

special
collections
DOUGLAS
Library



QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY
AT KINGSTON

KINGSTON ONTARIO CANADA

A Letter

TO

MR. BRIGHT

ON HIS

PLAN FOR TURNING THE ENGLISH MONARCHY
INTO A DEMOCRACY.

FROM

HENRY DRUMMOND.

Third Edition.

LONDON :

BOSWORTH AND HARRISON, 215 REGENT STREET.

1858.

HC911-1858 D78

LONDON:

Printed by G. BARCLAY, Castle St. Leicester Sq.

PREFACE TO SECOND EDITION.

ALL the copies of this Letter have been sold in the course of a fortnight, and a Second Edition affords an opportunity for making a few remarks upon its reception. It has been stated that the cheap newspapers, which are published for the lowest classes solely, must uphold the scheme of Democracy, because the major part of those classes think that they will free themselves from taxation, and throw the burden on an ideal body whom they call the Rich; for otherwise these newspapers would not sell. This they have done; they have also railed against the arrangement of the topics discussed. The arrangement is Mr. Bright's; the subjects have been taken up in the order in which he brought them forward, and his arrangement is correct. Some of the writers showed that they had not read the Letter they found it their interest to abuse; and others, that they did not understand what they read. All I have aimed at is, to recall to the remembrance of the reader first principles, leaving it to him to apply them for himself. But this is like putting men on an intellectual treadmill: principles in religion and politics are no longer known.

Men are carried away by declamation, because it does not force them to think ; and writers like those who get their bread by cheap newspapers have no refuge but in personal abuse. Cheap newspapers, like all cheap things, are bad : cheap wine is bad wine ; cheap beer is bad beer ; a cheap horse is a bad horse ; cheap newspapers are bad newspapers—bad paper, bad type, bad ink, bad information, and bad language.

Such is the clamour of rooks, daws, and kites,
Th' explosion of the levell'd tube excites,
 The screaming nations hov'ring in mid air
 Loudly resent the stranger's freedom there ;
 And seem to warn him never to repeat
 His bold intrusion on their dark retreat.

A LETTER,

§c. §c.

SIR,

You have made two able speeches at Birmingham. You have called editors of newspapers "the best possible public instructors," and have stated that the *Times* newspaper is more worth reading than Thucydides. Some of these "best public instructors" have said that the substance of your speeches is so flimsy that any disciple of Mr. Croker could easily blow it to atoms. Another "best possible public instructor" declares the principles you then announced are "political verities which cannot be too firmly riveted in the minds and hearts of the people." I think the speeches able; the principles detestable; the reasoning contemptible to those who are well-informed, but sufficiently plausible to deceive the multitude, as it evidently did the brass and iron politicians of Birmingham, and, on this account, should receive a reply.

I have stated in the House of Commons that you are the only man amongst the members there assuming to themselves the title of "advanced Liberals," who has sufficient sense to know where the measures he advocates are tending, or if he has, moral courage enough to avow it. I repeat the same statements here; I take your opinions from your own words, and I quote them as necessary to point out the key-note to which the Birmingham programme is attuned. You have been saying for the last ten years:—

"Governments must be embarrassed; they are put in office to be embarrassed, and it is our duty to embarrass them." Strange opinions for one who aspires to govern a state.

"We live in an age of agitation. I greatly approve of this state of things and rejoice at it. There has been no demonstration that any body within the limits of this island cares a straw for our glorious constitution in Church and State.

"But yet there is an agitation going on in the country—and more of it now than at any former period—an agitation by the people, and

“ for the people ; and not for the purpose merely of bringing into office
 “ certain men, that they may distribute patronage in a certain direction,
 “ but such a party, and only such a party, as that by which great
 “ and wise principles are being carried out in the legislation of the
 “ United Kingdom. The party that is really moving and going through
 “ the country is tending towards a peaceable, wise, and enduring De-
 “ mocracy. . . . I have no object in making these observations, but
 “ to show to the people that they have been deluded by the idea that
 “ they have a glorious—that is an excellent—constitution. The Con-
 “ stitution of this country, said to be of a King or Crown, Lords, and
 “ Commons, is, in fact, an imposture, an imposture which I take it to be
 “ a part of my duty to expose. John Foster, speaking of the British
 “ Constitution, speaks of it as that canted and extolled humbug. They
 “ tell us that we owe everything to this Constitution. Now I deny it
 “ altogether.”

The first passage in your first speech deserving of remark is that in which, in further illustration of the predominant idea of your political Utopia, you identify Reform with Democracy—you avow that by Reform you mean to place the power of governing in this country exclusively in the hands of the dregs of the people—*i. e.* in the hands of those who are by necessity, in all ages and in all countries, the most distressed, the most ignorant, the most improvident, and the most reckless class of the community.

“ We have now a Government under the chieftainship of Lord
 “ Derby, who, during his short term of office in 1852, stated, if I
 “ remember right, that one of the chief objects of his government
 “ would be to stem the *tide of Democracy*. Now it may be that Lord
 “ Derby has entirely changed his mind—that he is as much converted
 “ to Parliamentary *Reform* as Sir R. Peel in 1848 was converted to Corn-
 “ Law repeal.”

Here Reform and Democracy are used as synonymous and convertible terms. To be converted to Reform is to be converted to Democracy ; and I quite agree with you : Reform, therefore, means the rule of the mob. Now it is a sufficient answer to this to observe that such never was at any time the Constitution of England ; and, therefore, the word Reform is used as a mask, under the pretence of which the alleged desire to amend one thing is intended to establish another thing entirely different.

You next proceed to an attack on the House of Peers. Certainly it requires reform—that is, requires to have abuses put an end to which have crept into its practices. The first of these is, the Voting by Proxy. It was probably right at the time

when the Kings of England had large possessions in the west and south of France, that the great commanders there should have been allowed to give their opinions on important questions, although employed at a distance from home. It may still be right for the Governor-General of India, and of any other dependency, Ambassadors at Foreign Courts, Lord-Lieutenant and Lord-Chancellor of Ireland, and other peers holding high offices, to be allowed to give their votes when absent from home on the public service; but it is clearly wrong, and without a single extenuating circumstance, that idle peers, trifling their time in London, or only absent on their own pleasure, should be permitted to vote on questions in the discussion of which they have taken no part.

Another point requiring amendment is, the Criminal Jurisdiction of the House of Peers. This, also, should be taken from them, because the circumstances out of which that function arose have ceased. Your language and sentiments about the House of Peers are, however, that vulgar and low abuse which marks the real adulation of titled persons, and which is the characteristic of pot-house politicians; and it is curious to observe that the worship of titles is greater in this than in any other country, and equally pervades high and low. All, however, who can appreciate that talent in which you were taking pains at Birmingham to distinguish yourself, know that every great question is debated in the House of Lords with far greater ability than it is in the House of Commons. You know, for that style of eloquence which is commonly called "the power of debate," no man can be compared to Lord Derby. Many speeches of Lords Lyndhurst, Brougham, Lansdowne, Granville, Clarendon, Ellenborough, the Bishops of Exeter and Oxford, far exceed anything that has been heard of late years in the House of Commons, although I am not unmindful of yourself, or of Mr. Cobden, and, above all, of Mr. Gladstone. The speeches of Lords Mansfield, Harrowby, and Grey, at the time of the Reform Bill, are almost the only speeches now referred to.

The following is from one of "the best possible instructors," a great admirer of yours, and a political opponent of the present Government:—

"Whatever may be thought of Lord Derby in other respects, friend and foe must alike admit his pre-eminent powers as a speech-maker. "Nobody can select topics with a nicer tact, or comment on them with happier illustrations. No one commands in equal measure a flow of language which is at once dignified and unaffected, simple yet forcible, flexible yet sustained. Everything is touched, but nothing overdone; there is neither omission nor redundancy; the right things are said.

“and the best words used. It is a rare and happy gift. When the thing is done, it seems easy to do; but let any one try it, and he will soon learn the difference between the power of appreciation and the power of performance.”

Any one who is capable of appreciating the amount of labour and intellect displayed in the debates in the two Houses of Parliament will not hesitate to give the palm of pre-eminence to the House of Lords. Not only is every subject discussed with more dignity, but a larger extent of information on the subjects is displayed. The same superiority is also observed in the reports of the committees of the House of Lords.

In early times the Peers were necessarily possessed of great wealth, and were obliged to furnish sufficient numbers of their own retainers to defend the country. Since the army has been exclusively in the hands of the Sovereign, that burden has been taken from the Lords, and the consequence is, that Peers may sit and vote in Parliament who have no property at all. The evil of this was pointed out, and a remedy suggested, by Sir W. Temple about a hundred and fifty years ago; and, without limiting the power of the Crown to make Peers, a law should prohibit any Peer from acting in Parliament who could not prove himself possessed of a free income of a given amount. This is according to the English Constitution; for in old times every noble lost the privilege of *haute noblesse* if he had not property to support his dignity. The power of granting entails might then be wisely limited by law. Because the essential characteristic of the House of Lords is its wealth, if it be not, *cæteris paribus*, as a class the richest in the country, it does not fulfil its proper functions in a monarchy.

The House of Peers is, if there be any difference, an older institution than that of the House of Commons, and yet at one and the same moment you assert your inability to find any use for it, and also affect to be indignant that any one should accuse you of being hostile to the ancient constitution of the country. Whereas it is obvious from your remarks, which are very long, on the House of Lords, the words, “revolutionary democrat,” have no meaning whatever if they are not applicable to you. The real liberties of the nation depend exclusively on the existence of a body which is independent both of the Crown and of the people. The Sovereign, the Lords, and the Commons, compose but one Council. I will not stop to inquire how it came to pass that in every European country since the introduction of Christianity

this form of government has prevailed, and which is unknown under heathenism ; neither to inquire whether the barbarians under Alaric, Attila, and Genseric, did not adopt this form from that of the Churches, each under its own bishop as head, with priests ordained for life, and deacons elected by the people ; but from whatever cause arising, certain it is, that no Christian nation, after the destruction of the Roman Empire, was without a body of nobles and representatives of the commonalty associated with the sovereign in consulting for the public good.

