I not expose myself to severe suspicions, and deservedly so, if I were under these circumstances to step from an Atlantic steamer into your cabinet? Understand, I beg, that I have no personal feelings which prevent me from accepting your offer. I have opposed you as the supposed representative of what I believed to be dangerous principles. If I have ever been personally offensive in my opposition it was not intended, and assuredly you never gave me any justification of such a course.’

“In reply he disclaimed any feelings of a personal kind, and said that even if there had been any personalities, they never ought to be remembered for three months; and he added in a laughing way that he thought Gibson had hit him quite as hard as I had. Then he commenced to combat my objections, and to offer, with apparently great sincerity, a variety of arguments to show that I ought to enter the cabinet, dwelling particularly on the fact that as questions of foreign policy were now uppermost, and as those questions were in the hands of the executive, it was only by joining the government that I could influence them. ‘You and your friends complain,’ he said, ‘of a secret diplomacy, and that wars are entered into without consulting the people. Now it is in the cabinet alone that questions of foreign policy are settled. We never consult parliament till *after* they are settled. If, therefore, you wish to have a voice in those questions, you can only do so in the cabinet.’ This was the argument I found it most difficult to answer, and therefore he pressed it more strongly.

“But finding me still firm in my objections, he observed laughingly, ‘Why are you in the House of Commons?’ I answered also with a laugh, ‘Upon my word I hardly know.’ ‘But why did you enter public life?’ said he. ‘I hardly know,’ was my answer; ‘it was by mere accident, and for a special purpose, and probably it would have been better for me and my family if I had kept my private station.’ Upon which he threw out both his hands, and, with a laugh louder than before, he exclaimed, ‘Well, but being in it why not go on?’ He added, ‘Recollect I don’t offer you the seat from any desire of my own to change my colleagues. If left to me, I would rather, of course, have gone on as before with my old friends. I offer you the seat because you have a right to it.’

“In answer to my remark that perhaps others might be found quite as much entitled as myself to represent the advanced Liberals in his government, he replied quickly, ‘Will you be good enough to mention the name of any one excepting Bright, Gibson, and yourself that I could bring into the cabinet as the representative of the Radicals?’ I urged that Bright had been unfairly judged, and that his speeches at Birmingham, &c., were not of a kind to exclude him from an offer of a seat, and I remarked that he had very carefully avoided personalities in those speeches. ‘It is not personalities that are complained of; a public man,’ said he, ‘is right in attacking persons. But it is his attacks on *classes* that have given offence to powerful bodies, who can make their resentment felt.’

“In the course of his remarks he gave me a full explanation of his views on the present war, and expressed his determination to preserve a strict neutrality, observing that, as the people of England would as soon think of ‘evacuating these islands’ as to go to war in behalf of Austria, and as France did not ask us to help her, he could not see any possibility of our being mixed up in the fray. On this point he remarked: ‘If you are afraid of our abandoning our neutral ground, why don’t you come into the citadel of power, where you could have a voice in preventing it?’

“On his remarking upon the difficulty there

would be in carrying on the government unless all parties were united, and how impossible it was for him to do so if the natural representatives of the Liberals would not take office, I replied that the very fact of his having offered me office was, so far as I was concerned, his justification; and that I should be blamed, and not he, in the matter. And I added, ‘I shall give just the same support to your government whilst Mr. Gibson is in it, who represents identically my views, as I should if I were one of your government; for I should be certain to run away if you were to do anything very contrary to my strong convictions.’ I added that at present there were only two subjects on which we could have any serious difference, and that if he kept out of the war, and gave us a fair reform measure, I did not see any other point on which I should be found opposing him. He returned to the argument that my presence in the government was the important step required; and I then told him that having run the gauntlet of my friends in Lancashire, who had kindly pressed the matter on me, and having resolved to act in opposition to their views, which nothing but the strongest convictions of the propriety of my course could have induced me to do, my mind was irrevocably made up. And so I rose to depart, expressing the hope that our personal and political relations might be in future the same as if I were in his government.

“As I left the room he said, ‘Lady Palmerston receives to-morrow evening at ten.’ To which I instantly replied, ‘I shall be happy to be allowed to present myself to her.’ ‘I shall be very glad if you will,’ was his answer, and so we parted.

“The next evening I was at Cambridge House for the first time, and found myself among a crowd of fashionables and politicians and was the lion of the party. The women came and stared with their glasses at me, and then brought their friends to stare also. As I came away, Jacob Omnium and I were squeezed into a corner together, and he remarked, ‘You are the greatest political monster that ever was seen in this house. There never was before seen such a curiosity as a man who

refused a cabinet office from Lord Palmerston, and then came to visit him here. Why, there are not half-a-dozen men in all that crowd that would not jump at the offer, and believe themselves quite as fit as you to be president of the Board of Trade."

Cobden did not and would not jump at it. Many of his friends were hurt and disappointed, and their disappointment affected him greatly, even to the extent of impairing his physical health; still he remained firm. One man, however, commended him. Bright saw that he could not take office in Palmerston's ministry without undergoing some depreciation of influence if not of self-respect. How could it be possible, he would probably have argued, that a man professing the views that Cobden and I have always held, could take office in a ministry where one of the first measures might be to entail fresh financial burdens upon the country on what we believe to be immoral grounds. Bright's own views were well known, and he had recently given new expression to them in an address delivered at Glasgow in December, 1858, when he was advocating a new measure of parliamentary reform, and had drawn up the sketch of such a bill as he believed might be effective.

"It is a curious thing," he had said to the Glasgow electors, "to observe the evils which nations live under, and the submissive spirit with which they yield to them. I have often compared, in my own mind, the people of England with the people of ancient Egypt, and the foreign office of this country with the temples of the Egyptians. We are told by those who pass up and down the Nile that on its banks are grand temples, with stately statues and massive and lofty columns, statues each one of which would have appeared almost to have exhausted a quarry in its production. You have, further, vast chambers and gloomy passages; and some innermost access, some holy of holies, in which, when you arrive at it, you find some loathsome reptile, which a nation revered and revered, and bowed itself down to worship. In our foreign office we have no massive columns; we have no statues; but we have a mystery as profound; and in the innermost recesses of it we find

some miserable intrigue, in defence of which your fleets are traversing every ocean, your armies are perishing in every clime, and the precious blood of our country's children is squandered as though it had no price. I hope that an improved representation will change all this; that the great portion of our expenditure which is incurred in carrying out the secret and irresponsible doings of our foreign office will be placed directly under the free control of a parliament elected by the great body of the people of the United Kingdom. And then, and not till then, will your industry be secured from that gigantic taxation to which it has been subjected during the last hundred and fifty years.

"There is much in this country, notwithstanding, of which we may be proud. We can write freely, we can meet as we are met now, and we can speak freely of our political wishes and our grievances. The ruling classes, with a wise sagacity, have yielded these points without further struggle; but we are so delighted with our personal freedom, we are so pleased that we can move about without passports, and speak, write, and act as freely as a free man requires to do; we are so delighted with all this that we are unconscious of the fact that our rulers extract from our industry a far larger amount than any other government does, or ever did, from an equal number of people. Dr. Livingstone, the African traveller, if I am not mistaken, is a native of this neighbourhood, and you no doubt identify his reputation in some degree with your own. He gives, in his interesting and charming book, many anecdotes of the various creatures which he saw and heard of during his travels. He describes in one place, I remember, a bird, which he calls a dull, stupid bird, a kind of pelican, which occupies itself with its own affairs on the river side. This pelican catches fish, and when it has secured them it puts them into a pouch or purse under its bill, instead of the ordinary accommodation which anglers have in Scotland for their prizes. Dr. Livingstone tells of another bird which is neither dull nor stupid, which he calls the fish-hawk. This hawk hovers over the pelican, and, waiting patiently until the latter has

secured the fish, he comes down upon him with a swoop and takes the fish from the purse, leaving the pelican delighted that the hawk has not taken him bodily away, and setting to work at once to catch another fish.

“I ask of you whether you can apply this anecdote to your own case? You are told that your government is a government which allows you to meet, and that it lets every man say anything short of absolute treason, at least in times of tranquillity; it permits your leading-article writers to denounce, at will, every member of the government; and, like the pelican, you are so delighted that you are not absolutely eaten up by it, that you allow it to extract from your pockets an incalculable amount of your industry, and you go to work just as the pelican does, until this great government fish-hawk comes down again upon you. What I want is, that all the people should examine the question thoroughly for themselves. Rely upon it, your present and future welfare as a nation is bound up with it. Many persons suppose that because some people pay but little in the shape of taxation that it matters nothing to them what taxes the government imposes upon the nation. Every man who drinks tea, or consumes any excisable articles, pays taxes; but apart from this view of the question, I would have you to understand that everything which the government expends, supposing it was all to come from the employers' pocket, would be a diminution of that great fund of capital out of which wages were paid. Every man, therefore, whether he pays taxes or not—more so, of course, if he does—every man, if he is not mainly living upon the taxes, has a most direct interest in establishing that representation of the people that will give the nation a firm control over the expenditure of its money.

“I have devoted many years of my life, I have spent much labour in advocating a greater freedom of the soil. I believe that it would work better and prove more profitable to the landed proprietors themselves. I think that free land, greater economy in the public expenditure, with the growing intelligence which we see all around us, and the improve-

ment which is taking place in the most temperate habits of the people,—all these things together fill me with the hope that, whatever we have in the annals of the past of which we can boast, there is still a brighter future in store for this country.”

But if Cobden could not take office—perhaps because he did not take office—he was able to effect vast and important changes in our commercial relations. Already the idea of international commercial negotiations was in the air. Count Persigny, in conversation with Lord John Russell, had referred to a commercial treaty between France and England as an earnest of the emperor's desire for peace. Mr. Bright had asked in parliament why, instead of lavishing the national resources in armaments, the government did not persuade the French emperor to induce his people to trade freely with us. It seemed only to want an interview of three men—Michel Chevalier, the great free-trade theorist of France; Richard Cobden, the practical political economist and free-trader of England; and William Ewart Gladstone, the foremost financial minister in Europe—to inaugurate a scheme which should result in a definite and mutually beneficial treaty that would ally the two nations in trade as well as in arts and arms. This interview virtually took place. Chevalier, after reading Bright's views, had written to Cobden on the subject of a possible commercial treaty, and coming to England in the summer of 1859 found that the English free-trader had intended to spend part of the winter in Paris. Here was the opportunity for endeavouring to convert the emperor to free-trade views, and Chevalier urged it with no little force and address. Cobden was deeply impressed with the idea. He believed that such a treaty would be possible, for in 1860 terminable annuities for upwards of two millions would fall in, and the chancellor of the exchequer would have that amount of money to deal with. If he could apply it to the reduction of duties on French goods so as to secure similar concessions on the other side, here would be a basis on which to proceed with something like security. In September Cobden was at Hawarden, deeply discussing the

whole question with Gladstone, who, in spite of the abandonment of the perfect rules of a free-trade policy which only a partial reciprocal remission of duties must involve, believed that abstract principles must give way to an approximate benefit when that alone is practicable, and may lead to complete liberty of commerce by the gradual removal of restrictions. At all events it was settled that Cobden should make use of his forthcoming visit to Paris to introduce the subject in a manner which, while he had the countenance of his own government without actual official authority, might enable him to make way for some more definite arrangement for working out, with them, a scheme for a treaty which would be of mutual advantage. Cobden came to London not over sanguine, for he had a poor opinion of the ability of any one to move governments in a direction not immediately and obviously in accordance with their own interests. His interviews with Russell and Palmerston were not particularly reassuring. They did not appear to think very much of the scheme or of M. Chevalier's theories. They did not dissuade him or forbid his going to Paris, however, and perhaps they reflected that if anybody possessed the art of persuading the emperor and his advisers to make a free-trade experiment it would be Cobden, whose manner, no less than his great reputation, was calculated to bring about such a result.

Under these circumstances he set out for Paris, where on the 23d October he went to see Lord Cowley. On the 25th Cobden, Chevalier, and Rouher dined together, and Mr. Morley, in his life of Cobden, says he has heard that the dinner was planned with as much secrecy and discretion as if they had been three housebreakers under the surveillance of the police.

Rouher was already a strong free-trader, but he was obliged to act under the orders of the emperor, and if only *he* could be convinced a great deal might be done. This must be the next step, and Rouher undertook to procure an invitation to St. Cloud. Cobden had once before met Napoleon III., but that was when he was called Louis Napoleon, and was at breakfast with Mr. Monckton Milnes three

days after escaping from Ham; and the impressions left upon the mind of his present visitor was that he was a person of no great ability. In this Cobden was mistaken. The emperor had been only imperfectly informed, his knowledge was defective on many subjects; but he possessed remarkable power of apprehension, and the invaluable gift of being able to receive instruction without any apparent desire to assert himself, or to lose his temper under contradiction.

The restoration of Mr. Gladstone to the office of chancellor of the exchequer may well have revived the hopes of those who looked forward to an advance in free-trade policy and in economical government; but though the former was to be quickly realized, so far as the mutual concessions of the commercial treaty with France were concerned, events had made it impossible to reduce taxation. On the contrary, an increased expenditure on the army and navy which had been thought necessary because of the threatening attitude of France and Austria in the affairs of Italy, and the possibility of hostilities in Europe, as well as in consequence of the suspicion which had been created by the augmented armaments ordered by the French emperor, had created a deficiency which not only perpetuated but increased the income-tax. Since his return from Corfu Mr. Gladstone had enjoyed a brief season of retirement, during which he had been occupied in those studies which enabled him to contribute a valuable addition to what may be called Homeric literature. Of his *Studies of Homer and the Homeric Age*, published in 1858, we cannot here enter into any description, nor would it be in place to discuss the indirect historical relation of the Homeric poems and the Sacred Scriptures which is there referred to. The address which Mr. Gladstone delivered, as chancellor of the University of Edinburgh in 1865, on the "Place of Ancient Greece in the Providential Order of the World," may be said to have been a subsequent incidental outcome of the studies which enabled the author to produce a work so full of thoughtful investigation. It should be remembered, too, that when

the book was passing through the press, Mr. Gladstone had but just returned from his mission to the Ionian Islands. That mission was not immediately successful, but the occasion as well as the result of it is exceedingly suggestive. In 1800 the seven united islands of Cephalonia, Cerigo, Corfu, Ithaca, Paxo, Santa Maura, and Zante had been formed into a republic, and in 1815 they had been placed under the protection of Great Britain; but the people were anxious to be released from that protectorate, that the islands might form part of the kingdom of Greece, and many disturbances took place. In the Derby administration Sir Edward Lytton Bulwer, or as he afterwards entitled himself Sir Edward Bulwer Lytton, was secretary for the colonies, and among other evidences of energy and ability succeeded in founding the colony of British Columbia, with which (in 1866) Vancouver's Island was afterwards incorporated. To a man like Bulwer the appointment of Mr. Gladstone as plenipotentiary for settling the affairs of the Ionian Islands was sure to commend itself. The cause of Greece, and also the cause of freedom and independence in general, had a supporter in the statesman who had exposed the abominable cruelties of the Neapolitan government, and by scholarship, sympathy, and sagacity he was well suited to go on a mission of inquiry to Corfu, where the inhabitants might well be reassured by the appointment of a man whose sympathies were known to be at all events in favour of an unbiassed examination of their claims. Mr. Gladstone was willing to undertake the duties of such a commission, and though the appointment met with much adverse criticism from people who would not admit that there could be any reason for preferring to be a part of a national kingdom instead of remaining a nominal republic under British protection, his nomination appeared to have but one drawback. It was so acceptable to the Greek islanders themselves that they persisted in misunderstanding its real intention. Lytton, in his despatch introducing the lord high commissioner, referred to the scholarship which had interpreted Homer, and for some time those fa-

cetious opponents of the appointment who were not scholars, dwelt with delight on a poor jest which represented Mr. Gladstone as attending assemblies of Greeks at Corfu, and addressing them in a classical tongue of which they could not understand more than a few words. What the Greeks really would not understand, was that the commissioner extraordinary had no authority to promise a withdrawal of the British protectorate for the purpose of uniting the islands to the Greek kingdom, but was only empowered to inquire into the best manner of securing the claims of the people under that protectorate. His was an exceedingly difficult and delicate position, for the Greeks insisted on receiving him as a liberator. His journey resembled a triumphal progress, and he was unable to stem the tide of misapprehension in which he found himself. He had gone out to accommodate the protectorate to their demands, and they hailed him as a deliverer from its exactions. He had hoped to arouse them to maintain their independence as a state separate from the monarchy, and they emphasized his arrival by welcoming him as the messenger of their union with the kingdom of which they earnestly desired to form a part. When reports of his reception reached England there was no little commotion among his opponents, who took care to represent that he had gone out with a determination to instigate the people of the islands to demand exemption from British influence unless that influence supported their claims to union with the Kingdom of Greece. However absurd it may have seemed to Britons at home for the Ionian people to desire to exchange a modified form of self-government under powerful foreign protection to an amalgamation with the rest of their countrymen under an uncertain and imperfect constitution, that desire was inextinguishable. Mr. Gladstone deprecated it; he tried to convince them that he had come for no such purpose as that of heralding their union with the Greek kingdom; but the national assembly refused to listen, and passed a resolution declaring for that union. It was with much difficulty that he induced them to appoint a regular committee who would draw

up a proper memorial. They had begun to feel still more aggrieved at the action of the protectorate. Two despatches, written by the lord high commissioner Sir John Young, had been published in the *Daily News*. These recommended the abandonment of all the islands except Corfu, which might be made a military station or fortress. It was then that the legislative assembly (on the 27th of January, 1859) proposed the annexation of the republic to Greece. When Mr. Gladstone received the report or petition of the committee he despatched to the queen the intelligence that the simple and unanimous will of the Ionian people was for their union with the Kingdom of Greece. The petition was not at once granted, however. Sir Henry Storks was sent out as lord high commissioner, and Mr. Gladstone returned to England. But the agitation among the people continued, and at length (in 1864), after the Greeks had got rid of King Otho, and a Danish prince had accepted the Hellenic throne, the islands were formally handed over as a part of the kingdom, and the British protectorate came to a peaceful end.

Sir Edward Lytton was not long enough in office to prove his practical statesmanship, but he had given evidences of his ability to settle down to earnest work in an office requiring assiduous attention, and he had succeeded in sustaining his reputation, or rather in adding to a literary reputation which was already world-wide, the claim to be an orator and an able politician. Strictly speaking he was neither one nor the other. He had for some time past been taking a forward part in parliament, and it was pretty well known that on the accession of the Derby party to power he would have some office in the government. His speech on the Reform Bill was, as we have seen, a great success, and even moved the admiration of Disraeli—nay, it was received by the house with a tempest of applause, and the cheering was twice renewed. Doubtless the speech was admirable in construction and illustration, and the declaration “the popular voice is like the grave: it cries ‘give, give,’ but like the grave it never returns what it receives,” was hailed with enthusiastic

appreciation, but the words were heard with difficulty, or were not heard at all by listeners at a distance.

