PREFATORY NOTE

I SHOULD like to thank Lord Granville and Mr. C. A. Gladstone for their kind encouragement to publish these letters. The Cabinet Office has given me permission to publish extracts from Gladstone's cabinet papers, which have helped to explain allusions in the letters. I owe a great debt to Miss Mary Anderson and Miss Winifred Bamforth who corrected mistakes in my copying. I have drawn heavily on the unfailing kindness and knowledge of Mr. H. N. Blakiston and Mr. M. R. D. Foot. But I should especially wish to write the name of Dame Lillian Penson in the front of this book in the knowledge of what, over the years, I have owed to her.

A. RAMM

Somerville College
Oxford
February 1961
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CORRIGENDA

In The Political Correspondence of Mr. Gladstone and Lord Granville 1868–76 edited A. Ramm for the Royal Historical Society (1952)

Stansfield should read -feld in the footnotes and index and in the text be followed by [sic].

p. x, footnote 7, read Lord F. C. Cavendish
p. 44, no. 105, line 6; p. 104, no. 235, line 11; p. 288, no. 609, line 1 for Bobby read Bobsy
p. 75, no. 165, line 4, for It read If
p. 82, line 6, for acute read acute
p. 100, no. 226, line 3, for bill read bible
p. 113, no. 261, line 5, for Stree read Street
p. 121, footnote 3, interchange France and Prussia
p. 207, no. 438, line 10, for Birmarck read Bis . . .

p. 284, no. 599, line 6, for Beau Elice read Bear Ellice
p. 339, footnote 4, for Glynn read Glynne
p. 351, no. 768, line 5, for herefore read therefore
p. 365, footnote 2, and index, omit Lord and read Rollo Russell
p. 369, line 5, for inmunities read immunities
p. 389, no. 861, line 6, for thinkin read thinking
p. 397, no. 872, line 10, for obita read obiter
p. 478, footnote 1, for no. 1027 read no. 1026
p. 479, no. 1030, line 21, for Harwarden read Hawarden
p. 488, no. 1047, line 1, delete [or]

I am indebted for substantial corrections to Miss Flora Russell, Mr. M. R. D. Foot, and Mr. A. F. Thompson.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Misplaced as a postscript to a letter of 14 Sept. 1876</td>
<td>P.R.O. 30/29/29 A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>874</td>
<td>Dated without the year and misplaced with 1881 letters</td>
<td>Add. MS. 44173, fo. 197.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>951</td>
<td>Dated with previous year’s date and misplaced with 1882 letters</td>
<td>Add. MS. 44174, fo. 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1360</td>
<td>Undated letter, misplaced as if it belonged to 21 June</td>
<td>P.R.O. 30/29/128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1365</td>
<td>Undated letter, misplaced with 1883 letters</td>
<td>Add. MS. 44175, fo. 188.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1483</td>
<td>Misplaced as if it were dated 28 Nov.</td>
<td>Add. MS. 44177, fo. 216.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1531</td>
<td>Dated with previous year’s date and misplaced with 1884 letters</td>
<td>Add. MS. 44176, fo. 91.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1539</td>
<td>Misplaced as if it were dated June</td>
<td>P.R.O. 30/29/29 A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1595</td>
<td>Undated letter, misplaced as if it were dated 18 March</td>
<td>Add. MS. 44178, fo. 103.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1609</td>
<td>Undated letters, misplaced as if belonging to 1884</td>
<td>Add. MS. 44176, fos. 171, 172.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1611</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1642</td>
<td>Undated letter, misplaced as belonging to 1881</td>
<td>Add. MS. 44173, fo. 97.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1647</td>
<td>Misplaced, because dated with the wrong month</td>
<td>P.R.O. 30/29/29 A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1821</td>
<td>Half of the letter misplaced as if part of no. 1826</td>
<td>Add. MS. 44179, fos. 113, 118.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTRODUCTION

The political correspondence of Mr. Gladstone with Lord Granville from December 1868 to August 1876 was published in 1952 by the Royal Historical Society. The present volumes continue this publication to 1886 when the political partnership of the two men ended. The letters are published, as before, from the holographs by Lord Granville preserved in the Gladstone papers in the British Museum and from Mr. Gladstone’s holographs preserved in the Granville papers in the Public Record Office. When original letters have not been found, the copies made by each man’s private secretary and to be found in his own papers have been published. Occasionally an original letter is found with the writer’s own papers when it was returned to him, the other man having written his answer on it. A few have been found with Foreign Office papers to which they relate. A note has been made of any letter not published because of its trivial character and of any omitted passage. Normally the letters are published in full with idiosyncrasies of spelling and dating, as far as possible, respected.¹ Brief exchanges of a line or two, sometimes unintelligible and mostly to be found in each man’s cabinet papers or correspondence with the Queen, have not been published, but reference has been made to them in the footnotes.

The letters are seldom reflective. They were the means of doing business between two politicians and cabinet colleagues working in close contact. Their intimacy by 1876 was well established. It owed as much to different social inheritances and contrasted temperaments as to interests and work shared. Granville Leveson-Gower was six years younger than William Gladstone, whom he followed at Eton and Christ Church. When Lord Leveson was elected as a whig to the Commons in 1837, Gladstone had already sat for four years as a tory, and had been in office from December 1834 to April 1835. Religion, the Church, finance, and trade engrossed the young Gladstone, who had taken firsts in Classical Greats and mathematics. He had inherited an ease with facts and figures from his father, a Liverpool merchant trading overseas. Parliament, society, and court absorbed the time of Lord Leveson, who was the son of an accomplished ambassador at Paris and grandson of that Lord Gower who, according to Horace Walpole, from timidity or indolence twice in 1782–3 refused to make a ministry. He was early in office as under-secretary for foreign affairs to Lord Palmerston (1838–41). Gladstone returned to office when the tories came in again in 1841. Lord Leveson was by then without a seat in parliament. In 1846 he returned to politics as Lord Granville with

¹ See Gladstone and Granville, i, p. xvii; the last sentence of many letters follows the signature and has normally, but not invariably, been marked [P.S.].
a seat in the Lords and a court appointment. He was next parliamentary
secretary to the Railway Commission and, when this was taken into the
Board of Trade in 1848, vice-president of that Board. Gladstone had pre-
sided over the Board of Trade in 1843–5. Granville and Gladstone were
now both to the fore in industrial, economic, and educational questions and
were both appointed to the Royal Commission which organized the Great
Exhibition of 1851. Granville was its working chairman under the Prince
Consort’s presidency. His discretion, good temper, and courtesy admitted
him to Prince Albert’s friendship and the special favour of the Queen; so
that it was not surprising that he should succeed the dismissed Lord
Palmerston as foreign secretary in December 1851. He and Gladstone
were for the first time cabinet colleagues when Gladstone was chancellor
of the exchequer, from 1853 to 1855, in the coalition government in which
Granville was lord president of the Council and in charge of the early
educational policy. Four years later, in 1859, Gladstone joined the liberal
party. The two men now also shared a concern for foreign affairs; for
Gladstone’s sympathies with the liberal party were strongest towards
its foreign policy. Between 1859 and 1865 Gladstone and Granville co-
operated as critics of Lord Russell’s foreign policy from within Lord
Palmerston’s cabinet. Gladstone’s vigour and masterful elaboration were
balanced by the point and grace of his ally. From 1868 to 1874 in Glad-
stone’s first cabinet Granville was his closest coadjutor. After June 1870,
when he became foreign secretary, he and Gladstone shaped foreign policy
together by letter and, at times of crisis, by talk—at Walmer during the
parliamentary recess or more usually in Downing Street—discussing dis-
patches and telegrams as they came in and often drafting between their
morning work at the Treasury and Foreign Office respectively, before
Granville received afternoon calls from ambassadors. Between the two
administrations, Gladstone having resigned the leadership of the parlia-
mentary liberal party, Granville exercised it jointly with Lord Hartington
who sat in the Commons. In the second administration foreign affairs and
the general business of government were in varying degrees at different
times the joint work of Gladstone and Granville.

The letters assume knowledge of events and documents which a modern
reader does not have. Yet without it they are not fully intelligible. An
attempt has, therefore, been made by means of footnotes to explain the
events and summarize the documents to which they relate. Some of these
documents simply brought information. Such were dispatches, telegrams,
private letters from diplomatic representatives or colonial governors
abroad, departmental memoranda, and articles in the periodical or daily
press. The first have mostly been found in the chronological series of ‘in’,
‘out’, ‘domestic’, and ‘domestic and various’ Foreign Office papers or the

1 Persons are identified in the index and not in the footnotes.
Colonial Office papers, both classified by countries. But a large number, together with a number of departmental memoranda, have been found in one or other of the series of so-called case volumes in the Foreign Office papers. These arose when a clerk was deputed to collect, on a particular topic, retrospectively or as they came in, all memoranda, dispatches from and drafts to the representatives concerned with it. 1 The collection, like the straight series, was the basis for the weekly sections of the confidential print, circulated to cabinet ministers, in the Foreign Office and to ambassadors and ministers abroad, and sometimes for a parliamentary paper. The private letters exchanged between Granville and the representatives abroad have been found in the appropriate volumes of his papers. 2 The Quarterly, the Edinburgh Review, the Contemporary (monthly), the Nineteenth Century (monthly) were the periodicals principally mentioned. The Times, Standard, Pall Mall Gazette, Daily News, and occasionally the Daily Telegraph and Morning Post were the daily papers most frequently used. Letters from private persons and from members of parliament to both men, of this informative kind, have been traced in the volumes of the so-called 'general' correspondence that both collections have. 3

Many of the documents to which the letters relate were argumentative rather than informative. These arose in the course of making policy which, under cabinet government, is, as a rule, a combined operation. It depends upon an approximation of ideas: between the prime minister and the minister concerned; or among a few members in wider questions; or among all in legislation and in controversial matters where the cabinet is likely to be brought into relation with parliament. This approximation was wrought, in its last stages on a large question, in the cabinet room, but was often begun by the exchange of letters and the circulation and minuting of memoranda. Letters from colleagues, and sometimes copies of letters to them, are to be found in the 'special' series 4 (so-called in the British Museum nomenclature simply because there were enough letters from and to one man to be bound in a separate volume or series of volumes) in both

1 Under America, F.O. 5, on the Fortune Bay dispute and on the Fenian Brotherhood; under Columbia, F.O. 55, on the Panama Canal; under France, F.O. 27, on relations between France and China; under Madagascar, F.O. 44, on French proceedings; under Persia, F.O. 60, on the detention of Ayoub Khan; under Prussia, F.O. 64, on Angra Pequena and on New Guinea; under Russia, F.O. 65, on Central Asia; under Turkey, F.O. 78, on Smyrna, on the guaranteed loan, and on brigands; under Turkey, Egypt, F.O. 78, on the trial of Arabi, on Churchill's accusation against the khedive, on the Suez Canal, on the Egyptian financial conference, on the Red Sea, and on the Northbrook mission; under Morocco, F.O. 99, on designs of France.

2 See Gladstone and Granville, i, p. xiv. The origin and arrangement of the Gladstone and Granville collections of papers was discussed in the introduction to this volume. Since it was written papers in the Gladstone MSS., described as unbound, have been bound. The introductory paragraphs to the British Museum's catalogue of the Gladstone MSS. may also be consulted.

3 Add. MSS. 44450–98; P.R.O. 30/29/146–53.

4 Add. MSS. 44095–349; P.R.O. 30/29/117–42 and 30/29/22 A–29 A.
the Gladstone and Granville papers; copies to Gladstone’s colleagues, when these were not made separately and bound with the letters from them, are to be found in his letter books;\(^1\) memoranda and minutes are mostly to be found in the volumes of cabinet notes\(^2\) and political memoranda in the Gladstone papers\(^3\) and in the volumes of ‘cabinet opinions’ in the Granville papers.\(^4\) When British representatives abroad shared in the making of policy as G. J. Goschen, Lord Dufferin, or Sir Evelyn Baring did, and their dispatches and private letters are mentioned by the correspondents, the reader is again referred to the appropriate place in the Foreign Office or Granville papers. Correspondence with the Queen was also important in the making and adjustment of policy. It is to be found in the appropriate volumes in the Granville papers,\(^5\) but is not generally available in the Gladstone papers, and the reader is referred to the selection printed by Philip Guedalla in *The Queen and Mr. Gladstone*.

A third part of the context of the letters represents the last stage in political action and is decisive rather than informative or argumentative. It includes speeches, both public and parliamentary, draft bills and acts of parliament, instructions for action in diplomacy or war. These have been traced in *The Times*, Hansard’s *Parliamentary Debates*, *Parliamentary Papers*, *House of Lords’ and House of Commons’ Journals*, and again the Foreign Office and occasionally the Colonial Office papers. No formal minutes of cabinet decisions are mentioned in the correspondence of the second or third administration. These minutes of advice to the crown, normally on single topics, were characteristic of the eighteenth and early nineteenth century and are distinct from the regular minutes of proceedings kept after the cabinet acquired a secretariat in 1916. Three were mentioned in the correspondence for the first administrations.\(^6\) By the time of Gladstone’s second administration they appear to have died out. His informal cabinet notes, however, were as scrupulously kept as in the first administration.\(^7\)

It is proposed in the following pages to discuss some of the inferences which may be drawn from the correspondence and its context of other papers. Gladstone and Granville were out of office when the first letters in these volumes were written. They often discussed the electorate as well as the government. Their letters suggest that Gladstone began now to practise popular politics and that the process, whereby the electorate came by 1886 to matter to Gladstone more than the parliamentary party or even cabinet unity, began in 1876. The more Gladstone relied on the electorate,
the less important the partnership with Granville became. The corres-
pondence, unlike that in the earlier volumes, discloses, indeed, not a
successful relationship but one, in the long run, ineffectual.

The first volume opens with Gladstone's campaign against the Turkish
policy of the conservative government. He called upon the electorate to
think out policy for itself and by public meetings and the press to impose
its conclusions upon a government that could no longer be trusted. The
early letters show both men sensitive to by-elections and Gladstone urging
liberal associations in the constituencies to adopt the Birmingham method
of organizing themselves. The writers refer to the demonstrations in the
West country in January, at Hawarden in the summer of 1877, on the
route to Scotland in 1879, and to the two Midlothian campaigns of 1879
and 1880. In 1868 Gladstone had accepted the rule that one member of
parliament did not, uninvited, speak in another's constituency. In 1876-80
he professed to respect the convention for the counties at least (nos. 3,
180) but scorned the charge that he was at fault in speaking in a borough
during its by-election (p. 102, n. 1). Gladstone, who in 1875 had
resigned the leadership of the parliamentary liberal party, soon afterwards,
by pen and reported speech, claimed the freedom of every county and
borough in the country. In September 1880 the Queen wrote coldly of
his 'royal progress'.\(^1\) He had been summoned that April to form a govern-
ment because the election was won on his presentation of liberalism. He
named, albeit reluctantly, as a colleague in the cabinet, the radical, Joseph
Chamberlain. This man was the standard-bearer of those who thought the
member of parliament owed his sole duty to the electorate and inherited
nothing from the dead constitutional idea of the representative summoned
by the crown to serve the national purposes of the crown. The National
Federation of Liberal Associations made by him in 1877 and the organiza-
tion of the Central Office under W. P. Adam were noticeable signs, in
addition to the constituency organizations, of the new popular politics. In
1880 Gladstone was already the national leader of a national party. This
was the beginning of the process, completed after the extension of the
franchise in 1885, and seen throughout the general election of 1885; for
before the autumn of 1885 public speeches by parliamentary leaders had
never been so many or so long. Already during the Scottish tour of 1884
it had proved impossible to speak only to constituents (no. 1446). Glad-
stone now made no claim to observe the old forms. At the time of the
general election of 1885 he deplored the failure of those with easier con-
tests to help in the more difficult constituencies.\(^2\) In 1886 he even regretted
that liberal peers observed the unwritten law forbidding them to share in
the electoral campaign after the writs had been issued (no. 1842).

\(^1\) To Granville, 4 Sept., P.R.O. 30/29/31.
\(^2\) Cf. Hartington to Granville, 3 Oct. 1885, P.R.O. 30/29/22 A.
After Gladstone's government had come into office in 1880 the corres-
pondence begins to disclose how foreign policy was made. It reveals that
Gladstone and Granville co-operated successfully in 1880 and 1885 in shap-
ing a well-directed and consistent policy, but less successfully in 1881–4
and least successfully between 1881 and 1883. During these years, owing to
the diversity of business which pressed upon him, Gladstone contributed
less than his share. He failed to direct by his general ideas Granville's talent
for negotiation and conciliation. He sometimes formulated guiding ideas
inappropriate to the circumstances. At other times he focused his ideas at
a point where nothing was happening, or upon a single aspect of policy,
and neglected to guide policy as a whole or important parts of it. Glad-
stone in the last resort was not interested in the relative power of the
several countries which foreign policy does help to decide, but in matters
both larger and smaller which it seldom decides. Granville had skill in
execution, but small power in construction.

In 1880 Granville had a policy, largely provided by Gladstone, that he
was admirably fitted to execute. Gladstone, by means of a letter to his
Midlothian constituents, ended his indictment of conservative foreign
policy. After a few months he claimed to continue it in its Turkish, if not
Afghan parts (no. 313). This claim was both a sensible
recognition that in practice policy cannot be turned inside out and a
country must honour its obligations, and an expedient, instinctively
adopted, to capture the support of a section of conservative opinion by the
argument that the liberals did all the conservatives did, but without
'jingoism'. The interesting and distinctive note was struck by what were
claimed as the warrants for action. These were all general ideas: the re-
sponsibility of the large for the small countries; the maintenance of rights
derived from 'public law' or treaties; universal or European utility and
concert. These guiding ideas displaced what were said to be the narrow and
exclusively British aims of Disraelian foreign policy.