It is, no doubt, true, that amongst men, as amongst other animals, the strong will oppress the weak : large military bodies enabled the sovereigns in Germany and France to do this effectually, but they never succeeded until they had destroyed the independence of the nobles ; and to take the single example of France, the monarchs successively aimed at this from the days of Louis XI., so that in those of Louis XVI. there was no body to withstand the overwhelming deluge of the rabble.

You rail at the House of Peers as a set of idle men, flattered from their childhood by being called "my Lord," and having no temptation to work hard. Nevertheless, they do work hard ; and as you attack them as a class, I will venture to assert that they are, as a class, immeasurably superior, in intellectual and moral qualities, to any other class that can be named. I should like to see a competitive examination in science between them, with Lords Wrottesley, Rosse, Brougham, and Lyttelton, at their head, and the whole race of cotton-spinners, brass and iron founders, and manufacturers of any description. I should like to see another examination between them in literature, either modern or ancient, and I will back Lord Derby, Lord Carlisle, Lord Stanhope, Lord Carnarvon, and many more, against all the owners of mills in Britain. But the fact is, this attack on classes is unstatesmanlike and narrow-minded, and proceeds only from an ignorance of mankind. Every class contains a proportion of good and bad, clever and stupid, learned and unlearned people, and that proportion is commensurate with the opportunities of each individual in it becoming what he is. A man who has to earn his daily bread, whether by ploughing, by spinning, by melting metals, by working in a mine, or in any other way, has no leisure nor means of becoming scientific or learned ; and, above all, has no means of acquiring that catholic mind and heart, and all the various endowments which constitute the Pericles, the Pitts, and Foxes of history.

Next you sneer at the Established Church : you do not sneer either at its doctrines or its discipline, but you sneer at it because it is established. It is the duty of every man to worship God ; it is the duty of every family as one body to worship God ; it is the duty of every nation as one community to worship God. The nation as one can only do this by established laws and regulations. To pull down the Established Church is an act of the nation saying, “ I will never pray to, nor serve, nor worship “ God again.” I have no doubt, however, that you will succeed shortly in your endeavours ; neither have I any doubt that God will destroy this nation for following your counsels.

The Established Church is the only Church in which the poor have a right to go and worship God, and hear His Word preached without paying for it. This is what “ the ruling class,” that is, the Government, in fulfilment of its duty, has done for the lowest class. The Dissenters are mostly of the middle class : they indulge in the luxury of chapels of their own, in which they allow no poor man to have his child baptized, nor partake of the Holy Communion, unless he pays for a sitting, which in the Free and other Dissenting Churches in Scotland costs six shillings a quarter. These six shillings go to the preacher, and this preacher is under the control of the rich middle-class Dissenters who sit in his chapel. The poor preacher dare not expose the villany of the manufacturers and shopkeepers who adulterate every article of food or medicine which they sell,—bread, milk, and butter, cheese, beer, wine, sugar, tea, &c.—as Mr. Wakley, a middle-class man, has exposed, and, by the help of Dr. Hassall, has published to the world. The poor preacher dare not expose the wholesale villany of the middle-class merchants who have figured in the Western, Northern, and Scotch Banks, because these persons would withdraw their distinguished patronage from the poor preacher, who is dependent on them, but they allow him to rail at the vices of the higher classes, of which they know nothing, and at the wickedness of taking a walk on a Sunday.

It is true that the bishops and clergy of the churches, both of England and Scotland, have grossly misconducted themselves. They have set up pews in the parish churches, by which in the London parishes of St. James’s, St. George’s, St. Margaret’s, and many others in all the great towns, the poor are wholly excluded. In their late repentance and building of new churches they have spent money which ought to have been employed in increasing the number of clergy, not of buildings, so that the morning,

forenoon, and Sacramental Services, besides the sermon, may not be crowded together, but performed at hours most convenient to the poor, not as they are now, for the sole convenience of the rich.

You think the ballot of great importance: I think it, on public grounds, of no value whatever. In your ignorance—an ignorance which prevails amongst all inhabitants of manufacturing towns—you speak of it as necessary to protect country voters. I believe, from the conversations which I have had with operatives everywhere, that it would be a great comfort to them as a screen from the tyranny of their masters, and more still from the tyranny of their own class; for in all large establishments the workmen lord it both over their employers in matters of business, and over their fellow-workmen in matters relating to elections, to strikes, subscriptions to clubs, and similar societies.

Your chief panacea, however, is, that the members of the House of Commons should represent men and not property. Now, since property always was, always is, and always must be in the hands of a few, and distress, poverty, starvation, wretchedness, suffering, cold, hunger, sickness, improvidence, and desperation, the lot of the many, your plan, which you have taken from the Socialists and Chartists, is that the members of the House of Commons should represent poverty and not wealth. The necessary and inevitable consequences of this must instantly be that the poor will take possession of, and divide the wealth amongst themselves: and the Chartists honestly avow and declare that all property is robbery.

A feeling that this ought to be done has been growing up amongst all classes of labourers in this country for several years; how long I do not know, but I first became aware of it about thirty years ago. In talking with some agricultural labourers, who in their youth had been smugglers, and were employed by persons on board the ships of the East India Company, I found them very sharp-witted gentlemen, and they informed me that in their opinion the country would never be happy until all the poor had their rights, and that these rights were, that each man should have five acres of land. I have since followed up these inquiries in other places, and have found that the same notion exists everywhere. Amongst the operatives in the manufacturing towns the object is not five acres of land, but a share in the profits of their employers; they have adopted the French expression, and say they will be no longer "*proletaires*;" that their masters are

merely fellows with money, and that these masters are making money out of their brains; that the improvements which are daily made in machinery are never invented by the masters, but by the operatives, whilst the masters reap all the advantages. You are going to give 1,000,000 of these men equal power to send members to the House of Commons with the 1000 masters who possess the mills. If any man is so devoid of common sense as to suppose that the end of this plan will not be the confiscation of the mills, and the pulling down of the millowners, he is incapable of following any premises to their natural conclusion.

But this is not all. The words Monarchy and Democracy are not empty sounds; these words express things, facts, realities. A monarchy is a state of society in which there are gradations of every kind; a Democracy is a state of society in which there are no gradations. You sneer at what you call "the Aristocracy," which is a vulgar way of expressing your hatred of the House of Lords. The essentials of a monarchy, in which the lowest classes are to be benefited, is that the persons of property should be associated together, and enabled to act independently both of the sovereign and of the people. You sneer at the word "Lords;" call them by any other name you please; the name is nothing; the thing is everything. But the advanced Reformers, as they call themselves, are so ignorant of the A B C of the science of government, that they confound in politics the word Aristocracy with titles and rank. Aristocracy, in a genealogical sense, means a class who by accident can trace their forefathers a few generations further back into antiquity than their neighbours. Aristocracy of talent means those who are the greatest mathematicians, mechanics, masters of languages, chemists, astronomers, poets, romance-writers, historians, surgeons, physicians, &c. Aristocracy of rank means simply those who are designated by the now absurd names of dukes, marquises, earls, &c., although the functions which these names originally expressed are no longer performed. Titles, however, are not the essential of our monarchy. The essential is a body of people possessing realised property—neither obliged to seek favour from the crown, nor to flatter the mob for the gratification of the objects of their ambition. If you mean to attack this institution, which there is reason to suspect you do, you have not stated your opinion clearly; if you do not mean to attack this essential part both of our monarchy and of the nation's liberty, you have merely raised a storm about a word, a sound, a term which might be changed a thousand times, and the thing itself remain unmoved.

You say that a representation which is not a mere representation of numbers is a disgraceful fraud. So it may be in a constitution of which you are to be the author; but it is no disgraceful fraud in the English constitution, for it was never intended so to be. "The Commons," says Blackstone, "consist of all such MEN OF PROPERTY in the kingdom as have not seats in the House of Lords; every one of which has a voice in Parliament, either personally or by his representatives. The counties are therefore represented by knights elected by the *propriators* of lands." The word people may be used for all the inhabitants of a country; but if used in the sense in which you use it, as contradistinguished from the crown, and from the landowners, such people never had in the olden time any voice or vote in the matter: "no Ceorl had political power: the *Plebs* were never consulted in national assemblies." Ceorl and Plebs designate the class you now call the people. See Palgrave, c. v. 28. The manufacturers had a voice: the principal inhabitants of towns in which trade of any special sort, ship-building, &c., was carried on, sent representatives of their calling, because it was for the common good that these trades or classes of property should have persons skilled in them to state in the public councils how they would be injured or benefited by any laws to be enacted. Such towns were Newcastle for its coals, Leeds and others for their woollens, and Sheffield and Birmingham for their iron; Stoke for its potteries; and Bristol, Liverpool, and many others, for their commerce. Circumstances have altered the condition of many of these towns, and by the last Reform Bill, and by any future one, towns which have no special trade or manufacture should be disfranchised, such as Abingdon, Newport, and several others. Another class of towns also returned representatives, and probably to attend to the interests of the priests, but which have no such necessity now; even all these called cities, from being the residences either of the sovereign or of the bishop, such as Winchester, Canterbury, &c. The representatives should be persons interested in, and understanding, the peculiar business of the town from which they are sent. You are a very fit and proper representative of Manchester; but as a man of peace at all price, a most improper representative for Birmingham, in which the chief talent is employed in inventing implements of war for the destruction of mankind.