It is recorded by a writer who was in the house on that occasion, that the sentence that reached him was “the popular yah! is like the grah! it cries ‘yah! yah!’ but like the grah! it never returns.” The speaker was not only deaf, but suffered from defective articulation, the result, perhaps, partly of impediment and partly of the remains of a former fashionable drawl. By the time Sir Edward had reached the end of a sentence his voice had as it were dropped under the table, and its sounds had become almost inarticulate except to those within a few feet of it. But at this time Lytton had determined to add to his achievements that of a parliamentary success, and this he accomplished in spite of physical disqualifications, and, it may be added, without having professed or adopted any pronounced political creed. He had, as we have already noted, begun life somewhat as Disraeli did, as a sentimental Radical, and indeed it was he who had introduced Disraeli and O’Connell. Before the passing of the Reform Bill he represented St. Ives, afterwards he sat for Lincoln till 1841, when he was defeated and remained out of parliament till July, 1852. It was well, perhaps, that he had these ten years to devote to literature, or, at all events thousands of readers all over Europe and in America may well have thought so, for with almost unbounded industry he had produced some of his most striking novels during that period. His fame had already been established, but it was not consolidated until after the early days, when, in common with many of the young aspirants of his time, he was equally noted as a dandy and an author. At one-and-twenty (in 1826) he had left Cambridge, whither he had gone without any of the intermediate rough discipline of a public school. The appearance that year of a volume of poems entitled *Weeds and Wild Flowers* meant very little; his first novel, *Falkland*, which was published anonymously in 1827, caused some curiosity; and when in 1828 *Pelham* appeared, it at once established the author’s success. That was a remarkable year in which

Pelham and *Vivian Gray* both appeared to mark the first important step in the lives of two young men who were afterwards to occupy such prominent places in the story of political and intellectual progress. But Disraeli made politics his career, while Bulwer, after several years in which parliamentary duties were not allowed to prevent his advance in the world of letters, was in 1844 removed from the necessity of becoming a politician by profession, in consequence of his succession to the Knebworth estates by the death of his mother. He had been created a baronet by Lord Melbourne in 1835, and his social rank no less than his attainments had marked him for the honour. Sir Edward Lytton Bulwer was the son of General William Earle Bulwer of Heydon Hall, Norfolk, and his mother was the only daughter and heiress of Richard Warburton Lytton of Knebworth in Hertfordshire, so that on his succeeding to that property, which was worth about £12,000 a year, he took the maternal name, and became known as Sir Edward Bulwer Lytton; a change which provoked a good deal of jesting in *Punch* and other humorous publications. Sir Edward must have been pretty well accustomed to the comic satirists, however, for his name was continually in their mouths for the period between 1845 and 1860. Certain references to the "truthful" and the "beautiful," and several rather inflated modes of expression in some of his works, were considered fair subjects for burlesque, and his personal peculiarities of dress and manner did not escape laughing criticism, while his own satirical writings, including the polished and brilliant verses of *St. Stephen's* and the later *hits* of *The New Timon* provoked repeated attacks and reprisals.

Thackeray in the *Yellowplush Papers* introduces Sir Wedwad-Lytton-Bullwig as one of the guests at the dinner where the literary footman waited at table; and it will be long before Tennyson's vigorous retort upon the author of *The New Timon* for an attack upon him will be forgotten by those who read it at the time of its publication, and noted the bitter scornful references to the assumption of the name of the rugged satirist by "the man

who wears the stays"—the lion "who shakes a mane en papillotes." But these sarcasms did not obliterate the appreciation of Lytton's genius; nor had his contemporaries forgotten the ringing lines in which, in 1846, in the same poem, he had referred to Lord Stanley:

"The brilliant chief irregularly great,
Frank, haughty, rash—the Rupert of debate.
Nor gout nor toil his freshness can destroy,
And time still leaves all Eton in the boy.
First in the class, and keenest in the ring,
He saps like Gladstone, and he fights like Spring."

Spring was, of course, the famous "Tom Spring," a well-known champion light-weight boxer, of gentlemanly manners, who for some time kept a famous coaching tavern on Holborn Hill, and was something of a dandy. It is curious to note that "The Rupert of Debate" afterwards became a common expression as applied to the Earl of Derby—more remarkable still, that the term was really originated by Disraeli, who, in 1844 (nearly two years before *The New Timon* was published), in the discussion which followed the charges brought against Sir James Graham by Mr. Ferrand, had said of Lord Stanley: "The noble lord in this case, as in so many others, first destroys his opponent, and then destroys his own position afterwards. The noble lord is the Prince Rupert of parliamentary discussion; his charge is resistless; but when he returns from the pursuit he always finds his camp in the possession of the enemy." Disraeli said few better things than this. But Sir Edward Lytton Bulwer Lytton, for that was his full denomination, had outlived much and achieved much, before he again returned to parliament in 1852. Not that he had altogether outlived remarkable peculiarities which at one period seemed likely to be developed into mental extravagances if not aberrations, but he had succeeded in establishing a second reputation. His romantic novels, and especially *Ernest Maltravers*, *The Pilgrims of the Rhine*, and *The Last Days of Pompeii*, had been read and translated all over the world. His dramas of *The Lady of Lyons* and *Money* were to keep the stage and to be popular through repeated revivals. He had long left sentimental Radicalism behind, and had

developed into a Conservative so moderate that he might have passed into office with the Whigs, since he concurred with the general policy of Lord Derby, would have readjusted the income-tax, mitigated the duties on malt, tea, and soap, had given up "the ballot" because of its alleged inefficiency in France and America, supported education on a religious basis, and would vote for a repeal of the Maynooth grant.

We have said he had achieved a second success. In 1850 he entered on a new literary career by the publication of *The Caxtons*, and in that and one or two succeeding works will be found those vivid pictures of contemporary life and manners with which his later reputation came to be chiefly identified. At the time of the Derby administration of 1859 he had also lost much that was singular in his appearance, though he could never lose that strange eager plaintive look that bespoke a highly strung organization, nor the worn expression, which, with his meagre frame, told of poor health and perhaps of an overwrought imagination. But there were other anxieties. Like Lord Melbourne he was not altogether happy in his marriage. Between him and Lady Lytton, who was the daughter of Mr. Francis Massey Wheeler, of Lizzard Connel, Limerick, there had arisen differences, which he accounted for on the ground of his wife's mental aberration. They were at all events sufficient to lead to a separation, and it was no light addition to the troubles of weak health, increased deafness, and nervous disorder, that Lady Lytton was the most merciless and denunciatory of all his critics, and assailed him in novels and sketches with persistent invective.

It may easily be supposed, however, that Lord Lytton himself was often "incompatible," and those who knew him could trace in his temperament, just that peculiar sensitiveness which might easily lead to extreme nervous irritability. His imagination, also, showed occasional signs of an irregularity, which, with his tendency to dwell on the preternatural, was likely to degenerate into occasional superstitions. Readers of "Zanoni" or of "A Strange Story," which appeared in Dickens' *All the*

Year Round, will, amidst the peculiar fascination of the narrative, detect an element which will indirectly serve to illustrate the mental condition referred to. An anecdote related by Mr. Serjeant Ballantine in his recent *Reminiscences* refers to Lytton's peculiar temperament, though the instinctive antipathy to which it relates is one of a class of comparatively common experiences, not easily to be explained, but by no means to be classified with superstitions. Mr. Ballantine says:—

"Lord Lytton was very fond of whist, and he and I both belonged to the well-known Portland Club, in which were to be found many of the celebrated players of the day. He never showed the slightest disposition of a gambler. He played the game well, and without excitement or temper, and apparently his whole attention was concentrated upon it; but it was curious to see that at every interval that occurred in the rubbers, he would rush off to a writing table, and with equally concentrated attention proceed with some literary work until called again to take his place at the whist table. There was a member of the club, a very harmless, inoffensive man, of the name of Townend, for whom Lord Lytton entertained a mortal antipathy, and would never play whist whilst that gentleman was in the room. He firmly believed that he brought him bad luck. I was witness to what must be termed an odd coincidence. One afternoon when Lord Lytton was playing, and had enjoyed an uninterrupted run of luck, it suddenly turned, upon which he exclaimed, 'I am sure that Mr. Townend has come into the club.' Some three minutes after, just time enough to ascend the stairs, in walked this unlucky personage. Lord Lytton, as soon as the rubber was over, left the table and did not renew the play."

From the same book we learn that Lytton was extremely interested in criminal investigations. "I could always obtain his attention," says Mr. Ballantine, "when I related any of those in which I had myself been engaged, and in novels that he had written previous to my acquaintance with him he had used the records of crime in their construction. The history of a person named Wain-

wright had furnished incidents very similar to those related in the novel of *Lucretia*. . . . He told me himself that the character of the banker in *The Disowned* was suggested by Fauntleroy."

The Wainwright here referred to was the famous "Janus Weathercock," who poisoned friends and relatives in order to procure the money for which he had induced them to insure their lives, the policies having been made over to himself.

But Lord Lytton's scholarship and his best literary faculty were still in the ascendant during the time that we are now considering. He had been elected Lord Rector of the Glasgow University in 1856, and, as we have said, had then (in his fiftieth year) entered into a second career of fame and of influence in the domain of thought if not in the arena of politics.

Sir Hugh M'Calmont Cairns, whose support of the Derby Reform Bill had been mentioned with such deep appreciation by Disraeli, had already so distinguished himself, that his appointment to the office of solicitor-general under the Conservative administration had been generally expected. He represented Belfast, which had returned him in 1852, so that his parliamentary distinction was rapid, and was afterwards completed by his becoming attorney-general in 1866, a peer and lord-justice in 1867, lord high-chancellor in Disraeli's first administration in 1868 and again in 1874, and an earl in 1878. It need scarcely be said that his eloquence was already famous in the house before his appointment to the solicitor-generalship in 1858, for at about that time Bulwer wrote of him in metaphor sufficiently stilted—

"Still when Cairns rises, tho' at break of day,
The sleepers wake and feel rejoiced to stay,
As his clear reasonings in light strength arise,
Like Doric shafts admitting lucent skies."

Sir Hugh Cairns possessed the eminently desirable faculty of stating a case with remarkable clearness and accuracy, and his knowledge of the law was believed by his friends to be profound and extensive. At

any rate, his tall commanding figure, added to great tact and command of language and gesture, gave effect to what, in a less accomplished speaker, would have failed to arrest so much attention, and Sir Hugh M'Calmont Cairns was regarded not only as a man on the road to great honours, but as the strength of the Conservative government.

The name of Mr. Robert Lowe¹ has already been mentioned, and it had become familiar to commercial politicians in connection with the resolution introduced by Mr. Collier and passed in 1854, pledging parliament to a modification of the law of partnership, which would enable persons to embark in commercial enterprise without assuming a liability for an amount larger than their interest in the undertaking. This resolution and its result in the bill which was passed on the 14th of August, 1855, limiting the liabilities of shareholders in joint-stock companies, changed the entire aspect of a large number of important enterprises, and found a powerful friend and advocate in Mr. Lowe, who, though he had warned Lord Derby that he would not be able "to stem the tide of democracy," had not distinctly attached himself to either party in the house. He had held no place in the ministry, but it was evident that he would soon occupy a prominent position in parliament, where he had taken office almost immediately after his election for Kidderminster in 1852. Mr. Lowe was a man who was sure to be marked for official life, for he had come—with a reputation already made—from Australia, where he had successfully practised as a barrister, and sat in the council of the colony from 1843 to 1850. But he had been known as a scholar long before he left Oxford to go to the Antipodes. His father was the Rev. Robert Lowe, rector of Ringham in Nottinghamshire, and he was educated for Oxford, where he graduated in high honours in 1833 when he was twenty-two years of age. In 1835 he was elected a fellow of his college and became a private tutor, but was called to the bar in 1842, and at once set out for

¹ Now Lord Sherbrooke.

Australia. From December 1852 to January 1855 he was one of the joint secretaries of the Board of Control, after which he occupied the position of vice-president of the Board of Trade and paymaster-general, retiring from which in 1858 he became vice-president of the Education Board in 1859, when he had exchanged the representation of Wiltshire for that of Colne. He was then coming more decidedly into the active political life of parliament, and we shall presently hear of him, and of the eccentric course which he more than once pursued in relation to prominent questions.

The Duke of Argyle, who had held the office of postmaster-general from 1855 to 1858 and now as lord privy-seal took his place in the ministry of Lord Palmerston, had been more distinguished in the world of letters than in that of practical politics; but his intellectual training and a certain faculty for incisive criticism well fitted him for taking a prominent part in the consideration of some important questions which were occupying attention. He had been Chancellor of the University of St. Andrews in 1851 and Rector of Glasgow University in 1854, and before the earlier of these dates had published an able essay on "The Ecclesiastical History of Scotland since the Reformation," which was followed by several other pamphlets on religious or ecclesiastical subjects. It is needless to say that the position held in the country by George John Douglas Campbell represented a wide social influence, if not a strong political following. The time had perhaps gone by when the descendant of Diarmid and MacCallum More was powerful, because he was the chief of a great clan; but to be the hereditary head of a large and influential family, of historical rank and distinction, was still sufficient to command an important place in the state, especially when the holder of the title had given proofs of remarkable ability for taking his part in the council of the nation.

In 1844 his grace married the charming and accomplished Lady Elizabeth Georgiana Leveson Gower, eldest daughter of the Duke

of Sutherland, and this union, of the hereditary master of the royal household in Scotland with the daughter of the beautiful Duchess of Sutherland, mistress of the robes, may naturally have brought the family of the Campbells into that intimate domestic relation to the children of the queen, which resulted in the alliance of the Princess Louise and the Marquis of Lorne. This, however, belongs to a later date, and is mentioned here chiefly because it has been believed that the peculiar position occupied by the Duke of Argyle has necessarily, or at least properly, acted in restraint of his taking so prominent a place in the political arena as he might otherwise have assumed.

There were three Campbells in the field in 1859, for the venerable lord chief-justice was still living, and the young law student of Lincoln's Inn—who, in the year 1800, had helped out his small allowance by reporting for the *Daily Chronicle*, was now lord-chancellor at eighty years of age, with an untarnished reputation for clear judgment and extraordinary acuteness, and a passion for work which had enabled him to devote his brief leisure to the production of two remarkable books, *The Lives of the Chief Justices* and *The Lives of the Lord Chancellors*. Lord Campbell was still vigorous, and intellectually capable of taking one of the highest and most responsible offices in the realm. His only rivals, both in vigour and intensity at an advanced age, were the venerable Lord Lyndhurst, who was still full of fire, though he had to lean on the back of the seat in front of him when he rose to speak in the House of Lords:—and Lord Brougham, who was yet to be seen walking across the lobby, not to the House of Commons but to the Lords, with his loosely-hanging, ill-fitting clothes, his hat pulled tight down over his great prominent forehead. Old he certainly looked, for he had passed his eighty-first year, but to the friend on whose arm he hung he talked volubly enough.

He still had the wonderful faculty not only of knowing something about everything, but of being able to talk about anything, and he still possessed the power of sleeping at will,



ROBERT LOWE.
NOW VISCOUNT SHERBROOKE
FROM A PHOTOGRAPH BY THE LONDON PHOTOGRAPHIC

or of doing without sleep for a long time and then making up the arrears. It was known that in a drawing-room, in the midst of a lively conversation which he would begin with a lady, he would softly slumber, or seem to slumber while his fair companion went on talking, and would wake up at the right moment to reply or to resume the discussion. There was a joke, probably well founded, that at a conversazione he was talking learnedly about a Hindoo poem written five hundred years before the Christian era, when suddenly somebody gave a turn to the conversation, which led him to discourse with equal knowledge and fluency on the philosophical method of cooking a beef-steak.

But we can scarcely pass the subject of veterans without referring to the third Campbell, the veteran warrior who had, at nearly seventy years of age, completed the great work of the suppression of the rebellion in India, and at last had received the recognition of his services there and in the Crimea, by receiving a peerage with the title of Baron Clyde. Sir Colin Campbell was born in Glasgow in 1792, and obtained such learning as he possessed at the High School. He entered the army as an ensign in the 9th Regiment of foot, when he was sixteen, his commission having been procured for him by his uncle, Colonel Campbell. The same year he was at Vimiera with Wellesley, and was afterwards at Corunna with Sir John Moore. His career begun with hard fighting, and it continued through the Peninsular war, and yet he only obtained the rank of captain, for there was no family influence to back him, and he gained every step by active service, such as the leading of a storming party at St. Sebastian, where he was severely wounded, and only recovered in time to take part in another engagement, in which he was again disabled by a musket shot.

In 1814 he was sent to America with his regiment—the 60th Rifles. And in 1815, when the peace was declared, he found leisure to study the theory of his profession, and made such proficiency that he rose to a command as brigadier-major, in which capacity

he went to Demerara, with the thankless duty of quelling the negro insurrection. By 1825, and again in 1832, he was able to purchase his majority, so that in the latter year he was lieutenant-colonel of the 98th, with which he went to China, and was rewarded for his brilliant services by promotion to a full colonelcy.

His next campaign was in India in 1848, when Lord Gough made him brigadier, and he retrieved the losses of the battle of Chillianwallah (where he was wounded), with the victory of Goojerat, which closed the Sikh wars, and brought him the honours of a K.C.B. Though he went through the Scinde campaign with Sir Charles Napier, his military rank of brigadier was local only, and on his return in 1853 he was still only a colonel, until he went out to the Crimea in 1854 as brigadier-general.

We have already seen what were his services during that terrible time, and it can scarcely be wondered at that, upon the appointment of General Codrington to the command, after the death of General Simpson, Sir Colin should have felt himself slighted at having been superseded by a junior officer. He returned to England, but being requested to resume active service, had prepared to take command of a large corps of British and Turkish soldiers, to land at Theodosia, ascend the river and take the Russian entrenchments in the rear, when the war was brought to an end, and he returned home to receive a well-earned reward, not only in an addition to his title by being made a G.C.B., but in the enthusiastic regard of the country, and the public presentation of a sword of honour by six thousand of his fellow-citizens in Glasgow.

After his brilliant services in the Indian mutiny he was able to rest on his laurels, and to receive from the queen and the nation those further distinctions which had been so arduously earned.

