Grand Duchy of Tuscany was restored, as well as smaller states. A quarter of a century passed away before the hollowness of these arrangements was tested by the revolt of some portion of the people of the Italian peninsula against their rulers, and by the loudly expressed desire of the whole for a common nationality.

Whilst the prosaic destinies of Europe had been settled amidst a conflict of jarring interests, the emperor of Russia had assiduously laboured to obtain converts to a political union, which should be founded upon principles very different from those which ordinarily guide the councils of diplomatists. In a manifesto from St. Petersburg, dated "on the day of the birth of our Saviour, 25th December, 1815," the emperor commanded that there should be read in all the churches a "Convention concluded at Paris, on the 26th of September, 1815, between the emperor of Russia, the emperor of Austria, and the king of Prussia," in which "they solemnly declare that the present act has no other object than to publish in the face of the whole world their fixed resolution, both in the administration of their respective States and in their political relations with every other government, to take for their sole guide the precepts of the holy religion of our Saviour, namely, the precepts of justice, Christian charity, and peace, which, far from being applicable only to private concerns, must have an immediate influence on the councils of princes, and guide all their steps, as being the only means of consolidating human institutions, and remedying their imperfections." This was the famous declaration of "The Holy Alliance." When asked to sign it, the Duke of Wellington said that the English Parliament would require something more precise. Whenever, in after years, either of the three Sovereigns manifested symptoms of disregard for "the precepts of justice, Christian charity, and peace," the Holy Alliance was held, perhaps somewhat unjustly, to be a cloak under which their violation of pledges to their own subjects, and their desire for territorial aggrandizement, might be best concealed. Denunciations of this Convention were long heard in the British Parliament.

The Peace of Europe was settled, as every former peace had been settled, upon a struggle for what the continental powers thought most conducive to their own advantage. The representatives of Great Britain manifested a praiseworthy abnegation of merely selfish interests. Napoleon, at St. Helena, said to O'Meara, "So silly a treaty as that made by your ministers for their own country was never known before. You give up everything and gain nothing." We can now answer that we gained everything when we gained a longer period of repose than our modern annals

could previously exhibit. We gained everything when, after twenty years of warfare upon the most extravagant scale, the spirit of the people conducted that warfare to a triumphant end. The gains of a great nation are not to be reckoned only by its territorial acquisitions, or its diplomatic influence. The war which England had waged, often single-handed, against a colossal tyranny, raised her to an eminence which amply compensated for the mistakes of her negotiators. It was something that they did not close the war in a huckstering spirit—that they did not squabble for this colony or that *entrepôt*. The fact of our greatness was not to be mistaken when we left to others the scramble for aggrandizement, content at last to be free to pursue our own course of consolidating our power by the arts of peace. There were years of exhaustion and discontent to follow those years of perilous conflict and final triumph. But security was won; we were safe from the giant aggressor.

If the plenipotentiaries of this country might return home a little imbued with the temper of despotic cabinets—if they could be accused of having too strenuously asserted the principle of legitimacy—if they had appeared to have contended too much for the claims of kings, and too little for the rights of the people—in one respect they had done their duty, and truly upheld the moral supremacy of England. They had laboured strenuously, and they had laboured with tolerable success, for the abolition of the Slave Trade. In the Treaty of Utrecht, England protected her commercial interests—despicable protection—by stipulating for a monopoly of the slave trade for thirty years. In the Treaty of Paris, England wrested from France an immediate abolition of the traffic, and a declaration from all the high contracting powers that they would concert, without loss of time, "the most effectual measures for the entire and definitive abolition of a commerce so odious." At the peace of 1814, the restored government of France—restored by our money and our arms—refused to consent to the immediate abolition. Bonaparte, amidst his memorable acts of the Hundred Days, abolished the hateful traffic by a stroke of his pen. The Bourbon government, a second time restored, dared no longer refuse this one demand of Great Britain. Other nations had promised. But, where we might have commanded, there alone was resistance. Spain and Portugal still maintained the traffic.