By your constantly holding up America as a model for this country to follow, you are evidently ignorant of two things,—first, of the real condition of America, and secondly, of the essential

difference between a monarchy and a republic. Another of your "best possible public instructors," as rabid a reformer as you are, complains of your "quakerly dislike to bishops, your little pettish errors of judgment with regard to the House of Lords and the Revolution of 1688—your strange hallucinations about the United States, which you declare, in spite of Judge Lynch, the burning of the quarantine station on Staten Island, and sundry other episodes of weekly and diurnal occurrence, to be a country of law and order, and the security of property." It is somewhat singular, also, that you should recommend an increase of the metropolitan members, after what one of your radical "best possible public instructors" says of those that exist already, which is as follows:—

One "objection to increasing the representation of the metropolis is the unfortunate fact, that with a few exceptions it has not hitherto done justice to itself in its representatives. They do not correspond to its position as the seat and centre of the empire—as the richest, the most sensible (?), the most business-like, the most influential city in the world. How few good measures, or even good speeches, come from three-fourths of our metropolitan members! How little have they done specially for the good of the metropolis! Some of them have their hobbies; some of them are invalids; most of them do nothing. The result is, that the two millions and a half included in the metropolitan districts are the worst represented, and also the worst governed part of the empire."

You next make an attack upon the character of Lord Stratford de Redcliffe, one of the ablest public servants the country ever had, and especially upon the subject of his want of temper. The Birmingham gentlemen had probably never seen you in the House of Commons, or they would have found little difficulty in perceiving how much of your radical zeal is warmed by personal hostility to Lord Palmerston.

A pamphlet was largely circulated at the beginning of the Crimean war, of which the author was a member of the "peace-at-all-price" party; it was distributed gratis, and never was surpassed for absurdity. It recommended that all soldiers, sailors, and policemen, should be discharged; that if any hostile persons came into our houses, we were to admit them with the greatest alacrity, set our best fare before them, and lay everything in the house, wives, children, all, at their entire disposal. The consequence of this, we were assured, would be, that such an exhibition of Gospel love would win their hearts, be like melted coals upon their

heads, that after a time they would all go peaceably back to France, or to any other place from whence they came, so melted by the warmth of this love, that they would tell to all their countrymen how thoroughly we were living under and acting up to the mild influences of Christian charity, and by this means the whole world would be converted. In answer to one of your speeches against the war, Lord Palmerston exposed this tract to the laughter and contempt of the House; you took it as a personal attack on yourself, whether justly or not I know not, and you never forgave it. Your whole conduct last session was influenced by this feeling. You hate the men now in office, but you would do nothing to weaken them, through fear of their resigning, and thus by possibility promote the return of Lord Palmerston to power. Mr. Cobden said well, that if it had not been for your external profession, you would have been a prize-fighter; and lately you have avowed yourself not to be "sufficiently pliant to act with other people." How, then, in the name of common sense, can you imagine that you can ever be a statesman in a free country? You may be another Louis Napoleon, and knock down all who differ with you, but you never can be the leader of an independent and enlightened nation.

You next repeat another of your accustomed sneers at what you call "the ruling classes." The persons who rule must always be persons whose minds are sufficiently enlarged to be enabled to take in the interests of the whole nation *viewed as one body*. Their minds must have been thus enlarged by instruction, by education, and by mixing with various classes. They must not be persons whose minds have become contracted by being absorbed in the pursuit of some one object. Hence, all things else being equal, a nobleman is more fitted for a ruler of a great country than a cotton-spinner. The nobleman considers the claims of all classes equally; the cotton-spinner considers everything to be good or bad according as it extends the interest of cotton. Let the cotton-spinner's son inherit an independent fortune from his spinning father; let him be sent to Eton or Harrow, Oxford or Cambridge, to get his mind enlarged by learning what has occurred in ancient times with all nations, he then will be as competent to rule as the nobleman. We have all seen an example of this before our eyes. The first Sir Robert Peel was a cotton-spinner, with all the narrow-mindedness of his class; his son went to Harrow and Oxford, had his mind enlarged, and became a first-rate statesman. The expression "a ruling class," is absurd; it is

contemptible in a man like you to use it. You mean it to designate men with titles, who are always with you objects of envy and of hatred.

By your sneers at the "ruling classes" in the state you compel us to draw comparisons with the capacity for rule of other classes. But, first, I assert the term "ruling classes" is absurd. Every man of talent who has ever shown in the House of Commons any capacity for office has been given place; and some have been elevated to the peerage. I could, and so could you, enumerate sons of colliers, hatters, soap-boilers, artists, newspaper-writers, brewers, physicians, Scotch parsons, weavers, &c., who have all sat on the Treasury benches. Let us look, then, where the middle classes have exhibited their powers freely, and uncontrolled by any hostile political faction, and have been enabled to exert themselves solely and exclusively for their own profit. When the first bills for railroads were brought into Parliament, Lord Dalhousie wished the Government to decide on the trunk lines, and leave to private enterprise to determine what local short lines should communicate with them. Sir Robert Peel, in the wanton exercise of his self-governing mania, rejected the plan of his wise colleague, and left the speculators to govern themselves. The consequence of this has been, that in England alone, of all the countries in Europe, railways are a ruinous concern; besides this, they are worse managed for the accommodation of the public, the carriages worse, and the cost higher than anywhere else. They have now literally fulfilled the supposed impossible story of the two Kilkenny cats devouring one another until nothing was left but their tails. The railway companies have eaten up each other, and on some of them very small bits even of the tails are visible. Many of them have been suppliants to men with titles to take the management of them, being conscious of not having a middle-class man among them who had the necessary capacity for doing it. General Anson, the Marquis of Chandos, and Mr. Scott are instances. This latter threw up the management in disgust, because the middle-class proprietors were dishonest enough not to stand to their engagements. Here is the test of the superior capacity of self-government possessed by the middle classes! And this is not all, for there is the Marylebone Parliament making a weekly exhibition of itself as absurd as that made by the Republican Chamber of Deputies in France, both exclusively composed of the middle classes.

Your class has had the exclusive management of the Crystal

Palace,—its proposal, completion, and subsequent conduct. Its present condition shows in what a plight the country would have been had the rulers of that speculation been also the rulers of the State. Your class has also in the House of Commons opposed the Government manufacturing the arms and accoutrements, and necessities for the army and navy; you have insisted that they should be supplied by contractors; you have had your own way, and the consequence is, that the public has been systematically robbed, and thus taxes have been laid upon the operatives to put into the pockets of the dishonest contractors, being all of your class. Moreover, your class has fought hard to force all our ships of war to be built by contracts, and you may remember some instances of ship-builders having built ships on purpose to go to the bottom with their crews, in order to defraud the insurance companies. Oh, wonderful class!

You say, "We have always been carrying on, for the last thirty years and more, a steady and perpetual war against the pre-dominance and power of the country gentlemen in Parliament." No doubt you have, because upon the predominance of agricultural over manufacturing interests the stability of every country depends. You have yourself said that "capital owes no allegiance" to the sovereign; by capital you mean mills, spinning-jennies, and cotton; and it is for this reason that a monarchy can only be based upon territorial possessions and territorial allegiance. You continue: "If we look at their past policy we shall not have much confidence in their proposed measure" (of reform). You are quite right; and unless the present ministers are the most disgraceful set of placemen that ever betrayed a country for the vanity of office, no bill of Lord Chelmsford, Lord John Manners, Mr. Henley, or Mr. Walpole, can be commensurate with your desires. You go on: "Their wars, their debts, their taxes placed upon the bulk of the people, lead us greatly to suspect them." This is a bold assertion, without a vestige of proof. The wars have almost invariably been provoked by commercial disputes, and encouraged by the traders engaged in them. It is false that the taxes have been intentionally laid by one class upon another class. When you shall have acquired some knowledge of the art of governing a country, you will know that the whole problem to be solved which presents itself to every financier's mind is, How shall a revenue be raised which shall press least upon productive industry? and this for the obvious reason, that if it does press upon such industry the tax will not be productive, and will become less and less so every year.

It is useful to all honest men to know what others have done before them in the line in which they are labouring; and I recommend the following passage to the consideration of yourself and others who are still possessed of realised property, which your coadjutors consider the result of robbery of the labourers :—

“Napoleon had been long convinced that the Revolution, whilst it had created great resources by equalising the taxes, had, nevertheless, pressed too hard upon property, in throwing upon it alone the burden of the public expenses, by the *suppression of indirect taxation*. That which the Revolution did is but too common in times of trouble. At the first difficulty the people, especially that of the towns, profit by it to refuse to pay any tax upon articles of food, and especially on liquors, which constitute the greater part of their enjoyment. . . . But these taxes, the most detested by the inhabitants of towns, are those, however, which characterise the countries truly prosperous; which press, in fact, upon the rich much more than on the poor, and are least hurtful to industry; whilst direct taxation upon land takes from agriculture its capital; that is to say, the stock and the manure, impoverishes the soil, and attacks the most abundant source of wealth. . . . The fancied theory of uniform taxation bearing exclusively upon the land, and providing for all the expenses of the state. . . . But this theory, generous in the intention, false in its effects, had to fall before experience. . . . It was indispensable to vary the sources of taxation, in order not to dry them up. It belonged to the man who had restored order in France, who had delivered the finances from confusion, in re-establishing the regular collection of direct contributions, to complete his work in opening again the closed source of indirect contributions. But it required a great authority and a great energy to accomplish this. Faithful to his character, Napoleon did not fear, at the very time when he was aspiring to the throne, to re-establish, under the name of *droits réunis*, the most unpopular but the most useful of taxes.”—xx. p. 168.

A partner with you in the manufacture of a democracy, Mr. Daniel Bishop, has favoured the world with what he calls “The Constitution of Society as designed by God.” He states that “the accumulations of the capitalist, or landed proprietor, are the accumulations of poor men’s labour, and that they (the capitalist and proprietor) are in possession of what is not thereby their own. Private property, therefore, we consider to be unlawful in the sight of Heaven.” Did your cotton-mills in Manchester, and the great works in Birmingham, ever strike you in this light? But this is not all. “Stolen property,” adds your fellow-labourer in the same cause, “continues to be stolen property

“ so long as it remains in the possession of the thief; and no lapse of time, sale, or other disposal of it, can cancel the claim of him from whom it was stolen. The inference I seek to induce is, that the soil cannot, by the principles of natural justice, be held as property by private persons.”

These may not be *yet* your maxims; but “let no one,” says a better politician than you,—Machiavelli, “who begins an innovation in a state expect that he shall stop it at his pleasure, or regulate it according to his intention.”—*See Hallam*, i. 443.