Both the ‘continuity’ and the general ideas were Gladstone's. Granville
would have begun his course of action at the Foreign Office by an overture
to Russia designed to lead to conciliation and to end the ‘russophobia’ that
had dominated British foreign policy since 1833. But his proposal petered
out when the cabinet was disinclined to seek fresh pledges from a power
that had shown itself in 1871 so notoriously unreliable in respect of
treaties. Superficially, then, Turkish policy was not reversed. Britain re-
tained Cyprus, but the undertaking to defend Turkey, which partly
justified its occupation, was practically cancelled owing to Turkey's failure
to fulfil the rest of the bargain by reforming Armenia (no. I 136). Indeed,
the cabinet decided to make an offer to Turkey to change the occupation
into absolute possession by ‘the purchase of the fee simple’. The decision
illustrates the ‘legalism' which changed the temper of foreign policy de-
spite Gladstone's maintenance of its outward continuity. The cabinet next
embarked upon negotiations to bring the pressure of the European powers to bear upon Turkey for the fulfilment of those articles of the treaty of Berlin which exacted cessions of territory to Montenegro and Greece, with the intention of ultimately enforcing the whole. Here Gladstone's doctrine of limited liability realistically set bounds to the responsibility which he had accepted; for the action of Britain was merged in that of the European powers as a whole in the so-called European concert. Gladstone and Granville resumed the habit of working together in these complicated negotiations. When the parliamentary session ended Granville went to Hawarden, on his way to Balmoral, on 23 September, and the two men were continuously in London again—a rare thing out of session—from 30 September until 12 October when the crisis of the European naval demonstration was successfully turned and Turkey yielded. Granville much missed Gladstone at his elbow when they parted (no. 349).

Already, however, in the autumn of 1880 pressure of other business began to cause Gladstone to loosen his grip on foreign policy. As prime minister he was responsible for shaping in the cabinet the legislative programme for each parliamentary session. This task was already in 1880 complicated by the cabinet's declining control of parliamentary time and by the prime minister's increasing difficulty in creating a 'common mind' in it. Further, as leader of the House of Commons Gladstone had heavy steering work there. He was also chancellor of the exchequer and responsible in each of the first three years for preparing the budget. The combined pressure of foreign policy, parliamentary planning, and financial contriving took its toll of his physical strength and he was ill and absent from Parliament and cabinet from 31 July and between 21 August and 4 September. He was engaged in planning the legislative programme for 1881—a large task comprising at that stage three main measures (see p. xxxviii)—when he was obliged to summon the cabinet, 30 September, which took the decision to assemble the fleet at Malta and to propose to the powers to seize Smyrna and so render effectual the naval demonstration that was in danger, so long as the powers refused to land troops, of becoming ridiculous. No sooner was the European crisis, which followed, safely over than an Irish crisis occurred, and by the time ministers returned to London in November the original legislative intentions had been discarded in order to plan and discuss measures for Ireland. But the partnership had worked well over Turkey, since the direction of policy had been set before Ireland seriously deflected Gladstone's attention. The seizure of Smyrna had been an idea in Gladstone's mind since 29 June (no. 229).

In 1881 when fresh questions arose Granville's equability, tolerance, and passivity rather than Gladstone's habit of generalization determined policy. The correspondence shows how the single matter of Ireland now overrode the succession of large questions claiming Gladstone's attention, but without lessening the pressure upon him. He was now the victim of
pressure from a variety of opinions which he could neither reconcile with each other nor reduce to conformity with his own. He complained of ‘the hurry, diversity and excess of business’ and lost the close contact with Granville over details of foreign policy. For four weeks, from the re-assembly of parliament on 7 January until the intervention of the Speaker to close the debate on the first of the Irish coercion bills and the passage of the urgency resolution on 3 February, only one letter has been traced. Gladstone was absorbed in the parliamentary battle, disabled by an accident, compelled partly against his will to proceed with a second coercion bill, and immediately afterwards drawn into the task, which lasted until 4 April, of working the Irish land bill painfully through the cabinet. The last stages of this task coincided with his framing of his second budget, introduced on 31 March. On 7 April the land bill was brought in and the patient and exacting labour of manipulating it clause by clause past Irish obstruction took the rest of the session. When parliament reassembled after the Easter recess, the matters which Gladstone wished to discuss with Granville overflowed, but he was ‘so pressed as to be very little able to write’ (no. 479). Foreign affairs in the first half of the year, as the correspondence indicates, crystallized into a number of incidents which had a curious and unfortunate equality of value. The Greek frontier was settled by renewed European pressure upon Turkey, France taking the lead that Britain had taken over Montenegro. An Anglo-French difference over the Enfida Estates in Tunis obscured the political significance of French proceedings until the occupation of Tunis was virtually a fait accompli. The Fortune Bay fishery dispute with America was settled. A Russian project to convene the powers to discuss concerted action against nihilism was successfully foiled. A difficulty with Turkey arising out of the ransoming of a British subject captured by brigands was more like Treasury business than foreign affairs. There was no planning and directing mind to give the emphasis and colour of policy to foreign negotiations. Such direction as there was, was supplied by Gladstone’s ideas of 1880. The extension of Greece, French action in Tunis and suspected designs on Tripoli, commercial negotiations with France and Spain, concern over parliamentary institutions in Bulgaria, and reform in Armenia—none of these prompted fresh thinking about foreign policy.

When the parliamentary session was over Gladstone was more closely concerned with foreign policy. But his powers of construction were turned upon Ireland as well as Egypt. In November 1880 he had already failed with one proposal for a radical and comprehensive solution of the Irish question. In October 1881 he presented a second (nos. 529, 533). He broached the Egyptian question in the same mood, but with less understanding. This question had been reopened by the mutiny of the army colonels. Gladstone defined the aims by which Granville might direct his policy: first, the closest co-operation with France (no. 529) or
'continuity' with the policy of the conservative government in order to honour obligations contracted by it; second, full recognition for the maintenance of Turkish authority (12, 13 September) in accordance with the principle of observing established rights; and third, the advantage of Egypt herself, added, 5 October, in order to discharge the responsibility of a large country towards a smaller one. Thus here in the second half of 1881 the correspondence begins to illustrate a second cause of the ill-working of the partnership. These aims were not well related to the actual situation. On 4 October Granville asked the British agent and consul-general in Cairo, Sir Edward Malet, to suggest 'any useful or harmless action we can take with the French'. Anglo-French co-operation could not have much value when means were to be invented to give it life. The ineffectual Turkish mission, to which were added a French and a British general, gave little reality to Gladstone's second aim. Much was to happen before the advantage of Egypt, even as Britain interpreted it, could be discerned. In December, it was not clear what the victory of the mutinous army colonels, and the constitutional changes they exacted, meant. Granville expected to be in a scrape if he was not ready with a policy, but was not prepared to propose anything himself (no. 588)! As the Egyptian constitutional, financial, and political problems unfolded, Gladstone's large ideas proved inappropriate. Applied and cut down to actual circumstances their consequences would be contradictory. If Britain took responsibility for encouraging the parliamentary movement, with which Gladstone sympathized (nos. 614, 620), she could not at the same time exact from Egypt the honouring in full of her financial obligations. In the circumstances, to encourage the Chamber's claims was to allow it control over the budget and to allow this was, as Granville was warned, to render impossible the work of the Anglo-French financial control. Or again, if Britain took responsibility for encouraging a national movement—it had become clear that the Egyptian army and its supporters were in some sort claiming Egypt for the Egyptians (no. 599)—she could not respect Turkey's sovereign rights. Nor could she co-operate with France, who was pressing for joint intervention against the popular movement. Gladstone contrived to evade the contradictions by limiting Britain's liability: that is by putting the whole Egyptian question into the hands of the European concert. On 8 February 1882 Granville accordingly made an overture to the powers.

Furthermore, in the course of 1882 policy began to be confused when most significance was attached to what in the long run was to matter least. This was probably because Gladstone was again distracted by other preoccupations. In the winter of 1881–2 he had, for a third time, failed to carry the cabinet with him in the radical solution of the Irish problem by a measure setting up institutions of local government to be completed by legislation on English and Scottish local government. By the spring of
In 1882 the maintenance of law and order was the first consideration. Parnell was arrested, the Land League was suppressed, and Lord Cowper resigned the viceroyalty. Gladstone had intended the business of the session to comprise again three main measures in addition to the reform of parliamentary procedure (see below, p. xl). None of this work was begun. Instead the session opened with the Lords carrying a motion against the government for a committee of inquiry into the working of the Irish Land Act. On 24 April Gladstone introduced his third budget. While the financial measures were going through, Gladstone’s energies were frayed by undecided conflict over Ireland. Whereas he worked towards reform, on the basis now of Parnell’s release, a bill to establish elected county boards, and an arrears bill, Forster looked only to the renewal of coercion (p. 356, n. 2). Forster was defeated and replaced as Irish secretary by Lord F. Cavendish. But Gladstone did not win. When Cavendish was murdered in Phoenix Park, 7 May, the chance of a peaceful reforming settlement passed. A new crimes bill was introduced before the arrears bill. The difficult passage of these two bills through the Commons exactly coincided with the decisive events in Egypt. There the struggle between the khedive’s government and the Chamber of Notables ended in the khedive’s calling to power an administration which included the leader of the mutinous army colonels. This at least seemed conclusive, but did not prove so; since, until the British occupation, nobody exercised actual authority in Egypt: neither the khedive, the national movement, nor the army. The false peace ended five days after the Phoenix Park murders. Two months later, Alexandria was bombarded by the British navy and on 12 July British troops landed in Egypt. Thus the conclusion of the proceedings in the Commons on the arrears bill, 21 July, was followed on the Monday, 23 July, by the announcement of the government’s intention to propose a vote of credit for the military occupation of Egypt and the occupation of the Suez Canal. The canal was occupied on 12 August and the battle of Tel-el-Kebir won on 13 September. The British army was the only army in Egypt, and the whole balance of Mediterranean politics was altered; a different foreign policy might now be needed.

The overlapping of business meant that Gladstone was far less closely concerned with the far more important naval and military action in Egypt in 1882 than he had been with the naval demonstration against Turkey in 1880. No. 743 shows how much it caused him to get matters out of focus. He attached importance to the conference of powers at Constantinople, which had met to agree on the conditions of Turkish military intervention in Egypt, to the negotiation of a military convention embodying them, and to the proclamation, declaring the leader of the army colonels a rebel, which was to precede the signature of the military convention. These negotiations had no consequences. By contrast, he was dis-
inclined to consider the effect of the withdrawal of the French (5 July) and not prepared to plan in advance to meet the implications of Britain’s isolated action in bombarding Alexandria. The consequences of these events were to be felt into the twentieth century. The coincidence of Egyptian and Irish crises had slowed down, if not muddled, Gladstone’s measurement of the relative importance of different aspects of policy.

From the autumn of 1882 onwards the partnership was less and less successful. When Granville’s qualities of conciliation and patience in negotiation were sufficient, British action was intelligible. When real political inventiveness was needed, while Gladstone was too preoccupied to supply it, policy is difficult to find or, at least, to understand. In 1883 policy was without direction. The dominating feature of the year was the deterioration of Anglo-French relations. This was the final result of a series of negotiations which Granville conducted skilfully, but separately, and without considering their combined effect upon the relationship with France. Gladstone was too concerned with domestic affairs to supply Granville’s deficiency. Such attention as he was able to give to foreign policy was anyhow mistakenly focused upon Constantinople instead of across the English Channel.

In the autumn of 1882 Gladstone put yet a fourth proposal for a radical solution of the Irish question to the cabinet, steered the resolutions on procedure through an autumn session of parliament, and, himself dropping the chancellorship of the exchequer, made a series of difficult changes in the membership of the cabinet. Granville negotiated with France for the abolition of the Dual Control in Egypt and the substitution of a single financial adviser; with the Suez Canal Company and the powers, in order to prevent a recurrence of the hostility that had obstructed British naval and military action in the summer; and, after Egypt had announced her inability to meet all her obligations to her European creditors, he began to supervise the reorganization of Egyptian administration. While the Dufferin mission for this purpose gave the government a respite on the Egyptian question, within the cabinet the arguments on domestic policy grew more severe. Hartington divided it in January 1883 by rejecting any measure of local government for Ireland; Chamberlain in June by calling for a fresh measure of parliamentary reform; Harcourt fought Gladstone to a deadlock over the London government bill. These battles were more wearing to Gladstone’s constructive powers and more distracting than any steady course of legislation, however exacting, would have been. From February to March 1883, moreover, he was again absent from cabinet and parliament. Meanwhile Britain’s isolated action in Egypt told on her relations with France and new difficulties occurred. France obstructed the new arrangements in Egypt; an attempt to mediate between her and China came to nothing; Britain and France pursued different policies in relation to the Suez Canal and appeared as rivals for influence with the
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Company; an incident arising from the French occupation of Madagascar looked like a repetition of the Tahiti affair which had so damaged the first entente cordiale in 1844–5. Gladstone gave his attention not to the relationship with France, but to Turkish policy and busied himself with Bulgaria, Servia, and Armenia. There was, then, in 1883 no discernible purpose to give coherence to what was happening in Anglo-French relations. The failure to focus attention here, moreover, blurred policy as a whole, since the position of France, as Bismarck brought his ‘system’ of alliances to completion and prepared to attach her to it, had become of key importance.

It was perhaps even more dangerous that Gladstone failed to provide coherent and appropriate general ideas for Sudan policy. The rising of the Mahdi against Egypt, when Britain possessed the only armed force in Egypt, was bound to concern the British government despite its disclaimers. Colonel Stewart’s mission of inquiry on behalf of the khedive had already made this clear in November 1882. During 1883 Britain continued, however, to refuse responsibility. In November, when Northbrook pressed for a reconsideration of this policy, Gladstone was too intent on the legal question of the khedive’s right to recruit troops in Turkey and on a humanitarian intervention on behalf of the ex-sultan Murad to give it. Nor had the policy been reviewed before cabinet conflict once again sharpened. In the winter of 1883–4 those who wished to extend the reform of the franchise to Ireland, and to include provisions for the re-distribution of seats in the same bill, were arrayed against those who were opposed to doing either or both these things. When the worst of the conflict was over, Gladstone turned back to foreign affairs. But he was almost as much concerned with the claims of the Greek patriarch and with speculation about Russia’s ambitions in the Balkans as with the pressing Sudan and Egyptian questions. When Gladstone did seek to supply direction, he was not successful. Decisions on the Sudan too often represented the last point at which opposing policies in the cabinet met before they finally diverged. Gladstone’s views, moreover, counted among the diverging instead of being those commanding general support. This was partly due to their not being coherent or held together by any clearly grasped aim. When rigid in limiting Britain’s responsibility, he insisted on the withdrawal of the Egyptian garrisons from the Sudan to the point of causing Cherif Pasha’s fall, although Granville wished not to press it so far. Yet again less rigid, he accepted the decision to send Gordon (which was taken by Granville, Hartington, Northbrook, and Dilke) to inquire into the best way to withdraw them, although he knew that Gordon might shift ‘the centre of gravity as to political and military responsibility’ for the Sudan from Egypt to Britain. Again rigid against Britain’s being further involved, he opposed the proposed expedition to the eastern Sudan, although Hartington and military opinion believed it was the only way to disengage Britain. And once more less rigid, he fought, against
the majority of the cabinet, for Gordon to be allowed to use Zobeir Pasha, which might well have involved Britain further since it was part of Gordon's policy of providing for the government of the Sudan after he left. If Gladstone had no coherent policy, Granville could not give him one and he was reluctant to accept one from Hartington and Northbrook, who could.

At the same time the government was involved in settling the financial future of Egypt. In this question Gladstone provided direction and insisted on both Britain's responsibility and her limited liability. European sanction was to be gained for whatever was done. The question was first faced when Gladstone was again ill and absent from cabinet and parliament (10–29 March). Yet from the beginning his aim was evident and he overrode cabinet opposition. During his illness he reviewed five possible courses with the object of leading Granville to the conclusion that nothing could be done without the co-operation of Europe (no. 1257). On the eve of the debate on the second reading of the franchise bill, Granville proposed a European conference. Just over a week later Gladstone drafted the invitation (nos. 1275, 1278). He drafted further dispatches in the negotiations with France (nos. 1293, 1300) for an agreement with her preliminary to the general conference. The course of the negotiations was chequered and cabinet and parliamentary business constantly distracting. Cabinet difficulties in 1884 were worst in June when Hartington sharply pressed his Sudan policy. While the conservatives renewed their attack on the whole Egyptian policy (nos. 1316, 1318), the parliamentary liberal party was itself restive (no. 1319). The height of the argument with France and the final negotiations coincided with the committee and last stages of the franchise bill in the Commons. The conclusion of the negotiation and the opening of the European conference coincided with the heavy work falling on Granville in whipping in the liberal minority of peers before the bill was introduced into the Lords, 7 July. The debate in the Lords and the negotiations before and after it (8–10 July) were immediately followed by the decisive events leading to the failure of the financial conference. Yet Gladstone and Granville maintained a consistent concentration on the negotiation, and there is no obvious sign that both franchise reform and Egyptian financial adjustment failed at this point because they ruined each other.