After great revolutions, such as those of France in 1814 and 1815—such as England had witnessed in the restoration of the Stuarts—it is almost impossible that a triumphant party should altogether have the magnanimity to pardon political offences. But History

looks with a just indignation upon any unreasonable severities, and especially upon any signal want of clemency in the ruler who has the unquestioned power to exercise the divine prerogative of mercy. Louis XVIII. can scarcely be accused of blood-thirstiness; yet his character would have stood better, not only with the French people, but with the British, had he not sanctioned the condemnation and capital punishment of three, who had indeed betrayed the trust which the restored government had reposed in them, but who had some excuse in their inability to resist the fascinations of Napoleon. Talleyrand had been unable to accomplish by negotiation as favourable terms for France as he had expected, and he resigned his office as President of the Council. He was succeeded by the Duc de Richelieu, who signed the treaty of the 20th of November. Whilst Talleyrand remained in power he, as well as Fouché, was anxious that no capital punishments should be inflicted upon any of those who were proscribed by an ordonnance of the 24th of July, for the part they had taken in the return of Napoleon in March. Ney, Labedoyère, and Lavalette were advised to place themselves in safety by leaving France. They were tardy and irresolute; the friendly warning was useless. Labedoyère was tried by court-martial, and was shot. Lavalette, who had been condemned to death by the Cour d'Assise, escaped through a stratagem of his wife, who, having visited him in prison, was able to disguise her husband in her own dress, remaining herself as an object for the possible vengeance of the royalists. Lavalette was assisted to pass the frontier by the generous friendship of three Englishmen,—sir Robert Wilson, Mr. Bruce, and Mr. Hutchinson; who were tried for this offence, and sentenced to three months imprisonment. The proceeding which most commanded public attention in England was the trial and execution of Ney; for it was held to involve the honour of the Duke of Wellington. Whilst the trial was proceeding before the Chamber of Peers, Ney was advised to rely for his defence on the capitulation of Paris. His wife had an interview with Wellington, who had previously expressed his opinion, in a letter to the prince de la Moskwa,—to the effect that the capitulation related exclusively to the military occupation of Paris; that the object of the 12th article was to prevent the adoption of any measures of severity, under the military authorities of those who made it, towards any persons on account of the offices which they filled, or their conduct or their political opinions. "But it was never intended, and could not be intended, to prevent either the existing French government, under whose authority the French commander-in-chief must have acted, or any French government

which should succeed to it, from acting in this respect as it might deem fit." * When the bravest of the French marshals was executed, party spirit blamed the duke of Wellington for not regarding the capitulation as an amnesty. It would have been generous in the king of France to have spared Ney's life; but the capitulation of Paris offered no legal obstacle to that infliction of punishment which the king had threatened to the guilty before the capitulation.

"One day of dreadful occupation more † before England could be held to be at peace with foreign foes. At the Congress of Vienna, the aggressions of the Barbary States formed a natural subject of deliberation. It was proposed that a general European crusade should be undertaken against the infidel corsairs; who, for three hundred years, had been the terror of Europe, warring against every flag in the Mediterranean, and carrying off Christian slaves from every shore. In 1815, the government of the United States, whose ships had been plundered by the Algerines, captured a frigate and a brig belonging to the Dey, and obtained a compensation of sixty thousand dollars. In the spring of 1816, lord Exmouth, with a squadron under his command, proceeded to Algiers, Tunis, and Tripoli, where he effected the release of seventeen hundred and ninety-two Christian slaves, and negotiated treaties of peace and amity on behalf of the minor powers in the Mediterranean. From Tunis and Tripoli a declaration was obtained that no Christian slaves should in future be made by either of those powers. The Dey of Algiers, however, refused to agree to the abolition of slavery without permission from the Sultan. Lord Exmouth acceded to a suspension for three months of the Dey's decision, and returned to England. One condition of the treaty with Algiers, then concluded by lord Exmouth, was, that the governments of Sicily and Sardinia should pay ransom for the release of their subjects; and, in point of fact, they did so pay, to the extent of nearly four hundred thousand dollars. This clause of the treaty was justly denounced in the British Parliament, as an acknowledgment of the right of depredation exercised by the barbarians.

The fleet of lord Exmouth was dismantled; the crews were paid off and disbanded. A sudden outrage which occurred even before lord Exmouth quitted the Mediterranean, but which did not then come to his knowledge, was the obvious cause of the

* "Despatches," vol. xii. p. 694.