Lord Lyndhurst was in his eighty-eighth year, and it was he who with amazing force and intensity advocated those additions to the national defences, which had been advised by Prince Albert and the Queen after their visit to

Cherbourg had shown them the French fortifications. Lord Palmerston was completely of the same opinion. In a strong speech in the House of Lords, Lord Lyndhurst had said: "If I am asked whether I cannot place reliance in the Emperor Napoleon, I reply with confidence that I cannot, because he is in a position in which he cannot place reliance on himself. He is in a situation in which he must be governed by circumstances, and I will not consent that the safety of this country should be placed in such contingencies. Self-reliance is the best road to distinction in private life. It is equally essential to the grandeur and character of a nation. . . . The question of the money expense sinks into insignificance. It is the price we must pay for our insurance, and it is a moderate price for so important an insurance. I know there are persons who will say 'Let us run the risk!' Be it so. But, my lords, if the calamity should come—if the conflagration should take place—what words can describe the extent of the calamity, or what imagination can paint the overwhelming ruin that would fall upon us!"

Lord Palmerston did not quite take this view. He had or seemed to have an invincible faith in England and in English pluck and mettle, but he was in favour of armaments for all that. He held that a frank avowal that we were prepared for war, if war should be necessary, was the best way of preserving peace. It was the friendship of the prize-ring; the shaking hands with an eye to a set-to, as much as to say, "Nothing could exceed my pleasure in our amicable relations; but if you want anything—come on!"

It is scarcely to be wondered at that people should have been asking how Mr. Gladstone came to accept office as chancellor of the exchequer. He had held an appointment, though an honorary and non-political one, under the Derby administration (for it should be noted that he had refused to accept any salary for his services as commissioner extraordinary at Corfu), but his sympathies were certainly not with the Conservatives, and his Liberal opinions had even gone far beyond those of many who sat with Lord Palmerston. At this time Mr.

Gladstone may be said to have belonged to no party and to neither side. The "Peelites," no longer had any existence. The small group who had been called by that name had dispersed. Cardwell had long ago thrown in his lot with the Palmerston ministry, and was now secretary for Ireland. Sidney Herbert had followed, and Graham had given a final blow to the Conservatives in the last debate, and was all on the Liberal side.

Before the dissolution following that defeat, Gladstone had sat solitary among the Conservative party. His political convictions were many of them with the other side; but not some of his deepest moral or religious convictions. It happened to him then, as it had happened before and has happened since, that he came to a decision through a mental conflict from which men of less sensitive (some have said fantastic) feelings—or less habitual self-dissection and investigation of motives—would not have suffered. He accepted the office of chancellor of the exchequer amidst the murmurs of the extreme Radicals and the satisfaction of the Whigs, but it was understood that if he continued to hold office there must be a good many open questions, and that he was likely to oppose the demand for increased armaments, and yet to be more in sympathy with the aspirations of the Italians for freedom than with the policy of conciliating Austria.

The probability of a war in Italy between Austria and Sardinia, or rather between the Austrians and the French, who were ready to stand before the Sardinians in the name of Italian freedom, had been the burning question at the beginning of the year 1859, and now by the end of June it had been emphatically answered.

Austrian rule in Italy had become unendurable. It did not need the vivid utterances of Mazzini, or the desperate protests of Italian conspirators—to convince the world of this. All lovers of liberty regarded with indignation the conditions under which the Italians of the Duchies were governed; and in England sympathy with Mazzini and those who cried out for a united Italy and the overthrow of the usurper, had reached to a great height.

But it had not reached to the height of intervention. Such representations as had been made when Mr. Gladstone exposed the revolting cruelties of the Neapolitan prisons might have been repeated, and perhaps with as much or as little effect; but to go further would have been virtually to declare war against Austria, while to espouse the cause of the "national party," who, under the direction of Mazzini, were endeavouring to effect the liberation of Italy by a series of insurrections, would have been to oppose the only firm Italian government in existence—that of Piedmont, under our former ally. Victor Emmanuel had in fact continued sentence of death against the republican agitator; while Cavour, in order to counteract the "fatal influence" of the fervid patriot not only in Italy but in Piedmont itself, became the prime mover of the "national society" which assumed to have for its object war with Austria. The policy of Cavour was to wait a little longer. The moderate party in Italy was also ready to look for some future advantage and to delay action. Mazzini was for immediate effort. What Cavour wanted was a monarchical Italy under Victor Emmanuel, and Mazzini suspected that he was ready to pay a price for it when the time came. That price the republican averred was the cession of Savoy and Nice to France for becoming an ally of Italy. He had written months before the event that Napoleon sought "in Nizza and Savoy the price for Lombardy, the throne of Naples for Murat, and of the centre for his cousin," and that Cavour had agreed to it. "If Austria resist to the utmost the whole design will be completed. If after the first defeats she should offer to abandon Lombardy in order to have Venetia secured to her, they will accept, and only the conditions concerning the aggrandisement of the house of Savoy will be fulfilled; the rest of uprisen Italy will be abandoned to the vengeance of her masters." He also pointed out the probability of what he said would be a "sudden ruinous peace, fatal to the insurgents, before the war is half over. . . . Louis Napoleon, fearing the action of the peoples, should the war be prolonged, will compel the Sardinian monarchy to desist, conceding to it a certain portion of

territory according to circumstances, and abandoning the betrayed Venetian provinces, as well as a portion of Lombardy, to Austria."

This was a close representation of much that afterwards took place, and also of the whole of what would probably have been the result but for an uncomputed factor. That factor was Garibaldi. Mazzini and Garibaldi, equally pure in intention, both ready to sacrifice everything to a noble patriotism, were never at one. Mazzini was a visionary statesman with exalted ideas of what a republic should be. He exhausted himself and the very cause which he had at heart in the endeavour to attain national liberty by arousing public spirit to insurrection by means of a sentiment, and then uniting in one great effort. Garibaldi was a warrior, believing that when there was a good hope for insurrection in the name of liberty,—and not before,—men needed only leaders who, with sword in hand, would help to fire them with immediate enthusiasm, and take them onward to battle. Mazzini would have had Garibaldi obey orders, and either fight, or stop fighting, on a sentimental principle of pure republicanism. Garibaldi refused to yield obedience against his own opinions, and cared less for subtle distinctions as to what kind of republic should alone claim the devotion of the nation, than for the actual achievement of national liberty and the destruction of the foreign yoke. Cavour—that rather commonplace-looking, stoutish, easygoing Italian, in spectacles, which gave him a still more ordinary appearance, and with a manner that, to superficial observers, suggested anything but subtle diplomacy worthy of the old Italian traditions—could outplot them both. He perhaps was not the equal of Mazzini for real insight, but he was far beneath him in scrupulousness, and this, added to the possession of power, gave him an advantage, which he used continually to check the effects of the fervid and unselfish appeals which so often seemed to be stirring a people to enthusiastic action, but which always fell short of achieving more than a partial outbreak. This is not the place to analyse or comment upon the character of Cavour. He succeeded in raising an Italian

monarchy, and he was able to counterplot Mazzini, who would have had a republic. He succeeded also in making an instrument of Garibaldi; but the man of action, who cut away superfine distinctions with his sword in the passion of battle, was an instrument that was near cutting his hand. But for Garibaldi, Italy might have been free only in name, and even the monarchy might have been a provincial rather than a national government. Garibaldi's simple enthusiasm, and the swift success that attended him when men flocked to his standard after the Franco-Sardinian war with Austria, would have forced a weaker or a less guarded hand than that of Cavour. But Cavour knew how to take quick and cunning advantage of the opportunity for making the Piedmontese rule Italian, and so to give to the world a more united Italy than even the insurrection had at first promised.

That, at the end of 1858, the Emperor of the French contemplated hostilities with Austria there was no room to doubt. In a letter to our queen he had announced the approaching marriage of Prince Napoleon with the daughter of the King of Sardinia; and a few weeks before, had actually discussed with Lord Palmerston (who, as we have seen, was at Compiègne), his plans for the expulsion of the Austrian troops from Italy, where a general rising had for some months been preparing in the north. At the diplomatic receptions on the 1st of January, 1859, he had said to M. Hubner, the Austrian ambassador at Paris, "I regret that the relations between our two governments are not more satisfactory; but I beg you to assure the emperor that they in no respect alter my feelings for himself." It should be remembered, however, that Austria, declining always to recognize the right of France to interfere in Italian affairs, had more than once refused to combine with Napoleon in any efforts to bring about reforms in the governments of the Duchies or the Papal States, whose sovereigns she was, in fact, pledged by treaty to support. The necessity for keeping an army in Italy on a war footing, because of the attitude of Piedmont, galled her and put a strain on her

resources; but that army was believed to be splendidly organized and under the command of the best generals in Europe. The train was laid, it only required the match. The match was ready. On the opening of the Sardinian chambers on the 10th of January, King Victor Emmanuel had said:

"Our country, small in territory, has acquired credit in the councils of Europe, because it is great through the idea it represents and the sympathies it inspires. This position is not exempt from perils, since, while we respect treaties, we are not insensible to the cry of suffering which reaches us from so many parts of Italy."

The military preparations of Austria had been pushed forward. Large bodies of troops were arriving in the plains of Lombardy. It looked much as though Austria would be the aggressor. Her officers were talking of an advance on Turin as a stage on the way to Paris.

The Emperor of the French had probably thought that Russia would gladly join in the chastisement of Austria; it was said that he had asked the question of Schouvaloff, and had been immediately undeceived. On the other hand, he was under the impression, misled perhaps by his conversations with Palmerston, who seems to have rejoiced in the notion of the Austrians having a castigation, that war with Austria for the restoration of Italian freedom would consolidate his alliance with England. He had at last reluctantly given up the notion that England would become his ally in the cause.

English statesmen on both sides were too acute to be led into what might prove to be a European war for the interest of France, when it was strongly suspected, if not absolutely known, that Cavour held the cue of the arrangement and that the price of French intervention had been already settled.

The restoration of Italy, and even the expulsion of the Austrians, was dear perhaps to a large majority of the English people, but the attitude of the French emperor caused no little suspicion. We had not yet got over the threats of the French colonels because of the alleged protection of Italian refugees in Lon-

don. Who could tell what might be the ultimate intention of France, or to what length the emperor might be driven? who knew whether we might not have to prepare against the contingencies of war in Europe?

The effect of the first note of hostility was to confirm the intention of increasing our armaments and to give a fresh impetus and completer organization to the Volunteer movement. But the note of war had not yet sounded, and before it was heard attempts were made at a pacific conclusion by means of a congress.

The Emperor of the French contended that he respected treaties, and had only agreed to interpose if Austria should commence hostilities, or invade Sardinian territory. He had already endeavoured to atone to the Austrian ambassador for his hasty words by using conciliatory expressions. In reply to a letter from the queen, in February, 1859, representing the anxiety in England for the maintenance of peace, he denied that there was any foundation for the alarms and suspicions which were constantly manifested with regard to his proceedings. He had received confidential communications from Italy that the state of affairs there would soon result in an insurrection, which was only prevented by the counsels of Piedmont, but that the Sardinians would not draw back from a war with Austria. He had replied that his first duty was to his country and its interests, that the traditional policy of France had always been opposed to the exclusive influence of Austria in Italy, but that his government could not encourage an aggressive line of conduct on the part of Piedmont, nor support her in a struggle in which right would not be on her side; but that, on the other hand, she might rely on being vigorously backed, either if attacked by Austria, or if she became involved with this power in a just and lawful war.

In the last phrase, which is here printed in italics, lay the key of Cavour's subsequent demands. What would be a war *juste et légitime*? It depended on any interpretation which might be put upon it.

"But," the letter went on to say, "these *pourparlers* came to nothing; but towards

November last, either because the unpopular measures taken by Austria in Italy had roused men's minds, or because indiscreet language had been held at Turin, or, finally, because a certain party had found its interest in disquieting public opinion, certain it is that all at once rumours of war were spread on every side, founded both upon the condition of people's minds in Italy and upon the state of our relations with Austria. In the hope of calming these apprehensions I caused it to be announced in the *Moniteur* that there was nothing in our relations with foreign powers to justify such fears. Notwithstanding this, as if under the influence of a real panic, everything continued to be construed in a warlike sense. The conciliatory words to M. Hubner, the despatch to Marseilles of six batteries (without men or horses) destined for Algeria, the construction, as an experiment, of ten gunboats, carrying each one gun, the armament of two troop-ships for the Algerine service, the purchase of some thousands of artillery-horses to bring their number up to the peace footing—finally, the progress made with the reconstruction of our artillery equipment begun two years before—these were what were taken as so many warlike symptoms; and, *although there was in fact nothing more*, the persuasion to the contrary is so general, that it would be difficult for me to persuade the public in France and abroad, that I am not even now making immense preparations for war. And yet at this very time simple prudence seems to me to enjoin that I should do much more; for on the one side I cannot blind myself to the ill-will that surrounds me, and on the other, for the last month I have been urgently appealed to by the King of Sardinia to mass 20,000 men upon the Alps, ready to come to his assistance, in case of his being attacked by the Austrians.

"I am, therefore, in no way responsible either for the apprehensions or for the agitation now on foot, and I can regard them with indifference. But . . . with complications beyond the Alps staring us in the face, people seem to deny to France by anticipation the influence to which she is entitled by her rank

among nations, as well as by her history. In presence of an imaginary intervention in the affairs of a country which touches our frontiers, all Germany seems of a mind to enter into a league against France, and to dispute even her most legitimate action. Did Germany intervene in our embroilment with Russia? Or did Europe intervene when Germany upheld the cause of Holstein against Denmark?

"I admit to your Majesty that this attitude of Germany sets me thinking deeply, and that I see in it great danger for the future, for I shall always respect the treaties."

There is much to read between the lines of this letter. It was evident enough from the position of affairs that the idea of a war in Italy would not be popular in France. The reception, or rather the want of a reception, of Prince Napoleon and his bride by the people of Paris indicated the coldness with which intervention on behalf of Sardinia would be regarded. The financial condition of Sardinia was such that Cavour could not negotiate a loan for any large amount. The French state debt had increased from £213,800,000 in 1851 to £336,880,000 in 1858. The emperor had been greatly mistaken as to the probable support of England and the general attitude of Europe in relation to a war in Italy. Prince Albert, writing to the King of Belgium, in January, 1859, said:—"Louis Napoleon has manifestly calculated thus: 'Russia will be well pleased to avenge herself on Austria, and will, therefore, support me in my attack on Italy. England hates Austria, is mad for Italian freedom and nationality, so she, too, will give me her moral support. Prussia hates Austria, will be glad to see her humbled, and is to be won over by promises of advancement in Germany at the expense of Austria. Italy yearns for freedom, and will, therefore, receive me and my army with transport.'"

It was afterwards understood that when war had commenced, Russia had represented that no intervention from Prussia was probable while the war was confined to Italy, but a rumour afterwards reached Napoleon that Prussia was preparing for war, and this, it was said, eventually hastened determination

to conclude the Italian campaign with a treaty in which the declaration that the country was to be free to the Adriatic, was left to the category of hyperbolic expressions. The real anxiety of Prussia, and of England also, was the continued restlessness of the emperor and the evident desire to remodel treaties and readjust frontiers. Thus it was feared that success in Italy might eventually lead to some attempt on the Rhenish provinces. It was in the most friendly spirit that the queen and English statesmen, even Lord Palmerston, urged the preservation of peace, and their representations combined with the indifference of the French people had some temporary effect in delaying further demonstrations, though it was believed that Cavour wrought on the mind of the emperor, not only by keeping before him their secret understanding, but by referring with sinister emphasis to the poignards of Italian assassins. At the same time Prince Napoleon was sarcastically inquiring whether the agreement with Sardinia was to be observed, now that it had been, as it were, ratified by his own matrimonial alliance.

That the emperor had been placed in a false position partly by his own expectation, but also, in part, by the representations of Russian diplomacy and the determination of Cavour not to abate one of his claims, there can be no doubt, but the question was, Did he at that juncture deliberately attempt to trick Europe? The Queen and Prince Albert had begun to distrust him some time before, and Lord Palmerston, who on the whole liked him very well, and had seemed to support his views, said not long afterwards, "The emperor's mind seems as full of schemes as a warren is full of rabbits, and like rabbits his schemes go to the ground for the moment to avoid notice or antagonism." "Il recule bien pour le moment, mais il n'abandonne jamais," had been said of him before this, and it seemed about to be verified. At all events he contrived to convey to Lord Cowley that he was ready to accept the good offices of England to negotiate a basis of arrangement with Austria. This Lord Derby's government was ready to undertake if Austria was

willing to accept an attempt at mediation. The queen's address at the opening of parliament had, with some emphasis, dwelt on the hope that peace might be maintained, and this was considered to have been taken as a suggestion for an endeavour to be made for arriving at a definite understanding.

On the return of Lord Cowley it was announced that Austria was ready to consent to a withdrawal of her troops from the Papal States, to support a system of internal reforms in Italy, to pledge herself not to attack Sardinia, and to negotiate some new arrangements to take the place of her special treaties with the Duchies. When we read these concessions carefully they mean little or nothing except in connection with a long conference and the settlement of preliminary measures. Perhaps Napoleon distrusted Austria as much as Prussia, and even more than England distrusted him. At all events, when Lord Cowley got back to Paris, he found that another proposition had been brought forward. Instead of negotiations between the parties immediately interested, there was to be a congress of the European powers for the preservation of peace.

The proposal came from St. Petersburg, but it had first been sent thither from the Tuileries. Renewed suspicion was the consequence of the proposal. On learning of it from Lord Malmesbury the queen replied, "A congress has always been the alternative to war which the emperor has put forward; but a congress to rearrange the treaties of 1815. Russia may intend to act in such a congress the part against Austria regarding Lombardy, which Austria acted against her in the last congress regarding Bessarabia. . . . Austria will have enormous armaments to keep up while the congress lasts, for otherwise France might suddenly break off and fall upon her simultaneously with a rising of the Italian populations. She will, therefore, be very averse (and justly so) to a congress. Is it the emperor's object to exhaust her?"

This curiously resembled the opinion of M. Thiers contained in a letter written at the same time, in which he said the aim

of the emperor was to compass war while talking of peace. "His adversary being ready, while he is not, this delay serves admirably his purpose of employing against Austria a method of dissolution, by prolonging a critical and irritating state of things that will exhaust her. In truth, Austria cannot remain in arms for an indefinite period without being exhausted. Another result of this state of things might be, that the young emperor, weary of an intolerable burden, may end by preferring war to a position as enervating as it would be disastrous. Thus, having perforce become the aggressor, he would play into Napoleon's hands, who might then proclaim triumphantly that it is no fault of his if the empire is not peace."