You have, as is natural, an exaggerated estimation of the value of manufactures. Manufacturers add nothing to the supply of our necessities, though they add much to our convenience and comfort. The cultivation of the soil gives corn, meat, milk, skins, wool. When the agricultural labourers’ wives spun their wool, and wore the linsey-woolsey, they were more warmly clad than they are now. Instead of this, you have given them cheap cotton; but it keeps out no rain, nor even dew when they work in the fields, and is of no use for covering on their bed at night. When the woodman wore his leathern coat, leathern breeches, and leathern gaiters, he was more warmly clad than he is now in cheap cloth, and he had a warmer bed at night. Man cannot do without bread, meat, clothes of woollen and skins: you tempt him to take your flimsy cheap and rotten plushes and corduroy. You say it is cheaper; yes, but cheap things are bad things; and the object of manufacturers everywhere now is, not to make the best they can, but the cheapest. The same principle runs into the arts, and one of your model Americans, Sam Slick, boasted that he had bought bran new pictures for half the price of old ones. Cheap newspapers are bad newspapers. The man is to be pitied who cannot appreciate the literary talents of the *Times*, whether he approves of its politics or not.

Countries have been great without manufactures, as Greece and Rome were. Capitalists who own no allegiance, and boast that they can take their capital to another country whenever they please, are of no more value to a state than Jews; and the only use of such is to be taxed while you can catch them. If you truly want to benefit poor operatives in your mills—the poor stocking-weavers in Leicester, and lace-knitters in Nottingham—pay for their emigration to our colonies, where they may become land-owners. The operatives in Glasgow know too well that the mill-owners there want to prevent emigration, and to keep the operatives in the lowest state of destitution at home, that they may be more completely in the power of their masters, who will overwork them when

they can make money by them, and leave them to starve when they cannot; as your model Americans do with the blacks.

There is no person that I am acquainted with who has given such striking proof of ignorance of the habits and feelings of all classes but his own, as you have done. You make a lamentation over Highland shepherds, because, in going forth to face a mountain blast, diversified with fog, rain, or snow, they find oatmeal-porridge, with a glass of whisky in it, a better breakfast to keep out the cold than the adulterated tea, alumned bread, and rancid butter, on which the wretched creatures regale who work for cotton-spinners in factories, with the thermometer at 80 degrees of heat.

So much for your knowledge of one class! Now for a specimen of your knowledge of another class.

You remember that you, Mr. Cobden, and I, served together on a committee to inquire into the expediency of reducing generally the salaries of the public servants of the Crown. One of the persons examined was Lord John Russell: he went into great details of the experience of his official life: he mentioned the number of occasions when ministers are called upon by their position to contribute largely to various public subscriptions: he pointed out the necessity of his having a larger house, and consequently larger establishment, than when he was not in office; and that being, not of extravagant habits, he had never from his earliest youth been under any pecuniary difficulties till he was in office, when he became slightly embarrassed. He stated amongst other expenses the necessity of seeing many persons at dinner whom he could not converse with at other times; not only members of parliament, but persons of intelligence from the country, and even from our colonies and foreign countries, by intercourse with whom he acquired much valuable information. Never shall I forget the astonishment of all of us when you and Mr. Cobden doubted the advantage to be gained by asking such persons to dinner, and inquired if he did not save as much expense by being asked out again to dinner in return for the invitations he gave: so little did either of you understand the real nature of such establishments, or the habits of private and friendly intercourse in that rank of society.

Mr. Russell writes to the *Times*, that "there is among the "Hindoos, as there is among all nations which possess great antiquity and historic families, a profound respect for old houses, "and for the descendants of those who were coeval with the early "records of their race, no matter in what position fate may have

“placed them, or their own personal insignificance, or the worthlessness of their forefathers. Mea Beer Sein, who boasts that he ‘is sprung from ‘forty generations of Rajpoots in the hills,’ is to ‘his people an object of attachment, *ipso facto*, to which the most ‘philanthropical governor of our race could never pretend.’ Every one in Parisian society paid the respect due to the rank of Mons. de Comenin, although his coat was often threadbare, and with holes at the elbows, because he was the legitimate descendant of the last Emperor of Constantinople. You may sneer, also, at this as a sentiment. Yes, it is a sentiment and a prejudice arising from the revelation by God of His method of dealing with mankind by primogeniture in families, and by an aristocracy of races. The poor operatives in your ‘busy hives of industry,’ never look to their employers as their protectors: neither do the poor in our unions look to the tradesmen, who are the elected guardians, for pity, charity, or kindness. They look to the *ex-officio* guardians, who are the magistrates and gentry, and from these they receive protection against the middle classes. They have been discussing in their meetings for what they call Social Science the subject of Labourers’ Cottages. The rent of these is invariably lower upon the properties of gentlemen than when they belong to the tradesmen of the neighbouring towns, in which case the last farthing is squeezed out of the wretched tenants, till at the end the very bed under them is seized and sold. This the labourers in the country know and feel. The only persons who are now really in earnest for reform are the operatives, and they cry for it as a means of wreaking vengeance, not on those you call the ruling classes, but on the mill-owners and master-manufacturers.

No sooner was the last Reform Bill passed than the New Poor-Law Bill was brought in by the same persons who had brought in the other. Read, now, the account of it from the pen of one of your own class:—

“By the new Poor-Law charity is totally excluded. It is a law, ‘not for relieving the poor, but for deterring the poor from asking relief. There is no one of its provisions framed with any other end than this. The ingenuity of its authors has been unremittingly, and almost necessarily, exerted in discovering an alternative worse than starvation. One of its leading principles is that of the most extreme selfishness, the most hardened experience—a kind of compunction at leaving the cry of distress unheeded altogether. And this law supplies them with the means of stopping the complaint, and quieting their consciences without drawing on their charity; it offers to the

“poor their miserable pittance, but clogged with conditions which drive them to refuse it. They have no need to starve ; there is subsistence provided for them. They seek it, and they find it worse than the wretchedness of want itself. They leave it, and carry away with them the additional burden of hopeless and unpitied despair. The odium is removed from the heads of the rich, and heaped upon their own. They starve, or hang, or drown, while the rich and thriving shake their heads at their wilfulness, with a satisfactory conviction that their own duty has been discharged. It was no easy consummation to achieve. A repulsive force was to be provided equal to the attraction of food to a starving man. A power was to be discovered to drive those back whom cold and hunger beckoned to come on. To compel a perishing neighbour to expire at his own expense and odium in the midst of your abundance was a problem worthy of a devil, and it has certainly been solved.”

Yes, Mr. Bright, it has been solved by that class of which you are the representative and champion ; and the labouring class knows it well, and will yet give you your deserts. The Poor-Law is the test of your sincerity in desiring the happiness of the working classes when reduced to the most helpless misery. The new Poor-Law Bill was exclusively the work of the Doctrinaires and Radicals. But this is not all. So cruel is the law, that in country places they have never dared to carry it out. This, however, they might have done, had they not fortunately discovered that it was cheaper to break the law, and give illegal out-door relief, than to refuse it in every case until the applicant brought his whole family into the union, having first given up his house, and sold all its contents. Great has been the labour of that part of “the ruling class” which has filled the office of President of the Poor-Law Board, to prevent the guardians from starving the poor, and depriving them of necessary medical relief ; the guardians, however, who preside over the London unions, sent round a circular, two years ago, to the guardians of the country unions, to urge them to agitate until they got rid of the General Poor-Law Board altogether, that they might be left uncontrolled to starve the poor as they pleased. There is no equality nor justice in your manhood suffrage which does confer upon the poor the right of choosing the guardians of the unions, as well as to the rate-payers, whose immediate interest it is to starve them, and which they certainly would do, were it not for the interference of the magistrates, “the ruling class,” who reside in the neighbourhood.

Of all the organised hypocrisies which were ever formed, none

has equalled the pretext that Democracy is sought for as a means of improving the condition of the operatives. You know that you, master-manufacturers—you, the industrial class, as you call yourselves—have systematically resisted all the endeavours of the “ruling classes,” to get some protection from destruction by your machines for the poor girls that work in your factories. You build greatly on the ignorance of your auditors when you imagine they have forgotten Lord Shaftesbury’s labours in this matter, and your opposition. Have they never read the reports of the factory inspectors, and seen how systematically your class has tried to set the laws at defiance which were framed to prevent your using up Lancashire girls, as the objects of your admiration, as the Americans do Negroes? To this day we are unable to stop with many of your class the truck system; but it is to the noblemen and gentlemen of England, and not to the master-manufacturers, that the operatives and their children are indebted for whatever measure of humanity and protection has been shown them.

You conclude with a long panegyric upon America, and ask, Why, since we import cotton from America, and wine from France, we should not import constitutions also? Are you going to reform the English Constitution, or to manufacture a new one? It cannot be the English Constitution that you want to import, because it is here already, and was here many centuries before we sent out of Newgate to America their first Adam and Eve.

Well, then, it is a new Constitution you are weaving, which is to be as like that of America as possible; but that of America does not differ more from that of England than from the Despotism of France. The French people have tried both—a Democracy, through a Chamber of Delegates, without a real House of Lords, the landed proprietors being destroyed, and an iron Despotism. They prefer the latter to the former; and so do I, upon the principle which Voltaire so well expressed when he said: “I had rather be devoured whole by a great lion than gnawed in pieces by four hundred rats like myself.”