† Southey—"Ode on the Battle of Algiers."

change in the determination of our government. Under a treaty of 1806, we occupied, for the protection of the coral fishery, Bona, a town in the regency of Algiers. On the 23rd of May, the fishers who had landed were massacred by a large body of troops; the British flag was torn down and trampled under foot, and the house of our vice-consul was pillaged. It was alleged that this outrage was a fanatical movement of the licentious Algerine soldiery. An expedition against Algiers was instantly determined upon by the British Cabinet. A formidable fleet was equipped, with the least possible delay, at Portsmouth, and crews were collected from the different guard-ships, and volunteers invited to serve upon this particular enterprise. For once, a British fleet went to sea without recourse to the disgraceful practice of impressment. Lord Exmouth left Plymouth on the 28th of July, with a fleet consisting of twenty-five sail of large and small ships. At Gibraltar he was joined by the Dutch admiral, Van Cappellan, with five frigates and a sloop; and he finally set sail for Algiers on the 14th. The winds being adverse, the fleet did not arrive in sight of Algiers till the 27th of August. During his course, lord Exmouth learnt that the British Consul had been put in chains.

A most interesting and graphic narrative of the expedition to Algiers was published by Mr. Abraham Salamé, a native of Alexandria, who was taken out by lord Exmouth to act as his interpreter. On the morning of the 27th, as the fleet was nearing Algiers, Salamé was sent forward with a letter to the Dey, which demanded the entire abolition of Christian slaves in the kingdom of Algiers; the restoration of all the money that had been paid for the redemption of slaves by the king of the Two Sicilies and the king of Sardinia; peace between Algiers and the Netherlands; and the immediate liberation of the British Consul, and two boats' crews who had been detained with him. At eleven o clock the interpreter reached the Mole, in a boat bearing a flag of truce, and, delivering his letters to the captain of the port, demanded an answer to the letter addressed to the Dey in one hour. He was told that if answer were returned at all, it should be delivered in two hours. Salamé waited for his answer till half-past two, but no answer came. During this time a breeze sprung up, the fleet advanced into the bay, and lay-to within half-a-mile of Algiers. The interpreter then hoisted the signal that no answer had been given, and the fleet immediately began to bear up, and every ship to take her position. Salamé reached the Queen Charlotte, lord Exmouth's ship, in safety; but, he candidly acknowledges, almost more dead than alive. Then he saw the change which comes over a brave

and decided man at the moment when resolve passes into action. "I was quite surprised to see how his lordship was altered from what I left him in the morning, for I knew his manner was in general very mild; and now he seemed to me *all-fightful*, as a fierce lion which had been chained in its cage and was set at liberty. With all that, his lordship's answer to me was, 'Never mind—we shall see now;' and at the same time he turned towards the officers, saying, 'Be ready!'" There is, perhaps, nothing in the history of warfare more terrific in its consequences than the first broadside that the British fired at Algiers. The Queen Charlotte passed through all the batteries without firing a gun, and took up a position within a hundred yards of the Mole-head batteries. At the first shot, which was fired by the Algerines at the Impregnable, lord Exmouth cried out, "That will do; fire, my fine fellows!" The miserable Algerines who were looking on, as at a show, with apparent indifference to the consequences, were swept away by hundreds by this first fire from the Queen Charlotte. From a quarter before three o'clock till nine, the most tremendous firing on both sides continued without intermission, and the firing did not cease altogether until half-past eleven. During this engagement of nine hours, the allied fleet fired a hundred and eighteen tons of gunpowder, and five hundred tons of shot and shells. The Algerines exclaimed that hell had opened its mouth upon them through the English ships. That the Algerines had plied their instruments of destruction with no common alacrity is sufficiently shown by the fact, that eight hundred and fifty-two officers and men were killed in the British squadron, and sixty-five in the Dutch. Lord Exmouth himself says, in his despatch, "There were awful moments during the conflict, which I cannot now attempt to describe, occasioned by firing the ships so near us" The Algerine batteries around lord Exmouth's division were silenced about ten o'clock, and were in a complete state of ruin and dilapidation; but a fort at the upper angle of the city continued to annoy our ships, whose firing had almost ceased. This was the moment of the most serious danger to our fleet. Our means of attack were well-nigh expended; the upper batteries of the city could not be reached by our guns; the ships were becalmed. "Providence, at this interval," says lord Exmouth, "gave to my anxious wishes the usual land-wind common in this bay, and my expectations were completed. We were all hands employed warping and towing off, and by the help of the light air the whole were under sail, and came to anchor out of reach of shells about two in the morning, after twelve hours' incessant labour." Nine Algerine frigates and a number of gunboats