It would seem, however, that neither side was sincere. Lord Cowley, who had perhaps the best opportunity of forming a judgment, came to the opinion that the emperor was really desirous of a congress, because the probabilities were that the decision arrived at would be against his entering on a war to support Sardinia; and that other proposals would be made, against which if Cavour should endeavour to exact fulfilment of a promise of French intervention, it might be answered that France could not be expected to oppose herself to the decision of all the great powers of Europe. But Austria, with "her bigotries, her hauteur, her insincerity, and her blundering statesmanship," as old Stockmar had just expressed it, soon made the decisions of a congress, or indeed any untrammelled and genuine negotiations for peace, difficult if not impossible. How much probability could there be that such a convention would succeed in settling questions which were keeping a great part of Italy in a state of insurrection? There was no certain basis to go upon. "I believe," said Lord Clarendon in the House of Lords, "that all my noble friend (Lord Malmesbury) knows is this: that one despotic power has proposed to another despotic power, that by means of a congress a third despotic power should pave the way for liberal institutions."

Austria had professedly as an evidence of her pacific intentions proposed as one of the

matters to be settled by the congress, the simultaneous disarmament of the great powers. This the emperor had declined, on the ground that the armaments of France were all upon a peace footing; but Lord Cowley remonstrated with a directness and emphasis which are very unusual in diplomatic representations to a foreign sovereign, and begged him solemnly not to reject any offer which, while it left the honour of France untouched, might lead to peace; representing that while he had no cause of quarrel with Austria, to draw the sword might rivet faster the chains of Italy.

This appeal had great effect. The emperor afterwards assented to the arrangement that the congress should meet, Sardinia and the other Italian states being admitted to take part in it, and Sardinia consenting to join in the general disarmament. A telegram was despatched to Count Cavour asking his immediate concurrence in this arrangement. The demand was serious, and would have been a critical one, but for the fact that the proposal to disarm would come from all Europe. Cavour could not hesitate. France, England, Russia, and Prussia were all ready, and had agreed on the basis of the conference. They waited for Austria, and Austria kept them waiting in doubt of her acceptance of the arrangement which she herself had suggested. When the message came it was one pressing for disarmament as a *preliminary* to the congress. Then public opinion, here at all events, began to turn. Austria meant to begin hostilities, and to strike a blow before the French were ready. It was in fact a case of suspicion all round, or as Prince Albert put it: "Suspicion, hatred, pride, cunning, intrigue, covetousness, dissimulation dictate the despatches, and in this state of things we cast about to find a basis on which peace may be secured."

We have seen that as early as the 1st of January, 1859, it was evident that some action was contemplated by Napoleon against the Austrian occupation of Italy. On that day the words he addressed to M. Hubner were not unnaturally interpreted to prelude a warlike manifestation. The King of Sardinia's language at the opening of his chambers, which took place on the 10th of January,

confirmed that impression. It was spirited, determined, and hopeful. Everybody surmised that some agreement had already been entered into between the respective governments, a surmise which rose to certainty when, the hand of the Princess Clothilde, the only daughter of Victor Emmanuel, was formally demanded by General Niel, on behalf of the Emperor of the French, for his cousin Prince Napoleon.

That marriage took place on the 30th of January, and by that time Austria had begun to prepare for war, and to concentrate its troops in Italy, which it occupied with a persistency that became actually aggressive, and defiant of the treaties which were intended to protect the country from foreign occupation. Victor Emmanuel at once asked his government to raise a loan, and in supporting it Count Cavour made an eloquent speech on behalf of Italian liberty.

We are now briefly following events as they were publicly known to show what were the relative positions of the disputants.

On the 7th of February, at the opening of the French session, the emperor made no declaration of a warlike character; he rather endeavoured to calm the excitement which the prospect of war had produced, and spoke of the possibility of further disagreement being averted by a conference. England, too, made active efforts to avert what seemed to be an inevitable conflict in Italy, and, addressing the Sardinian government through its ministers at Turin, requested to know what the specific complaints were which the Italians had to make against Austria. This appeal was ably answered in a long memorandum, which concluded by saying that war or revolution might be averted, and the Italian question at least temporarily solved, by obtaining from Austria a national and separate government for Lombardy and Venetia; by requiring, in conformity with the Treaty of Vienna, that the domination of Austria in Central Italy should cease, and consequently that the detached forts outside the walls of Piacenza should be destroyed; that the occupation of the Romagna should cease, and that the principle of non-intervention should be proclaimed

and respected; by inviting the Dukes of Modena and Parma to give to their people institutions similar to those existing in Piedmont; by requiring that the Grand-duke of Tuscany should re-establish the constitution to which he freely consented in 1848; and by obtaining from the sovereign pontiff the administrative separation of the provinces beyond the Apennines.

The first note of war was sounded by Austria, and it almost immediately woke English sentiment on behalf of Italy. The wrongs inflicted by Austrian tyranny were remembered, and thenceforth every battle in which the aggressors were defeated was hailed with satisfaction by the friends of freedom in this country.

On the 23d of April the aide-de-camp of the Austrian general, Baron Kellersberg, arrived at Turin with a summons from the Austrian government, calling on Sardinia to disarm in three days, under the threat of immediate hostilities if she failed to comply. Three days afterwards Count Cavour sent a temperate but firm reply, referring to the attempts to avert hostilities by a congress, and maintaining the position of the King of Sardinia.

The next day Victor Emmanuel issued proclamations to his troops and to all Italians. The latter spoke of Austria refusing to listen to a European congress, and made known that France would fight side by side with Italy in the impending war. The English government recorded a solemn protest against the course taken by Austria, and declared the negotiations for a congress to be at an end. Count Walewski, the French foreign minister, made a statement to the Corps Legislatif detailing the whole particulars of the case between Austria and Sardinia, and declaring that, in the event of the invasion of the territory, France would not hesitate to respond to the appeal of her ally.

On the following day (April 27th) the Emperor of Austria declared to his army in Lombardy that war had commenced, and ordered them to enter Sardinia. On the 3d of May the Emperor of the French announced that the cause of Sardinia and of Italy would be

taken up by France against a power which violated treaties and justice; that Austria had brought affairs to such an issue that she must be free to the shores of the Adriatic. He proclaimed that he should place himself at the head of the French army, and appointed the empress as regent in his absence, "seconded by the experience and the enlightenment of the last surviving brother of the emperor." He "confided her and his son to the army left in France to watch the frontiers and protect the homes, and to the entire people who would surround them with the affection and devotion of which he himself daily received so many proofs." An imperial decree appeared in the *Moniteur* confirming these arrangements. The empress was to preside at the privy-council and the council of ministers, and to take the advice of Prince Jerome Napoleon, the uncle of the emperor, who was to preside at the council of ministers in her absence. The emperor quitted Paris on the 10th of May, and was in Genoa on the 12th with the army, to whom he at once issued an order of the day, exhorting and reminding them of the part they were to take in the conflict.

The Sardinian army had altered its position several times because of the movements made by the Austrians, who seem to have been undecided as to the strategic position they meant to assume. The first, second, and third corps of the French army had, by the 16th of May, occupied positions which gave the allies the command of the whole line of the Po. Marshal Baraguay d'Hilliers, General MacMahon, and General Niel commanded the French divisions, General Forey was at the head of the division which formed their vanguard on the extreme right, opposite to which the Austrians, in strong force, occupied the road to Pavia, behind Casteggio.

On the 20th of May the Austrian general, anxious to ascertain the strength of the enemy on his left, ordered Count Stadion to make a reconnoissance on the right bank of the Po with a considerable force, which crossed the river and took Casteggio and Montebello, at that time occupied by the Piedmontese troops. They then pushed on in two columns, but were

checked by the advance of the French division under General Forey, who drove them back on Montebello, where a desperate hand-to-hand conflict took place, amidst which fresh troops from Forey's division continued to arrive by railway. From the heights of Montebello the Austrians beheld a novelty in the art of war. Train after train arrived by railway from Voghera, each train disgorging its hundreds of armed men, and immediately hastening back for more. In vain Count Stadion endeavoured to crush the force in front of him before it could be increased enough to overpower him. The Austrians gave way and retired on Casteggio, which they quitted at nightfall, crossing the river by the bridge at Vacarizza. In this engagement, which was called the battle of Montebello, the Austrians lost 294 killed and 718 wounded, with 200 prisoners, and the French 671 killed and wounded. Among the killed was General Benuet, who had served with distinction in Algeria and in the Crimea.

The object of the Emperor of the French was to deceive the enemy by a strategical movement, making them believe that he was about to attack on the right of his position, and appearing to concentrate troops in that direction. On the morning of the 30th of May the Piedmontese divisions moved in different directions, so that the Austrians imagined they were about to attack Mortara, where they (the Austrians) occupied a strong position. In order to keep them still more in error the Sardinians were ordered to advance upon Bobbio (between Vercelli and Mortara), where the enemy was in great force; and General Gyulai, the Austrian commander, thinking General Canrobert was about to cross the river at Prarola, determined to anticipate him by attacking Palestro, which was defended by Piedmontese, commanded by the king in person. A severe combat ended in the defeat of the Austrians, while at the same time General Fanti and his Piedmontese division drove back the enemy from Confienza.

The great body of the French army was meanwhile marching rapidly to the left towards Novara, where it encamped on the 31st of May, while the Austrians supposed that it

was moving in the contrary direction towards Mortara.

On the 2d of June the French Imperial Guard was ordered to advance to Turbigo, where, finding no enemy, they threw bridges across and crossed the river, followed by the main body of the corps d'armée under General MacMahon and a Sardinian division. The attack of an Austrian corps, brought hastily by railway from Milan, was soon repulsed. On the same day General Espinasse advanced towards Buffalora, and the enemy abandoned their intrenchments and retired to the left bank of the Ticino, thus giving up the territory that they had occupied as an act of aggression. The Emperor of the French proceeded to Buffalora on the 4th of June to command the attack in person, the Austrians having strengthened their position at Magenta, where their reinforcements were arriving constantly. The grenadiers of the guard and the Zouaves, commanded by the emperor in person, rushed forward to carry the position. They gained the high ground beside the canal, where they were surrounded by masses of the enemy, and sustained a fierce combat for four hours against unequal numbers, until the attack of General MacMahon, on the Austrian right, changed the fortune of the day. That general advanced in two columns and drove the enemy back with the bayonet, the troops fighting hand to hand amongst the vineyards. It was a frightful scene of carnage, especially on the railway line and the station near the village, where the Austrians concentrated all their efforts.

General Canrobert's division was able at last to join that of the emperor, and part of General Neil's corps had also come up. General Espinasse had been killed in the attack on the village, which was taken and retaken several times. At eight o'clock in the evening the allied armies were masters of the field, and the Austrians retreated, leaving 7000 prisoners in the hands of their opponents.

The victory of Magenta was followed by the entry of the emperor and the King of Sardinia into Milan. This event took place on the 8th of June amidst the enthusiastic demonstrations of the people. The King of

Italy, assuming that Lombardy would be added to his dominions, issued proclamations, and appointed a governor of the territory. The emperor also issued a proclamation to the inhabitants of Lombardy explaining his alliance, and urging the people to join the standard of the king.

Having evacuated Milan, the Austrians had assembled in great force at Malegnano, half-way between Milan and Lodi, intending to hold that position while their main army retreated across the Adda. This the French were determined to prevent, and on the 8th of June three divisions of the 1st corps, under Baraguay d'Hilliers, engaged them, and, after a tremendous struggle, which ended in severe street-fighting, drove them out with serious loss. The Austrian army then retreated across the plains of Lombardy, on the line of the Mincio, in three main columns. By the 11th of June the whole army had crossed the Adda, blowing up the bridges after them, and destroying the works at Piacenza and Pavia as they were evacuated by their garrisons. Lodi and Pizzighettone were also destroyed, so that the fortresses built to overawe Italy were shattered by their constructors. Not till they reached the Mincio and were within the lines of the famous "Quadrilateral" did they attempt to make a stand, protected by its four fortresses of Peschiera, Verona, Legnano, and Mantua. They were followed by the allied armies across the plains of Lombardy, and before it could be conjectured what course they would take they recrossed the Mincio and assumed an offensive position. A reconnaissance pushed forward by the French met their advanced posts near the village of Solferino, and an aeronaut who accompanied the army of the allies ascended in a balloon to explore the position. The enemy occupied the hilly country which there forms a kind of parallelogram, the angles of which are Sonato, Peschiera, Volta, and Castiglione. Their line extended for about twelve miles from Peschiera down into the plain of Mincio. The centre of it was Cavriana, which the Emperor of Austria had chosen as his headquarters. On the 24th, in the morning, the French were aware of their movements, and

the emperor at once directed his attention to bringing together the various corps of the allied armies that they might support each other. He then repaired to the heights in the centre of the line of battle, where Marshal Baraguay d'Hilliers, who was too far from the Sardinian army to act in conjunction with it, was engaged in a severe conflict against superior numbers at the foot of the hill leading to Solferino, which was intrenched and defended by the enemy. The emperor ordered Forey's division to advance, and it was supported by a division of light infantry of the guard. With these there advanced the artillery of the guard, under the command of General de Sevelinges and General Lebœuf, which took up an uncovered position at about 300 yards from the enemy. This manoeuvre decided the fate of the centre, and by a brilliant attack the divisions took the position, the Austrians retiring under the fire of the artillery, with a loss of 1500 prisoners and fourteen pieces of cannon. It then became necessary to attack the position at Cavriana behind Solferino, and this also was carried after a tremendous struggle, the horrors of which were increased by a violent thunder-storm.

The Austrians then fell back on the Mincio and occupied Verona, after burning the bridges in their retreat. On the 1st of August the allies had crossed the Mincio. While everybody was wondering what would be the next step, now that the Austrians had sought the shelter of the Quadrilateral, where it was believed they would be able to resist the combined forces of France and Sardinia, it was suddenly announced that an interview had taken place between the Emperors of France and Austria at Villafrauca, and that the terms of a treaty of peace had been agreed on. The overtures which led to this came, in the first instance, from Napoleon III., who did not hesitate to assign as his reasons the necessity which he foresaw he would be under of "accepting a combat on the Rhine," if he pushed his successes further. He felt that the chances of a collision with the whole power of a German Confederation might be directed against him if he drove Austria to extremities, and

caused the other German states to rally round her from an instinct of self-preservation, and at the same time it was prudent to end the war before public feeling in France was again subject to a reaction.

An armistice was signed on the 8th of July, and was immediately followed by a treaty of peace, the conditions of which were these:—

“The two sovereigns will favour the creation of an Italian Confederation.

“That Confederation shall be under the honorary presidency of the Holy Father.

“The Emperor of Austria cedes to the Emperor of the French his rights over Lombardy, with the exception of the fortresses of Mantua and Peschiera, so that the frontier of the Austrian possessions shall start from the extreme range of the fortress of Peschiera, and shall extend in a direct line along the Mincio as far as Grazio; thence to Scorzarolo and Luzana to the Po, whence the actual frontiers shall continue to form the limits of Austria. The Emperor of the French will hand over (*remettra*) the ceded territory to the King of Sardinia.

“Venetia shall form part of the Italian Confederation, though remaining under the crown of the Emperor of Austria.

“The Grand-duke of Tuscany and the Duke of Modena return to their states, granting a general amnesty.

“A full and complete amnesty is granted on both sides to persons compromised in the late events in the territories of the belligerent parties.”

By a proclamation the Emperor Napoleon III. announced this treaty to his army. Plenipotentiaries were appointed, and though some delay took place, the agreement was regularly signed on the 11th of November, its terms being substantially in accordance with the clauses of the original treaty.

The emperor returned to Paris after the conclusion of the treaty at Villafranca, and on the 19th of July received the great bodies of the state at St. Cloud, where they presented him with congratulatory addresses—one from the senate, pronounced by its president, M. Troplong, and the other from the corps législatif, by Count de Morny. Soon afterwards

the emperor wrote to the pope, seriously advising him to surrender the revolted provinces of the Romagna. The letter was couched in the most respectful and persuasive terms, reminding his holiness of all that the writer had done “for the Catholic religion and its august head;” but, at the same time, frankly recommending the cession of the revolted provinces for the sake of tranquillity.

But it is time to turn again to the progress of events at home, where the change of government had given another aspect to domestic legislation, and where the years of conflict abroad had made the task of the chancellor of the exchequer more than usually arduous. But Mr. Gladstone was equal to the occasion. It was noticed that he had improved in appearance after his journey to the Ionian Islands. He seemed to be in more vigorous health, which added fire to his manner of speaking. His financial statement was complete and lucid as ever, and it was more concise than usual. Instead of being somewhat diffusive it was compact, but it dealt thoroughly with the state of affairs. A deficiency must be met, and the question was how best to meet it with the least possible pressure of taxation. Provision had to be made for a large addition to our naval and military establishments. It was expected that while the revenue for the coming year would be £64,340,000, the expenditure would be £69,207,000. There would thus be a gross deficiency of £4,867,000 for the current year. The committee were therefore not to busy themselves with comprehensive plans of finance on that occasion. In the following year it would be necessary to enter upon larger views of our financial system, for then the income-tax would lapse, as well as certain war duties upon tea and sugar; on the other hand, the long annuities would fall in. How were they to raise the necessary funds to meet the present deficiency—by borrowing or by taxes? The sum required was a large one, but it ought never to drive the British Parliament to the expedient of augmenting the national debt—which nothing but dire necessity should induce it to do. It appeared to him that a loan ought not to be resorted to. It would not be desir-

able to increase the malt duty or the spirit duties. It would be impolitic to increase the duties of customs or excise. There consequently remained the income-tax, which had been originally introduced, first, to make reforms in our fiscal system, and secondly, to meet public exigencies, and when it was for the dignity, honour, and safety of the country that efforts should be made to augment the national defences, the income-tax was above all others a regular and legitimate resource. The system of nearly six months' credits which the government allowed to maltsters, thereby to that extent finding capital for them, was bad in principle, and might be so modified that six weeks of the credit could be taken away and four per cent discount allowed on the payment. This would bring £780,000 to the exchequer. The adopting of a penny stamp on bankers' cheques drawn across the counter would yield a further sum, and the deficiency of about £4,000,000 would be met by an addition to the income-tax. It now stood at the rate of 5*d.* in the pound, and an additional 4*d.* would yield something over £4,000,000. He proposed that this additional sum should be levied on incomes amounting to upwards of £150, but that incomes under that sum should pay only 1½*d.* extra; and he also proposed that the augmented tax should be leviable upon the first half-yearly payment after the resolution should have been adopted by the house. This addition to the tax, added to the sum derived from the maltsters, would produce £5,120,000. Deducting the whole deficiency of the year, there would thus remain a surplus of £253,000.