It was foreign policy as a whole which suffered and its balance which was wrong. Throughout the rest of 1884 the financial question continued to bulk too large and the Sudan to be too little regarded. This confused policy and the difficulties with the second franchise bill prevented Gladstone and Granville from clarifying it and perhaps from allowing others in the cabinet, who saw more clearly, to do so. Before the actual end of the financial conference on 2 August, Hartington had revived his pressure for an expedition in support of Gordon (25 July). Gladstone
represented Hartington’s renewal of this topic at a time ‘when we have already on our hands a domestic crisis of the first class likely to last for months, and a foreign crisis of the first class’ on Egyptian finance (no. 1371). He hoped, as if the Mahdi could be bidden to wait, ‘that nothing would be done to accelerate a Gordon crisis’ until the conference crisis was turned. Within the Sudan question Gladstone again misjudged. He attached much importance to Gordon’s request to be allowed to use Zobeir Pasha (no. 1361), with which he sympathized, and dismissed Gordon’s inquiry about a relieving expedition as arising from curiosity not need (no. 1362). The real decision, therefore, on the question of relief was disastrously postponed by the device of asking parliament, before the prorogation on 14 August, for money for undefined military preparations. On Egyptian finance, however, progress was steadily made. On the very day the Egyptian financial conference dispersed, it was proposed to send Lord Northbrook—a member of the cabinet and of the Baring family—to find out facts and remedies. Gladstone was preoccupied with the assurances which might allow the conservative majority in the Lords to pass a new franchise bill and he was about to embark on the campaign of speeches in Midlothian (30 August to 25 September). Yet he made time to confer with Northbrook (27 August) before Granville and Lord Lyons saw him (30 August to 1 September). It was he who had suggested that Lyons should be summoned from Paris, and even in the midst of the Scottish engagements and with the franchise negotiations pending, he still had mind and time to make fresh proposals for an accommodation with France (no. 1402). On the Sudan, by contrast, each half-decision was wrung from Gladstone by Hartington and his supporters, Gladstone then yielding with a different intention from theirs. On 22 August he had agreed to a small expedition under General Wolseley to go as far as Wadi Halfa. But his intention was to curb Wolseley’s ardour for an advance, and he still thought a positive order to Gordon to come away might be effective. He found encouragement in the cold response of the Midlothian audiences to any allusion to the country’s obligations to Gordon. Hartington’s conviction that the abandonment of the Sudan had been a mistake only hardened (18 September) and he worked the more obstinately to get Wolseley forward. Gladstone’s mind, however, was given to the financial question. This he continued to dominate. He insisted upon his views to the point of a breach with Northbrook. On 18 September the Egyptian government suspended payments into the caisse de la dette publique—the reserve for servicing the foreign debt—and Northbrook recommended the use of British credit to meet Egypt’s needs (nos. 1441, 1442). This Gladstone opposed and Granville supported him. Northbrook found an alternative resource in the British debt to the Egyptian railways on account of troop movements in 1882, and the breach was temporarily healed. Meanwhile instructions to Wolseley for the relief expedition had at last been agreed upon, 2 October. But still
no clear policy or purpose governed decisions. Gladstone’s mind con-
tinued to be given to Egyptian finance. He refused to accept the recom-
mendations of Northbrook’s report of 17 October. Northbrook agreed to
modify them, but sided henceforward more firmly with Hartington, with
whom he already sympathized over the Sudan, in criticizing the passivity
of the Egyptian policy as a whole. On the Sudan there was some discussion
between Gladstone and Granville about the relations between Wolseley
and Gordon before the autumn session began and the correspondence
virtually broke off. There were only six letters between 19 October and 12
November. The crisis over the new franchise bill, which was now before
the Lords, coincided exactly with the difficulty Gladstone and part of the
cabinet found in accepting Northbrook’s recommendations. Gladstone’s
insistence prevailed and he now carried foreign policy through to the end
of the administration.

During the remainder of the administration, Gladstone played a similar
part in shaping foreign policy to that which he had played in 1880. This he
could the more easily do since, until the re-emergence of the Irish diffi-
culty in May 1885, he had no major piece of legislative work to do. In the
execution of the general ideas which Gladstone provided, Granville’s
powers of conciliation and manipulation were tested to their limits.
Britain revived her mediation between France and China. Behind this was
the Gladstonian assumption that there was a rule of international conduct
by which disputes might be tried and settled, and a Gladstonian dis-
regard for the power politics of the French proceedings in Indo-China.
Negotiations on Egyptian finance were resumed with France when she
replied, 28 January, to the British proposal of 25 November 1884. Negotia-
tions on the same subject were opened with Turkey, when a special
Turkish mission arrived with ten bases of an agreement for the future of
Egypt; and with the powers generally, when Germany and Russia de-
manded representation on the caisse de la dette publique. Gladstonian ideas
dictated the policy of these negotiations. Britain accepted responsibility
by, for example, guaranteeing the loan to Egypt. Turkish rights were
strictly observed and an attempt was made to establish new international
law in the effort to neutralize the Suez Canal. Britain limited her responsi-
bility by setting the seal of European sanction on what was done.

Gladstone’s view of the prime importance of this side of the Egyptian
question continued to prevail. Hartington’s proposal for a fresh expedition
to the eastern Sudan and war on Osman Digna was refused, and there was
no real decision on the political implications of proceedings in the Sudan
even after the news of the fall of Khartoum was received in London on
5 February. The immediate response to the disaster was a decision to
begin the reconquest of the Sudan and to send the eastern Sudan expedi-
tion after all. But by the end of February Gladstone’s more characteristic
views reasserted themselves. The negative attitude of restraint was
re-established, as Gladstone and Granville successfully rebuffed Baring when he tenaciously supported Wolseley’s pressure for full powers in the Sudan (25 February to 22 March).

The colonial discussions with Germany made an even heavier call upon Granville’s powers of conciliation. They were exercised within an acceptance of German colonization, dictated by Gladstone. The colonial quarrel, from which the discussions arose, was the result of the want of direction during 1883–4 when Gladstone gave no lead and Granville’s personal qualities determined what happened. Granville had kept this business in his own hands and those of Lord Derby at the Colonial Office and of the two permanent staffs. He had taken Germany’s opening inquiry about South West Africa at its face value as a request for information, and he had not appreciated the political character of the questions which subsequently arose as the discussions widened. The matter was not one with which Gladstone, overburdened by the cabinet and parliamentary difficulties of 1883 and 1884, would have concerned himself of his own initiative. Granville’s passivity excluded it from those on which his co-operation was invited. Ignorant of the change in Bismarck’s attitude towards empire-building, he conducted the discussions in a dilatory and casual way until by August 1884 an Anglo-German breach was an accomplished fact. It was 18 August when he brought the question before Gladstone, in the midst of the discussions of the constitutional consequences which might follow should the Lords reject the second franchise bill (15–19 August 1884). The mending of the quarrel and the terms of the reconciliation, right or wrong, were the result of Gladstone’s resuming his fair share of the partnership in foreign affairs. He provided direction when, during the Midlothian campaign, he pronounced encouragement for German colonization and so set the course for reconciliation. Britain gave way over South West Africa, attributing to Germany, in the Gladstonian formula, a responsibility there such as Britain shouldered in Egypt. Established rights and treaties were to be maintained and the needs of British colonies respected. So Britain insisted on her claims in New Guinea, but agreed to the submission of the disputed frontier to the decision of a joint commission. She embarked also on an unavailing and isolated attempt to limit the scope of the Berlin West Africa Conference beforehand. But ‘the miserable and dastardly creature’, prestige, must be shut out, and Britain’s responsibility limited. So Gladstone intervened to cancel instructions to encourage Zanzibar to resist German penetration into East Africa. British policy at the Berlin West Africa Conference—to which allusion is only once made in the correspondence—was stamped with Gladstonian legalism, care for British trade, and readiness to yield on the political questions, that is on the questions involving considerations of power. From August 1884, when Granville first made his overture to Herbert Bismarck, until March 1885, Granville’s patient firmness in
negotiation slowly extricated Britain from what had been an ugly quarrel. He defended himself against the charge of deliberate hostility, made because he had failed to reply to the dispatch of 5 May 1884 with its alleged offer of a colonial understanding; he convincingly insisted that British colonial policy was framed independently of Germany’s action and not designed to encircle her colonies; he worked each individual question at issue to a solution. But it was Gladstone’s initiative in the autumn of 1884, and his sustaining of it during 1885, which made all this possible.

In 1885 Gladstone was also fully engaged in the dispute which developed with Russia over the Afghan boundary, and used his replies to questions in the House of Commons to clench a tentative and equivocal agreement that neither Russia nor the Afghans would advance farther. Here, too, the early happenings were unfortunately determined by Granville’s being without Gladstone’s stiffening and purposive direction—by Granville’s contributing too much and Gladstone too little to their partnership. An Anglo-Russian frontier commission for the Afghan frontier had awaited the arrival of its Russian member since November 1884. Meanwhile Russia steadily pushed her military posts forward to the frontier claimed by the Afghans. This did not stir serious British protest until the engagement between the Russians and the Afghans at Pendjeh (30 March 1885). Britain’s policy, under Gladstone’s direction, was to fulfil her obligations to Afghanistan and to maintain continuity with past policy. She acted in the mood of her policy towards Turkey in 1880 and took a stand which brought her to the edge of war with Russia and her navy into temporary occupation of the harbour of Port Hamilton, with a descent upon Vladivostock in prospect (no. 1641). In the end, the liberals continued rather than reversed the conservatives’ Afghan as well as their Turkish policy.

The colonial quarrel with Germany was the first to be settled. Bismarck’s conciliatory speech in the Reichstag on 3 March was followed by conversations between Herbert Bismarck and Lord Rosebery and Herbert Bismarck and Granville (7–9 March), Rosebery’s visit to Berlin, and the making of the Anglo-German colonial entente (21–27 May). The Egyptian financial negotiations were brought to a conclusion, not without last-minute difficulties, in the convention and declaration of 15/16 March. The worst of the Sudan storm was weathered, but without any satisfactory political decision on the future of the Sudan. The break with Russia was avoided by agreement to define the frontier, to refrain from further advance, and to submit the question of responsibility for Pendjeh to arbitration.

After the first successful year of 1880, Granville and Gladstone had worked better together to rescue the wrecked relationships with Germany, France, and Russia than to shape British policy. In 1885, as in 1880, Gladstone drafted much and continually co-operated with Granville.
Indeed all the foreign achievements of the administration bore the marks of successful co-operation. These were few but important: the fulfilment of the Berlin treaty over Montenegro and Greece; the great work of political construction in Egypt, where Britain created an army and institutions as if Egypt were a second India; the Shipowners’ agreement with the Suez Canal Company to give Britain greater say in the control and working of the Canal; and the stabilization of Egyptian finances. But policy as a whole both men acknowledged to have been a failure. When Gladstone was pre-occupied with questions of more popular interest, they failed to work together on the basis of Gladstone’s ideas and Granville’s skill. Laxity, aimlessness, and confusion had resulted. In the autumn of 1884, when the cabinet had argued about the Sudan for over a year, the financial conference had failed, and the future held only the tedious work of re-negotiation, when the series of disputes with Bismarck baffled him by their malicious hostility and at home the prospect of manoeuvring the second franchise bill through the Lords wearied him in advance, Granville wished to lay down his ungrateful task. Gladstone would not let him go (no. 1419) and offered him the Foreign Office again in 1886. So that it was Granville, and not Gladstone, who saw that the public verdict on his tenure of his office made it impossible for him to return. Yet Gladstone, too, implicitly acknowledged its failure. In his address to the Midlothian electors in 1885, with a curious blindness to their implications, he made serious strictures upon his own government’s foreign policy and particularly upon that part of it for which Granville was especially responsible: the sending of Gordon to the Sudan. In the first version Gladstone had also dissociated himself from the occupation of Egypt, admitted that the Suakin expedition was a mistake, and allowed it to be inferred that Granville had been unnecessarily yielding to Bismarck. In 1886, when Granville returned to the Colonial Office, which he had held from 1868 to 1870, it was a sign of the failure of the partnership in foreign affairs.

In the second place, the correspondence and the context of papers in which it has been set, show that Gladstone was failing to work the machinery of parliamentary government effectively by the end of the second administration. The partnership of Gladstone with Granville was evident to some extent in all its parts: cabinet, Commons, Lords, and crown. And here, too, in the end it failed.

The cabinet was the mainspring of the machine, since in one aspect of its work it was simply programme-maker to parliament, especially to the Commons. Granville was Gladstone’s deputy in the cabinet. When Gladstone was present he sat beside him.¹ When Gladstone was absent (31 July to 4 September, except 21 August, 1880, February 1881, and Feb-

¹ See plans of the seating at the cabinet table in Add. MSS. 44642, fo. 102, and 44647, fo. 2.
ruary to March 1883, and 10–29 March 1884) Granville caused it to be summoned, presided over its meetings, and reported them to the Queen. He was concerned with the planning of legislation chiefly because Gladstone had grown accustomed to submitting memoranda on legislative projects to him before putting them to the cabinet. He put before Granville his conclusions and arguments on Irish government, Irish land, parliamentary procedure, London government, and parliamentary reform. Granville was too ready to be convinced, too sparing of his criticism, and too far behind Gladstone in his mastery of the details of these questions to be of much value as a counsellor. The memoranda enabled him to act as Gladstone’s spokesman and supporter in the cabinet. But the failure of the cabinet to plan effectively for parliament, which is discussed separately below, was due to Gladstone and to circumstances, which co-operation with Granville could scarcely have influenced.

As for the House of Commons, Granville sometimes saw more clearly what was happening there than Gladstone. He realized that Gladstone began, after 1882, to lose his hold on the party in the Commons, even though one great speech might always win it back for a time. It was difficult, indeed, to hold the party together, when there was no succession of clearly defined legislative tasks for it to carry through. As has been seen, in each session after the first, the legislative programme outlined in the Queen’s speech was largely abandoned. The year 1881 was taken up with Ireland; 1882 with the crimes bill, arrears bill, and resolutions on procedure. In 1883 the main measure, the London government bill, failed even to come before parliament, and on 7 July the cabinet abandoned eight bills and allowed six to go forward, of which three passed. The year 1884 was wholly taken up with the franchise bills and 1885 with the re-distribution bill. Measures for the reform of the land laws, English local government, and for administrative reform (to set up a Scottish department and a ministry of education) were constantly postponed or, having been introduced, failed to get through before the session ended. Yet parliament was more hard-worked than ever before. William Rathbone, a highly respected liberal back-bencher, who might have had office had his ambitions lain that way, wrote to Gladstone on 9 May 1883 describing the discontent in the parliamentary party and deploring its growing incoherence. He believed it was falling apart because the labours of the House were so barren of result and parliament was so evidently unable either to redress grievances or to pass legislation. He appealed to Gladstone to call the party together and to put an end to its bewilderment. Gladstone had already twice summoned formal party meetings: on 27 February 1882 to explain his proposals on parliamentary procedure and 13 July 1882 to explain the arrears bill. But the formal party meeting, addressed by Gladstone, with no questioning or discussion at large, was not permanently effective for

1 Add. MS. 44480, fo. 309.
restoring confidence. The meeting of 10 July 1884 on the franchise question was no more effective than the others. Gladstone made a rhetorical speech and was led by his earnestness to go beyond the facts in describing Salisbury’s attitude. G. J. Goschen, who had so far opposed the equalising of the county with the borough franchise, spoke in order to explain his conversion. John Bright, too, explained his position. The good temper and solidarity of the party were not restored by these formalities. The demonstrations during Gladstone’s Scottish tour had the unfortunate effect of increasing his self-confidence and blunting any sense he may have had that all was not well with the parliamentary party. On 1 December 1884 the fourth party meeting was assembled and addressed by Gladstone on the position of the franchise and re-distribution questions as they then were. On 27 May 1886 the party met for a fifth time and heard Gladstone explain the cabinet’s position on Irish home rule. These formal meetings of the parliamentary party were the measure of Gladstone’s aloofness from it. Upon this Granville could exercise no mitigating influence and it grew worse. The number of letters to Gladstone from back-benchers of long parliamentary experience, men such as Samuel Whitbread, written not in any spirit of self-advertisement, but in simple bewilderment, appealing for explanations and guidance, increased during the winter of 1885–6 and the session of 1886. Joseph Pease wrote from the radical side on 14 May 1886 appealing to him to delay measures for Ireland until he could carry the whole parliamentary party with him and to give the party time to be convinced. Gladstone appealed from the parliamentary party to the electorate: he referred Pease to the enthusiasm of the nation and even to that of the British race throughout all the world.

Granville was of course of more importance to Gladstone in the Lords, but here too he fought a losing battle. His task here was, first, to hold the diminishing minority of the liberal Lords together. Lord FitzWilliam, the young Lord Lansdowne, Lord Blachford (a creation of Gladstone’s first ministry), and the Duke of Bedford were notable defections. The losses to the party in the Lords over the Compensation for Disturbances (Ireland) bill in 1880 were exceeded by the losses over the land bill in 1881 and followed by further ‘migrations’ (no. 633) over the Lords’ proposal for a committee of inquiry into the working of the Land Act in 1882. In January of that year the government was already having difficulty in finding peers to move and second the address in reply to the speech from the throne. These were much more serious in 1886.

It became especially important in 1884 to increase the liberal minority, or at least to pull down the conservative majority, and before the second reading of the franchise bill in the Lords on 8 July and again in the autumn, Granville sought to bring home to vote those away on foreign or imperial service (Lords Ampthill, Lyons, Dufferin, and Lansdowne).

1 See Add. MSS. 44480–98 passim. 2 Sec vol. ii, p. 449, n. 2.
Gladstone, after consultation with Granville, wrote to the bishops adjuring them to vote, whichever way. To recommend fresh creations would have been the only effective way to increase the liberal vote in the Lords. Granville and Gladstone did not renew the battle of the first administration to induce the Queen to create peers in an effective number. In the struggle to get parliamentary reform through the Lords in 1884, they deliberately rejected this course. Indeed, the number of creations was notably few and almost entirely limited to men whose services either party might have rewarded. It remained, then, only to hold the existing party together and to keep its members active. A method used was to assign some departmental work, giving access to papers, to peers appointed to household office. They would be responsible for answering questions relating to the Treasury, the Home Office, or the Board of Trade or to any other office whose head and parliamentary under-secretary happened both to be in the Commons. The device was of limited range and of no use at a critical time. Granville was moderately, but reliably, successful in using his skill in debate to keep the voting strength. But this again was of little use on the large matters of Ireland and parliamentary reform where minds were already made up.

Granville as leader of the party in the Lords was responsible for the management of bills, and the general defence of the government. On at least two occasions (nos. 658, 1350) he defended Gladstone against personal attack from Lord Salisbury. But in this position, he chiefly bore the brunt of the negotiations that were necessary each session in order to avoid a conflict between Lords and Commons, and he held Gladstone back from untimely threats against the Lords (no. 310). In 1882 his mediation helped to avoid a conflict over the Lords' inquiry into the working of the Land Act. He was a key man throughout the negotiations over parliamentary reform. On 8 July, during the second reading debate in the Lords, he made the last offer, through Lord Cairns, to Lord Salisbury designed to save the bill by giving the conservatives some guarantee that a general election would not be held with the enlarged electorate and unreformed constituencies. When the second franchise bill was before the Lords in the autumn, Granville conducted the negotiations, which the conservative leaders had allowed the liberals, through the Queen, to know that they would accept (31 October). These began on 14 November, on the basis of assurances about the clauses of a re-distribution bill. Granville also at first formed part of the joint committee to discuss the details of these. But the home rule bill, upon which Gladstone staked the fate of the third administration, never had a chance of passing the Lords, even had it passed the Commons. In the long run Granville's work could not alter Gladstone's prospects.