were burning within the bay; the storehouses within the Mole were on fire. The blaze illumined all the bay, and showed the town and its environs almost as clear as in the day-time; instead of walls, the batteries presented nothing to the sight but heaps of rubbish; and out of these ruins the Moors and Turks were busily employed in dragging their dead. When the fleet had anchored a storm arose—not so violent as the storm which here destroyed the mighty fleet of Charles the Fifth, and left his magnificent army, which had landed to subdue the barbarians, to perish by sword and famine—but a storm of thunder and lightning, which filled up the measure of sublimity, at the close of the twelve awful hours of battle and slaughter.

On the morning of the 28th, lord Exmouth wrote a letter to the Dey, who had himself fought with courage, in which the same terms of peace were offered as on the previous day. "If you receive this offer as you ought, you will fire three guns," wrote lord Exmouth. The three guns were fired, the Dey made apologies, and treaties of peace and amity were finally signed, to be very soon again broken. The enduring triumph of this expedition was the release, within three days of the battle, of a thousand and eighty-three Christian slaves, who arrived from the interior, and who were immediately conveyed to their respective countries.

CHAPTER XXI. *

Meeting of Parliament.—Reception of Lord Castlereagh.—Debates on the Address.—Government defeated on the proposed renewal of the Property-Tax.—Marriage of the Princess Charlotte.—Unpopularity of the Prince Regent.—Complaints of Agricultural Distress.—Depression of Commerce and Manufacturers.—Causes assigned for the depression of Industry.—Reduction of the Circulating Medium.—Unfavourable Season.—Riots and outrages in Agricultural Districts.—Renewal of Luddism.—Private Benevolence.—Progress of Legislation for Social Improvement.—Criminal Laws.—Forgeries of Bank Notes.—Police of London.—Gas-Light.—Mendicity and Vagrancy.—Law of Settlement.—General Administration of Poor Laws.—Inquiry into the State of Education.—Savings' Banks.—Game Laws.

THE Imperial Parliament assembled on the 1st of February, 1816. At this opening of the Session the ministry met the representatives of the people with all the pride and confidence of a success beyond hope. The march to Paris, twice over, says a conspicuous actor in the politics of that hour, was sufficiently marvellous; "but it appeared, if possible, still more incredible, that we should witness lord Castlereagh entering the House of Commons, and resuming, amidst universal shouts of applause, the seat which he had quitted for a season to attend as a chief actor in the arrangement of continental territory."† Why incredible? Lord Castlereagh in the House of Commons was the impersonation of a great national triumph. The parliamentary majority cheered the Minister for Foreign affairs as he would have been cheered by any other assembly, when he came home flushed with success. For a little while the nation might bear even the presumption of those

* The period comprised in this Chapter, and in Chapter XXII., embracing the annals of 1816 and 1817, has been previously treated of by the author of "The Popular History" in "The History of the Peace," published in 1846. This work, begun by him, was continued and completed by Miss Martineau, and therefore bears her name. Although in the present history the author proposed only to occupy about half the space of what he had previously written, he felt the extreme difficulty of relating the same events, and expressing the same opinions, altogether in new words. Having stated his difficulty to Messrs. Chambers, who are now the proprietors of the copyright of "The History of the Peace," he has received from them a very kind permission, to condense the original narrative, or adopt any passages, at his own discretion. Whilst this licence relieves the author from an obvious embarrassment, he has nevertheless been desirous to avoid a mere transcript of any large portion of what he had previously written. But he has not made the useless attempt to distinguish between the new matter and the old, hoping that he has amalgamated the separate parts so as to produce a harmonious result.

† Brougham's "Speeches," vol. i. p. 634: Introduction to Speech on Holy Alliance.