Mr. Disraeli, after vindicating the financial scheme, and partially defending the foreign policy, of his own government, objected to the proposed plan of levying the income-tax, and urged that the income-tax itself should, like an army, be regarded as a means of support to be resorted to only in times of extremity. He maintained that the nation could not go on raising £70,000,000 annually, and concluded by demanding that France and England should mutually prove, with no hypocrisy, but by the unanswerable evidence of reduced armaments, that they really desired

peace, and thus terminate "disastrous and wild expenditure."

Mr. Bright must have smiled at this declaration when he rose to denounce the income-tax as odious and unjust beyond all others, and not to be defended as a permanent tax, though at the same time he acknowledged that in the emergency which had to be met, the budget of Mr. Gladstone was as satisfactory as it was possible for a very disagreeable thing to be. Why, he asked, was the income-tax odious? Because it was a tax upon property? No; but because it was unjustly levied. Why should not the farmers, for instance, pay as much on their incomes as other people did on theirs? Then there was the succession duty. Could anything be more unjust than that? There was a gentleman lately who had a landed estate worth £32,000 left him by a person who was no relative. Now if that had been left in money the duty would have been £3200, but being a landed estate the duty was only £700. Was that just? was it consistent with fairness? Was it consistent with our duty to society that we should take the class of property the most select, attracting towards it many social and practical advantages, having in it the most certain means of accumulation and improvement, and charge it only £700; whilst on another description of property that was not worth a bit more in the market we should charge £3200? Mr. Bright spoke with remarkable force on the subject of the financial policy which had constantly to take into consideration the maintenance of great armaments; but it was on the question of the proposed conference and the mutual relations of France and England that he spoke with equal or even more effectual emphasis. "If England is to go into the conference merely to put its name to documents which are of no advantage to Italy, which do not engage the sympathies of this nation, England had much better have nothing to do with it. But there is another course which I should like to recommend to the noble lord who now holds the seals of the foreign office. I cannot believe that Frenchmen, in matters of this nature, are so very different from ourselves as some people wish to teach us. I do believe that the thirty-six

million Frenchmen engaged in all the honest occupations of their country, as our people are engaged here, are as anxious for perpetual peace with England as the most intelligent and Christian Englishman can be for a perpetual peace with France. I believe, too, because I am convinced that it is his wisest course and his truest interest, that the Emperor of the French is also anxious to remain at peace with us, and the people of France are utterly amazed and lost in bewilderment when they see the course taken by the press and by certain statesmen in this country. With that belief what would I do if I were in that responsible position?—for which, however, I know that I am thought to be altogether unfit—but if I were sitting on that bench, and were in the position of the noble lord, I would try to emancipate myself from those old, ragged, worthless, and bloody traditions which are found in every pigeon-hole, and almost in every document, in the foreign office. I would emancipate myself from all that, and I would approach the French nation and the French government in what I would call a sensible, a moral, and a Christian spirit. I do not say that I would send a special envoy to Paris to sue for peace. I would not commission Lord Cowley to make a great demonstration of what he was about to do; but I would make this offer to the French government, and I would make it with a frankness that could not be misunderstood; if it were accepted on the other side, it would be received with enthusiasm in England, and would be marked as the commencement of a new era in Europe. I would say to the French government, We are but twenty miles apart, the trade between us is nothing like what it ought to be, considering the population of the two countries, their vast increase of productive power, and their great wealth. We have certain things on this side which now bar the intercourse between the two nations. We have some remaining duties which are of no consequence either to the revenue or to protection, which everybody has given up here, but they still interrupt the trade between you and us. We will reconsider these and remove them. We have also an extraordinary heavy duty upon one of the

greatest products of the soil of France—upon the light wines of your country. The chancellor of the exchequer, and perhaps the right hon. gentleman opposite, may start at once and say that involves a revenue of £1,500,000, or at least of £1,200,000. . . . What is £1,200,000—what is £1,500,000 for the abolition of the wine duties, or their reduction to a very low scale, if by such an offer as this we should enable the Emperor of the French to do that which he is most anxious to do? The only persons whom the French emperor cannot cope with are the monopolists of his own country. If he could offer to his nation thirty millions of the English people as customers, would not that give him an irresistible power to make changes in the French tariff which would be as advantageous to us as they would be to his own country? I do believe that if that were honestly done, done without any diplomatic finesse, and without obstacles being attached to it that would make its acceptance impossible, it would bring about a state of things which history would pronounce to be glorious.”

It was to this portion of Mr. Bright's speech that the practical proposals of the French commercial treaty was afterwards attributed. At all events it was immediately after his attention had been arrested by reading a report of this speech that M. Chevalier wrote to Mr. Cobden expressing his belief that a commercial treaty between England and France might be negotiated, and urging him to visit Paris during the autumn to make the attempt.

To that visit and its results we shall now turn, and we may at once avail ourselves of so much of Cobden's own account of it as will enable us to follow it to its conclusion. We have already seen under what discouraging circumstances from the premier he set about his mission. Probably Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Milner Gibson were the only persons in the ministry who fully appreciated his difficulties, and what might be gained by surmounting them. But Cobden was not the man to turn back till he had exhausted all reasonable efforts, and after some delay he succeeded, as we have already noted, in obtaining an in-

interview with the emperor. This was on the 27th of October, 1859, and in describing it he says:—

“After a few remarks upon the subject of the improvements in Paris, and in the Bois de Boulogne, and after he had expressed his regret at my not having entered the ministry of Lord Palmerston, the emperor alluded to the state of feeling in England, and expressed his regret that notwithstanding he had for ten years given every possible proof of his desire to preserve the friendship of the British people, the press had at last defeated his purpose, and now the relations of the two countries seemed to be worse than ever. He appealed to me if he had ever done one act to justify the manner in which he was assailed by our press? I candidly told him that I thought the governments of both countries were to blame. He asked what he could do more than he had already done to promote the friendly relations of the two countries. This led to the question of free-trade, and I urged many arguments in favour of removing those obstacles which prevented the two countries from being brought into closer dependence on one another. He expressed himself as friendly to this policy, but alluded to the great difficulties in his way; said he had made an effort by admitting iron in bond for shipbuilding, which he was obliged to alter again, and spoke of the sliding-scale on corn which had been reimposed after it had expired. I spoke of the opportuneness of the present moment for making a simultaneous change in the English and French tariffs, as there was a prospect of a surplus of revenue next year, owing to the expiry of our terminable annuities, and that Mr. Gladstone was very desirous to make this surplus available for reducing duties on French commodities. Louis Napoleon said he had a majority of his chambers quite opposed to free-trade, and that they would not pass a decided measure; that by the constitution he could alter the tariff by a decree, if it were part of a treaty with a foreign power; and he asked me whether England would enter into a commercial treaty with him. I explained that we could give no exclusive privileges to any

nation; that we could simultaneously make reductions in our tariffs; and the alterations might be inserted in a treaty, but that our tariff must be equally applicable to all countries. He said he was under a pledge not to abolish the prohibitive system in France and substitute moderate duties, previous to 1861. I told him that I saw no obstacle in this to a treaty being entered into next spring, for that the moral effect would be the same even if the full operation of the new duties did not come into play for two or three years. He asked me to let him know what reductions could be made in our tariff upon articles affecting his country, which I promised to do. He then inquired what I should advise him to do in regard to the French tariff. I said I should attack one article of great and universal necessity, as I had done in England, when I confined all my efforts to the abolition of the corn-laws, knowing that when that *clef-de-voûte* was removed the whole system would fall. In France the great primary want was cheap iron, which is the daily bread of all industries, and I should begin by abolishing the duty on iron and coal, and then I should be in a better position for approaching all the other industries; that I would, if necessary, pay an indemnity in some shape to the iron-masters, and thus be enabled to abolish their protection immediately—a course which I should not contemplate following with any other commodity but iron and coal. He spoke of the danger of throwing men out of work, and I tried by a variety of arguments to convince him, especially by a reference to the example of England, that the effect of a reduction of duties is to increase, not diminish, the demand for labour. I showed that in England we had much machinery standing idle in consequence of the want of workmen at the present time; and in order to allay his fears of an inundation of British products, to throw his own people out of work, I explained that there was not an ounce of our productions which was not already bespoken, and that it would take a long time to increase largely our investment of capital, whilst it was impossible to procure any considerable addition to our labourers.

On my giving him a description of the reforms effected by Sir Robert Peel, and the great reverence in which his name is held, he said, 'I am charmed and flattered at the idea of performing a similar work in my country; but,' he added, 'it is very difficult in France to make reforms; we make revolutions in France, not reforms.'

Cobden was greatly impressed with the good qualities of the emperor, and he felt that he was making way with him at a subsequent meeting. He was gaining courage to attempt a movement against the protectionists of France. Next M. Fould had to be converted, and then came disturbing influences of the mistrust of France on the part of England in relation to the emperor's foreign policy. The treaty, or something like it, had been sketched out after long conversations and discussions with Rouher and Chevalier, and during a temporary attack of illness which confined Cobden to his bed, but did not prevent him from continuing the discussions in his bed-room. At last the proposals were ready and things took a turn.

M. de Persigny had come from London to tell his master how hostile and dangerous was the state of opinion in England. For the first time in his experience he said he believed war to be possible, unless the emperor took some step to remove the profound mistrust that agitated the English public. The security of the throne, he went on to urge, depended on the English alliance being a reality. So long as there was a solid friendship between England and France they need not care what might be in the mind of Russia, Austria, or Prussia. This was the course of reasoning which, in Cobden's opinion, finally decided the emperor. In other words, Napoleon assented to the treaty, less because it was good for the French than because it would pacify the English. It was the only available instrument for keeping the English alliance.

M. Rouher presented his plan of a commercial treaty, together with sixty pages of illustrative reasoning upon it. The whole was read to the emperor; he listened attentively through every page, approved it, and declared his intention of carrying it out. He then produced

a letter which he had prepared, addressed to M. Gould, and intended for publication, in which he announced his determination to enter upon a course of pacific improvement, to promote the industry of the country by cheapening transport, and so forth.

The project was now disclosed to Count Walewski, the minister for foreign affairs, and Cobden was invited to have an interview with him. Once more he went over the ground along which he had already led Gould, Rouher, and the emperor. "I endeavoured," says Cobden, "to remove his doubts and difficulties, and to fortify his courage against the protectionist party, whose insignificance and powerlessness I demonstrated by comparing their small body with the immense population which was interested in the removal of commercial restrictions." The discussion with M. Walewski was followed by a second interview with the emperor.

December 21.—"Had an interview with the emperor at the Tuileries. I explained to him that Mr. Gladstone, the chancellor of the exchequer, was anxious to prepare his budget for the ensuing session of parliament, and that it would be a convenience to him to be informed as soon as possible whether the French government was decided to agree to a commercial treaty, as in that case he would make arrangements accordingly; that he did not wish to be in possession of the details, but merely to know whether the principle of a treaty was determined upon. The emperor said he could have no hesitation in satisfying me on that point; that he had quite made up his mind to enter into the treaty, and that the only question was as to the details. He spoke of the difficulties he had to overcome, owing to the powerful interests that were united in defence of the present system. 'The protected industries combine, but the general public do not.' I urged many arguments to encourage him to take a bold course, pointing out the very small number of the protected classes as compared with the whole community, and contending for the interests of the greatest number rather than those of the minority. He repeated to me the arguments which had been used by some of his ministers to dissuade him

from a free-trade policy, particularly by M. Magne, his finance minister, who had urged that if he merely changed his system from prohibition to high protective duties it would be a change only in name, but that if he laid on moderate duties which admitted a large importation of foreign merchandise, then, for every piece of manufactured goods so admitted to consumption in France, a piece of domestic manufacture must be displaced. I pointed out the fallacy of M. Magne's argument in the assumption that everybody in France was sufficiently clothed, and that no increased consumption could take place. I observed that many millions in France never wore stockings, and yet stockings were prohibited. He remarked that he was sorry to say that ten millions of the population hardly ever tasted bread, but subsisted on potatoes, chestnuts, &c. (I conclude this must be an exaggeration.) I expressed an opinion that the working population of his country were in a very inferior condition as compared with those in England.

"Referring to the details in his intended tariff, he said the duties would range from ten to thirty per cent. I pointed out the excessive rate of the latter figure, that the maximum ought not to exceed twenty per cent; that it would defeat his object in every way if he went as high as thirty per cent; that it would fail as an economical measure, whilst in a political point of view it would be unsuccessful, inasmuch as the people of England would regard it as prohibition in another form. He referred me to M. Rouher for further discussion of this question. He described to me the letter which he thought of publishing declaratory of his intention of entering on a course of internal improvement and commercial reform, and asked me whether it would not place him at a disadvantage with the British government if he announced his policy beforehand, and whether they might not be inclined afterwards to withdraw from the treaty. I replied that there might be other objections to his publishing such a letter, but this was not one, and that I was sure it would not be taken advantage of by our government. We then talked of our immense preparation in naval armaments. I said I expected that in

a few months we should have sixty line-of-battle-ships, screws, in commission. He said he had only twenty-seven. Talking of the excited state of alarm in England, he said he was dictating to M. Mocquard a dialogue between a Frenchman and an Englishman, in which he should introduce all the arguments used in England to stimulate the present alarm of French aggression, and his answers to them, and he asked if I thought the *Times* would print it.

"Whilst we were in the midst of this familiar conversation, during which he smoked several cigarettes, the empress entered the room, to whom I was introduced. She is a tall and graceful person, very amiable and gracious, but her features were not entirely free from an expression of thoughtfulness, if not melancholy. The emperor is said by everybody to be very fascinating to those who come much in personal contact with him. I found him more attractive at this second audience than the first. His manner is very simple and natural. If there be any affectation, it is in a slight air of humility ('young ambition's ladder'), which shows itself with consummate tact in his voice and gestures."

Cobden gives some further particulars in a letter to Mr. Bright (Dec. 29, 1859):—

"I saw the emperor again for a full hour last week, as you would learn from your brother. Of course I tried to employ every minute on my own topic, but he was in a talkative mood, and sometimes ran off on other subjects. It was at four o'clock; he had been busy all day, and I was surprised at the gaiety of his manner. He smoked cigarettes all the time, but talked and listened admirably.

". . . On this occasion my private lesson was chiefly taken up with answering the arguments with which M. Magne, his minister of finance, who is a furious protectionist, had been trying to frighten him. Here was one of them, which he repeated word for word to me: 'Sire, if you do not make a sensible reduction in your duties the measure will be charged on you as an attempted delusion. If you do make a serious reduction, then for every piece of foreign manufacture admitted into France,

you will displace a piece of domestic fabrication.' I, of course laughed, and held up both hands and exclaimed: 'What an old friend that argument was! how we have been told the same thing a thousand times of corn, and how we have answered it a thousand times by showing that a fourth part of the people were not properly fed. And then I showed how we had imported many millions of quarters of corn annually since the repeal of our corn-law, whilst our own agriculture was more prosperous and productive than ever, and yet it *was all consumed*. I told him that his people were badly clothed, that nearly a fourth of his subjects did not wear stockings, and I begged him to remind M. Magne that if a few thousand dozens of hose were admitted into France, they might be consumed by these barelegged people without interfering with the demand for the native manufacture. . . . We then got upon the condition of the mass of the working people, where his sympathy is mainly centred, and on the effect of machinery, free-trade, &c., on their fate. He said the protectionists always argued that the working-class engaged in manufactures were better off here than in England, and they always assumed that free-trade would lower the condition of the French operatives. I told him that the operatives in France were working *twenty per cent more time for twenty per cent less wages*, and *paid upwards of ten per cent more for their clothing*, as compared with the same class in England. He seized a pen and asked me to repeat these figures, which he put down, observing, 'What an answer to those people!' I told him that if M. Magne or anybody else disputed my figures I was prepared to prove them. But I need not repeat to you a course of argument with which we are so familiar."

After this interview the negotiation reached the stage of formal diplomacy. Cobden's position had hitherto been wholly unofficial. He had been a private person, representing to the French emperor that he believed the English government would not be indisposed to entertain the question of a commercial treaty. The matter came officially before Lord Cowley in the form of a request from Count Walewski

that he would ascertain the views and intentions of his government. Lord Cowley applied to Lord John Russell for official instructions to act, and in the course of the next month Cobden received his own instructions and powers. Meanwhile not a day was lost, and he brought the same tact and unwearied energy to the settlement of the details of the treaty which he had employed in persuading this little group of important men to accept its principles and policy. There was one singular personage who ought from his keen faculties, his grasp of the principles of modern progress, and his position, to have been the most important of all, but in whom his gifts had been nullified by want of that indescribable something which men call character and the spirit of conduct. This was Prince Napoleon. Cobden had several conversations with him, and came to the conclusion that few men in France had a more thorough mastery of economic questions.¹

The Emperor of the French showed some sagacity in taking the earliest reasonable opportunity of making terms of peace with Austria, although neither the King of Sardinia nor Prince Napoleon considered that he had fulfilled the obligations which he had previously incurred. Cavour was so bitterly disappointed at the sudden peace and the terms of it that he resigned office. The French people were satisfied with the emperor for having led the army in Italy and beaten the enemy, but they were by no means enthusiastic enough to look forward to a prolonged conflict, especially as the cession of Savoy and Nice had yet to be accomplished. On the other hand it might truly have been said that French intervention in Italy had aroused the suspicions of the rest of Europe. When he had reached Genoa on the 12th of May, the emperor had issued a proclamation to "the army of Italy," saying, "We are about to second the struggles of a people now vindicating its independence, and to rescue it from oppression. This is a sacred cause, and has the sympathies of the civilized world." The cause was sacred and worthy of sympathy, no doubt, but a considerable part

¹ Mr. John Morley's *Life of Richard Cobden*.

of the civilized world doubted the agency by which it was to be vindicated. They failed to see in the "man of December"—the sovereign who had gained power by a *coup d'état*—the consistent rescuer of an oppressed people, the upholder of freedom, the champion of the oppressed. Germany, perhaps, showed the greatest perturbation, by the immediate mobilization of the greater part of the army; and still more by the demand made by an influential party that they should at once annex Alsace and Lorraine, march to Paris, and effectually cripple France for the remainder of the century. The cry "To Paris! to Paris!" was as shrill and persistent then in Berlin as that of "To Berlin! to Berlin!" was eleven years later in Paris, when Napoleon was precipitated into the war with Germany which lost him his throne and cost France so dear. Nor were the Germans without reasonable excuse for the outcry. French military officers were again too free with their tongues, and the words of General Espinasse—"I accompany the emperor to Italy with pleasure, for it is the first step towards the Rhine"—were perhaps an example of other phrases which were sure to be repeated. An article in the *Allgemeine Zeitung*, which was reprinted in the *Times*, interpreted the desire of the Germans. Commenting upon it the *Times* said: "If we may trust the *Allgemeine Zeitung*, which does not often speak without some authority, all Germany, from Cologne to Swabia, from the Baltic to the Euxine, is possessed by one unanimous uproarious enthusiasm for the conquest of Alsace and Lorraine, and for the occupation of Paris! Sober, steady-going old Germany is, we are told, dreaming quite seriously of some tremendous scheme of invasion, of which France is to be the victim, and we English are to be part agents in the work, but by no means participants in the gain."