1 See Gladstone and Granville, i, nos. 111-14, 116, 117, 120, 126, 127, 130, 132.
2 See below, p. 233, n. 2, and p. 239, n. 5.
In relation to the parliamentary party as a whole, Granville was essential to Gladstone in innumerable personal and tactical questions at all levels. In 1879, when Gladstone was rapidly displacing Hartington as actual liberal leader in the public mind, Granville persuaded Hartington not to resign and so put upon Gladstone ‘the sole responsibility for leaving the party without a leader’.1 Hartington stayed perhaps to his own disadvantage and certainly to Gladstone’s gain. Granville supported Gladstone’s course during the general election of 1880 and eased his return to power at the head of a new government. His assistance was indispensable to Gladstone in forming the government, especially in filling the household offices, so as to reconcile the Queen’s wishes about persons with the use of the offices to ensure political activity on the part of liberal peers. Although he failed to prevent Lansdowne’s resignation of the under-secretaryship for India in 1880, he persuaded Argyll to postpone his resignation until 1881. He was ‘feud-composer’ with Hartington over Irish local government, the Egyptian difficulties, and parliamentary reform; his advice was resorted to with Harcourt over London government and his influence used to hold back Chamberlain. He had gone to Birmingham in 1883, breaking, as he wrote to the Queen,2 his rule against attending provincial meetings, especially for that purpose. It was he who made Gladstone aware of Harcourt’s wish for the chancellorship of the exchequer. He was active in persuading Northbrook to remain in the cabinet, despite its rejection of his financial proposals for Egypt. He helped to persuade Spencer to accept the viceroyalty of Ireland; helped to bring Derby into the cabinet in 1882 and to induce Carlingford to leave it in 1885. He bore the brunt of the unavailing efforts to keep the Duchess of Bedford as the Queen’s mistress of the robes and the Duke loyal to the government. Gladstone even submitted his difficulties with Lord Rosebery to the judgement of Granville, who attempted to use his good offices. In 1885 Granville’s assistance was invaluable to Gladstone in enabling him to preserve the ambiguities in his published views, so that the party might go ‘united’ into the general election of November to December. It was invaluable, too, in enabling Gladstone to devise a programme to steer between Irish home rule and Chamberlain’s ‘unauthorised programme’. The party was thus just sufficiently united to allow Gladstone to form a government in January 1886. Granville shielded Gladstone from pressure to relinquish his aloofness and to consult his ex-cabinet; yet he could honestly satisfy Hartington that he was endeavouring to persuade Gladstone to come to London to meet it. In the winter of 1885–6, as the correspondence in P.R.O. 30/29/22 A shows, Granville was the last link between Hartington and the whigs on the one hand and the Gladstonians
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1 See Hartington to Granville, 7 Dec., and following correspondence, P.R.O. 30/29/22 A.
2 15 June, P.R.O. 30/29/31.
on the other, and he negotiated strenuously to avoid the break. He supported Gladstone in the procedure adopted to bring the conservative government down in January 1886 and then, for the last time, helped in the formation of a government. Later it was his impossible task to provide replacements for the numerous men who resigned during the stormy course of the third administration. His advice was sought in the appointment of lords-lieutenant of the counties, in appointments to the orders of chivalry, in the distribution of honours (knighthoods as well as peerages), and in the tedious case of a vacant first-class civil list pension. Nos. 290 or 1378 afford typical examples of the number of small personal questions on which Gladstone consulted Granville and took his advice—seldom contrary, be it said, to his own inclinations.

Gladstone had held the balance between radicalism and whiggery, maintaining through Granville a predominantly whig temper until he leant too far towards Joseph Chamberlain, whom the Queen called his ‘evil genius’, and then, relying too much on support from the electorate, came in the end to divest the party in parliament of both its traditional elements and so to bring it to defeat in the general election of 1886. This was as much a defeat for the partnership between Gladstone and Granville as it was for the old liberal party. Already in the last months Gladstone had come to rely more upon the younger men, Lord Rosebery and John Morley (so that the Standard called it the Gladstone–Morley administration), than upon Granville, who saw that Gladstone was losing his influence with the party in parliament, but could no longer counsel him how to recover it.

The last part of the machine of parliamentary government to move was the crown. Here, too, Granville was at first indispensable but ultimately ineffective. The difficulty which the Queen and Gladstone found in understanding or indeed in tolerating each other is well known. This was much greater in the second than in the first administration. Lord Granville received both the Queen’s complaints against Gladstone and Gladstone’s complaints of the Queen. He was the only colleague who could explain Gladstone’s views to her with any hope of making them understood. His usefulness with the Queen declined. This was only partly because the special favour, which the friendship of the Prince Consort had gained for him, had worn thin after he objected to the royal titles bill and identified himself, first, with Gladstone’s attack on conservative foreign policy and, next, with what the Queen regarded after 1882 as a weak foreign policy and a demagogic domestic policy. It was principally because, as time went on, both the Queen and Gladstone grew less persuadable. Relations were

1 To Granville, 21 May 1882, P.R.O. 30/20/31.
2 An extreme case was Ponsonby’s laconic note, 29 April 1880, ‘the Queen commands me to let you know that she thinks that there are now enough radicals in the Ministry and trusts that no more may be admitted’. P.R.O. 30/20/31.
better in 1883, when Gladstone’s illness drew out the Queen’s human sympathies, and in the autumn they were so good that the Prince of Wales sought approval for an attempt to induce the Queen to offer the garter to him. The attempt, however, was never made even at the end of the ministry, for it was known that the Queen was resolved against it, though she might offer promotion to the Lords as she did through Granville in February 1883 (no. 971) or direct in 1885 (no. 1691).

The most important of the services with the Queen which Granville rendered to Gladstone were, first, in foreign policy; secondly, in restraining her hostility to Gladstone’s appointments and curbing Gladstone’s readiness to do battle over them; and thirdly, in easing the working of the constitutional relationship in its more technical aspects. In foreign policy, he was most successful in 1880. He chose well the moment at which to hint at a cabinet, in order to bring the Queen, by gentle and judicious intimidation, to abate her opposition to pressure upon Turkey to execute the treaty of Berlin. He had more difficulty in reconciling her to the Egyptian policy; for she opposed the early beginning of the withdrawal of troops from Cairo, could not understand the British intervention to save Arabi Pasha from an unfair trial, and she was violent in her opposition to the concession to the French of a term of three and a half years—or any term at all—for the duration of the British occupation. Indeed, the Queen turned the tables on her government, when she proved right in protesting against the continuation of the empty negotiations at Constantinople after the British troops had landed in Egypt (nos. 810, 811, 819). The occasions to which Harcourt alludes, in the memorandum printed in the appendix to Gardiner’s Life, when the Queen appealed to the cabinet against the foreign secretary and prime minister, were over the useless military convention with Turkey and Arabi’s trial. The cabinet supported the foreign secretary and prime minister against the Queen, but on the first, the victory of Tel-el-Kebir, which came on the very day of the cabinet, proved the Queen right. Over the withdrawal of troops in 1883, Granville on 14 October, faced with the Queen’s opposition, offered a cabinet decision (no. 1124). On 25 October the cabinet met and made a formal decision to reduce the troops to 3,000 men which the Queen accepted on the 27th.

An example of the second kind of service was Granville’s reassuring the Queen against Sir Charles Dilke’s republicanism, both when he was made parliamentary under-secretary for foreign affairs and when he was admitted to the cabinet. Granville took on his shoulders much of the unpleasantness arising from Dilke’s abstention from the parliamentary vote of a grant to Prince Leopold, 28 March 1882. He eased, so far as it could be eased, the Queen’s acceptance of Lord Derby as a member of the cabinet. On the other side, he curbed Gladstone’s vigour in combating the Queen’s disinclination to bestow the K.G. on Lord Derby and, above all, he saved Gladstone in 1881 from choosing a bad ground in the Wolseley
peerage question for an upstanding fight, to the point of resignation, with the crown (no. 493).

In the more technical constitutional matters Gladstone entertained fears of extreme and unreal dangers. In 1880 (no. 311) he contemplated the Queen's dismissing her government; and he remembered the pledge which George III had asked from the whigs over Catholic emancipation. In 1881, when the Queen was led by a rumour to fear that the restoration of Cyprus was again being considered and announced that she would never agree, he feared she would request a promise, which he could not give. When the public disagreement between Hartington and Chamberlain threatened to become irreconcilable, Gladstone returned to speculations about dismissal. Granville did Gladstone a service in not taking up these speculations and in moderating the dimensions to which Gladstone enlarged his difficulty with the Queen. More interesting was his helping to parry the Queen's complaints of Gladstone's allowing too much meddling and interference on the part of the Commons; of his high-handedness and dictatorial manner;¹ of his own as well as Gladstone's reporting of cabinet meetings (nos. 437, 439, 471). Of still greater interest was the Queen's genuine concern for constitutional values which led her, quite apart from her dislike for his radicalism and 'socialism', to complain of Chamberlain's speeches, because she rightly understood that the Ipswich and Birmingham speeches of 1885 threatened cabinet solidarity. Granville's most important part in this constitutional connexion was played in 1884. In July he helped to make acceptable, so far as this was possible, the decision not to ask for a dissolution, after the defeat of the government by the Lords' decision to shelve the franchise bill, but to ask instead for a prorogation and an autumn session. In August, after Gladstone had sent, in his usual way, a memorandum of his views, Granville began to persuade the Queen to co-operate in the task of procuring the passage of a new bill without a conflict between Lords and Commons. At Osborne from 25 to 27 August he did something to soften to the Queen the outspokenness of Gladstone's memorandum, and later something to persuade Gladstone that the overthrow of the Lords by the Commons was not yet inevitable and to draw from him an avowal of his own attachment to the hereditary principle. Gladstone was now able to visit Balmoral (for the first time during this administration), 9 to 10 September, and the Queen conferred with the Duke of Richmond (12–14 September). Discussions followed between Ponsonby and Gladstone (15 September) and Ponsonby, on the Queen's behalf, saw the Duke of Richmond on his way south for the Lords' debate (13 November). The Queen, helped by Granville's work, played the difficult part of constitutional neutral and mediator, at the same time as she renewed her complaints to Granville of Gladstone's agitation in Scotland. In the end Granville found himself in the opposite position

¹ See the Queen to Granville, 17 Aug., 29 Dec. 1881, P.R.O. 30/29/31.
from that of July 1884 and defending the government’s resignation to the Queen; for in June 1885 she was taken by surprise by the resignation and doubted the constitutional propriety of resignation after defeat on a single clause of the budget. This was Granville’s last service to Gladstone with the Queen; for he was of no use during the third administration.

Finally the correspondence suggests the inference that Gladstone’s loss of control over his cabinet was his most marked failure of all. Control depended in the last resort on his own ability to bring the cabinet to agreement and Granville could not have helped here. But at an earlier stage, when Granville could have helped, either he fell in with Gladstone’s views or found his good advice disregarded.

In the first administration cabinet proceedings had a notable regularity. During the parliamentary session, the cabinet met weekly, for two to three hours each time, often on a Saturday with the following week’s parliamentary business chiefly in view. Out of session, a regular series of planning cabinets began in November about the time of the lord mayor’s banquet. The series would be broken off and might be resumed either in December or in the following January according to the legislation in prospect and the success of the preparation so far. The work of preparation ended in January with a cabinet or series of cabinets to draft the Queen’s speech, which was the epitome of the autumn and winter’s work. Special cabinets for foreign, colonial, or Indian business might be called with a day’s or two days’, or, more rarely, a few hours’ notice.

This ‘system’ worked during only two years of the second administration, 1880 and 1883, and then not successfully. In 1880 there was no chance of planning between the formation of the government and its meeting parliament. But a series of autumn cabinets prepared the work for the session of 1881. Gladstone had intended this series to plan measures for the reform of the English land laws, of the franchise, and of local government, but it was in fact dominated by the Irish question, and was largely a failure. He could not bring his colleagues to prepare that comprehensive measure, which would have relieved the Westminster parliament of some Irish business and, it was hoped, of Irish obstruction, and at the same time improved parliamentary procedure. A fortnight of cabinets (10, 12, 15, 17, and 25 November) was time wasted, since he could neither bring his colleagues to accept his own view nor induce them to agree on the less radical programme of coercion coupled with land reform. In December a new series of cabinets (13, 14, 16, 30, and 31) adopted in principle a land bill, providing for land purchase and the three F’s, and Gladstone carried his view that remedial and coercive measures should be announced together when parliament met at
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1 See J. L. Hammond, Gladstone and the Irish Nation, 200; Chamberlain, A Political Memoir, 9.
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the normal time in January. But Gladstone had not succeeded in engaging
the whole cabinet’s convictions in this programme. Argyll was later to
recollect that Gladstone had bounced it into decisions rather than carried
it with him (nos. 466, 471, 481). Gladstone battled to keep the legislative
preparation normal and time was in fact found for sketchy consideration
of the corrupt practices bill, of Childers’s plan for the reorganization of
the army, and of the navy estimates before parliament met. But in the end
virtually the whole of the session was taken up, as has been seen, by the
two coercion bills and the land bill, and the work was not evenly shared
among the cabinet. Gladstone faced the fifty-eight sittings which it took to
pass the land bill through the Commons almost in isolation. Hartington
afterwards said that ‘the history of the . . . seven months was the record of
the energy, resolution, knowledge and resource of one man’.

It may have been the bad experience of 1880 or simply his awareness
of how little control, until parliamentary procedure was reformed, the
government could expect to have over parliamentary time, which caused
Gladstone not to summon any autumn planning cabinets in 1881. There
were only two cabinets, on 12 October and 10 November, and the work of
planning was left to the nine cabinets of January and February. It was a
bad omen for the smooth working of cabinet government, which depended
upon carrying the convictions of its members to a real confidence in each
other and in the measures before them, that Gladstone presented in this
year his proposals for a radical solution of the Irish question to the
electorate first (nos. 529, 533). In his speech at Leeds, 7 October, and in
the City of London, 13 October, he outlined a measure devolving some Irish
business on new local institutions to be set up in Ireland. This was before
he had begun any campaign of persuasion among his colleagues, at a time
when a new battle over coercion was about to divide them (p. 298, n. 2 and
p. 299, n. 1), and Parnell and two other Irish M.P.s had just been arrested.1
It was as if Gladstone had stepped out of the arena and was preparing to
force the cabinet from outside. It is true that the cabinet on 10 November
nominated a committee to work out a scheme of Irish local government,
but this was rather in order to shelve the question than to accept Glad-
stone’s views, even in principle. Gladstone had set a bad precedent that
Chamberlain would follow and extend in presenting the ‘unauthorised
programme’. Moreover, had there been the usual series of autumn
cabinets, Dilke could not have complained that the Borneo Charter had
been insufficiently considered by the cabinet, and the government would
have had one storm the less to face in 1882. Granville unfortunately fell
in with Gladstone’s views. In December 1881 ministers were expecting
public criticism if the cabinet did not meet, but Gladstone refrained from
summoning it and Granville agreed in objecting ‘to Cabinets, when there

1 The cabinet of 12 October decided after five hours’ discussion to make the arrests
and to take measures against the Land League.
was nothing to do' and thought 'one Cabinet would not much disarm criticism, & if we separated without doing anything, it would be considered as an additional proof of our weakness and of our being disagreed' (no. 587). The nine planning cabinets were too near the session and too little at ease to be a success. That on 1 February discussed the Queen's speech for five hours and for a further two after the cabinet dinner. Even Gladstone confessed it was 'rather long winded and needlessly effusive' (no. 623). The unprecedented difficulties of the session of 1881 meant that the reform of parliamentary procedure was the principal business for that of 1882. Its preparation had been the main agendum of the cabinet of 10 November and of the nine planning cabinets of January and February 1882. The legislation considered also included the corrupt practices bill, twice postponed, legislation on English local government, and a bill for the reorganization of the government of London. This had only the appearance of normality, for these measures, though announced in the Queen's speech, were not fully prepared. The session of 1882 was a disaster. Ireland blocked the urgent task of reforming procedure let alone the legislative programme. An autumn session was especially convened for 24 October to pass the resolutions on procedure. Twice in 1882 Gladstone was occupied with schemes for radical reform in Ireland. The first was in connexion with land purchase and in agreement with Parnell. Gladstone in April 1882 circulated to the cabinet a draft bill to set up county boards in Ireland to administer land purchase and other things as well (no. 675). Secondly, in the autumn, Gladstone had before him a plan from Parnell to devolve some Irish parliamentary business upon Grand Committees as part of the reform of parliamentary procedure (no. 861). The small chance of the cabinet's agreeing on an Irish measure of this kind, such as Gladstone would have wished to submit to a series of planning cabinets, and the practical difficulty of planning during the autumn session meant that in 1882 there was again no series of planning cabinets. The cabinet met on Egyptian policy on 13 September and three times to prepare for the autumn session (20, 21, 24 October) and then resumed its normal weekly sessional meetings, ending on 4 December, two days after the session. The work, therefore, of 1883 was left, as that of 1882 had been, for the new year. It was done in the brief series of February cabinets, presided over by Granville. These, unlike the old series of planning cabinets, made only the most cursory preparation, having before them no draft bills through which to work clause by clause. The session of 1883, like that of 1882, was a failure. The want of autumn planning was generally recognized by those, who had been members of the first administration, as the cause of increasing cabinet disintegration. Hartington wrote, in February 1883, urging Granville to see Harcourt who was 'in a fuss about our unprepared condition'.

1 To Granville, 3 Feb. 1883, P.R.O. 30/29/27 A.
any cabinet consultations. There were no November cabinets.¹ It was only after three protests that the February cabinets were held by Granville, Gladstone being then in Cannes. In the autumn of the same year Spencer wrote in anxiety to urge the early beginning of November cabinets lest the mistake of 1883 be repeated and the new session find the cabinet again unprepared.² In the autumn of 1883, a November series of cabinets met as in 1880, on 10, 13, 14, 17, 20, 22 November, with the object of working to an agreement on the legislative programme for 1884 and especially on parliamentary reform, which was to be the main part of it. This series of planning cabinets was a failure. It ended with the question, whether there were to be separate franchise and re-distribution bills, unanswered. The November cabinets, far from bringing about an approximation of views, precipitated a public disclosure of cabinet differences. When Hartington and Chamberlain made their separate and opposite pronouncements, the failure of the autumn cabinets was again recognized, by his colleagues, as a failure of Gladstone to work the old cabinet ‘system’. Harcourt wrote a long troubled letter to Granville:

I am so uneasy at the present state of affairs that I cannot resist writing a line to you as I think if anyone can avert the disaster that I see impending it is you. [The liberals] have confided the fortunes of the party to 14 gentlemen who they expect to act together in their interests. [But they were breaking up.] Of course the main cause of the present situation is the manner in which the critical questions were shunted or evaded in the November cabinets.³

Gladstone’s strategy had been at fault. Instead of putting his plans before both the radical and whig wings of the cabinet, he addressed himself only to Hartington. The prime minister was no longer neutral. When Hartington resisted the pressure Gladstone brought to bear from 22 October onwards and continued to assert that franchise and re-distribution must be taken together and the Irish franchise not lowered, Gladstone only held his cabinet together by maintaining that the question was still open. The cabinet was not again summoned until 3 January. The effective planning for the session of 1884 was done in the end in two sets of cabinets: on 3 and 4 January to decide the outstanding question of principle; and in a series between 22 January and 6 February to go through the franchise bill, which had been drafted in the interval, clause by clause.