The Americans are the only nation now which speaks of the Negroes as an inferior race. The cold-blooded, systematic cruelty exercised by them over these unfortunate people, greatly exceeds any cruelty exercised in Russia, France, or Italy. Their pretended love of freedom is the most barefaced falsehood that ever existed. They are utterly without private or public honour, and the only people on earth who ever avowed that gain was their sole object in

every relationship in life. The unhappy French, who took for their motto when they were a Democracy, "Equality, Liberty, and Fraternity," translated it truly for themselves, from their own experience—Equality of misery, Liberty to do ill, Fraternity such as Cain's to Abel. This, under your able guidance, will be ours also. You wish England to be like America, and to adopt her laws and institutions. The judges have declared, that by the laws of America "black men have no rights which white men are bound to respect." The wife of a freed negro, purchased and presented to him by his former master, has been held in law to be property, and she was seized and sold by the lawyer in the case for the payment of his fees. Mr. Cobb, the Secretary of the Treasury, has announced that no black can receive a register for a vessel which is his own property, nor command a vessel sailing under the flag of the United States. An American writer in the *Daily News* says :

"As for the barbarism of the manners of the aristocracy, who constitute a small minority of Southern society, any man may satisfy himself by the simple method of standing within ear-shot of Southern senators and representatives in the Capitol. Nowhere else, as far as my experience goes, is such an amount of swearing and indecent language heard, nor so barbaric a temper of insult and violence manifested, by men who assume to be gentlemen. The impression is rather strengthened than modified by passing through the colleges and booksellers' shops of the slave states, and by meeting Southern men in educated society, at home and abroad."

Such is the love of freedom, such the morals, such the Christianity, such the manners, such the laws, such the institutions, you recommend the people of England to adopt ! Do you approve of these things ? Abstractedly, no : but when you consider that these people send cotton, then welcome the blood of blacks, middle passages, tortures and all, as joyful offerings at the shrine of your Cotton God !

We now come to Speech the Second. Having favoured us with the reasons for which you wish us to convert this monarchy into a second America, you proceed to enlighten us on foreign policy. You begin by quoting the opinions of Sir R. Walpole, Mr. Fox, Lord Grey, and Sir R. Peel, in favour of a state of peace to one of war. You might have quoted with equal propriety every statesman of every country, beginning with one celebrated 3000 years ago, who said,—

“ Cursed is the man, and void of law and right,
 Unworthy property—unworthy light;
 Unfit for public rule or private care,
 That wretch, that monster, who delights in war;
 Whose lust is murder, and whose horrid joy
 To tear his country, and his kind destroy.”

The same is said by every man in private life; yet wars have never ceased, and standing armies, and hundreds of attorneys and barristers subsist, solely by the love of all men for public and private strife.

You assert, that up to the time of the Revolution in 1688 we had “endeavoured to keep ourselves from European complications,” but that after that period “the great territorial families of England” contrived to engage in continual wars for the preservation of the balance of power and of the Protestant interest. In making this assertion you draw largely on the ignorance of your Birmingham audience, or some one would have reminded you that never was England so respected and powerful abroad as under the rule of that sturdy old Protestant Dissenter Cromwell, and that the cause of the wars in Europe from about the year 1550 was entirely the struggles for religious liberty against the Courts of Rome, Spain, and Austria. The Papal power tried to exterminate the Protestants, and succeeded in Spain; the English of those days were actuated by something more noble than the interests of cotton-spinning, and sided against the oppressors; and “the great territorial families” were much more inclined to the Popish than to the Protestant side throughout that whole period. The different powers of Europe never were, nor ever can be, all equal; circumstances will sometimes give to one, and sometimes to another, a preponderance, and any man fit to guide the destinies of England must sometimes side with one and sometimes with another. Your errors on such subjects must render you incompetent to give sound advice to the Sovereign of England, to which you aspire.

You say that every one now agrees that the war in 1793 was unnecessary, and you enumerate this as one of a series of wars, all entered into for the benefit of the land-owners. The facts of the case are, that democrats having, under the name of Reform, got the government of France into their hands, did what beggarly democrats always will do,—namely, seize all the property, first of

the Church, then of the peers, then of the land-owners, and then of the manufacturers. They afterwards cut the throats of all rich men, and then proclaimed war against every nation and people which would not do the same; and if you can contrive to get political power into the hands of those who have no property—that is, of those who are neither land-owners nor manufacturers, nor possessed of any realised property of other kinds—they will assuredly pursue the same course as the French beggars did in 1790. The French nation, of all classes, had, however, been so cruelly tyrannised over for a long time, that every one at the beginning of their struggles hoped they would succeed in obtaining redress. Mr. Pitt was of this number, and did everything in his power to avoid war; and even after all official intercourse had ceased between the two countries, he continued to keep up, by private means, some relations, in the hopes of preventing collision. But those sanguinary fanatics would know no bounds; they had friends in this country who associated together in order to assist them, and with great reluctance he was compelled to commence hostilities. The largest landed proprietors, however, were always against the war,—Bedford, Devonshire, Norfolk, Somerset, Grafton, Hamilton, Lansdowne, Breadalbane, Lauderdale, Derby, Carlisle, Fitzwilliam, Coke of Norfolk, and many others. So much for your historical accuracy! Perhaps the Birmingham Literary Institution does not contain an “Annual Register.”

Now for your financial accuracy. You make a rough calculation of the expenses of the French war, and consider it as money altogether thrown away; but never did this, or any other country, make such extraordinary and rapid progress in manufacturing and trading wealth as England did between the years 1790 and 1815. In those twenty-five years she swept every ship but her own off the waters of the ocean. The whole carrying trade of the world was in our hands; not a particle of French manufacture was sold out of France. The cotton lords acquired an importance they never possessed before,—in every department of national wealth, ships, colonies, commerce, mines, manufactures of every description, increased in a far greater ratio than the debt. Yet what is the talent of a financier who, in estimating an expenditure, leaves out the amount of capital which has been created by it, and the revenue which is to defray it? Ask in Manchester the amount of capital invested in 1790, and that in

1858, in cotton manufactures alone. So much for the exhibition you have made of your capacity for fulfilling the offices of Minister of Foreign Affairs and Chancellor of the Exchequer !

Now for your military qualities—your talents as a strategist, capacity for estimating the probabilities of attack, the means adopting to make it, and the proper mode of resisting it.

You say, that “ nobody is dreaming of attacking us.” There is, probably, not a man in Europe of half your mental activity who is of the same opinion. One of your “ best possible public “ instructors” says, most truly,—

“ While the English people can see with dignified calmness the “ prosperity or the reverses of their neighbours, and would be deterred “ even by pride from seeming to gloat over their temporary embar- “ rassments, the organs of such public opinion as remain on the “ Continent make no attempt to conceal their pleasure at the massacre “ of our officers, and the anarchy which reigns in one of the provinces “ of our Empire. . . . It would be affectation to pretend that on the “ Continent the embarrassments of this country have been seen with “ displeasure. Indeed the French journals which venture to say a “ few words in our defence are obliged to apologise to their readers for “ running counter to the public feeling, and openly acknowledge that “ the total destruction of the British power has been anticipated with “ satisfaction as the result of the late events. Envy is the true feel- “ ing which has prompted all these demonstrations of satisfaction. “ The *Revue des Deux Mondes* is conducted by men who are generally “ honest and courageous enough to speak the truth, and it has had “ experience of French and Continental opinions. ‘ Let the English “ ‘ nation,’ it says, ‘ be well assured, that it is [not loved in the world ; “ ‘ it is too selfish for its misfortunes to be looked upon by other “ ‘ nations as family misfortunes, and it has been too fortunate not to “ ‘ have provoked immense envy.’ ”

The hatred of this nation by the French is obvious to every one who will take the pains of examining into the subject. Not a month ago there was a long and virulent attack upon us for purposely insulting the Parisians in their own city, by wearing clothes of such shape and colour as no man, who values the decency of his appearance, would wear in London. The fact is, no doubt, true ; but if all the 10,000 Frenchmen now in London were to dress in any uncouth manner, we should never imagine that they intended to insult us, nor would the French so think of us if they had not a morbid irritability against us, which alone can account for their feelings on such a trifle.

Our political and commercial existence is a standing insult to a people impatient of the iron despotism under which they groan. Every article in every newspaper insults them, and all the educated and commercial classes in the ports read English. Every speech in Parliament irritates them: the speeches of Mr. Roebuck and Mr. Lindsay, harmless enough as they appeared to us, insulted them. The whole nation is exasperated against us. Their passion is military glory; it is the only one of which they boast; it is the thing for which they are willing to pay any price: an army must be employed fighting, as a pack of hounds must be kept hunting, or race-horses kept racing. There appeared in the *Journal des Débats* (and, be it remembered, nothing of importance can appear in any newspaper which has not the sanction of, or is not written by, one of the ministers), an article in reply to Messrs. Roebuck and Lindsay, which urged that it was bad taste in those gentlemen to say uncivil things about the ugliness of French women, when the Emperor had just been doing honour to the Queen and to the flower of the nobility of England: for, the writer says, "it required "but the hoisting of a flag upon a mast to have converted that roadstead into a sea of blood." Now, hoisting a flag does nothing: if, indeed, people are prepared to do something previously agreed to be done on seeing that signal, then, truly, the flag does perform an important part in the play. Such is the fact; the wonder is that they should have let it out. A considerable number, both of artillerymen and sailors there, did want to shoot their guns: they were restrained, but it was only under the promise, conveyed through the army and navy chaplains, that *à moins de deux ans ils seront vengés de l'Angleterre*.

I cannot blame the Emperor; he must do that which he thinks best for the country that he rules. He has been perfectly free and honest in his remarks to many of the persons with whom he became acquainted when in this country. He has said that he did not wish to invade England, because her alliance was necessary to consolidate his throne: that end is already served, and he, like you, is a man of progress. He has also said that France needs to have its attention turned to commercial rather than to military enterprise, but he foresaw, from the way in which both his army and people were irritated by England, that they would become too strong for him.

It is not possible that what has been going on at Cherbourg can have any meaning other than a menace to this country. France has no colonies, and scarcely any foreign trade by sea.

There is not a single European country that has half the navy which France has ; yet the Emperor goes on building, being determined to surpass us in number of ships, in their size, and in the weight of their guns. Our supremacy, which existed by the superior merit of our sailors, is greatly reduced by the employment of steam : the arrival of any number of ships, with any amount of men on board, can be calculated on now with greater precision than the concentration of an army on land. By steam-ships the Channel is almost bridged over.

The last official returns show that he has 11,000 workmen employed in Brest alone, besides the numbers in Cherbourg, Toulon, L'Orient, &c., whilst the men of progress in the House of Commons have refused to vote more than 10,000 for all our harbours, — Portsmouth, Plymouth, Woolwich, &c.