England, however, took good care to let the world know that Germany would receive no help from her, and that without this assistance the north German coast would be exposed to France and also to Russia, who had at the same time concentrated 200,000 men on the Austrian frontier, and in the neighbourhood of

the Danubian Principalities. So wide-spread was the suspicion that the intervention of France would not end with a war in Italy, that Switzerland placed 100,000 men under arms, and Denmark 70,000; Belgium alone, relying on the guarantees of her independence, making no effort to increase her defensive armaments. It therefore became of the utmost importance to the Emperor of the French that the war should be localized. The States of the Confederation were already demanding to be led to the support of Austria. Prussia, though understanding the danger which such a policy must involve, could not venture wholly to dissociate herself from the prevailing sentiment of the North German States. She had accordingly made the French ambassador at Berlin aware, that while she would not say that no territorial change must be effected by the war, she would not see with tranquillity any heavy sacrifice inflicted upon Austria, nor any change made which would enhance the strength of one power at the expense of another. To localize the war, therefore, and to leave Austria and France with her ally Sardinia to fight it out alone, became a matter of vital importance to the Emperor of the French. If he succeeded in this, and Austria were defeated, she might naturally, in resentment at being deserted by Germany, stand aloof and leave the other States of the Confederation to withstand without her aid any attempt upon the Rhine, which France, flushed with victory, might afterwards make. It was thus by no means clear that it was for the interest of Germany that the war should be localized. To Russia, however, it was scarcely of less moment than to France that it should be so; for, if Germany embarked in it, Russia must declare her policy, and either break with France or with Germany. For neither event was she prepared, and she was, moreover, without either the men or money required for an active participation in such a war as must then have ensued.

It soon became evident to Napoleon III. that, unless he confined his interposition to helping to drive the Austrians out of Italy, he would cause a general state of hostility in Europe. The queen, in reply to a letter from

the empress, had already warned him against an attempt to invade the Austrian States, when it would only be natural that Germany, alarmed at seeing one of the most important members of her Confederation attacked and in danger, should be impelled to come to her assistance, and that all Europe should take alarm at seeing the treaties put in question on which its peace and its existence rested.

On the attitude of England the ultimate direction of the war seemed to depend, and England maintained a strictly neutral position. We had, however, hastily strengthened our naval armaments, and the Rifle Volunteer force, the formation of which, perhaps, received a new stimulus from the general condition of affairs in Europe, was growing with enormous rapidity, and was being formed into a regular body. "Volunteer corps are being formed in all the towns," wrote Prince Albert to Baron Stockmar on the 8th of December. "The lawyers of the Temple go through regular drill. Lords Spencer, Abercorn, Elcho, &c., are put through their facings in Westminster Hall by gaslight in the same rank and file with shopkeepers. Close on 50,000 are already under arms."

Prince Albert shortly afterwards was called upon to take a prominent part in the public demonstrations of this force, which had grown spontaneously in numbers and efficiency, but at the time he wrote he was but just recovering from one of those attacks of illness to which he appeared to be increasingly liable. But he was still actively busy in so many directions that probably few men in the kingdom worked harder. As a relief from the cares and anxieties which he shared with the queen there had been a very delightful family reunion. The princess royal (the Princess of Prussia), and her husband, Prince Frederick William, had again been on a visit to Windsor to keep the queen's birthday, and her company was always a great delight to her father; and now he was prepared to welcome her with tender solicitude, for she had become a mother, and the first grandchild of the queen had only just been baptized at Berlin. The Prince of Wales, too, had just returned from Rome, where he had been staying after

a continental journey, during which he had given ample promise of that distinguished frankness and simple bonhomie which have always made him not only popular, but welcome, in every country to which he has paid a visit. Nowhere have these qualities been more truly recognized than among his own countrymen, who see in the Prince of Wales much that is to be regarded as typically English. His characteristic outspokenness, no less than his rank, places him above artifice, and he has at command a certain serious dignity by which he can always protect himself from vulgar familiarity, while he succeeds in placing those about him at their ease, and accepts with genuine appreciation courtesies which his station might entitle him to leave unnoticed.

There had been more than one gap made in the royal circle, for Prince Alfred had commenced his nautical career at the end of October in the previous year, and was with the *Euryalus*, which had been placed on the Mediterranean station for two years. The Prince Consort and the Prince of Wales had accompanied him to Spithead. The Prince of Wales had shortly afterwards received the rank of colonel in the army and had been invested with the Garter. Mr. Gibbs, his former tutor, had retired, and Colonel Bruce, the brother of Lord Elgin, had become his governor, and with Major Teesdale had accompanied him on a visit to the princess royal, and there produced a remarkable impression by his singular tact and unaffected manner. "All that a parent's heart could desire," the Prince Regent (the present Emperor of Germany) wrote to Prince Albert. His royal highness had returned to London, and resumed some of his studies, among the pleasiest of which, we may think, were a series of lectures on history by Charles Kingsley, who had been appointed one of her majesty's chaplains, mainly in consequence of the great admiration of Prince Albert for his books, especially *Two Years Ago* and *The Saint's Tragedy*. By the end of 1858 Prince Alfred was at Malta, and we afterwards hear of him at Tunis and Algiers, and in Greece, especially at Corfu. The Prince of Wales was then starting for Italy, and his route was not at

first changed because of approaching events. In February, 1859, he was in Rome, and, after some stay, extended his tour to the south of Spain and Lisbon, where he remained till June, when he was to return to Edinburgh to resume his regular studies, and afterwards to go to Oxford. On the 3d of September Prince Albert wrote to Stockmar from Balmoral:

“In Edinburgh I had an educational conference with all the persons who are taking part in the education of the Prince of Wales. They all speak highly of him, and he seems to have shown zeal and good-will. Dr. Lyon Playfair is giving him lectures on chemistry in relation to manufactures, and at the close of each special course he visits the appropriate manufactory with him, so as to explain its practical application. Dr. Schmitz (the Rector of the High School of Edinburgh, a German) gives him lectures on Roman history. Italian, German, and French are advanced at the same time; and three times a week the prince exercises with the 16th Hussars, who are stationed in the city.

“Mr. Fisher, who is to be the tutor for Oxford, was also in Holyrood. Law and history are the subjects on which he is to prepare the prince.”

His royal highness entered on his Oxford career soon afterwards, and was to be in residence for nine months, an arrangement having been made that before he again returned permanently to town, to take possession of Marlborough House, which had been prepared for him, the new museum in the park should be opened by the queen and commemoration should be held in the same week.

Marlborough House had been adapted to the purpose of a picture gallery, containing the Vernon and Turner collection of paintings, and as it was now to become the residence of the Prince of Wales, the collection was removed to the South Kensington Museum, which already contained the “*Sheepshanks*” collection. The new portion, which was twice the breadth of that just mentioned, was built in six weeks at a cost of £3000, and consisted of brick, with fire-proof floors, and the whole structure, planned with a view of holding more or less permanent art and industrial exhibi-

tions, was promoted by Prince Albert, and its completion greatly accelerated by the active interest he manifested in it, and the assistance given to the enterprise by Mr. Henry Cole, who had taken a prominent part in the Great Exhibition of 1851. So great had been the success of that undertaking, that the Society of Arts had already proposed to commence arrangements for organizing another such display in 1861, and Prince Albert was solicited to take part with the former commission in carrying out the necessary provisions. It is not surprising that he shrank from it a little, but he did not refuse, though he was in precarious health, and the number and importance of his engagements scarcely left him time for necessary rest and little or none for general recreation.

As we have noted, he had taken an immediate personal interest in the organization of the Volunteer force, and when the government decided to authorize the formation of rifle corps, as well as of artillery corps and companies in maritime towns with forts and batteries, the prince applied himself to the study of the means of organizing these bodies in such a way as to make them a permanent means of defence, on which the country might confidently rely upon an emergency. The results were embodied by him in an elaborate series of “Instructions to Lord-lieutenants,” which he sent to General Peel, as secretary of war, on the 20th of May, 1859. It was by him found to be so complete, that he submitted it three days afterwards to the cabinet, by whom it was adopted, and ordered to be issued forthwith. Accordingly it was printed and sent out to the lord-lieutenants throughout the kingdom next day (25th May), and formed the code for the organization and working of these volunteer corps.

But at the end of the year he was again engaged in the promotion of scientific and social progress. The meeting of the British Association for the Promotion of Science had invited him to preside at their meeting, which was to be held at Aberdeen on the 14th of September; and to be president involved the delivery of an address. The task was no light one, especially to a fastidious speaker who had

only a general knowledge of science in relation to its aims and objects, but he was just the kind of speaker they needed.

During his visit to the Association meeting the prince stayed at the house of Mr. Thomson of Banchory, about five miles from Aberdeen. Here he was met at dinner on the 14th by the Duke of Richmond, Lord Rosse, Sir David and Lady Brewster, General and Mrs. Sabine, Sir Roderick Murchison, Professor Owen, Professor Phillips, and others. After dinner the whole party drove to Aberdeen, where the prince delivered his inaugural address to an audience of 2500 people. It occupied fifty minutes in delivery, and was confined to general principles, and a comprehensive statement of the main object of the Association in advancing the arrangement and classification of what the prince called "the universe of knowledge." The address had peculiar interest for men of science, because of the keen sympathy which it showed with their pursuits, and for what it did in quickening the interest of both the public and the government in scientific research.

He referred with remarkable appropriateness to the recent death of the great naturalist Von Humboldt, and reminded his hearers that the day on which they had met was the anniversary of the birthday of that distinguished man. His address concluded with some striking remarks on the advantages and the true signification of such assemblies as that at which the Association had invited him to preside:—

"These meetings draw forth the philosopher from the hidden recesses of his study, call in the wanderer over the field of science to meet his brethren, to lay before them the results of his labours, to set forth the deductions at which he has arrived, to ask for their examination, to maintain in the combat of debate the truth of his positions and the accuracy of his observations. These meetings, unlike those of any other society, throw open the arena to the cultivators of all sciences to their mutual advantage: the geologist learns from the chemist that there are problems for which he had no clue, but which that science can solve for him; the geographer receives

light from the naturalist, the astronomer from the physicist and engineer, and so on. And all find a field upon which to meet the public at large,—invite them to listen to their reports, and even to take part in their discussions,—show to them that philosophers are not vain theorists, but essentially men of practice—not conceited pedants, wrapt up in their own mysterious importance, but humble inquirers after truth, proud only of what they may have achieved or won for the general use of man. Neither are they daring and presumptuous unbelievers—a character which ignorance has sometimes affixed to them—who would, like the Titans, storm heaven by placing mountain upon mountain, till hurled down from the height attained by the terrible thunders of outraged Jove; but rather the pious pilgrims to the Holy Land, who toil on in search of the sacred shrine, in search of truth—God's truth—God's laws as manifested in His works, in His creation."

Unhappily inventions for the promotion of human welfare, however, had not alone engaged the attention of scientific men. Unless from the point of view, that the more destructive war can be made, the greater is the probability of nations declining its deadly arbitration, the "improvements" made in weapons at about the period of which we are speaking can scarcely be regarded as an addition to beneficent progress. There were many ingenious contrivances in rifles, of which the Martini-Henry and the Schneider were the outcome; bayonets and revolvers underwent sundry changes, and there was much contention on the subject of the superior rapidity and accuracy of firing of one or other of the "arms of precision" which then engaged attention. Of course in artillery there was an enormous accession of calibre as well as perfection of aim and of destructive power, and among these the Armstrong gun, invented and manufactured by Sir William Armstrong, the famous military and naval engineer, held the foremost place. It was found to be a gun built up in separate pieces of wrought iron, a method that secured the substance from flaw, and ensured great strength, lightness, and durability. The guns were to be built as

pounders, 70-pounders, and 100-pounders; and at a distance of 600 yards, an object of the size of the crown of a hat could be hit at almost every shot. At 3000 yards a target 9 feet square, which at that distance appears a mere speck, was struck five times out of ten. A ship could of course be struck at a much larger distance, and either shot or shell could be thrown into a fortress five miles off.

It was evident that ships armed with these guns would destroy each other if they continued to be made of timber. Therefore the "Armstrong gun" was supposed to be invaluable for fortresses and defences against invasion, but useless for ships opposing each other and equally armed. The "wooden walls," it was believed, could not stand against the tremendous artillery, and the inference was that to resist it they would have to be put in armour; the Armstrong gun was the forerunner of the armour-plated ship. There were, of course, other inventions, of which the *Winans*, or cigar-shaped steamship with propeller amidships, and intended to make the voyage across the Atlantic in four days, was one of the most remarkable, though it did not fulfil the expectations of its inventors. It is manifestly impossible to do more than indicate that in every branch of manufacture where machinery was employed, as well as in engines of warfare, the implements of civilization, and the means of intercommunication, ingenuity had been stimulated, and the investigations of thoughtful and patient scholars and experimentalists had produced marvellous results.

We shall presently have to return to some evidences of the great social progress made at this period as evidenced by various remarkable inventions and discoveries, but we may here mention one of the "wonders" of the time, which, though it was far from being a surprising success, became associated with the initiation of one of the most amazing achievements known to mankind. The *Great Eastern* steamship was an experiment of which bigness was the chief attraction, and it might almost have ceased to be remembered but for the fact that it was afterwards used to convey those submarine cables which were to be the

mediums of flashing instant intelligence round the world.

There had been a monster steamship launched in 1843, the largest ever built up to that date, named the *Great Britain*. Her length of keel was 289 feet, her main breadth above 50 feet; the depth of her hold more than 32 feet, and her tonnage 3444 tons. Her commander, Captain Hoskins, received the queen on board, and her majesty wished him success on his voyage across the Atlantic. It was a magnificent vessel, and could run, under favourable circumstances, at a speed of nearly sixteen statute miles an hour.

This was a decided success, but many persons who were believed to be competent judges declared that there was no advantage in enormous ships, and that the *Great Britain* represented the limit beyond which it would be difficult to ensure safety or convenience. This, however, did not prevent the enterprise of construction in 1856-1858, of the *Great Eastern*, a vessel of much vaster proportions, and of which the chief dining saloon, occupying only a portion of the poop, was 120 feet long, 47 feet wide, and 9 feet high under the beams. The main shaft of the paddle engines weighed 40 tons, the rudder 13 tons. The appointments were to be luxurious, including hot and cold baths, with fresh as well as sea water, handsomely furnished cabins, and arrangements for the complete comfort of a large number of passengers of each class. It was computed that the vessel would run at the lowest estimate 17 or 18 miles an hour—about the speed of a parliamentary train, and great expectations were formed of the advantage of possessing two or three such vessels to be used in case of war, as troop-ships, by which an army of 30,000 men might be transported to any part of Europe in ten days. Of course the exponents of this view had not sufficiently considered the consequences of such a leviathan filled with troops being intercepted by smaller ships of war, nor had the difficulties of navigating a vessel of that size at points where troops could be readily disembarked been computed. The *Great Eastern* was, so to speak, an expensive toy. The company originally interested in the construction had to go into "liquida-

tion," and a "Great Ship Company" was formed for purchasing and completing the vessel, £300,000, including the subscriptions of the old shareholders in the Eastern Steam Company, being subscribed to purchase and finish the ship and to provide working capital. The ship was completed, and it was a truly magnificent example of what could be accomplished by the skill of the engineer and the naval architect. The names of Mr. Brunel and Mr. Scott Russell were everywhere mentioned in terms of admiration, the latter having been the originator of the idea of constructing a vessel of such magnitude. Early in August, 1859, the completion of the vast undertaking was celebrated by a banquet on board, when a large number of distinguished visitors were present, and Lord Stanley presided. The ship was then ready for her eastern voyage, and the whole arrangements were such as would satisfy the expectations even of those passengers to the East who demanded luxurious surroundings. The larger berths were handsome rooms for parties of four or five persons, the smaller berths were commodious cabins, the chief saloons were elegant and spacious apartments, the main saloon a sumptuous and magnificent hall. The ice-house held above 100 tons of ice, the wine-cellar a wine merchant's stock. In every detail of the machinery and rigging the utmost thought and care had been exercised, and the innumerable contrivances for dealing with enormous masses of machinery and working gear were more wonderful even than the enormous bulk and extent of the floating city, with its fleet of twenty boats of the size of sailing cutters hanging to the davits at the sides. Both paddle and screw engines were used for propelling this vast edifice through the water; the paddle engines of 3000 horse-power, the screws from 4000 to 6000 horse-power; the average consumption of coal when both engines were at work was estimated at 250 tons a day.

The initiatory experiences of the *Great Eastern* were not altogether encouraging. On her trial trip to Portland she had only arrived off Hastings, when, through some negligence, the explosion of a jacket or casing for heating the water before it entered the boilers had a

terrific effect, blowing up the centre of the ship and tearing away the enormous funnel of eight tons weight, and along with it the decks, cabins, and steam-gearing. The furnace doors were burst open, and a number of firemen killed or seriously injured. Captain Harrison and the officers showed prompt courage and mastery of the accident, and many of the passengers were also of great service in attending to the wounded or scalded men. The vessel did not discontinue her course, and arrived at Portland the next morning. Captain Harrison was four months afterwards drowned in Southampton Water by the capsizing of a small boat, in which he was being rowed to the town. A sudden squall took the boat, and the intense cold (it was in January, 1860) was supposed to have caused the death of the captain by bringing on a fit of apoplexy when he was submerged. The coxswain and the son of the purser also perished. The *Great Eastern* subsequently made a successful voyage to the United States, reaching New York in ten days and a half. She was received with great enthusiasm, and made the return run from New York to Halifax in forty-six hours, the shortest time then on record. Her speed during the whole voyage averaged fourteen knots an hour. She afterwards left the Mersey to convey about 3300 troops to Canada, where, being caught in a storm about 280 miles west of Cape Clear, she was so damaged that she had to put back to Kinsale. The experiments made with this "Leviathan" seemed to show, that while she was not likely to become a profitable investment as a passenger vessel, which could only make a paying voyage by conveying an altogether unusual number of persons at one time, she was too unwieldy and too much exposed to accident either for a passenger or a troop ship to run in all weathers and for any voyage.