Cabinets proceeded regularly throughout the extremely crowded year of 1884, with its two parliamentary sessions, and were not intermitted until mid-August. They were resumed in order to prepare for the autumn session on 6, 8, and 22 October. There were nine cabinets during the session between 31 October and 2 December, the last of the year. The cabinet worked to an agreement on the terms of the re-distribution bill for 1885.

¹ To Granville, 2 Feb. 1883, ibid.
² To Granville, 8 Oct. 1883, P.R.O. 30/29/29 A.
³ To Granville, 16 Dec. 1883, P.R.O. 30/29/29 A.
INTRODUCTION

But no other parliamentary plans were laid for 1885 and the cabinets of 2, 3, and 4 January were too much occupied with the questions of Egypt and New Guinea to provide an opportunity. Gladstone, indeed, was partly disabled by illness from thinking ahead, and was absent from the cabinet of 7 January. Since Gladstone gave no guidance about future domestic policy and made no attempt to bring the cabinet to a common view on legislation, Chamberlain stepped in, and, going well beyond his colleagues, outlined to the public his 'unauthorised programme'. The cabinets of 6, 7, 9, 11, 16, 17 February, which preceded the opening of parliament on 19 February, were almost exclusively concerned with foreign affairs and the military preparations consequent upon the fall of Khartoum. Only on 16 February was any serious attempt made to work over the prospective business of the session, and this failed; for, when Harcourt expounded a scheme for legislation for the Scottish crofters, Hartington and Chamberlain both objected on opposite grounds.

The frequency of cabinets in 1884 and 1885 was not a sign of the healthy working of the 'system', but rather the reverse. Gladstone was in fact becoming increasingly reluctant to summon the cabinet. He was more and more incapable of preventing reluctant meetings, when they took place, from causing only a redefinition of divisions and from leading to adjournments and a series of meetings where, had agreement been possible, one would have sufficed. The irregularity and number of cabinet meetings was a sign of Gladstone's weakening control.

There is much evidence of Gladstone's reluctance to summon the cabinet. On 5 July 1882 he doubted that one was necessary after the French had withdrawn from joint action in Egypt. He summoned no cabinet between 7 and 26 May 1883 after the disagreement on the London government bill. Again the normal weekly sessional cabinets did not meet between 8 and 22 August after disagreement on the reduction of the Egyptian occupying forces. In October 1883 Granville, who rarely took the initiative, twice pressed for a meeting (nos. 1122, 1132). In November-December 1883 it was clear that British policy in the Sudan needed reconsideration, and Granville urged the meeting of the cabinet. Gladstone was deaf to Northbrook's as well as Granville's observations (no. 1156) and did not summon a cabinet for the Sudan. It was indeed essential not to reassemble if Gladstone still cherished the hope of agreement on parliamentary reform. In the autumn of 1884 there were three occasions when a cabinet was proposed and not summoned: once over Gordon, once over New Guinea (no. 1450), and once on the franchise question itself. In 1885 Gladstone succeeded in avoiding a cabinet between 16 May and 5 June.

A legitimate way of relieving an overburdened and divided cabinet was to delegate the preparation of business to a committee without power to decide. The weekly preparation of parliamentary business was never dealt with this way, but otherwise there was a marked increase in the number of cabinet
committees during the second administration. In 1880 there were two, in 1881 three, in 1882 four, in 1883 five, in 1884 four, in 1885 one, in 1886 two. There may have been others which have escaped record. The committee was legitimately used for preliminary preparation of business, for matter of a technical kind, or for a by-question which there was neither time to settle nor wish to drop (28 December 1883, no. 1200). It was dangerous, however, to allow decisions to be taken by part of the cabinet, since this threatened confidence among colleagues who were all ultimately responsible. This happened increasingly, too, during the second administration. It was partly the result of Gladstone’s reluctance to summon the cabinet, but it made the causes of this reluctance only worse. Decisions not taken in formal cabinets were taken by a ‘quasi-cabinet’, an ‘open cabinet’, a ‘conclave’, and sometimes by two or three, Gladstone and Granville, or these two with one other. These different kinds of meetings had in common: that they were called for single topics, that they were held outside the cabinet room, and that they might be attended by others not cabinet ministers. Gladstone used ‘quasi-cabinet’ to describe a meeting of six peers and five commoners, members of the cabinet, in his room in the House of Commons, with the attorney-general, the solicitor-general, and the party whip in the Commons on 22 February 1882, to decide whether the prime minister should intervene or leave it to the Speaker to enforce the resolution expelling Bradlaugh (no. 639). There was a ‘quasi-cabinet’ on Egypt on 22 June and the news from Egypt, just before the instructions to bombard Alexandria were sent, was received piecemeal as it came in by a ‘quasi-cabinet’ on 1 July (no. 736). The term meant an informal meeting not attended by all the members. The ‘open cabinet’ (vol. ii, p. 153, n. 5) seems to mean the same kind of meeting, but complete or attended by all. Both these were aids to efficiency. The small group or ‘conclave’ (vol. ii, p. 161) might be more dangerous. Much was decided during July 1882, at the time of the bombardment of Alexandria, by Granville, Hartington, Northbrook, and Childers, who met daily at one o’clock within reach of Gladstone or of the whole cabinet if necessary (p. 385, n. 2). Other small informal meetings decided questions on 25 April, 25 October, and 15 November. On the whole the decisions committed to these small groups seem not unreasonable. But this was not always so. The decision to send Gordon to the Sudan, taken in the last resort to save the face of the War Office, should have been taken by the whole cabinet and not by four (see p. xxiv). The practice was dangerous when Gladstone used it to avoid calling the whole cabinet. In December 1883, when Granville

1 See Add. MS. 44643, fo. 54, and p. 344, n. 3; cf. p. 180.
2 See Add. MS. 44643, fo. 132.
3 See Add. MS. 44643, fo. 75, 25 April, on the Arrears of Rent (Ireland) bill; ibid., fo. 180, presumably on Egyptian finance; no. 877, on the instructions to Malet over Arabi’s trial.
wanted a cabinet on Northbrook’s letter urging a review of the Sudan policy, Gladstone decided with Granville alone. Much of the Sudan policy, where the cabinet could not agree, was decided this way, on 12 December 1883 and 4 January and 6 February 1884 (nos. 1170, 1207, 1226).

Another legitimate way to speed work through an overburdened cabinet was to take a decision by vote. Decisions sensibly settled this way were: not to build a Channel tunnel (12 February 1882); not to appoint Lords Justices during the Queen’s absence abroad (18 February 1882); on Bradlaugh (22 February 1882); on the emigration clauses in the arrears bill (18 July 1882); on the position of the Duke of Wellington’s statue (8 August 1883); on the Lords’ amendments to the agricultural holdings bill (21 August 1883).¹ But the habit, as Granville called it, of ‘counting noses’ grew and it dangerously hardened divisions. When an open vote was taken on a serious question it obstructed the work of producing a common mind. Gladstone may well have made a mistake in allowing the decision to arrest John Dillon to be taken by a vote on 29 April 1881, for the decision raised wider issues and proved to imply a choice between coercion and radical reform. He was certainly wrong in taking decisions on Egyptian and Sudan policy by vote. It was a sign of his failure to bring about a real approximation of opinion that he felt the need to call for a show of hands, on 17 May 1884, over Britain’s advancing the whole of the proposed loan to Egypt, on 20 January 1885 on accepting the French proposals on Egyptian finance, and on 11 February 1885 over the appointment of General Graham to command the Suakin expedition and so commit, it was said, Wolseley to the advance into the Sudan.² These votes made the opposition to Gladstone’s Egyptian policy self-aware. Hartington and Northbrook voted together against Gladstone each time. After the vote of 11 February they and Carlingford, also of the minority, offered to resign. It was only fortunate that Selborne, Chamberlain, Harcourt, and Childers were not all consistently with them.

The ‘leakiness’ of Gladstone’s second cabinet should be interpreted as a consequence of the radicals’ individualism, ruthlessness, and preference for popular politics. Although the leakages themselves stopped, it was the attitude which caused them that also made it increasingly difficult for Gladstone to bring his cabinet to a common mind on any question. The worst leakages to the Standard (of cabinet discussions and of two drafts of the Irish land bill) occurred in November and December 1880 and April 1881. Suspicion fell on W. E. Forster, through his stepson, E. P. Arnold-Forster, Chamberlain, and Dilke. There were no radicals on the committee set up as a consequence in January 1882 to investigate the disposal of cabinet circulation-box keys and the distribution of secret cabinet papers; and there were no further leakages of this kind after it had done

¹ See Add. MS. 44643, fos. 41, 46, 54, 151; Add. MS. 44644, fos. 98, 102.
² Add. MS. 44645, fo. 94; Add. MS. 44646, fos. 14, 35.
its work. The publication in *The Times* of the British overture to the powers on Egyptian finance (5 January 1883) and in the *Observer* of an account of a cabinet meeting (1 April 1883) seem to be casual and accidental compared with the earlier communications to the *Standard*. The leakages were not, since the worst occurred when Gladstone was still master of his cabinet, themselves a sign of Gladstone's growing weakness. Indeed, by the time his control had seriously loosened, Joseph Chamberlain had used a more direct way of practising popular politics than the radicals' alleged disclosure of cabinet papers to the *Standard*.

In June 1883 he published his demand for parliamentary reform; in November to December 1883 he defined before the public at Bristol and Wolverhampton his opposition to Hartington, who hastened to answer, over the relationship between the extension of the franchise and re-distribution; in January 1885 at Ipswich and Birmingham he published his 'unauthorised programme'. Moreover he gave the appearance of system to these breaches of cabinet solidarity by laying down a theory that the joint responsibility of the cabinet meant that a member surrendered his liberty of action about the present, but retained his liberty of speech about what should be done in the future or, as Gladstone said, claimed a liberty to agitate against his colleagues (nos. 1055, 1056). In defending himself after the Ipswich and Birmingham speeches he drew a distinction between undecided questions, where any member might speak as he chose without breaking cabinet solidarity, and questions for immediate decision. The latter fell into two classes: where differences of opinion were surrendered and where they were not. In the second case solidarity did not arise since a man would resign. According to Chamberlain cabinet solidarity could only be broken on a question where a member had committed himself by some surrender of opinion towards a common mind. This went beyond Henry Fawcett, the postmaster-general, who, on the question of India's share of expenses for the Egyptian campaign, had voted against his colleagues in the government but refrained from speaking in the debate (no. 1072). It also went beyond Gladstone himself. In March 1884 (no. 1268), in conversation with the French ambassador, who had asked discreetly about the cabinet divisions, Gladstone drew a distinction between, on one side, 'differences of view stated ... and then advisedly surrendered' for the sake of a 'common conclusion' and, on the other side, 'unaccommodated differences on matters standing for immediate action'. The latter constituted real cabinet divisions, but did not, as Chamberlain would have claimed, give all members the right to do battle with each other about them before the public. But Chamberlain's defence had anticipated, except in using 'decision' for 'action', Gladstone's own distinction, and Gladstone, always sympathetic to the forward position, was disarmed by Chamberlain, who could draw Dilke and sometimes Harcourt with him. Hartington and Northbrook were likely to take Selborne and
Childers with them on Egyptian and Sudan questions. Gladstone became in 1884 increasingly isolated in his own cabinet.

More revealing of Gladstone's growing difficulty in bringing the cabinet to agree than evasion of occasions for meeting, the decisions by a few on the Sudan or the votes on Egyptian finance, were the constant redefinitions of division and the inconclusive and adjourned discussions. There were too many cabinets for the amount of business done. Textbook examples of a prime minister's shortcomings as chairman of the cabinet, in the period of unminuted discussions and decisions, occur when a minister goes away from a meeting uncertain of the decision he is to execute in his department. Gladstone was not a fumbling chairman. There was one occasion in the second administration, on 5 July 1882, when Hartington, possibly distracted by Bright's threatened resignation, left the meeting uncertain what decision he was to execute and another occasion in October of the same year in which Hartington was again concerned. Division was too sharp for any chairman's skill in finding the formula of agreement or in stopping discussion at the right moment to have prevented them. There were two instances in 1883, on 28 April and 8 August. On the first date, the cabinet divided on the London government bill and new arrangements for the administration of Scottish business. It had met at 2 and adjourned at 5.30 unable to agree. On the second date it broke off, divided on the method of reducing the British occupying force in Egypt with Hartington on one side and Gladstone on the other. On the franchise question, Gladstone insisted that the discussions of November and December had been inconclusive, and that the question was still open or, rather, decided contingently on his remaining in office. That Gladstone, an honest man, took this false position, since the contingency was really predetermined, showed to what lengths he had taken his skill in making fine distinctions in order to avoid a decisive break. This division was bridged by 4 January 1884, but a new division opened on 19 January 1884 on expenditure. Gladstone unavailingly pressed, against Childers, Hartington, and Northbrook, for a reduction of the estimates. Next came division on the Sudan. Hartington wished effectively to support Gordon's evacuation of the garrisons and proposed an expedition to the eastern Sudan to protect his flank and to hold open the roads to the coast. He was supported by Chamberlain, Dilke, Northbrook, and Childers. These five carried their view against Gladstone and Granville after three cabinets (8, 11, 12 February). The cabinet overrode Gladstone's wish to allow Gordon to use Zobeir Pasha. On 27 March the cabinet again divided on support to Gordon, Harcourt and Selborne representing opposite poles of opinion. The cabinets of 27 May and 16 July decided, disastrously, against preparations to support or relieve Gordon. There was a general inclination in favour of Hartington's and Selborne's wish to send troops to the Sudan and Gladstone was
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alone in thinking the other way, but for once he carried his view. On 14 May, in a far-ranging discussion on Egyptian finance as well as the Sudan, Hartington and Northbrook, supported to a greater or lesser degree by the rest of the cabinet, were on one side and Gladstone on the other. On 22 May Gladstone deliberately avoided any decision on the provision in the proposed Anglo-French agreement, fixing a term for the duration of the English occupation of Egypt, since Hartington was adamant for the minimum of five years. Hartington inevitably complained of Gladstone's high-handedness and, in the cabinet of 25 July, of Gladstone's failure to give him a hearing. Gladstone was, indeed, mulishly irresponsible to Hartington's and others' strong sense of urgency over the Sudan. Although he could not induce the cabinet to support him, his attitude meant that Hartington, the minister responsible and most widely supported, could not carry it with him either (vol. ii, p. 221, n. 1).

After three cabinets, 2, 5, and 6 August, the decision taken (the vote of credit for undefined military preparations) was a defeat for Gladstone without being a success for Hartington. The cabinets of 15, 19, and 20 November and 2 December were divided on Northbrook's report on Egyptian finance. Gladstone took his usual course of adjournment to avoid discussion in a full meeting and of bringing about agreement piecemeal in between formal meetings. 'I hope', he wrote, 'we shall not have a general discussion on this today [15 November] for fear of creating difficulties. We should try to adjust among a few of us, N[orthbrook] of course included, a sound basis of possible present action.' Nearly the same letter might have been written about almost any of the cabinets on the Sudan, the budget, or Ireland in 1885. In the last cabinet of the year, 1884, Northbrook and Childers stated their plans for increased naval and military expenditure and the cabinet divided yet again. On 20 January 1885 it divided on the French proposals on Egyptian finance and, opinion going against them, Hartington and Northbrook proposed to resign. The cabinet protested against Chamberlain's Ipswich and Birmingham speeches, and Chamberlain and Dilke threatened to resign. The decision on 11 February to put Graham in command of the expedition to the eastern Sudan, which Hartington had insisted on, was taken against Gladstone and Granville supported by Derby and Childers. The Khartoum disaster helped to restore unity. There were no further serious divisions until parliament and cabinet reassembled after the Easter recess (9 April). For Gladstone the most pressing business was now to reverse the decision to reconquer the Sudan, which had been taken under the influence of Gordon's death against his better judgement. He at once encountered Hartington's opposition and provoked fresh cabinet dissension (11 April). Again, as in 1884, the decision to ask for a vote of credit, with both the Sudan and Central Asia in view, tided over difficulties, but left the question of advance or

1 To Granville, Add. MS. 44645, fo. 215.
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retreat in the Sudan undecided. Two more cabinets met to decide the details of the vote of credit. Then on 21 April a fresh division opened on the budget. This proved to be the first of three final crises. It was overcome by a decision to postpone. The Irish question, on 6, 9, and especially 16 May, provided the next crisis and could not be settled under the pressure of the parliamentary session. It was precisely the kind of question that the old autumn planning cabinets had been designed to solve before the session began. The final crisis came when the discussion of the budget was resumed on 5 June. And on this question, after defeat in the Commons, the government resigned. Gladstone did not recover control over his cabinet in 1886. From April to May 1885 nine, in addition to Gladstone himself, out of fourteen members of the cabinet had contemplated resignation.¹ During the third administration there was the same continual offering of resignations. ‘Only two resignations in the Cabinet today’, 14 April 1886, ‘happily both withdrawn!’ wrote Gladstone on one occasion. Granville replied: ‘Is there not something a little ridiculous in these weekly assertions of independence and responsibility, always followed by the same results.’² It was a damning criticism of Gladstone’s management of his cabinet. In the end the art of government had eluded Gladstone, though the art of swaying opinion he never lost. He could not now manage the small teasing human difficulties, although he could still stir the mind and heart with the large idea that often proved right in the end. Success by depending upon the able, but phlegmatic, Granville for the small difficulties had been possible to achieve in the leisured and personal ways of the more aristocratic time of the first administration. Granville’s particular gifts were unavailing when ‘the masses’ had come into politics at every point.