It is not the Emperor alone that has these feelings and intentions towards us. So far from “ nobody dreaming of attacking us,” it is an astonishing proof of ignorance of the French people towards us in all times, not to know that they are never dreaming of anything else. Fifty years ago, Mr. de Maistre expressed his vexation that the cause of liberty was defended by, and exhibited amongst, a nation that France so much detested as it did the English. Under Louis Philippe, the Prince de Joinville wrote :—

“ The modern invention of propelling ships by steam has entirely changed the art of war. By this invention the sea becomes a fortified camp. Naval war can be carried on in the depth of winter as advantageously as in the midst of summer. The future destiny of France by this invention shall record her former glory, and she may successfully dispute with England the claim she puts forth as the mistress of the waves. France can call out an army of 900,000 men, and in the space of four days she could embark, in eight squadrons, 20,000 men on board war-steamers and light frigates, and carrying with them all the facilities for their disembarkation. The invasion of England is, therefore, a matter of easy attainment by usual stratagem. Naval warfare is no longer the conflict of trained seamen, it is rather the battle of soldiers ; and hence Young France, by her innumerable land forces, will very soon be in a position to dispute with England the sovereignty of the seas. That time will be when France will be urged to the contest by the call of justice and the cry of national revenge.”

Just after the Emperor mounted the throne, he said to an eminent diplomatist :—“ I have three missions to fulfil : re-

“establish the Napoleon dynasty, revise the Treaty of 1815, and “revenge Waterloo.” “At these last words,” said the reporter of this anecdote, “his voice altered and trembled with emotion, and “his dull eyes sparkled like those of a basilisk.” He has often declared to others that he had three things to accomplish—the first, to re-establish the empire; second, to put down the press; third, to revenge Waterloo. He has done the two first, which, when he said this, were more unlikely to be fulfilled, and, certainly, more difficult, than the last.

Hear another of your “best possible public instructors:”—

“Chauvinism means nothing but blind, unreasoning detestation of “the English. As it constituted, however, one essential element of the “Bonapartist creed, ten years have been employed by the partisans of “Louis Napoleon, during all the various phases of his brilliant and “eventful career—as Pretender, Demagogue, President, Usurper, “Dictator, and Emperor—in reviving the hateful sentiment. Consi- “derable success has attended the manœuvre, as is evident from the “fact, not of the appearance of anti-English pamphlets—for they are “part of the machinery employed—but that all the journals which “support directly or indirectly the Imperial Government are constantly “filled with denunciations of this country, yearnings for its downfall, “glorification of its enemies, ignoble rejoicings over its sufferings and “disasters. The supporters of those publications, which are copied “and imitated by nearly all the provincial press, must, to a certain “extent, share their opinions; and therefore we are compelled to “believe that a considerable portion of the French public have been “corrupted, in the absence of all freedom of discussion, by the malign- “ant libels, whose circulation is avowedly patronised by the censor, “and secretly stimulated by the Government.”

In defiance of all this foreign and domestic evidence, you have dared to impose upon the people, and say that no one is dreaming of attaching us.

M. de Montalembert declares that “the rupture of the alliance “between the Emperor and this country would greatly augment his “popularity.” (P. 5, note.) At this very moment that he is prosecuting M. de Montalembert for writing in praise of our institutions, he has allowed the publication of a very violent pamphlet exciting the animosity of the French against us. The comments and applause of this pamphlet in the newspapers are, if possible, more violent than the pamphlet itself. The priest party is preaching the making of war upon, and the destruction of this Protestant country, to be a religious duty and a holy crusade.

He is not a man to do things without preparation ; besides which, he will give us no warning. He knows that his whole prospects, life, and fame, depend on the success of that one stroke. He will send from Toulon and Algiers, at one and the same moment, fleets and armies against Malta and Gibraltar. He will send a fleet with troops on board to Ireland, where he will be joined by rebellious Papists, determined to unite with anything which shall destroy Protestantism, as their authorised journals in France and Belgium have declared. He will send a fleet to fight your fleet in the Channel, whilst gunboats from Cherbourg, Brest, and Boulogne, land troops in the Thames, in the Mersey, on the southern coasts, and, probably, at Glasgow. After he is here, he will perhaps proclaim war. He will risk 300,000 men ; he will land 100,000, and destroy here, at least, three times that number of men, women, and children, besides burning an immense amount of property in buildings ; and the 10,000 foreign patriots now in London will set it on fire in twenty places, for the sake of plunder, and the shopkeepers will run away.

Now, you will ask—Are you really afraid of this ? My answer is, that there is no cause for fear if we are prepared for such a contingency. But I have no confidence either in the talents or energy of the Queen's present Ministers. I doubt if any one of them, except Lord Derby, ever dreamed of such a thing as how to defend this country. I have no more faith in them than I have in you under these circumstances.

He is not a wise householder who is not prepared every night against burglars and fire. The general is incompetent who is not prepared, on going into the field, for every contingency of either flank of his army being turned, or his centre forced, as well as for every kind of success to be gained against his enemy. In like manner every one who has been Prime Minister, or Secretary of State, deserves to be impeached who has not all proclamations ready prepared for use, on every possible contingency of the appearance of a hostile flag on the coast : as I know Mr. Secretary Dundas had during the last French war. In such cases rapidity of action is essential ; and I confess, I wish I saw men of more energy at the head of affairs.

We cannot keep a standing army sufficiently numerous, and it is not advisable that we should ; we have no plains on which to fight a great battle, nor general to command us if we had. But there are ample means, nevertheless. If those means are taken, there is no cause for apprehension : if they are not taken, we must

become, at least for a while, a province of France ; and that, at least, is preferable to being under mob rule as in America.

We have 93,000 bayonets in India ; they should be brought home as soon as possible. I fear the people must look to themselves, and not trust to the Horse Guards, to defend us from foreign attack. The country is thickly enclosed, and raw soldiers can do much behind hedges and buildings which they could not do in the open field. An invading army could bring neither cavalry nor artillery. Our roads are narrow, and the columns of march must be long ; more men perish in war from want of rest than from bullets, and the invaders should never be allowed to sleep for a single instant. Every one who can afford to buy a rifle and revolver should procure them forthwith, and they should instantly form themselves into rifle clubs ; the people who cannot, must use pitchforks, scythes, or billhooks on poles, flails, or whatever else they can get. Every village or town where the invaders halt to rest should be set on fire, and their flanks and rear should be hung upon, and no quarter given. If the emergency be not thought sufficiently urgent to require the Militia to be now embodied, at least all the officers should be assembled, and formed into regiments at Aldershot, that they may be thoroughly prepared, which the greater number are not now, to take the effective command of men when the necessity for calling them out arises. The Lords-Lieutenant of counties, with the aid of the Deputy-Lieutenants, should have lists of every cart, waggon, horse, and all other means of conveyance for troops, guides through back lanes, and over unenclosed downs and heaths, to conduct the armed masses on the flanks of the invaders, all ready for the use of the Government at a moment's notice. These measures would cost very little ; but the moral effect of such a demonstration on the part of the whole population would be immense on the ardour of those who are planning our conquest.

We are the most quarrelsome people in the world, the most insulting, the most offensive, and yet will not learn or practise the means of defending ourselves from the consequences of our misbehaviour. On the first symptom of a hostile sail appearing, martial law should be proclaimed, and every male thing brought out to fight ; and, from the experience which we have had in late years of the conduct of kings, let us thank God that we have a Queen rather than a man on the throne, and one with all the courage of her race.

Every statesman that I have ever known has lamented the necessity of weakening the defences of the country so soon as war

is over, in compliance with the clamour of the manufacturers and merchants. The consequence is, that when war again breaks out we are unprepared, the former implements rotten and useless from neglect, and we are thereby obliged to incur double expense from the suddenness of the emergency. Your assertion that we have rushed into wars too soon, is so far from being true, that great mischief has arisen from our not interfering to prevent the partition of Poland. Again, it was the known reluctance of Lord Aberdeen and the rest of the ministers to go to war, that allowed the Russians to cross the Pruth with impunity. If we had resisted that, the Crimean war would have been avoided. All our wars were pressed on the governments by some one or other class of traders, and for commercial purposes; and yet, with extraordinary perversion of history, or recklessness of veracity, joined with the consciousness of the ignorance of the persons you were addressing, you had the effrontery to state that all wars have been undertaken for the benefit of land-owners.

You then refer to the duties on corn, which you assert were laid on for the benefit of the land-owners, which assertion also is totally false. In all times, and in all countries, and by all governments, from the Roman Republic down to this hour, the endeavour has been to keep the food of the lowest orders as free as possible from fluctuation in value. In old times this was done by the erection of public granaries, and was in small states and in some climates effectual. In other countries exportation of cereals was prohibited altogether, solely with a view to the food of the lowest orders; and in others, importation was prohibited in order to induce more corn to be cultivated at home. The only question between Whigs and Tories for the last fifty years was, by what means could steadiness of price be best secured, the object of both being the same. One party said, by a fixed duty; the other, by a variable duty. Long before your Corn League was ever heard of, I addressed some observations to the agriculturalists of my own neighbourhood, under the title of "Cheap Corn best for Farmers;" in which it was endeavoured to be shown, that although during the currency of their leases it was their interest to have corn dear, yet so soon as the leases terminated it was their interest to have corn cheap, because they were capitalists; and all capitalists were interested in having all commodities cheap. A lord's son, Mr. Villiers, was the man, and neither Sir R. Peel, nor you, nor Mr. Cobden, nor your League, who took the sound view, which was to leave the trade open like other trades. The question between Sir R. Peel and Lord

J. Russell was a mere faction fight, and Sir Robert gave up very foolishly all duty together, in order to outbid Lord John for popular favour. Farmers who were bound by leases (and you and your party have been always sneering at those who have not long leases) were ruined by a sudden fall in the prices of their produce, and complained with justice that the same law which took away the value of their earnings, did not also ease the weight of their responsibilities ; and thousands were ruined. Land-owners also, whose estates were settled for other members of their families to share the income, and had annuities to pay, justly complained that their incomes were taken from them, whilst the incumbrances which had been made under the same authority were still riveted on their shoulders. The cry of the League, so far as it contended for the freedom of trade in corn was right, but so far as it pretended to be interested for the labourer was pure cant. The cry was got up entirely and exclusively in the interest of Manchester, Birmingham, Leeds, Glasgow, &c. that their manufactures might go out in exchange for corn to come in. They cared nothing for rents, settlements, mortgages, &c.; and because their class was not affected, they were too narrow-minded to consider any other.