It will be seen, however, that the possibility of constructing such a vessel complete in all its parts, and including so many remarkable inventions and contrivances, showed an extraordinary advance in practical and mechanical science. In another direction, too, there had been an equally astonishing application of recent discoveries. Communication by means

of electric telegraphy had, as we have seen, become possible not only between distant points of the same mainland, but between countries separated by seas and rivers. We were already in constant communication with the Continent of Europe, and it was being urged that the telegraph lines should be brought to us direct from India, that we might not derive our intelligence from our Indian possessions through foreign channels. The prospect of establishing a great length of submarine cable between England and the United States had not been very cheering; but that was not unnaturally regarded as a supreme test, and discoveries were being perfected which might eventually enable us to redeem the first failure. It was during the visit of the queen to Cherbourg in 1858 that two vessels, the *Agamemnon* and the *Niagara*, had gone out in unfavourable weather, and laid an electric cable at the bottom of the Atlantic. Messages of congratulation had passed between her Majesty and the President of the United States, and between the Lord-mayor of London and the Mayor of New York. The jubilation was great on both sides. It was hoped that a vast scientific success had been achieved; and so it had, for the fact of having been able to send messages at all was a great step in advance; but the signals became fainter; the electric current apparently grew feeble, and at length ceased altogether, or was too weak to transmit any further signals. It was at first suspected that a portion of cable, temporarily laid down to make good the connection in the shallow water near the Irish coast, was weaker than the rest, and that there the fault would be discovered. This, however, proved not to be the case; the cause of the cessation of the current could not be detected, and the first great Atlantic cable was set down as a failure, and remained at the bottom of the ocean.

But science, or rather the patient indefatigable workers of science, can accept no failure; science to them is indeed the constant rectification of mistakes by repeated processes of experiment; and there was a man at work whose discoveries had already prepared the way to the ultimate success of the scheme.

It was not till 1866 that a second Atlantic


cable was taken out by the *Great Eastern* steamship, which had from that time found a vocation, and afterwards took out the French and the Suez cables with equal success; but this is the fitting time to introduce the name of the man who may be said to have come to the rescue. This was Mr. William Thomson, who, beside the highest academical titles conferred on him by the Oxford, Cambridge, Dublin, and Edinburgh universities, and by scientific associations, has received the honour of knighthood in recognition of his claims to public honour by the state.

It is not out of place to record here that submarine telegraphy owes its present degree of perfection, if not its practically useful existence, to the remarkable research and the inventions of Sir William Thomson, the professor of natural philosophy in the University of Glasgow. It would be difficult to name any subject of modern science with which this distinguished experimentalist has not been associated, but for some time his investigations were particularly directed to the various conditions affecting the transmission of electricity. His father, the late James Thomson, LL.D., who was lecturer on mathematics at the Royal Academical Institute at Belfast, was appointed to the mathematical professorship of the University of Glasgow, and Sir William, when he was only twenty-two years of age, was appointed professor of natural philosophy in the same university, where he had entered as a student in 1835 when he was only eleven years old, and—after completing his course of study—had left it for Cambridge, where he graduated as second wrangler, was immediately afterwards elected to a fellowship, and was appointed to his professorship in the following year, when he also accepted the editorship of the *Cambridge and Dublin Mathematical Journal*. It was during the time of his editorship (about seven years) that he published in its pages some remarkable papers on the mathematical theory of electricity, and these studies were followed by many valuable experiments on the electrodynamic properties of metals, his investigations being afterwards summarized in the "Bakerian" lecture which he delivered in 1855. But perhaps still more

important to the development of electric science and its numerous associations were his studies of atmospheric electricity, and the electrometers and other instruments of his invention, which have since remained in use, for determining and marking atmospheric conditions. From these it was but a step to the "mirror galvanometer" and the "siphon recorder," those delicate instruments which, because of their capability of being worked by a low power, have been so effectual in preserving submarine cables. It was by the ingenious application of these instruments that the Atlantic cable was at last successfully completed in 1866, on which occasion the inventor received the honour of knighthood, and was presented with the freedom of the city of Glasgow. This was in 1866; but his name is naturally associated with the first mention of the great advance made, not only in the science of practical magnetism and electricity, at the period which we are now considering, but also in any record of the march of social progress. He had then, and has since, been a constant and indefatigable worker for the public advantage, and even the list of his writings and lectures would give but an imperfect idea of the ardour with which he patiently pursued experiments of which the world can know little except the results by which it is benefited.

The generally prosperous condition of the country at the end of the year 1859 enabled Mr. Gladstone and his colleagues to look forward with some confidence to a favourable financial statement in the coming session. There were still many proposals for measures of financial reform, and an association which had been organized at Liverpool drew public attention to the increase of taxation which had taken place during a few years. To this it was answered that the increase of taxation was less rapid than the increase of population, and that while at the beginning of the present century the taxation of the country had represented 43s. per head, in the year 1858 it was only 41s. 2d. per head, while in 1851 it had fallen as low as 39s. per head. It was also argued that the increase of wealth had during the same period gone on much more rapidly than the increase of taxation. The

proportion which the taxation of the country bore to its wealth was only half that of the year 1803, and four-fifths of what it was in 1845, and this notwithstanding the large expenditure for national defences. The cost of collecting the revenue was said to be excessive. It was stated that to collect the £69,207,000 of estimated revenue it would cost very nearly £7½ per cent, and the Financial Association computed it at a still higher figure; but the cost was alleged to be lower in England than in France or America, and also to be placed at a higher rate than it really was, because it included the payment for a large number of extraneous services, such as the collection of statistics and of light duties, the working of the merchants' shipping act, and the cost of bonding and warehousing incurred for the benefit of the merchant. When these various items were deducted it would be found that the actual cost of collecting would probably not exceed £3 per cent, and if certain remaining protective duties were abolished, the amount would undergo further considerable reduction. Still it was contended that the cost of collection was excessive, and that a saving of at least two millions might be effected. This was before Mr. Cobden had fulfilled his mission to France, and Mr. Bright, at a meeting of the association on the 1st of December, 1859, proposed a scheme for a financial reform which would, it was contended, repeal those taxes that pressed unduly on the larger portion of the community, and on persons with precarious incomes, and substitute for them taxes on property which produced a fixed and comparatively certain income. This would involve the abolition of the existing income-tax, assessed taxes (except the house duty), the tax on marine assurances and fire assurances, and the excise duty on paper. All duties on the customs' tariff were to be struck off except those on foreign wines, which were to be reduced from five and sixpence to one shilling a gallon, and the duties on foreign spirits and tobacco. These remissions, it was calculated, would reduce the revenue by upwards of £26,000,000, and he proposed to cover this enormous deficiency by a tax of eight shillings per cent on the income



SIR WILLIAM THOMSON, LL.D. D.C.L.
PROFESSOR OF NATURAL PHILOSOPHY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW

of all persons whose property was above £100, which according to the estimate based on parliamentary returns would, he said, yield a revenue of about £27,000,000, and thus more than cover the deficiency caused by the proposed reductions.

Such a scheme of course excited considerable attention, and though this is not the place to consider its merits or demerits, it could scarcely have been passed by without notice, as illustrating the extent to which financial questions were then being discussed.

Before parliament met in 1860 Mr. Cobden's mission had been fulfilled, and the approaching financial statement of the chancellor of the exchequer was looked forward to with no little interest, and with some anxiety, for it was known that the commercial condition of the country—notwithstanding some disturbances, one of the principal of which was a long and obstinate strike of the workmen employed in the building trades—was such as to warrant a wide and comprehensive scheme. In these respects Mr. Gladstone was not likely to disappoint the public expectation. For two or three days the financial statement had to be postponed, because of a temporary illness from which he was suffering; but on the 10th of February he walked into the house without any apparent traces of his recent indisposition. Every seat was occupied, every avenue crowded, and he was received with cheering from all parts of the house, after which every sound was hushed, and the whole assembly listened with almost breathless attention, for it was known that the revenue from customs, excise, assessed taxes, and the post-office had surpassed that of any previous year by £2,023,000; that the imports and exports had increased also beyond those of any other period, amounting to nearly £335,000,000; that pauperism had diminished, wages were high, employment plentiful, the funds steady and at a good figure, the rate of discount low, and money abundant; and that the budget must derive peculiar importance from the changes which would result from the commercial treaty concluded with France. There was neither doubt nor hesitation in the manner

in which the chancellor of the exchequer introduced his financial scheme, nor in all that speech which included an elaborate statement did he once falter or fail to hold the deep interest of his audience in the lucid explanations which he put forth.

“Public expectation,” he said, “has long marked out the year 1860 as an important epoch in British finance. It has long been well known that in this year, for the first time, we were to receive from a process not of our own creation, a very great relief in respect of our annual payment of interest upon the national debt—a relief amounting to no less a sum than £2,146,000—a relief such as we never have known in time past, and such as, I am afraid, we shall never know in time to come. Besides that relief, other and more recent arrangements have added to the importance of this juncture. A revenue of nearly £12,000,000 a year, levied by duties on tea and sugar, which still retain a portion of the additions made to them on account of the Russian war, is about to lapse absolutely on the 31st of March, unless it shall be renewed by parliament. The Income-tax Act, from which during the financial year we shall have derived a sum of between £9,000,000 and £10,000,000, is likewise to lapse at the very same time, although an amount not inconsiderable will still remain to be collected in virtue of the law about to expire; and, lastly, an event of not less interest than any of these, which has caused public feeling to thrill from one end of the country to the other—I mean the treaty of commerce, which my noble friend the foreign minister has just laid on the table—has rendered it a matter of propriety, nay almost of absolute necessity, for the government to request the house to deviate under the peculiar circumstances of the case from its usual, its salutary, its constitutional practice of voting the principal charges of the year before they proceed to consider the means of defraying them, and has induced the government to think they would best fulfil their duty by inviting attention on the earliest possible day to those financial arrangements for the coming year which are materially affected by the treaty with France, and which, though

they reach considerably beyond the limits of that treaty, yet, notwithstanding, can only be examined by the house in a satisfactory manner when examined as a whole."

Mr. Gladstone went on to state that the financial results of the year, so far as the receipts were concerned, were eminently satisfactory. The total estimated revenue was £69,460,000; the actual amount produced was not less than £70,578,000. The expenditure had been £68,953,000. Under ordinary circumstances this amount would have left a surplus of £1,625,000; but there had been additional charges, arising out of the expedition to China, in the army of £900,000, and the navy £270,000. Then came the effect of the treaty with France, for which there was to be deducted from the customs £640,000. The total was £1,800,000, which would have placed the revenue on the wrong side of the account; but in a happy moment, Spain, "not under any peculiar pressure from us, but with a high sense of honour and duty," had paid a debt of £500,000, of which £250,000 would be available at once, so that a small surplus would still be left on the total revenue. With regard to the interest of the debt in the coming year, the estimated charge was £26,200,000, leaving £2,438,000, or more than the annuities which were about to lapse. The consolidated fund charges would be £2,000,000; the army, militia, and the charge for China would be £15,800,000; the navy and packet service, £13,900,000, or altogether £29,700,000, being an increase of more than £3,000,000 on the military estimates of the preceding session. The miscellaneous estimates were £3,500,000; the revenue departments, £4,700,000—the grand total being £70,100,000. Coming to the estimate of the year in perspective, Mr. Gladstone said that, taking the imports as they then stood, it was: Customs, £22,700,000; excise, £19,170,000; stamps, £8,000,000; taxes, £3,250,000; income-tax, £2,400,000; with the post-office the total being £60,700,000; thus leaving a deficit of £9,400,000, and this without any provision for £1,000,000 coming due on exchequer bonds. Even if the existing war duties on tea and sugar should be retained the deficit would still

be £7,300,000. This would require an income-tax of 9*d.* in the pound, there being no remission of taxation in the trade and commerce of the country; but the £9,400,000 would require an income-tax of 1*s.* in the pound. He knew that it might with justice be demanded of him, "What has become of the calculations of 1853?" His answer was, that in that year it was reckoned there would be gained by taxes then imposed between that and the present time a sum of £5,959,000, which was about the sum that the income-tax would have reached at 5*d.* in the pound in the present year. The succession duty had failed to produce what was expected; surpluses had been stopped by the intervention of war; and there was, moreover, the charge for additional debt incurred by the Russian war, which amounted to £2,920,000. The alteration in the spirit duties, however, had added £2,000,000 to the revenue; and the revenue generally had been so prosperous that if the expenditure had not rapidly increased the amount calculated in 1853 would have been realized. It was a constantly increasing expenditure which had destroyed the calculations of 1853.

The chancellor of the exchequer then brought forward statistics showing how much richer the country was than in 1842 and 1853. In the former year the annual income of the country was £154,000,000; in 1853 it had risen to £172,000,000; in 1857–58 it stood at £191,000,000, and in 1859–60 at £200,000,000. The increase had occurred in every class in the country, and in the agricultural class most of all. In 1842 the gross expenditure of the country was £68,500,000; in 1853 it was £71,500,000; in 1859–60 it was £87,697,000; these totals, including the local expenditure as well as that of the state properly so called, showing a gradual but large increase. The comparative growth of wealth and expenditure was therefore wholly unequal, and it showed the course which the country was pursuing—a course with which he was far from being satisfied. But there was a deficit of £9,400,000 to be met. He had shadowed out a budget by which, with an income-tax of 1*s.* in the pound, their object could be achieved, with a relief to the consumers of tea and

sugar to the extent of the remaining portions of the war duty; or, there was a more niggardly budget, which would keep up the duties on tea and sugar, yet still leave the country liable to an income-tax of not less than 9*d.* in the pound. It was his intention to apply in aid of the expenditure of the year a sum of not less than £1,400,000, which was no part of the proposed taxation of the year, but which would be obtained by rendering available another portion of the malt credit, and likewise the credit usually given on hops. The heavy income-tax which had been borne would not have been borne as it had been, but for the strength which the country had derived from the recent commercial legislation, and the confidence of the nation in the integrity and wisdom of Parliament.

Enforcing the duty of the government to take further steps in the direction of relieving trade and commerce from imposts in pursuance of the principles of free-trade, notwithstanding the difficulties which existed, Mr. Gladstone entered into calculations to show that remissions of taxation had always been accompanied by increase of revenue consequent on the increase of trade and commerce. He then announced that he did not propose to touch the taxes on tea or sugar, which would be renewed as they then stood for one year. "I now come," he continued, "to the question of the commercial treaty with France. And I will at once confidently recommend the adoption of the treaty to the committee as fulfilling and satisfying all the conditions of the most beneficial kind of change in our commercial legislation." The first points of the treaty were that France was to reduce the duties on coal and iron in 1860; on yarn, flax, and hemp early in 1861. On the 1st of October, 1861, the duties would be reduced or prohibition removed from all British articles, so that no duty should be higher than 30 per cent *ad valorem*, all the staple manufactures of Britain being included. In three years afterwards the maximum duty was to be 25 per cent *ad valorem*. England, on her part, engaged herself immediately and totally to abolish all duty on all manufactured goods from France, to reduce the duty on brandy

from 15*s.* to the level of the colonial duty of 8*s.* 2*d.* per gallon; and that on foreign wine (not merely French) from nearly 5*s.* 10*d.* a gallon to 3*s.* per gallon, and in 1861 still further, in reference to the strength of the wine—the lowest duty being 1*s.* per gallon; the charge on French articles liable to excise duty in England to be the same as the English duty. The treaty was to be in force for ten years. Mr. Gladstone denied the charge of subserviency to France brought against the treaty, and said that he was aware it would be held to bear a political character. He pointed out that this was not alone an union of the governments, but that it was hoped it would be an union of the nations themselves, and that their being in harmony would be a conclusive proof that neither of them could be engaged in meditating anything dangerous to the peace of Europe. He next combated the objection which then existed, and has never ceased to have some force, that a commercial treaty is an abandonment of the principles of free-trade. That would be so in one sense if it involved the recognition of exclusive privileges. This particular treaty was an abandonment of the principle of protection. He was not aware of any entangling engagement which it contained; and it certainly contained no exclusive privilege. He hoped it would be a means, "tolerably complete and efficacious, of sweeping from the statute-book the chief among such relics of that miscalled system of protection as still remain upon it. The fact is—and you will presently see how truly it is so—that our old friend protection, who used formerly to dwell in the palaces and the high places of the land, and who was dislodged from them some ten or fifteen years ago, has, since that period, still found pretty comfortable shelter and good living in holes and corners; and you are now invited, if you will have the goodness to concur in the operation, to see whether you cannot likewise eject him from those holes and corners." Dwelling upon the effects of the treaty, Mr. Gladstone said that the reduction on wine would cause a loss in revenue of £515,000, on brandy of £225,000, on manufactured goods of £440,000—making a total of £1,180,000. He main-

tained that these were not revenue duties, but were all protective duties. Statistics were quoted to show that it was desirable to make such a bargain with France as would allow of the interchange of manufactures and commodities, which was already important, and which must largely increase when France was induced to break down her prohibitory system. That which had been done would have been good for this country if France had done nothing; it was better for us in proportion as France did something. One result of the high duty on French brandy, for example, was the manufacture of an unhappy production in the shape of a spirit called British brandy. As to wine, it was said to be the rich man's luxury, and tea the poor man's luxury; but in 1760 tea was the rich man's luxury, and sold at 20s. a pound; and by reducing the duty you might make wine the poor man's luxury. In fact the existing duties were not merely protective but prohibitory, and there was a pressure with regard to that article which, apart from any treaty with France, would compel a dealing with the wine duties. The consumption of foreign wines in this country had greatly increased—by at least 168,000 gallons in the last year; and concurrent with that there had been a large consumption of colonial wines and even of British wines. This showed a great demand for wine, and there was reason to believe that a greater production of wines, fitted for the English market and middle and lower classes of this country, could be effected. The idea that under no possible circumstances could Englishmen like French wines ought to be exploded, there being, in fact, a great taste in England for those wines; but it was stifled by prohibitory duties, which generated a mass of evils in the shape of fraud and adulteration. The alteration in the tariff with France would tend greatly to facilitate personal intercourse with the Continent, by enabling the customs authorities to withdraw the greater part of the annoying restraints now existing on the rapid transit of passengers and their baggage.