¹ See Add. MS. 44646, fos. 133, 134.
² See Add. MS. 44647, fos. 89, 90.
I had stupidly forgotten that you were in London or I should have reminded you that there are at least six fast trains a day each way between us with a good telegraph five minutes walk from our door. I have a high opinion of your spirit and energy, and on this opinion I found a vague hope that you may run down. Remember that no notice is required—only we are not likely just at present to offer much in the way of company.

I do not recollect that you have ever seen Hawarden in summer.

For fear I should say ugly things about Dizzy, I find it best not much to open my mouth: and to be content with trying to extract from old Mr Garet (a £7500 a year man) a bet of £5 which he owes me for this Earldom; he having wagered that I should first cross the Rubicon.

There is to be a meeting for the Bulgarians in Hyde Park. The letter which notifies it asks subscriptions for the expences. I have half a mind to send them a trifle. Do you object? And altogether I feel more inclined to say something, during the recess, on the Turkish policy, than I have been for any such escapade during the last four years.

I suppose Musurus sent you Edib Effendi's Report. Is it really intended as definitive upon the question? If so it is a sheer & a gross mockery.

Palmerston certainly had something of a weak side with respect to brag. It was the supposed glory of Conservatives of his time to resist and denounce him for it. But during the last eight months the present Govt. have enormously outdone whatever in him was open to exception, and without his redeeming qualities for he was a lover of liberty all over the world and was entirely above flattering as these people have done (with great effect) the most vulgar appetites & propensities of the people:

I am always at your command but it is little likely you should at this time utter it.

We shall hope for good accounts of Lady G. It is a great mercy that the Dss of Argyll has made so good a rally. He is in great disgust with the foreign policy.

1 Gladstone subscribed before Granville's objection reached him; see no. 3.
2 He spoke at Blackheath, 9 Sept.; see no. 7.
3 The Turkish commissioner sent to inquire into the Bulgarian atrocities reported that the Bulgarian rebels were more guilty than the Turks; see Musurus Pasha to Derby, 4 Aug., enclosing, 'Further Correspondence respecting Affairs in Turkey', Parl. papers (1876) lxxxiv. 683–95, laid 8 Aug.
4 Granville's youngest daughter, Susan Katherine, was born 21 Aug.
2. **Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone**

18, Carlton House Terrace. Aug 26/76.

You see Carrington is sanguine—a good fault in the young. Shall I give him a kind message from you.

He tells me that all Bucks is certain that the address was your's.

The Prince of Wales found him here yesterday, & among other things said 'I cannot compliment you on your address. I am sure it was written by Rosebery or Napier Sturt'.

The Prince of Wales told me that Dizzy had told the Queen he must resign, that the Peerage was then suggested, that at first he said 'yes' but accompanied with resignation, but was told, that 'in the present state of Europe that was impossible'.

Can you suggest any one who could speak in Bucks, & make up for the complete absence of country gentlemen on C's side.

---

3. **Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville**

H[awarde]n. Aug 27. 76.

Together with the inclosed the post brought me a letter from Lord Carrington. I expressed great zeal (with truth) but gave him two reasons against my going.

'The first, that my appearance would be so much of a "measure", as to lead to speculations on my position in the party, and thus possibly to produce mistrust & division. The second, that the appearance of a stranger in a County Election would raise the cry of intrusion & dictation, & would I fear place an effective weapon in the hands of your opponents, who must be rather at a loss for one'.

I gave some suggestions on the Eastern question—as he asked for them.

The incessant publication without any authority of letters of mine & other matters, sure to be open to more or less misapprehension, is a great

---

1 i.e. of winning the Buckinghamshire by-election, caused by Disraeli's peerage. A liberal in a conservative stronghold, he was defeated, 21 Sept., by T. F. Fremantle with a majority of 200; see no. 14.

2 For Carrington's election address, see *The Times*, 23 Aug., p. 7f.

3 A version reconcilable with the Queen to Disraeli, 5 June, Monypenny and Buckle, v. 491; Disraeli to the Queen, 7 June, and reply, *Letters*, ii. 457–9; see also Disraeli to Richmond, 24 July, Monypenny and Buckle, v. 491–2.

4 Not traced.

5 Lord Carrington (signed here with a single 'r'), 26 Aug., asking Gladstone 'to come into Bucks.' and to speak during his brother's election campaign, or to give suggestions for a speech, Add. MS. 44451, fo. 82; cf. to Granville, 25 Aug., asking whether Gladstone would speak, P.R.O. 30/29/26 All; see nos. 7, 10.
annoyance to me. One of the worst is in Manchester through a slight imprudence of T. B. Potter's.¹

I have however given authority to the Working Men's Committee to publish a letter I wrote them.²

And I had sent my five pounds³ before your dissuasive arrived—as some days had elapsed.

I really hope that on this Eastern matter the pot will be kept boiling.

So you wrote the Address! What a pity you cannot write one for yourself and come into the House of Commons.

And Napier Sturts thin coat of Conservatism will not do! Thanks for the conversation—and good news of Lady G. I hope you will continue to look closely after the Buckinghamshire Election. Perhaps Wolverton may be back in time to help. Would not Sir H. James know of the sort of man you want for it? I am afraid I do not.

4. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

Hawarden Castle. Aug. 29. 76.

I am glad to see that you continue to nurse the Bucks Election.

I agree with the Spectator (near the close of its article)⁴ that the existence of the Government should be challenged in this Election on the ground of the Bulgarian Massacres and of their conduct about them & what hangs on to them. Good ends can rarely be attained in politics without passion: and there is now, the first time for a good many years, a virtuous passion.

I am much struck with the indications of feeling that the Post (as well as the newspapers) brings me daily.

The question of speech and subscription is gone by: but I am in half, perhaps a little more than half, a mind to write a pamphlet:⁵ mainly on the ground that Parliamentary action was all but ousted.

Does this shock you.

Have you seen Schuyler's report,⁶ or have you any idea how it can be got?

¹ See The Times, 22 Aug., p. 9e.
² See Gladstone to the Central Committee to organize the Working Classes of London against supporting the Turks, 23 Aug., welcoming, in view of the government's mistaken policy, the people's initiative in speaking for themselves, The Times, 30 Aug., p. 7f.
³ See no. 1; for 'dissuasive' see Gladstone and Granville, ii, no. 1052.
⁵ The Bulgarian Horrors and the Question of the East was written between 28 Aug. and 5 Sept., published 6 Sept.; cf. Hartington to Granville, 3 Sept., on a pamphlet's being unnecessary and the obscurity of Gladstone's meaning in the phrase 'Parliament had been ousted', P.R.O. 30/29/26 Aii.
⁶ i.e. of 10 Aug., to the American minister at Constantinople on Bulgarian atrocities, noticed in The Times's second leader, 28 Aug., p. 9b; published in a supplement to the London Gazette, 19 Sept., and laid before parliament at its opening, 8 Feb. 1877; see Parl. papers (1877) xc. 167-71.
As it may not have occurred to you, let me suggest that it would be an immense kindness were you to visit Panizzi. Between 12 & 1, or between 5 & 6.
All well with you I hope.
I am sadly bored with lumbago.

5. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone [Add. MS. 44170, fo. 234]
18, Carlton House Terrace. Aug 31/76.

Thanks for your note. I have crammed Stansfield[1] who is going to Halifax tonight up to the muzzle.
Carrington in a speech which it was hardly discreet in a Peer perhaps to make at the outset of an Election opened up the Bulgarian case, & his brother[2] has promised to go on.
I regret the speech, but cannot object to a pamphlet.
I will try & get Schuyler's report.
Many thanks for the hint about Panizzi.
All well with Lady G.

6. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone [Add. MS. 44170, fo. 236]
18, Carlton House Terrace. Sep 1/76.

So sorry to hear of your lumbago. Everybody felt the effects of a change of 34 degrees in temperature. I have had neuralgia, but it is nearly gone.
Pray be merciful to Elliot.
I doubt dedicating your pamphlet to Lord Russell. It is too late. Delane sent me a letter which he had rec[eive]d from him for publication beginning with

My dear Monsieur Thiers
I am glad that the French are beginning to appreciate liberty, and after a long rigmarole ending with allusions to Bedfordshire.
Carrington writes sanguine of success. I shall meet him and his brother this afternoon at a flower show at Latimer—the Cheshams are behaving very well. Rupert seems to have made a very good speech.

[1] For Stansfeld's speech, 1 Sept., to his constituents at Halifax, denouncing the Bulgarian atrocities, see The Times, 2 Sept., p. 8a.
[2] The candidate, Rupert Carrington; his speeches were reported, but not those of Lord Carrington; see The Times, 1 Sept., p. 7f; 4 Sept., p. 9f; 7 Sept., p. 11c.
[3] It was dedicated to Stratford de Redcliffe.
I meant to have written to you by the evening post but stupidly missed it, & I think you get the morning one pretty early.

Here I have been dwelling in much grandeur & luxury in a great degree involuntary; but I have [not] ‘consumed your substance with riotous living.’ Lady Granville being only allowed the upstairs region is quite a secondary personage.

Yesterday I asked for cold meat for luncheon and when Hudson & Lacaita announced themselves at two I thought they looked hungry and asked them to share it when lo! to their manifest satisfaction there was a luncheon ample & hot for us there all ready.

Today I tried to show off with Carrington in the same way but he had eaten—and now I come to business. He declares they are to win. A cautious & timid old agent says so—he did not give any totals but some remarkable particulars of Tory districts.

He greatly wishes me to go to Wycombe Abbey for a night—with my wife if she comes up for Saturday which I expect. I told him I would go on Monday if possible. He wants you to go too—without at all limiting you to that day. The meeting at Greenwich is for Saturday at three. We settled particulars in your drawing room today. The people asked if you would go. I said I thought if you did you would like to have the option of going quietly.

My wife and I go to Frognall [sic] after the meeting—which I think Lady Sydney will attend—for Sunday. So I shall at length cease to be your most kindly entertained guest.

The pamphlet is alive & kicking: four & twenty thousand copies were printed, & they think it is not at an end.

I send 250 little ones to Carrington as my contribution to the Bucks Election.

1 Granville to Gladstone, 2 Sept., encouraging him to come to London, offering his house, and noting favourable signs in the Bucks. election, Add. MS. 44170, fo. 238, not printed; Gladstone stayed at 18 Carlton House Terrace, 4–9 Sept.

2 See no. 10; cf. Lord Carington [sic] to Gladstone, 6 Sept., asking to be allowed to call and describing the favourable prospects in Bucks., Add. MS. 44451, fo. 132.

3 i.e. 9 Sept., on Blackheath; for Gladstone’s speech calling for the Turks’ departure from Bulgaria, and marking the end of his political retirement, see The Times, 11 Sept., p. 10a.

4 Granville’s going would show his conversion to full Bulgarian autonomy, see A. T. Bassett, Gladstone to his Wife (1936) 218, 219–20; cf. Morley, ii. 552; see also Halifax to Granville, 7 Sept., hoping Granville would go in order to restrain Gladstone, P.R.O. 30/29/26 Aii.

5 See Lady Sydney to Gladstone, 6 and 7 Sept., arranging this, Add. MS. 44451, fos. 140, 144.
I dine out tomorrow.
Inclosed is an account\(^1\) from N[octon] Hall.

8. **Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone**

Walmer Castle. Sep 8/76.

1000 thanks for your cheery letter. I wish you joy of the success of the pamphlet. I am very sorry that I cannot go to Sydney’s to meet you on Saturday, but I have asked people to dine in Carlton H. Terrace.

I cannot say how pleased I am at your backing up of Carrington. I am afraid he is very sanguine. It would be a great triumph.

Will not you & Mrs Gladstone lunch with me on Monday [11 September] on your way through London.

The ground floor will still be at the disposal of you both.

I wish you all prosperity for tomorrow and a ‘jour de demoiselle’.

9. **Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone**

18, Carlton House Terrace. Sep 12/76.

I am miserable at having forgotten my engagement for yesterday.

I was glad to hear that Wright thinks there is a fair chance. You may depend upon my doing all in my power.

I met the ‘Handsome Donkey’\(^2\) at Holmbury. He told me that he had heard that Dizzy has been consulting May about taking the Lord Treasurer-ship, in order to give him precedence over Richmond. I believe it would be a good thing to do, but if I was the new Earl of Beaconsfield, I should not move in the matter.

I apologise for ‘Mar’s’ manner. I believe Lady G will not keep him.

I shortened the paragraph about Elliot,\(^3\) but it still looks too long in print.

10. **Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville**

Private.

Hawarden. Sept 14. 76.

I am more than ordinarily sorry to have missed you: there is so much to say that is better said than written.

The figures of the Bucks Election were not to me of themselves at all conclusive, though they did not look ill. Carrington seems to be of a rather

\(^1\) Presumably from Lord Ripon but Add. MS. 44286 has no letters from Ripon to Gladstone between 26 May 1875 and 5 Sept. 1878.

\(^2\) Thomson Hankey.

\(^3\) i.e. in his open letter, 10 Sept., to the Committee for the City meeting in Guildhall. It deprecated the condemnation of Elliot without full information and urged that, if he was to blame, Derby, under parliament, should deal with him; see *The Times*, 13 Sept., p. 8a. The letter at the time was compared with Gladstone’s pamphlet.
sanguine temper. But Mr Wright, who seems sharp and cool is very sanguine.

However what they ought to do is to work incessantly on the lists of the non-promised and get at as many as they can by private channels, & not rely too much on meetings.—Pray continue to give your mind to this.

Derby’s declarations\(^1\) were well described by Panizzi as a ‘mystification’. Under cover of them they may continue to act in the old spirit. There is nothing for it but ‘the polls’.

Ought you not however to think also of County meetings now? Yorkshire should begin. Middlesex would I should think be safe. Lancashire ought to be well considered but I am not so sure whether it is safe to lead off with. The London people have pressed me with a lot of Telegrams and propose a deputation here but I have refused all applications where I have not a proper capacity to appear in.

If I speak again I must discuss the attitude of the Government, which throws upon us if we acquiesce all the responsibility of what may happen. ‘One way or other’ as Derby says I shall have to acquit myself by getting this out.

Argyll is to speak at a great Glasgow meeting on the 19th. He is full, and warm.\(^2\)

I suppose the Pope has kept Ireland quiet. But a line to Law would cause them I think to move in the North.

At Wycombe Abbey\(^3\) I had an Address from the Liberal Association and could not refuse to write them an answer to be used as they may find it discreet.

I was glad to see Lady Granville looking so well. Argyll gives a good though not highly-coloured account.

Bucks, Bucks, Bucks.

II. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

18, Carlton House Terrace. Sep 15/76.

I send you the enclosed,\(^4\) although I do not quite see to what conclusion Overstone thinks they lead.

\(^1\) i.e. to the two deputations from trade unions and the Workingmen’s Peace Association, received at the Foreign Office, 11 Sept.; see The Times, 12 Sept., p. 8a.

\(^2\) See to Gladstone, 12 Sept., Add. MS. 44103, fo. 222; to Granville, 15 Sept., ‘perhaps you have heard I am boiling’, P.R.O. 30/29/29 A; for speech at Glasgow, see The Times, 20 Sept., p. 7a; printed as What are the Turks and how we have been helping them (Glasgow, 30 Sept. 1876).

\(^3\) Where Gladstone had been Lord Carrington’s guest, 11–12 Sept.; for the address see Add. MS. 44763, fo. 32.

\(^4\) Two letters from Col. Loyd Lindsay, decrying the anti-Turk excitement in England, sent in confidence by Overstone to Granville, 14 Sept., with praise of Lindsay’s calmness and judgement; P.R.O. 30/29/26 Ai.ii.
You will observe he makes the communication confidential.

I am sorry to hear that Barrington’s brother, said to be a very shrewd resident in Bucks and who was extremely nervous a short time ago, now thinks that Fremantle is safe.

I have set a friend of Baroness Lionel’s at her.

I do not know Law, but I spoke to Hartington, whom I saw for a little time before his departure for Constantinople last night. He is rather afraid that demonstrations in the North would put the rest of Ireland the wrong way.

Lowe’s was a powerful clever speech, and good in much of his answer to Derby, but he said much that was unnecessary, and that will lay him open to attack.

12. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

Hawarden. Sept 16. 76.

You will see from my former letter that I did not feel satisfied about Bucks. I recommended relying less on meetings and speeches (though good in their way) & more upon careful examination of lists and marking down the doubtfuls.

Lord Overstone’s communication is a curiosity as he is himself. No man’s judgments have really more exaggeration in them than his: as when he told me not long ago that it might have been just as well if we had not had the great & main legislative changes of the last thirty years. His own geese, too, are all swans. Col. Loyd Lindsay almost a prodigy of cool judgment, another George Lewis. I have never seen any man in Parliament under more absurd excitement than this Col. Loyd Lindsay. I do not know enough of him to judge but he seems to be a man fitted well enough for every day matters but quite below and behind anything special. Can there be anything more absurd than his recommending old O. to make out of his letter a letter to the Times? Why does he not write himself. Some of his statements are important such as the use of the Red Cross, the number of self-mutilations, & the statement that the Servians were not even militia men. And his general view would be all the better for being ventilated. But Overstone takes it all for gospel. This judicial man you observe desires them to contradict the burning of Russians. But on his showing they have no right to do it—all that appears is that they were two

1 The conservative candidate who won the Bucks. election.

2 Baroness Lionel de Rothschild.

3 At Croydon, 13 Sept., answering Derby’s assertion (see no. 10) that Britain had no special responsibility to stop Turkish cruelties and censuring Derby’s professions of support for Turkish integrity while he discussed autonomy for parts of Turkey, see The Times, 14 Sept., p. 10a.
not six, & that his informants had no evidence except the expression of the countenances, so that it was very far indeed from being proved.

My deputation\(^1\) yesterday was a strange fact enough—but it was an indication of the state of the public mind.

I hope it may now be said that Derby’s programme of last Monday\(^2\) has broken down but I do not yet abandon all hope of working them up to the mark. I agree with the Times in disliking an Autumn Session but I have given in my adhesion to Hartington’s proposal\(^3\) (is it a lapse of the pen, when you tell me he has gone to Constantinople?\(^4\) query Kimbolton?) for it, as a lever.