The population varies with the facility for procuring food. It is the same with all animals. If it is wished to have hares in a country where there are none, sow parsley, and there will soon be plenty of hares. If foxes are wanted, turn out rabbits, or water-hens, and there will soon be plenty of foxes. When corn is cheap the population increases. But "cheap" is a relative term : what is cheap corn to one amount of population, and consequently of wages, is not cheap corn to a larger amount of population, and consequently lower wages. If corn were to fall now to a shilling a bushel, it would be a great advantage to the present population of England, but very soon the population would increase to the point when corn at a shilling a bushel would be dear ; and therefore the cheapness is no permanent advantage to the working men.

There is, again, a most false assertion, that the taxes are raised from labour alone. All that is raised from capital is raised from the rich. It does indeed affect the poor, because it diminishes the power of the rich to employ so much labour, and by so much tends to lower the rate of wages by throwing so many more hands into the market ; but it is to be remembered that almost all the revenue of the country is spent upon, and in wages to, English labourers. If wars were to cease, the Birmingham gun-makers

would cease also. The private soldiers, and sailors, policemen, coast-guards, ship-builders, miners, builders, brickmakers, masons, iron-founders, cloth-weavers, are all of the class of labourers ; the cost of their clothing, food, &c. all employ labourers. There is still plenty of money expended in barracks, fortifications, gunpowder, &c., to make war, and even the preparations to prevent war most wasteful.

No charge, however extravagant, is beneath your making in your savage antipathy to land-owners ; and amongst other things you accuse them of resisting Sir Samuel Romilly's attempts to mitigate the sanguinary state of our laws. It is true that there were a great many laws which inflicted the punishment of death for very trivial offences ; but you have falsely imputed them to the land-owners, when in fact they were entirely caused by the manufacturing and commercial classes. Every manufacturer presented petitions continually for "death without benefit of clergy," for stealing from his works. The acts which Sir S. Romilly wished to repeal in 1810 were,—one, which made it a capital felony to steal to the amount of five shillings from a *shop, warehouse, stable, or coach-house*; another, to steal to the same amount from a *vessel in a navigable river* ; another, to steal privately from a dwelling-house to the value of forty shillings. The laws against forgeries of notes and drafts were all clamoured for by the merchants; and also stealing from a bleaching-ground. In your model state of America, the convicted forgers are twelve times as many as in England.—*See Miller on the Criminal Law.*

You say, "I care for the constitution of the people among whom I live. There is no man in England who is less likely to speak irreverently of the crown and monarchy of England than I am. We who stand upon the old landmarks, who walk in the old paths, who would conserve what is wise and prudent, are hustled and shoved about as if we were come to turn the world upside down."

You avow that you are endeavouring to destroy King and Lords, and to establish a democracy. You are therefore turning the world, at least trying to turn England, upside down, without having the most distant idea of what then is to follow. You are a perfectly honest man : you are led away by vehement antipathies and partialities to exaggerate, and therefore to make assertions which will not stand the test of accurate analysis ; but you are utterly incapable of intentionally avowing one thing for the sake of, and as the means of attaining to, another. You

have not, however, the most remote idea of that which constitutes the essence of government. You can see, doubtless, the brute and vulgar kind of government which exists amongst savages, or the Chinese, Mahometans, and over all the Continent of Europe. You can see, that if there were a good obstinate man as Emperor or King, with 500,000 bayonets ready to stick into any body that thwarts him, that government by such means is easy enough. But you have never yet learned, nor ever conceived the idea, of a government existing amongst freemen, all equal before the law, but all having distinct and different rights according, first, to the amount of their wealth, and secondly to the nature of it ; that is, of what it consists. You have a dreamy vision of a republic, not like Switzerland however, but like America, and yet you cannot see that no two things of the same nature can be more entirely dissimilar than the constitution of England and the constitution of America. You avow that you want to establish a democracy. Every one who unites with you is bound to carry out the same view. It is unworthy of you to use the word Reform any longer, but say truthfully, "I want to change the constitution of England from being a limited monarchy, to being a democracy."

The "old landmarks, the old paths," which you are so anxious to conserve, consist of order and suborder of classes. First, the Crown, with rights of its own, which it is its duty to conserve at all hazards, and not allow either or both Houses of Parliament to take from it. When the Pope told William the Conqueror to do fealty to him for the crown of England, which he asserted he had given to the king, the latter replied, "I do not owe my crown to him ; by my good sword I got it, and by my good sword I will "keep it." This is true of all property and rights, whether public or private. If a thief come to take the property of any householder, the householder must shoot him ; he must defend his property and rights by the sword. So alone have been, and ever must be, rights of property defended in all ages and in all countries. "*Vaincre ou mourir en Roi*," as the noble Queen Amélie said to Louis Philippe. Secondly, the land-owner, whose place is the House of Lords ; but since it is wealth that is more important than the nature of that wealth, opulent manufacturers, or traders of any kind, ought in the present circumstances of the country, at the pleasure of the sovereign, to have seats for life, provided they possess a given amount of realised property ; and it is the duty of the House of Lords to reject all bills sent up from the Commons that infringe on their rights. Thirdly, the representatives of all the interests in the

kingdom, such as the cotton trade in Manchester and Glasgow; the iron trade in Birmingham, Sheffield, &c.; the shipping interest in Liverpool, Hull, &c.; mining interests in Cornish towns; coal interests in Newcastle, Merthyr Tydvil, Wolverhampton, &c.; linen manufactures in Belfast, Dunfermline, &c.; the landed interest in all the counties of England, Scotland, and Ireland. Towns in which there is no special industry should be disfranchised.

Every man might have a vote for as much share in the common wealth as he possessed. In large towns, the right of choosing Members of Parliament was always vested in the men who possessed the wealth which was the peculiar product of the place, whether under the name of burgesses, freemen, or any other: whilst all the inhabitants might have the right of voting for those with whom the choice of members rests. The towns might still continue to return members as well as the counties. By these means the franchise would be extended to all, and yet the order and suborder of all classes preserved as they ever were in the days of our Saxon, Norman, and English ancestors, and must be still.

The Chartist and Socialist plan which you have adopted, of giving to millions of men without property the power of disposing of the property of others, is not a whit more absurd than the petition presented to Lord Palmerston by sundry lords, placemen, *savans*, and sundry notabilities, praying that all the philosophers, the Royal Society, the Royal Academy, the Inns of Court, the London University, &c., &c., may have representatives. Scientific paupers have as little right to dispose of the property of others as unscientific paupers. Property is sufficiently difficult to define, but knowledge, talents, science, are still more so; and these persons have no right to be represented which every pauper in the country does not possess. A briefless barrister, an attorney without clients, a doctor without patients, a painter whose pictures won't sell, an architect who has neither churches nor palaces to build, a mathematician with only geometry and algebra, a scholar with nothing but a digamma, are all equally paupers. In governments we have to deal with tangible things. The Crown, as the executive, sees that the laws are fulfilled which it, with the other branches of the legislature, have enacted. It appoints all subordinate persons in the executive—judges, magistrates, generals, admirals, &c., with which the other branches cannot meddle; and the meddling of the House of Commons in these appointments is always mischievous and unjust to the officers. It

is bound to carry the laws into effect, and mow down with grape-shot, if need be, all who rise up against them. The lawmaker must be a possessor of property, because the end of all legislation is the security of property. Laws are not made to make men scientific, nor artists, nor physicians, nor surgeons, but to secure all property, whether small or great. A penny edition of the "Voyage to "Laputa" would be an excellent work for all literary and scientific institutions.

Your spleen against, and jealousy of the landed interest, is curious, because of all men they get least return for their capital. It may be possible to buy land in obscure and ugly districts which brings a better return, but it is rare to find any near a gentleman's residence, or a town having a railway-station, which does not command a fancy price; and no land in such a situation can be procured which will pay two per cent interest; so that, of all species of property, it is the one which least merits your envy. The influence of the land-owners is not from their wealth, but from their use, benevolence, and example to all around. You used to declaim most loudly against class legislation, whereas it now turns out that your meaning was to cry down every class which did not give pre-eminence to cotton-spinners, to slave-dealing cotton-growers. The charm of landed, in preference to commercial property, is its less liability to fluctuation; and not requiring the activity, which is as great an evil to some constitutions of mind as ease and tranquillity is to many others; and most manufacturers and traders long for the time when they can retire from the anxieties of trade, and rest on their farms.

With regard to public business, you know well that it is not carried on by great speeches, but in committees upstairs, and in debates on the annual estimates, which are seldom reported, because they would be unintelligible, from their complexity, if they were. In both of these the country gentlemen are sought for to serve in preference to the representatives of manufacturing towns, because the former understand the questions brought before them infinitely better than the latter. The Chairman of Ways and Means, the Chairman of the Pannels for selecting the election committees, and all such offices, are almost invariably chosen from the country gentlemen, and generally from the county members.

And now, having given these reasons why a monarchy is preferable to a democracy, and why it is the duty of the Crown and of the men of property in Great Britain to contend to the death for the Constitution, of which you say nobody cares a straw, I must

add, in conclusion, that I think you will succeed, although you ought not to do so.

Your brother-democrat, Mr. Bishop, has given us his notion of "the constitution of society as designed by God ;" but he has not vouchsafed to tell us to whom God revealed this design, nor has he referred to God's word to prove his assertion. If you and he would learn from Holy Scripture, from the history of the Jews, from the testimony of the heathen, and from the feelings implanted in the hearts of all nations, you would come to more correct ideas of Churches and Monarchies, than you have at present.