But Mr. Gladstone had now to speak of Cobden's exertions, and in felicitous words and with ardent feeling he said: "I cannot

pass from the subject of the French treaty without paying a tribute of respect to two persons, at least, who have been the main authors of it. I am bound to bear this witness, at any rate, with regard to the Emperor of the French: that he has given the most unequivocal proofs of sincerity and earnestness in the progress of this great work, a work which he has prosecuted with clear-sighted resolution, not, doubtless, for British purposes, but in the spirit of enlightened patriotism, with a view to commercial reforms at home, and to the advantage and happiness of his own people by means of those reforms. With regard to Mr. Cobden, speaking as I do at a time when every angry passion has passed away, I cannot help expressing our obligations to him for the labour he has, at no small personal sacrifice, bestowed upon a measure which he—not the least among the apostles of free-trade—believes to be one of the most memorable triumphs free-trade has ever achieved. Rare is the privilege of any man who, having fourteen years ago rendered to his country one signal and splendid service, now again, within the same brief span of life, decorated neither by rank nor title, bearing no mark to distinguish him from the people whom he loves, has been permitted again to perform a great and memorable service to his sovereign and to his country."

Mr. Gladstone then proceeded to explain his supplemental measure of customs reform. He had asked the committee, he said, to sacrifice £1,190,000 of the existing revenue in order to effect a relief to the consumer of £1,737,000 by giving effect to the provisions of the treaty with France. That treaty would bring about a sensible reform in the customs establishments of the country; at the same time, it would not effect a reform which would, of itself, have any pretensions to a character of completeness, and there were many other duties still remaining on the tariff of a description which called for the attention of parliament, and by the reduction or removal of which immense advantage might be conferred upon the nation. It was proposed to reduce custom duties, in addition to those named, to the extent of £910,100, but

to supply that sum by other impositions on trade. The duties to be abolished were those on butter, tallow, cheese, oranges and lemons, eggs, &c., which amounted to £380,000 a-year. There were to be reductions of duties on timber, currants, raisins, figs, and hops, making together £658,000; the total reduction being £1,039,000. An extension of penny taxation would be resorted to, in order to compensate this loss, and by this means £982,000 would be restored to the general revenue. The loss to the revenue by the French treaty and reduction of duties he estimated at £2,146,000, but of this sum half was redeemed by the imposts specified.

The chancellor of the exchequer next announced that he proposed the abolition of the excise duty on paper. And this proposition served in some degree to mark the changes which had taken place, not only in his views, but in the current periodical literature. Besides, the duty had been condemned by the House of Commons. It operated most oppressively on the common sorts of paper, and tended to restrict the circulation of cheap literature. By taking off the duty it was contended that the house would promote rural labour, and so produce a beneficial effect on the poor-rates of the various districts. He therefore proposed that the paper duty should be abolished from the 1st of July, allowing the usual drawback to those who had stocks on hand. It was also proposed to abolish the impressed stamp on newspapers. With this announcement he had reached the end of the remissions it was proposed to make. But he still had to refer to some articles which were connected with the departments of excise and taxes. With regard to hops, the system of credits would be altered. It was proposed to remove the prohibition on malt, and to fix a duty on it of 3s. a bushel. The alterations and reductions he had proposed would give a total relief to the consumer of £3,931,000, and cause a net loss to the revenue of £2,108,000, a sum about equivalent to the amount falling in from the cessation of government annuities that year. The number of articles which would remain on the customs tariff would be forty-eight, and in the following year forty-

four—spirits, tea, tobacco, sugar, wine, coffee, corn, currants, and timber being the principal—only fifteen of the whole being retained for purposes of revenue. He expected to obtain £1,400,000 by taking up the malt and hop duties within the year. Mr. Gladstone then came to the last of the chief points of his budget. There was no liberty of choice but to retain the income-tax. He consequently proposed that, in order to supply the remainder of the deficit of £9,400,000, the tax should be renewed at the rate of 10*d.* in the pound on incomes of upwards of £150 a year, and at 7*d.* below that sum; the tax to be taken for one year only, three-quarters of the year's rate to be collected within the year, which would give a sum of £8,472,000. This would bring the total income up to £70,564,000. The total charge was £70,100,000; and thus they remained with an apparent or estimated surplus of £464,000.

“Our proposals,” said Mr. Gladstone, in concluding his statement, “involve a great reform in our tariff; they involve a large remission of taxation, and last of all, though not least, they include that commercial treaty with France which, though we have to apprehend that objections in some quarters will be taken to it, we confidently recommend, not only on moral, and social, and political, but also, and with equal confidence, on economical and fiscal grounds. . . . There were times, now long by, when sovereigns made progress through the land, and when, at the proclamation of their heralds, they caused to be scattered whole showers of coin among the people who thronged upon their steps. That may have been a goodly spectacle; but it is also a goodly spectacle, and one adapted to the altered spirit and circumstances of our times, when our sovereign is enabled, through the wisdom of our great council, assembled in parliament around her, again to scatter blessings among her subjects by means of wise and prudent laws; of laws which do not sap in any respect the foundations of duty or of manhood, but which strike away the shackles from the arm of industry, which give new incentives and new rewards to toil, and which win more and more for the throne and for the institutions of the

country the gratitude, the confidence, and the love of an united people. Let me say, even to those who are anxious, and justly anxious, on the subject of our national defences, that that which stirs the flame of patriotism in men, that which binds them in one heart and soul, that which gives them increased confidence in their rulers, that which makes them feel and know that they are treated with justice, and that we who represent them are labouring incessantly and earnestly for their good—is in itself no small, no feeble, and no transitory part of national defence. We recommend these proposals to your impartial and searching inquiry. We do not presume, indeed, to make a claim on your acknowledgments; but neither do we desire to draw on your unrequited confidence, nor to lodge an appeal to your com-

passion. We ask for nothing more than your dispassionate judgment, and for nothing less; we know that our plan will receive that justice at your hands; and we confidently anticipate on its behalf the approval alike of the parliament and the nation.”

We can do no more than give the actual outline of this great financial scheme—and even had the speech itself, with all its fulness of detail, its remarkable illustrations, and its wealth of suggestion, been printed in these pages, the reader would not—could not realize the tone, the voice, the manner, which, added to a masterly dealing with the subject, enchained the house for four hours, during which neither they nor the orator exhibited weariness or exhaustion. The budget speech of 1860 soon became historical.

END OF VOL. III.

NOTICE.—THE SALE OF VERE FOSTER'S COPY-BOOKS IS NOW GREATER THAN AT ANY PREVIOUS PERIOD OF THEIR HISTORY, AND IS INCREASING.

VERE FOSTER'S WRITING COPY BOOKS

MESSRS. BLACKIE & SON desire to draw attention to the following important testimony to the great excellence and utility of VERE FOSTER'S well-known series of WRITING-BOOKS.

From a letter addressed to the Publishers by the Rev. J. RICHARDSON, Superintendent of the Normal School (in connection with the London Missionary Society), in Antanarivo, capital of the island of Madagascar.

“For the last eight years I have had charge of the Normal School at Antanarivo, in connection with the London Missionary Society. The students are young men or lads, who, after a competitive examination, are received for three years' training. Our numbers range from 100 to 140, and in addition there is a practising school of from 200 to 300 scholars.

“My attention was accidentally called to Vere Foster's Copy-books some years ago; I was much struck with the philosophical gradations of the books, and I began some experiments on a small scale. I was so pleased with the results that, when we got into our new building, I determined to experiment on a larger scale.

“I took 50 new students, I got some copy-books, or rather exercise books, ruled on Vere Foster's plan; and I began by copies on the black board (assisted by his cardboard examples) to make every one of the lads strictly adhere to his principles. I left another senior class of almost equal numbers to follow out the usual methods in use. I made the two classes spend exactly the same time in writing exercises. And at the end of the year, on comparing the writing of the two classes, the one taught on Vere Foster's principles, although two years the junior of those taught on other principles, was immeasurably in advance, both as regards form, regularity, legibility, and rapidity.

“As a consequence, I have adopted his system both in the training and practising departments, and on no consideration could I be persuaded to change. I am sure that if British teachers would only give Vere Foster's method a fair trial, it would be adopted as the only method of teaching writing in schools.”

**Opinions of H.M. Inspectors of Schools. Extracted from the Reports
printed in the Education Blue Books.**

- | | | |
|--|---|--|
| <i>Mr. McCallum,</i>
<i>H.M. Inspector,</i>
<i>says—</i> | { | <p>“More rapid progress is made by Vere Foster’s than by any other method which has come under my notice.”</p> |
| <i>Mr. Brewer,</i>
<i>H.M. Inspector,</i>
<i>says—</i> | { | <p>“With books like Vere Foster’s, and the exercise of ordinary care in supervision during the writing lessons, there is no excuse for the slovenly no-style of writing too often presented to me.”</p> |
| <i>Mr. Warburton,</i>
<i>H.M. Inspector,</i>
<i>says—</i> | { | <p>“I wish that the use of the excellent copy-books such as Vere Foster’s was begun earlier and more persisted in.”</p> |
| <i>Mr. Newell,</i>
<i>H.M. Inspector,</i>
<i>says—</i> | { | <p>“I know no series by means of which children can be so quickly taught to write with freedom and legibility.”</p> |
| <i>Rev. J. Lomax,</i>
<i>H.M. Inspector,</i>
<i>says—</i> | { | <p>“The introduction of Vere Foster’s Copy-books in some of my schools has been attended with marked success.”</p> |
| <i>Mr. Carrol,</i>
<i>H.M. Inspector,</i>
<i>says—</i> | { | <p>“Writing.—Mr. Vere Foster’s Copy-books continue to give a great impetus to this subject.”</p> |
| <i>Dr. Patterton,</i>
<i>H.M. Inspector,</i>
<i>says—</i> | { | <p>“The writing, especially of the junior classes, has much improved. Vere Foster’s excellent Copy-books are used in nearly all the schools, and have greatly conduced to this result.”</p> |
| <i>Mr. McMillan,</i>
<i>H.M. Inspector,</i>
<i>says—</i> | { | <p>“The writing of pupils above junior second class continues to improve. The comparatively satisfactory state of this branch is largely owing to Mr. Foster’s Copy-books.”</p> |
| <i>Mr. O’Hara,</i>
<i>H.M. Inspector,</i>
<i>says—</i> | { | <p>“Mr. Foster’s Copy-books are in use in every school in the district. I concur with the teachers in thinking them much superior to the other copy-books on the Board’s list of school requisites.”</p> |
| <i>Mr. Irving,</i>
<i>H.M. Inspector,</i>
<i>says—</i> | { | <p>“I consider Vere Foster’s Copy-books well adapted for successful teaching when used according to their numbers—that is, beginning with No. 1 and going regularly over the set.”</p> |
| <i>Mr. Bole,</i>
<i>H.M. Inspector,</i>
<i>says—</i> | { | <p>“Very marked improvement in penmanship is visible from year to year. This is largely owing to the introduction of the excellent set of Vere Foster’s Copy-books.”</p> |
| <i>Mr. Fitzgerald,</i>
<i>H.M. Inspector,</i>
<i>says—</i> | { | <p>“In no branch does the proficiency of the pupils appear to be increasing so steadily as in penmanship, and this gratifying result is, I apprehend, attributable to the general employment of the Vere Foster Series of Copy-books.”</p> |
| <i>Mr. Hanlon,</i>
<i>H.M. Inspector,</i>
<i>says—</i> | { | <p>“The comparatively satisfactory state of this subject (Writing) is principally owing to the use of the excellent Copy-books of Mr. Foster.”</p> |
| <i>Mr. Cowley,</i>
<i>H.M. Inspector,</i>
<i>says—</i> | { | <p>“Writing is much better taught in this district than in any other of which I have had charge. This is due mainly to the influence of the Model School, in which the Vere Foster system has been taught with a success not even approached by any other school in the three kingdoms.”</p> |
| <i>Mr. Mahoney,</i>
<i>H.M. Inspector,</i>
<i>says—</i> | { | <p>“Penmanship has been considerably improved by Vere Foster’s examinations, and in an incredibly short space of time. Teaching it has now become a reality. In the lower classes improvement has been the most marked.”</p> |

* * * N.B.—Besides the above, Messrs. Blackie & Son have pleasure in stating that Vere Foster’s Writing Copy-books, as well as Drawing Books, have been highly spoken of by a number of H.M. Inspectors of Schools in their Annual Reports to the Education Department, though the Government had not sufficient space to print these Reports in the Blue Book.

*Adopted by the London, Liverpool, Manchester, and all important School Boards,
and by the National Board of Education in Ireland.*

Vere Foster's Writing Copy-Books.

Popular Edition, 1d.

Superior Edition, 2d.

The special features which preferentially distinguish Mr. Vere Foster's Writing Copy-Books are as follows:—

- (1) The more faithful imitation of natural writing.
- (2) The combination in the greatest possible degree of legibility with rapidity of execution. The formation of all the letters, and notably of the letters *a, d, g, q*, is adapted to this end.
- (3) The writing of each word continuously from end to end, with the sole exception of the letter *x*.
- (4) The exclusion of large hand, as unfit for small fingers.
- (5) The tailed letters of moderate length.
- (6) The up and down strokes of nearly equal thickness, as in the ordinary writing of both sexes, and as contradistinguished from the engraver's stiff thin up and thick down style.
- (7) The systematically progressive arrangement and variety of headlines—two lines on each page.
- (8) Traced lines under each copy, to be written over (in Book 1).
- (9) Guide lines to regulate the length of tailed letters (in Books 1½ to 6).
- (10) Analysis of Capitals. Showing how the stiff Printed Capitals become transformed into Running Hand.
- (11) The same clear style of writing for both sexes—*there being no reason why girls should be taught a cramped illegible hand.*
- (12) Careful and abundant selection of proverbs and aphorisms, maxims, morals, and precepts (in Books 3½ to 9).
- (13) Collection of over two hundred of the Christian names in most common use, affording scope for a great variety of elegant Capitals (in Book 7).
- (14) The most perfect collection yet published of Plain and Ornamental Lettering, comprising thirty-three different alphabets (in Book 10).

Contents of the Numbers.

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. Strokes, Easy Letters, Short Words. | 10. Plain and Ornamental Lettering. |
| 1½. Long Letters, Short Words, Figures. | 11. Exercise Book.—Wide Ruling, with Margin. |
| 2. Long Letters, Short Words, Figures. | 11½. Home Exercise Book.—Same as No. 11, but octavo size. Price 1d. |
| 2½. Words of Four, Five, or Six Letters. | 12. Exercise Book.—Ruled in Squares. |
| 3. Capitals, Short Words, Figures. | 12½. Home Exercise Book.—Same Ruling as No. 12, but octavo size. Price 1d. |
| 3½. Sentences of Short Words. | 13. Exercise Book.—Ruled for Book-keeping. |
| 4. Sentences, mostly composed of Short Words. | 14. Essay Book.—Ruled for Composition, &c. |
| 4½. Select Quotations from Shakspeare. | 15. Exercise Book for Beginners, ruled for Small Text. |
| 5, 6. Sentences.—Maxims, Morals, and Precepts. | X. Copy-Book Protector and Blotter. Keeping the Books clean. One Penny. |
| 5½. Sentences, in Writing of Three Sizes. | |
| 6½. Sentences, in Writing of Two Sizes. | |
| 7. Sentences and Christian Names. | |
| 8. Sentences.—One Line on each Page. | |
| 9. Sentences.—Two Lines on each Page. | |

* *National Competition in Writing and Drawing. Mr. Vere Foster's Scheme of Prizes for the present year will be sent post free on application to the Publishers.*

Adapted to the Recommendations of the Civil Service Commissioners.

PALMERSTON EDITION.

Vere Foster's Writing Copy-Books.

Price Threepence each Number.

These books have been designed by MR. VERE FOSTER, to carry out the principles of clear and legible handwriting, as laid down by the late LORD PALMERSTON FOR CIVIL SERVICE AND DIPLOMATIC CORRESPONDENCE, and also to afford a simple, rapid, and elegant style of writing for the Education Department in Ireland.

- (1.) The quality of paper is superior to that of any copy-books in this country.
- (2.) The printing is done in the most finished manner from the original engraved copperplates.
- (3.) All the books are ruled in blue and red, giving to them an air of neatness and effect, and thereby encouraging the pupil to tidiness and carefulness.
- (4.) The selection of sentences has been most carefully made, Mr. Vere Foster having devoted many years to the production of this set of copy headlines.

Contents of the Series.

1. Strokes, Easy Letters, Short Words.—(*Also showing the elements and combinations of all the small letters.*)
2. Short and Long Letters, Easy Words, Figures.—(*Showing the various combinations of short and long letters.*)
3. Capitals, Short Words, Figures.—(*Showing the various combinations of capitals and small letters.*)
4. Sentences of Short Words.—(*Proverbs and Axioms.*)
5. Easy Sentences.—(*Maxims, Morals, and Precepts.*)
6. Sentences.)
7. Sentences.) (*Wise Sayings, Quotations, Aphorisms, and Proverbs from many Lands.*)
8. Sentences.) (*All the Sentences differing in each book, and in progressively Small*
9. Sentences.) (*Writing, each word being written from beginning to end without lifting*
10. Sentences.) (*the pen.*)
11. Plain and Ornamental Lettering.—(*Extra Edition on Fine Drawing Paper.*)

VERE FOSTER'S Writing Charts for Class Teaching.

SHOWING THE SHAPES AND PROPORTIONS OF LETTERS AS ADOPTED IN
VERE FOSTER'S SERIES OF WRITING COPY-BOOKS.

Size, 25 × 20 inches.

Price in Sheets, 1s. per pair; Mounted on Millboard, 1s. 6d.

Vere Foster's Improved HAT Ink-Wells.

The "HAT" INK-WELL (stoneware) is suitable for either School Desk or Private Table. The advantages of this Ink-Well are as follows:—Having a broad rim it will fit into various sized holes *in* School-desks without falling through. Having a broad base it will stand steadily *on* desk or table. On account of its depth, and increasing width towards the base, it has a good hold in the desk so as not to be easily jerked out. It will economize ink, as it offers but little surface for its evaporation, or for the entrance of dust. It can be easily stopped with an ordinary cork. It is neat in appearance. It can be easily cleaned. It is very strong. It is very cheap. Price 1s. per dozen.

DA
550
A7
v3

THE LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
Santa Barbara
Goleta, California

THIS BOOK IS DUE ON THE LAST DATE
STAMPED BELOW.

AVAILABLE FOR
CIRCULATION AFTER
DISPLAY PERIOD

~~SEP 9 1967~~

U

~~FEB 6 1967~~

U

~~JUN 5 1967~~

N

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY



D 000 790 531 8