From the commencement of the history of mankind, God has instructed men with great detail in the manner in which He would be approached. It is man's duty to know and adapt himself to these forms, and his happiness also ; because the forms are the outward expression of eternal truths essential to that happiness. If there may be some excuse for illiterate people, there is none for the cultivated classes. The scientific men know that there is not a part of creation which, when left free to act, does not assume a specific form peculiar to itself, and different from all other. The earth, the metals, water, and all inorganic matter, each follow their own law. Organic matter does the same. Mosses and trees, insects, animals, and man the highest of all, have structures and organization peculiar to each class, and without which the ends for which they were created cannot be effected. Yet the philosophers, the clergy, the chemists, the botanists, imagine that the Church, the body of Christ, that for which all other things consist, and to which all other things are subservient, has no organization at all : that it has no fixed forms through which alone God can be approached, and by which alone He will be worshipped, and by which alone He guides and rules over men ; but that any number of people assembling in a room and hiring a man to make them a speech is worshipping God. The Church is the only living instrument by which is revealed "the constitution of society as "designed by God." It is her business to show His method of carrying on the government of His intelligent creatures, both in heaven and on earth, in order to insure their happiness. This method is through order and suborder, in the Heavenly Host first, and amongst men also. This is, however, neither the time nor place to go into the details on the subject ; but you may spend an hour profitably in reading the first book of Hooker : or the speech of Ulysses to Agamemnon, in "Troilus and Cressida," Act I. The question is summed up in few words,— Do Truth, Wisdom, Justice,

Mercy, descend from God to instruct man, or do they rise up to instruct God out of the bottomless pit of the disorganized mass of His creatures? When God showed Himself the living embodiment of these things, the people who knew Him best rushed at Him, called Him an impostor, and put Him to death: and He punished them by destruction through civil war and foreign invasions. This nation, that boasts of purer knowledge of Him than any other, rushes now at His Body, the alone dwelling-place of His Spirit upon earth, calls it imposture, and will not listen to its teaching; and He will punish this nation first, and all Christendom now, by civil war and by foreign invasion. Each class in a state has separate functions, and separate functions imply separate rights. It is the duty of each member to defend his class from all encroachment from others, or die in the attempt. Such a death is glorious as well as happy; no death is so happy as that which is incurred in the performance of duty.

There is, apparently, amongst all politicians, a total want of knowledge of principles. Being ignorant of the principles of the Church, they are necessarily so of a limited Monarchy and of a Republic or Democracy. Wherever the state of the House of Commons is discussed, every one agrees in testifying that the character of members has greatly deteriorated since the Reform Bill. It is much worse now than it was ten years back. There is a want of honesty in members to declare their real opinions. They speak to please their constituents, not from conviction. Many of the most violent advocates for reform in public, declaim against it in private. One of these, with whom I was scarcely acquainted by sight, called out aloud to me in the crowded salon of the Hôtel du Louvre, at Paris, and asked me whether, if there were the ballot in the House of Commons, I thought there would be many votes for Reform. Very many try to get in for the gratification of personal vanity. It is the most expensive club in London. The Ministers degrade the Court of the Sovereign by bringing into it persons who ought never to be seen there, merely because they vote for them in Parliament. At the daily opening of the House for business, many gossips appear; they dwindle away during the discussion of important business to from fifty to sixty, rush back to vote on questions which they have never heard discussed, and of which they are utterly ignorant; the more nice, complicated, and difficult the questions, the less do they listen to them: but their names are proclaimed by the Reform Association as the most useful members, because they

have most often voted on subjects of which they know nothing. The real business of the country is done, not on great field-days, but in committees both upstairs and in the House, and in these the "advanced Liberals" are rarely seen, and evidently show they know nothing of business when they are. Principles being lost sight of, there is neither compass nor chart to guide us on the political sea. Every man may amuse himself in making a Constitution; all will be equally good and equally absurd.

The Bill you will bring in is a necessary sequence of the last Reform Bill. That Bill had the single object of enabling the Whigs to wreak their vengeance on the Tories, who had properly kept them out of power for several years, whilst they were insulting their sovereign, vindicating all innovations against his authority, and patronising traitors and mutineers. They were so full of this one idea that some did not remember, and some did not care, that they were revolutionising the country, by transferring power from those who had a permanent interest in the country, whose property did owe allegiance, to those who had only an ephemeral interest, and who since have boasted that their property owed no allegiance to the throne. Lord Melbourne often spoke of it as "that d——d "Reform Bill, which had undermined the throne."

A familiar instance in private life will illustrate the operations performed in State affairs. Let us suppose that you are one of a half-a-dozen partners in a large cotton manufacture; that you have an hereditary right in the buildings, machinery, and that your partners have only a life interest. Increased knowledge of mechanics, and ingenuity of inventors, make it advantageous that much money should be laid out in expensive alterations and in new machinery. It is obvious your partners will refuse to make this outlay: they will say, "No, the old will last my time, and I will "not invest money in that of which I and my family have only a "temporary, and not a permanent interest."

There was no principle in a franchise of 10*l.* any more than in 9*l.* or 8*l.* Your Democratic Bill is a necessary consequence of the last Reform Bill. I fear your Bill will be carried sooner or later, or else one more republican still; for the most violent, the most revolutionary, the most democratic, is probably that which will ultimately prevail.

Newspapers are halting for a short time to see how the middle classes, who have now much power, will like to be supplanted by classes still lower; but when these classes begin to show their numbers and organisation, the newspapers who do not agree in

their views will cease to sell, and therefore will change. The local cheap papers which you have been so active in encouraging, must go with the lowest classes, and will outbid each other in virulence and falsehood.

The example of France might teach you that democracy can never be met but by grape-shot ; and you, man of foreign peace, are leading your countrymen peaceably into a sea of domestic blood. All practical statesmen know this, and the good fear a Democracy on this account. Theoretical statesmen—men who study from books, or spin out of their own brains how to rule mankind, and not by practice amongst them—are unteachable ; they can see no reason why the lowest should not rule the highest, just as well as the highest rule the lowest ; they see no reason why men should not stand with their legs in the air, and resting on their hands just as well as on their legs, with their arms hanging down ; they see no reason why men with property should not retain it without the power to do so, or why beggars, with power to rob with impunity, should take such a thing into their heads. All men of sense in France hate the rule which oppresses them as much as we do, but bitter experience has proved to them that a democracy is infinitely worse. I doubt whether there is sufficient sense of duty left in the higher classes here to make them resist, at all risks, democratic encroachments, because the principles of government are no longer known.

There will be struggles, but there are none to lead the various contending factions. The nation no longer exists as one body, bound under and to the sovereign as its head ; neither are there classes each a body in itself, yet all subordinate to the one whole. You, and every other who is exalted on the shoulders of the mob to-day, will be dragged down to-morrow—Sejanuses are not always of the highest classes—and you will only be remembered as the mushroom Mazzini, the Kossuth, the Ledru Rollin of England.

I must yet tell you one thing more. You know not what spirit you are of, nor the reality that lies within your outward endeavour, nor the religious apostasy, at the head of which you are placing yourself. All Protestants—and this country, beyond all others—boast that they are only influenced by the plain letter of the Bible ; that that is their guide in politics and in religion ; that other nations not so guided are idolaters or infidels. Now God declares by St. Paul, “ All power is of God.” By Solomon He declares, “ By Me kings rule, and princes administer justice.”

By the prophets He declares, "The Most High ruleth in the kingdoms of men, and giveth it to whomsoever He will." The Church held in the beginning the same language, as you may see by consulting the ancient chronicles. In 180 Pope Eleutherius wrote to Lucius, king of Britain, in which letter, amongst other things, he tells the king, "Out of the Divine mercy you have of late received into your kingdom both the Old and New Testament; out of them, in God's name, by the council of your state, take you a law, and therewith, by God's permission, govern your kingdom of Britain, for you are God's Vicar in your kingdom." The Pope concludes with the benediction: "Almighty God grant you so to rule your kingdom of Britanny, that with Him, whose Vicar you are in your kingdom, you may reign eternally." Our most ancient law-books are full of similar expressions, and although the truth was misused by the Stuarts, it was never openly rejected until the French Revolution, when those fanatics there, and some Whigs in England—Lord Fitzwilliam and the Duke of Norfolk—set up the doctrine that power proceeded from the people, and not from God. Since the Incarnation God has spoken through consecrated men, and He speaks now by no other, even through His kings and priests. It is true, that the main part of them have used the power entrusted to them for their own personal advantage, and not for the benefit of those for whose sakes they were entrusted with it; it is true, that by their misconduct the name of God, in human government, has become an offence in the ears of men, of which the degrading superstitions inculcated by Roman priests, and the despotism of priests and emperors, are examples. Hence God's interference with the government of men is unheeded, forgotten, or denied. The Church, which was appointed to teach these things, teaches them no more. The machinery of temporal government, which was ordained to be the scaffolding for building that Church, is therefore become useless. Men will have none of God's ways, and He has left them to their own.

The end is, that God must vindicate His own cause. You are realising the fabled battle of the Giants against Jupiter, and leading on the masses of Englishmen to say, "No: God is not the source of power; it is we who are." You will cause as much confusion as took place under the last Reform Bill. You have avowed your statesmanship to consist in "embarrassing a government." Under such guidance no administration of the Queen's Government can be carried on; and in the midst of a nation in

confusion, without any to command or to obey, a political chaos, the Emperor insulted by some and despised by you, will send an army, perhaps under the pretext of protecting his friend the Queen from her own subjects, and, certainly, to put down a lawlessness which, if not suppressed, must communicate a similar flame to every nation in Europe. Europe in flames—physical, moral, and religious—is the only possible ultimate end of your able, misdirected zeal. Happy alone are they who know the refuge into which they may flee, and “escape the things which “are coming on the earth.”

I am, Sir,

Your obedient Servant,

HENRY DRUMMOND.

November 1858.

LONDON :

Printed by G. BARCLAY, Castle St. Leicester Sq.