A certain Mr Austin\(^5\) has written an eloquent and rattling answer to me. I address to Walmer.

We go off on Wed[nesda]y to Raby, Ford, and elsewhere.

I agree about Lowe. It is a misfortune not a crime.\(^6\) He cannot help dealing backhanders to associates.

13. **Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone** [Add. MS. 44170, fo. 249]

St Katherine’s, Regent’s Park. Sep 16/76.

I slept out of town last night, and I am writing from Hudson’s to save the post. As I bored you with little objections to the pamphlet & the speech, I must write one line to say that having done my very best to criticize I cannot find one word to object to in your letter.\(^7\)

It is a real clincher & to my apprehension unanswerable. I do not know whether Northcote will try to do so at Edinburgh.\(^8\)

---

1. At Hawarden, to persuade him to speak in the city of London, on behalf of the fund for Bulgarian relief, see the Rev. W. Denton to Gladstone, 14 Sept., and tel. 15 Sept., Add. MS. 44451, fos. 187, 203.

2. See no. 10.

3. For the reassembly of parliament, made in his speech at the Cutlers’ Feast, Sheffield, 7 Sept.; see *The Times*, 8 Sept., p. 8d; for Gladstone’s adhesion, see no. 13, n. 7.


5. i.e. Alfred Austin, later poet laureate; see *A Letter to the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, M.P.* (Chatto & Windus, Sept. 1876); see also Gladstone to Austin, 15 Sept., copy, Add. MS. 44451, fo. 196.

6. Lowe at Croydon referred to the Crimean War and described Britain’s leaguing herself with Turkey ‘as running after a new chimera’, but, as reported in *The Times*, did not describe it as a crime.

7. To the editor of *The Times*, analysing Derby’s policy (which he deduced from Derby’s recent speeches, see no. 10) calling for an end to empty protests and for the reassembly of parliament, *The Times*, 16 Sept., p. 5d.

8. His speech, 16 Sept., asserting that the British people did not understand foreign policy, deplored their failure to follow the government’s lead, see *The Times*, 18 Sept., p. 11a; cf. Andrew Lang, *Life, Letters and Diaries of Sir Stafford Northcote* (1891) 294–5; Beaconsfield to Northcote, 11 Sept., Monypenny and Buckle, vi. 61–62.
14. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Did you ever read so much trash as Northcote’s speech. It must have taken 2 hours. I expected a much better one.

Are you the ‘eloquent demagogue’?

I see they have artfully fixed the election for the day after the meeting of the Bucks Agricultural meeting, where Dizzy is to attend.

Carrington also is to be there, but with all his pluck, will of course not be a match for him.

My friend saw Baron & Baroness Lionel yesterday. Violently in favor of Dizzy, & Derby—but talked as if he was in favor of Carrington but how impossible it was under the present system of voting to know how votes would go—Gave as an instance 3 of his tenants, could not tell whether they would vote with him or the rector. His belief was that F[remantle] would win by 5 or 600.

Did Lacaita tell you he saw a letter from Lytton to Lady Holland, in which he said that Dizzy in answer to his question about Eastern Policy, stated that he understood the Eastern question in India, but was completely ignorant as to the Eastern question in Europe?

15. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

We have advanced thus far in a northern & eastern tour and we hope to be at Castle Howard on Saturday evening & home on Wednesday. I left home at this particular time partly with ideas of health and relaxation, partly because I thought that being everywhere and nowhere I should escape a little from the turmoil of the time. Through Cheshire & Lancashire we accomplished the first stage of our journey to Raby without witnessing any particular indication of public sentiment; and this rather encouraged our extending a little the circle of our visits which I am now half tempted to regret. For at every point I have had the greatest difficulty in maintaining any show of privacy and avoiding strong manifestations. I never saw such keen exhibitions of the popular feeling, appearing so to pervade all ranks and places—A Tory County member said to my wife two days ago ‘if there was a dissolution now I should not get a vote’. This may be in some degree peculiar to the Northerners with their strong character and deep emotions: and certainly for the only election now pending, that of Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities, our people have done all they

---

1 The letter is headed with a drawing by Granville of Beaconsfield in the stocks.
2 i.e. the Bucks. by-election; see no. 2.
3 Printed to this point from Gladstone’s copy by Morley, ii. 555-6.
could (I imagine) to let the Govt keep the seat, by choosing as the Liberal Candidate\textsuperscript{1} an old local solicitor, recommended I suppose only by the fact that he has the needful money & is ready to spend it.

Almost every day I have refused public meetings at a distance as well as on my line of march; and I see no immediate likelihood of being driven from this course. At the same time a local case might arise: & a new question has come up, raised by Dizzy's declaration that he is not backed by the country\textsuperscript{2} conjoined with the fact that they are persevering in a disapproved policy without dissolving or consulting Parliament. On this subject Lowe's letter\textsuperscript{3} without its last sentence would have been very good. This is in itself serious.

In case you have at all formulated your ideas, or advanced to any particular point in the consideration of the question, I shall be glad to be kept informed that I may have regard to it even in charging my pocket pistols in the shape of short letters which I cannot altogether avoid writing & which sometimes struggle into notice.

I hope Lady Granville has now quite recovered her strength.

16. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone [Add. MS. 44170, fo. 254]


Forster goodnaturedly stopped here last night, with a very pleasing daughter.

None of his original views seem changed.\textsuperscript{4}

He is confirmed as to the effete character of the upper classes among the Turks. He has no doubt not only of the atrocities but of its having been the fixed purpose of the Gov to stamp out the insurrection in Bulgaria. He says that the insurrection was of a very formidable character, & that it's being stamped out broke down a portion of the Servian plans.

He believes Elliot to have been at fault. At all events such is the opinion of all at Constantinople—but he does not intend to bear heavily upon him.

He believes autonomy to be insufficient from the large proportion of Turks in Bulgaria & Bosnia, that some sort of occupation is necessary, or

\textsuperscript{1} i.e. Dr. Anderson Kirkwood. The Lord Advocate, William Watson, retained the seat for the conservatives with a majority of 604 in a poll of over 4,000, 10 Nov.; see The Times, 11 Nov., p. 96.

\textsuperscript{2} At Aylesbury, 20 Sept., on the eve of the Bucks. election, in the speech chiefly known for its attribution of the Bulgarian rising to secret societies, and erroneously said to have won the election; see The Times, 21 Sept., p. 6a; Monypenny and Buckle, vi. 65-67.

\textsuperscript{3} To the editor of The Times, using Beaconsfield's saying that the nation was not with the government to call for an autumn session, The Times, 30 Sept., p. 5f. The last sentence alluded to 'rights of self-government... wrung from powerful Kings' which could not be 'wrested from Ministers, the creatures of our own creation'.

\textsuperscript{4} After his visit to Turkey; see T. Wemyss Reid, Life of W. E. Forster (1888) ii. 116-42.
Govt which can be backed up by occupation if required. He does not intend to produce any cut & dried scheme.

The subscriptions of Russia enormous—the connivance at the rush of officers complete—Some Russians much alarmed at the popular manifestations [in favour] of a policy which is known to be in opposition to the personal wishes of the Czar.

He will make a speech, I expect a judicious one, almost immediately.¹

17. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Walmer Castle. Oct 4/76.²

I hope a letter written by me on Tuesday³ will have been forwarded to you. It gave an account of Forster’s ‘impressions de voyage’.

If you & Hartington had not declared yourselves in favour of an autumn session,⁴ I should not have been keen on the subject. If we met it would require a vote of Censure on our part—which would be met by a counter resolution likely to be carried by large majorities in both houses. I am afraid we should have more defections on our side, than on that of the Conservatives.

The Anti-Russian feeling is very strong, & I am told that in Bucks, the liberal votes given in favor of Fremantle were numerous.

Forster doubts the expediency of an autumn session. He does not like Northcote’s meeting in Yorkshire.⁵

I cannot avoid suspecting grave differences in the Cabinet.

I hear that Dizzy is very excited in his opposition to Russia. From their utterances it does not seem improbable that Carnarvon & Salisbury are with us. But supposing the improbable event of a Tory breakdown, what a state our party is in for a reconstruction of a liberal Gov.

Your progress in the North has been an immense triumph, & the greater from the privacy which you have endeavoured to maintain. But if I were you, I should contrive to avoid further utterances for the present moment, which appears critical.

Professor Hunter⁶ wrote to me about the Scotch University Election. I could not answer his application for money without reference to Adam but promised my mite if Freeman stood. In the meantime Adam had

¹ To his constituents at Bradford, 5 Oct., advocating not autonomy for the Christian provinces, but European supervision of Turkish rule; see The Times, 6 Oct., p. 8a.
² Corrected in Gladstone’s hand to 5 Oct; cf. no. 18.
³ 3 Oct.
⁴ See p. 9, nn. 3, 7.
⁵ At Nostell Priory, 26 Sept., Lang, op. cit. 295; The Times, 28 Sept., p. 5d.
⁶ Cf. from W. A. Hunter, 27 Sept., thanking Granville for his promise of support, but saying Freeman had been withdrawn as Adam did not act and Kirkwood had been selected that day, P.R.O. 30/29/26 Ai; cf. p. 11, n. 1.
declined furnishing the money, probably with reason, and the 'parochial' candidate was chosen.

I go to town tomorrow—& dine with the Wolvertons.

18. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

Castle Howard. Oct 7. 76.

I thank you for your clear and interesting account of the views with which Forster has returned from the East. Reflection had already brought me to the conclusion that in all likelihood, after the practical emancipation of the three Turkish Provinces, a temporary military occupation on a small scale might be necessary, for purposes of police, to keep the peace between Mussulman and Christian. It is a pity: but the thing may have to be done.

*Before receiving your letter of the 5th (written '4th' in error) I had been driven to the conclusion that I must make a further utterance, following the actual course of the transactions. And upon the whole I adhere to this conclusion notwithstanding your opinion to which I attach great weight. There is a great difference in our situations which I think accounts for this difference of view. I found Ailesbury of course full of friendship & loyalty to you but disposed to regret that you had not been able to see your way to a more advanced and definite policy. I told him that I found no cause for surprise in your reserve and thought you held yourself in hand for the purpose of holding your party in hand—, a view which I think he more or less embraced. Now I have not your responsibilities to the party, but I have for the moment more than your responsibilities to the country in this sense that I feel myself compelled to advise from time to time upon the course of that national movement which I have tried hard to evoke and assisted in evoking. I have tried and shall try to avoid speaking: but if I do not speak I must write, only taking care not to do it except under a clear sense of necessity and within the limits established by it. I regard myself as an outside workman, engaged in the preparation of materials which you & the party will probably have to manipulate and then to build into a structure. For though I do not wish to shut the door upon the Govt., I despair of them, after so many invitations and so many refusals.*¹ I consider, you will see, as refusals the measures they have lately been adopting, that is to say as refusals couched in the form of evasions. I am convinced that a virtual emancipation ought to take place, & I rather believe it will: and at any rate I find myself bound to promote it as one of the public. The distinction involved in these words may be fine, but I think I have only to observe it as well as I can.

We came to this fine place today from Jervau[l]x & find among others

¹ Starred passage, printed Morley, ii. 556.
the Halifaxes & F. Cavendishes. I am so glad Wolverton has come back: better as I hope.

I am surprised at what you tell me of the votes in Bucks but I am by no means sure that the Govt could keep their forces together in Parliament on a well chosen motion, or that, if they did, it would determine the strife in their favour.

I followed Hartington reluctantly and at a distance, but when I read his speech at Sheffield I assumed that he was more or less in concert with you about the suggestion of an Autumnal Session which would be an intolerable nuisance.

Hawarden on Wedy.

19. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Walmer Castle. Oct 15/76.

I was exceedingly touched by what Ailesbury tells me you said of me at Jervaulx.

I hear there is to be a Council on the 22d for the prorogation of Parliament—which is to be short—I presume leaving it open whether the Govt will meet Parl before Xmas. I doubt their doing so. When it does meet, much will depend upon the state of affairs at the time.

This armistice throws responsibility upon the powers, and especially upon England. I cannot say I am much in ecstasy with D[erby]'s despatch. There is no conclusion in it. It does not put our right of dictating on its right basis; but I rejoice that it cuts away their ground of attack upon you & Argyll, & others who have been exposing the crimes of the Turks.

There is an article in the Edinburgh, which might have been, & perhaps has been dictated by Derby. I do not know whether it is Reeve or Grant Duff.

20. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

Many thanks for your letter.

My son Harry starts next week for India and I go to London to bid him good bye there. I mention this in case you should chance to be going up.

---

1 See p. 9, nn. 3, 7.
2 For six months, proposed to be imposed upon Turkey and Servia by the powers.
3 To Elliot, 21 Sept., instructing him to demand a personal audience of the sultan in order to communicate the substance of Baring's report on the Bulgarian atrocities and to make specific demands for reparation and punishment of those responsible, printed The Times, 7 Oct., p. 9f, and Parl. papers (1877) xc. 237.
4 Reviewing the blue book, Correspondence respecting Bosnia and Herzegovina, laid before parliament, July 1876; defending Elliot and advocating administrative reform, but not autonomy, for Bulgaria, the Edinburgh Review, Oct. 1876, pp. 535–72.
(I rather think we communicate, though rarely, yet more than members of the Cabinet do.) I expect to be there from Monday to Thursday.

Forster's speech\(^1\) was like all he does thoroughly well intended but in my opinion was calculated to do and did great mischief. However our Government had gone too far in their game of unconscious playing into Russia's hands to be materially helped even by him.

I observe he says (in a letter)\(^2\) that in 1856 we renounced the right of interference. This I think quite erroneous. What we renounced was the title to interfere on the ground of the insertion of a certain article in the Treaty.

I am also extremely sorry that Hartington dined with the Turkish Ministers.

When the six months armistice fell to the ground, I felt relieved by the explosion of a great imposture.

My correspondence is unmanageably large, and very curious. I get abusive letters from 'Liberals', and laudatory ones from 'Conservatives': but the Conservatives sign, the 'Liberals' do not, and I much doubt whether they are not rank Tories.

I quite agree with you about Derby's letter of vengeance.\(^3\)

[...]

[P.S.] I cannot turn round as often & easily as the Tories; on account of my (late) lumbago.

21. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone [Add. MS. 44170, fo. 264]

Walmer Castle. Oct 20/76.

I believe that Hartington will be here Saturday or Sunday. We have a few people coming during the next few days. Is there any chance of your giving us the pleasure of a little visit after your son is gone. It would be very pleasant. If not, I will try & run up to London during your stay.

They thought Delane rather wanting, when at Dunrobin. The change in the Times has been since his return, & he certainly seems to have lost his head entirely.

I wrote to Charles Cotes about the S. Shropshire Election. I am sorry to say that he says it is impossible to find a candidate, or to do anything till a general election. Lawley would be the best candidate.

What amount of danger do you think there is of a coup de tête on the part of the Govt.

---

\(^1\) See p. 12, n. 1.

\(^2\) To the editor of The Times, 17 Oct., p. 6b.

\(^3\) To Elliot, 21 Sept., referred to in no. 19.

\(^4\) Where a by-election was rendered necessary by the death of the conservative member, Sir Percy Egerton Herbert. No liberal standing, Edward Corbett and Capt. J. E. Severne were returned, 3 Nov., unopposed.
P.S. the papers are arrived, & I see that the Gov are going to do nothing, and that Lawley is going to stand,¹ which gives me great pleasure. Cotes thought there was no chance of his doing so. Perhaps you have contributed to this result.

22. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone [Add. MS. 44170, fo. 267]

Walmer Castle. Oct 24 [1876].

Hartington came here the day before yesterday, & left early yesterday by a very early train. Your first post card² came after he was gone. He intended trying to find you yesterday, and I am sorry that he will have failed.

I have rec[eive]d your 2d card today. Besides the pleasure of seeing you here, I was rather glad to get it, as I managed to get a chill yesterday, & was in bed till this afternoon.

I suggest a change of your plan—viz sleeping here on Friday, & giving Harty Tarty a rendezvous in London for Saturday when he will pass through town again. But pray do whatever is most convenient to you.

23. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville [P.R.O. 30/29/29 A]

Hawarden. Nov. 2. 76.

I should have sent back the inclosure³ on Sunday but that I thought my wife and daughter might read it.

It is truly moving: so simply and yet so deeply good. The initials I presume disclose the cause of your special interest in it.

For the party I am tempted to select the line ‘Whose voice was all their ear, whose form their eye’ p. 7 and with this I compare half a line in Tennyson’s forthcoming drama⁴ (he has just been here) ‘You were his music’ and I presume the authoress knows Dante and especially the notable line in him

‘Amor che a nullo amato amar perdona’,⁵ a line so difficult to translate, of which she has supplied a fresh rendering

¹ He did not finally stand for south Shropshire.
² Of 23 Oct., announcing a change of plan since no. 20, to go to Dover instead of London, and proposing himself to Walmer for the morning of Fri. 27 Oct., P.R.O. 30/29/29 A. Gladstone returned to Hawarden, 28 Oct., Morley, ii. 557; cf. Hartington to Gladstone, 27 Oct., on his coming speech at Keighley when he would not condemn the government as much as Gladstone nor favour it as much as Forster, and showing that he could not meet Gladstone in London, Add. MS. 44144, fo. 218.
³ Possibly a poem by Lady Georgiana Fullerton, not traced.
⁴ Harold, which Tennyson read aloud to the Gladstone family on the morning of ¹ Nov., Mary Gladstone Her Diaries and Letters, edited L. Masterman (1930) 111.
⁵ Inferno, v. i. 103.
For love can only be repaid in kind p. 20.
Acton is here, drawn over to see Tennyson.
I have learned from a good source, through Lord Stratford, that the Russian demand does include self-governing powers for the three Provinces B[osnia] H[erzegovina] & M[ontenegro].
The South Shropshire Election is a heavy discouragement to such of us as hold the recent movement (I am one) to have deserved the name of national.
We i.e. the Govt. have given Russia a magnificent position. God grant she may not turn it to ill purposes. You will find the letter inclosed here-with well worth reading. Please to return it. I hope you have quite recovered.

24. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Many thanks for your charming commentary on 'the pictures'.
I have always thought that the prettiest English hexameter is Long-fellow's 'When she had passed, it seemed, like the ceasing of exquisite music'.
I have forwarded the letter you sent me to Lord Stratford. The information it contains is most interesting—the writer seems to have succeeded in persuading the Time's correspondent to give the pith of it.
I believe Hartington is in town, but I have not seen him. We are to meet at Sandringham tomorrow. I trust there will be a full report of his speech in some of the papers tomorrow. It is difficult to make out what he said from what appeared on Saturday.
I entirely agree with you & Punch, as to the position in which Russia has been placed by our diplomacy.
I hope Mrs Gladstone is quite well again.

1 Stratford de Redcliffe, 29 Oct., enclosed an anonymous statement of the substance of the Russian ambassador's (Ignatyev) instructions, Add. MS. 44452, fo. 88.
2 Untraced letter from Ashmead Bartlett, who visited the scenes of the Bulgarian atrocities on coming down from Oxford; see Stratford de Redcliffe to Gladstone, 10 Nov., returning the letter which Granville had sent on to him, Add. MS. 44452, fo. 112.
3 Evangeline, part i, l. 62.
4 A. C. N. Gallenga in Constantinople or W. J. Stillman in Herzegovina; the article referred to has not been identified.
5 For full report of Hartington's speech at Keighley, 3 Nov., see The Times, 6 Nov., p. 7c.
6 i.e. in a leading article commenting, The Times, 4 Nov., p. 9a, and in report of part, p. 6a.
7 Tenniel's cartoon, Doubtful Diplomacy, showed the Balkan children running up to the Russian bear and John Bull asking Derby: 'Is that what you have been driving at?', Punch, 4 Nov., lxx. 193.
25. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

H[awarde]n. Nov. 8. 76.

Though Salisbury is not a very safe man, yet his appointment\(^1\) is in spirit the best thing the Government have done yet since the Eastern question began to burn—and on the whole I am pleased.

But my special objects in writing to you are two. The first, to tax your memory.

You may remember that when Lord P[almerston] and Lord R[ussell] proposed to the Cabinet in 1862 to give up the Protectorate of the Ionian Islands they also proposed that Turkey should be asked to give Thessaly and Albania, or Epirus, to Greece, as tributary States—and the Cabinet without difficulty agreed to all?\(^2\)

But what became of that proposal to Turkey? It must have been made confidentially? and at once extinguished by the Porte? on this part of the case I have no clear recollection.

Now I want to tax your invention. Some day or other will come up the question of the clausure, say closure, of the Bosporos against ships of war.

Is it possible to maintain that closure on principle, & a l'outrance?

Is it not a natural highway & why, except for temporary reasons, should it be closed? Is it not a hardship on littoral states of the Black Sea to be forbidden using the means of defence equipped there for war purposes except in the Black Sea? Should we stand it in our own case? Could we go to war to maintain it? Doubtless the waters of the Bosporos are Turkish waters but I never heard that this maritime jurisdiction accorded to all countries extended to prohibiting the non-hostile use of such waters by vessels of war.

So much for this subject.\(^3\)

There is a story that the Cabinet have decided to occupy Egypt if Russia occupies Bulgaria.

I suppose Hartington did the best that circumstances would permit. He could not afford to march through Coventry with me.

26. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Great Glemham, Wickham Market. Nov 12/76.

We left Sandringham yesterday. Glad to escape before the Prime

---

\(^1\) As British plenipotentiary to the Constantinople conference, announced 8 Nov.

\(^2\) For the cabinet's decision, 8 Dec. 1862, see H. Temperley, 'British Secret Diplomacy during the Palmerston period', \textit{Festschrift til Halvdan Koht} (Oslo, 1933) 285-6; for Elliot's special mission to Athens and Constantinople to propose the Turkish cession to Greece, Turkish resistance supported by the British ambassador, and the failure of the proposal, see E. Prevelakis, \textit{British Policy towards Greece, 1862-63} (1953) 97-104.

\(^3\) Cf. \textit{Gladstone and Granville}, i, nos. 382 and note, 389, 399.
Minister arrived. You would have liked the answering of his speech. But I am not sure it does not answer his purpose.

I do not [know] what to say about Salisbury. He is a strong & very clever man—certainly not a prudent one—and I presume with no habit of dealing with Foreigners.

Which would be his prevailing bias—sympathy with the Xtiants, or jealousy of Russia.

I remember the proposal you mention about Turkey giving up Thessaly and another province to Greece—but I have forgotten if I ever knew what became of it. But I think I can find out for you.

As to the opening of the Bosphorus, I think the Russians if they were strong enough to assert the claim, could make out a good case for themselves in demanding it. But I certainly do not wish to encourage them to do so. I know of no nation who would wish to give them the right, excepting the Americans, who have I believe never acknowledged the right of the other European Powers to exclude their (the American) men of war from passing through the Straits.

I believe Austria, Italy, & France would dislike it and the popular feeling here would be violently against it & it would be inconsistent in the late Gov, after the trouble we took on this point during the Black Sea conference, to show any favor to a change.

We are forced by public opinion to keep up an unnecessarily large fleet in the Mediterranean out of jealousy of France. If a large Russian fleet were to cruize in the Mediterranean without the necessity of sailing all round Europe to get there, the cry for more ships would be encreased.

But I see your question is whether we could object à l'outrance to such a claim. It is highly probable that the Russians may take advantage of favorable circumstances to advance this claim, but I doubt their doing so in a normal state of things.

I see a distinct disclaimer was made by Dizzy of any intention on our part to take any province.

We go to Chatsworth next week, and to Longleat the week afterwards, but please direct whenever you have anything to say, to London.

I hope Mrs Gladstone is quite right again as you do not mention her.

Ld Stratford has written to announce his having returned the letter to you.

He fears that the Gov have shown more fear of pricking their fingers, than sagacity in arriving at satisfactory results.

---

1 At the Guildhall, 9 Nov., known chiefly for its warning to Russia that any power who challenged Britain would find her prepared for a struggle of any length, to accomplish her purpose; see The Times, 10 Nov., p. 8c.

2 In the peroration to the Guildhall speech: 'Peace is especially an English policy. . . . She covets no cities and no Provinces.'

3 See p. 17, n. 2, and no. 24.
27. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone  
Great Glemham, Wickham Market. Nov 15/76.

There is no trace in the public correspondence, of any negotiation with Turkey for the cession of Thessaly & Epirus to Greece when we gave up Corfu.

If there was any communication on the subject, it must have been by private correspondence.

It was suggested by Prince Christian of Denmark1 to Sir Augustus Paget in 1863.

28. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville  
Hawarden Castle. N. 17. 76.

Many thanks. I have no doubt the suggestion was privately made to the Turk, & privately knocked on the head. Lord R[ussell] does not recollect but thinks this probable.² I mean to mention, in a non-polemical article for the C[ontemporary] R[evieu]w on the Hellenic case, the proposal to & decision of the Cabinet.³

I ought perhaps to have told you that I did not dream of touching the question of the Bosporos.

My article will not be polemical.

But I am glad that Argyll has fired into Dizzy again.

I have advised the postponement of a meeting at Holywell.

You looked so domestic & maritime at Walmer that I did not dream of your coming North—and you never told me. Can you not squeeze us in on any between-days you may have free? I would fish for Bright who I see is at Llandudno.

On another question I want to be set, or kept, right.

Is our real, valuable, hold over the Suez Canal, in war-time, any other than our maritime superiority in the Mediterranean?

Would Egypt make any real addition to it?

If it would not, then the holding of it would be a new military responsibility, a burden, & an evil?

Westminster is anything but Fitzwilliamish.

¹ His son William was in 1862 about to become George I, King of the Hellenes.
² See Lady Russell to Gladstone, 13 Nov., answering Gladstone's inquiry this way; and 22 Nov., adding that Russell had always favoured the union of Thessaly and Epirus, Add. MS. 44452, fos. 121, 153.
³ See 'The Hellenic Factor in the Eastern Problem', Contemporary Review, Dec. 1876; reprinted W. E. Gladstone, Gleanings of Past Years, iv. 259–304; the views of Russell and Palmerston were given but not the decision of the cabinet; see no. 30.
29. **Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone** [Add. MS. 44171, fo. 11]

18, Carlton House Terrace. Nov 18/76.

I am very sorry to say, that we have rashly and most ungeographically promised to go to Longleat from Chatsworth. I am rather curious to hear what Bath says at this moment, and to learn whether he has any friends in the House of Lords. I am afraid that my position in that assembly will be worse than ever.

Westminster, & Ailesbury are the only stout men I have seen.

I always thought there would be some reaction to the great excitement of the early autumn, but I did not expect it to come so soon & so strong. I am not sure whether it is not better that it should have come soon, and given time to a counter reaction before Parliament meets—there are some symptoms of this already.

I presume Dizzy & the Czar¹ are playing at an unworthy & dangerous game of brag.

I agree with you about Egypt—but I see Dizzy disclaims the idea of taking any ‘province’.

Are you sure that it is right for you to announce what was decided in the Palmerston Cabinet about Thessaly & Epirus.

What lapse of time is sufficient to justify an individual member of a Cabinet announcing, without having obtained the consent of the Sovereign, what passed in a Cabinet without being at the time officially made known.

The Queen would be as Lord Melbourne said of Peel ‘a bad mare to go up to in the stable’ just now.

And are you quite sure of what the precise character of the decision was.

I remember the matter being discussed, and I think I remember the decision being taken, but I should be rather staggered if any of our late colleagues were to deny that we came to any absolute decision.

I do not know how you bring in the statement, but the tendency of it would be to advocate the aggrandizement of Greece at the expense of Turkey.

But I, and I believe you, do not agree to Lowe’s doctrine that to obtain proper guarantees from Turkey as to the Gov of its Xtian subjects, is to break up the Treaty of 1856, whereas to take away two provinces & give them to another power would clearly do so.

There is a good article in the Times today²—and a speech, I presume

---

¹ Supposed to have answered, at Moscow, 11 Nov., Beaconsfield’s Guildhall speech, 9 Nov., by asserting Russia’s readiness to act alone if the Constantinople conference failed; for discussion of the improbability of this, see B. H. Sumner, *Russia and the Balkans* (1937) 126–7 and note.

² See leading article, contrasting the dangers of European war with the palliatives proposed to avoid it, and writing of the folly of encouraging Turkish hopes that Britain would fight for her, *The Times*, 18 Nov., p. 9a.
required by the feeling of his constituents from General Gordon almost in our sense.

I came up yesterday with an inflamed gum, and have seen no one yet but my dentist.

Did you read Dodson, not only advocating our keeping our powder dry, but pointing out the advantage of burning a little of it, to show that it was dry.

30. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville  

Hawarden Castle. Nov 19. 76.

I think that Pascal in the Provincial Letters says that according to the casuistry which he assailed, a man might do any particular thing he had a mind to, provided he could find one probable doctor in whose opinion the said thing was lawful.

Looking to the converse, I regard you as a probable doctor, & in your opinion it is of questionable lawfulness to mention without permission the decision of the Cabinet in 1862. In the face of my probable doctor, I will not persist.

I see nothing however to prevent my asserting the matter as the opinion of Lord Palmerston & Lord Russell, with the addition that I have good grounds for believing that opinion to have been acceptable to their colleagues generally.

Lord Russell makes no doubt whatever about the fact, & on that my memory is quite positive. My own concern with the affairs of the Ionian Islands had put my mind into a receptive and retentive attitude.

We are very sorry you cannot come.

As to the reaction in my belief it is very much confined to the Clubs & Upper Circle, & there it is not so much that the people have changed as that they have got together, heard one another's voices, & taken courage. I will not yet speak for the Election. But of the people's interest & unchanging sentiments, I have no doubt. Even on Friday night last, when I went to the play in Liverpool, I had such a fuss made about me as never happened before. Last Sunday we had sermons in the Church here for the Eastern Christians, & a far larger number of coppers, which is the true test, than had been ever known. I do not mean that these are proofs but they are indications of what can only be proved by a multitude of particulars much beyond the circle of private experience.

I have most sanguine accounts from Frome.

1 Not traced.  
2 Lettres Provinciales, cinquième lettre.  
3 See The Times, 18 Nov., p. 6c, for account of the audience's rising and cheering when Gladstone entered the Theatre Royal for a benefit performance for W. H. Pennington, the tragedian.  
4 Where a by-election had been rendered necessary when the member, H. C. Lopes, was made a judge of the High Court.
[P.S.] After all, in all the great questions, a large number of the Liberal Peers are, until brought into rank, not the head but the tail of the party? (What blasphemy).

31. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

[Add. MS. 44171, fo. 17]

18, Carlton House Terrace. Nov 24/76.

I have been in bed, instead of at Chatsworth this week. The insidious foe placed himself in the funny bone of the elbow, the most painful place he has yet attacked. But you will think it sufficient compensation, that I am in the hands of Andrew Clarke, who has treated me in a way which I entirely approve.

A pamphlet has just been sent describing the causes of the fall of your Gov, among which the most prominent is my constant opposition to you in and out of the Cabinet. I am afraid I must let judgment go in default. But I am glad to say, that there is a complete defence for Dodson, of whom I complained to you the other day. He has explained that his phrase was misunderstood—that the powder to which he alluded was opposition powder not national ammunition, & that he was going to address his Constituents in an Anti-Turk sense.

Prince Christian is the present King of Denmark. I believe the despatch containing his suggestion has never been presented.

The very few who have penetrated into my bed room, are very irate with Beaconsfield. I have seen no defence of him.

Frome is a refreshing incident.

32. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

[P.R.O. 30/29/29 A]


I am much concerned to hear that after your gallant self-denial the old enemy still will not let you alone: although a little glad to find that you too have sought refuge within the all-embracing arms of Andrew Clark.

Of one thing I am certain that you will find him as a man in every way entitled to your esteem.

Now about the pamphlet. I got it on Friday and yesterday wrote the inclosed note to the Authoress, which please to send to the pillar post as soon as you can after reading it. I was struck by the pith with which she handled the points of the Eastern question.

1 Annie Besant, Why did Gladstone fall from Power?; cf. Mrs. Besant to Gladstone, 23 Nov., sending him the pamphlet, Add. MS. 44452, fo. 157.

2 A conservative seat won, 23 Nov., by the liberal H. B. Samuelson, by 93 votes, owing, it was said, to the active local liberal association; see no. 34.

3 To Mrs. Besant, 25 Nov., copy, thanking and complimenting on the pamphlet, but strongly denying her allegations about Granville's hostility, Add. MS. 44452, fo. 179.
Frome is certainly an agreeable incident. But may it not be something more, an important indication?

Yesterday night, in the Tory town of Liverpool, when Othello was being acted & the words were reached ‘the Turks are drowned’ the audience rose in enthusiasm & interrupted the performance for some time with their cheering.

These things are not without meaning.

I hear most flourishing accounts of the progress of preparations for the ‘Conference’ of which I have been a promoter from the beginning. They urge me to speak on the 8th—but I should much prefer that others should put themselves in the foreground.

The provocation offered by Disraeli at the Guildhall is almost incredible. Some new lights about his Judaic feeling in which he is both consistent and conscientious have come in upon me.

My paper about Greece I consider a contribution to the case but not to the controversy.

Wishing you well through, I remain always yours . . .

I forgot that I have offered you no affirmative testimony in reply to what the pamphlet says. Freely could I give it, if it were needed.

Dated N. 24, your letter came this morning.

33. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

18, Carlton House Terrace. Nov 27/76.

How much too goodnatured of you to have taken the trouble of writing to Miss [sic] Besant. But on reflection, I ask you not to send any contradiction of her statement about me.

If, I or my friends are to begin denying such a statement as that I have been disloyal to you as my chief, where are we to end.

I hear that something is to be credited to good management at Frome, but on the other hand, Bath exercised all his influence in favor of the Tory.

When I talked of reaction the other day, it would have been more accurate to have said the counter excitement of the Russophobia.

I saw Westminster yesterday. Very cheery—He agrees that the front bench had better not appear.

I have also seen Adam. Hartington does not like the conference, and thinks that public meetings of indignation though he does not at present wish to recommend them would have more effect.  

1 It originated in a liberal meeting at Darlington to protest against the government’s eastern policy. It met at St. James’s Hall, Piccadilly, 8 Dec., was addressed by Gladstone and other public figures, and intended to inaugurate The National Convention on the Eastern Question.  

2 See p. 19, n. 1.

3 See from Hartington, 26 Nov., which Granville paraphrases, arguing against the conference as sure to get into the hands of extreme and irresponsible men and to drive the whigs to the side of the government, P.R.O. 30/29/22 A.
As to your speaking, it would of course give great brilliancy to the proceedings, but on the other hand your opinions are known, you have not been slack whatever some of us may have been, and your position adds some weight to the prejudice which has been so carefully cultivated, of embarrassing Salisbury at a critical moment.

I go to Longleat today nearly well.

34. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone [Add. MS. 44171, fo. 25]

Longleat, Warminster. Dec 3/76.

Bath believes that there are some Tory MPs who agree with him but he has had no private communication with them.

He consulted some Peers, who he thought might agree with him, but found them very strong the other way.

He attributes the defeat at Frome to a superior organization of the liberals, than had ever been previously known. He says that the Eastern question had no direct only an indirect effect, giving Samuelson and his supporters something to talk about. Ferguson satisfied Burnett. Three or four high Churchmen went over on account of the Church discipline Act.¹

Lady Bath thinks the defeat was owing to the Eastern question, to Ferguson having identified himself with Dizzy, and above all to superior organization.

I saw Prince Leopold yesterday, who is better.

Salisbury's journey² is somewhat like Thiers, at the time of the war.³ It is a pity he could not have seen the Emperor of Russia.

35. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville [P.R.O. 30/29/29 A]

73 Harley] St. Dec. 6. 76.

I was in Chester when your note reached Hawarden and it was sent to me here. I have come up to attend the Conference.⁴

I came to the conclusion after much consideration that it was desirable for me to make a further utterance. It is anything but a pleasant task: for the ‘situation’ which twelve months ago was in my judgment comparatively easy has become extremely difficult. In this difficult situation we send a clever but raw man to face much low cunning—of the Turk—and much astuteness—of the Russian—without, so far as I know, any thing to lean

¹ Public Worship Regulation Act (1874) which embodied similar provisions to those of the Church Discipline bill of 1873.
² He visited Paris, Berlin, Vienna, and Rome on his way to the Constantinople conference.
³ Relates to his mission to London, Florence, Vienna, and St. Petersburg, 12 Sept.–5 Oct. 1870, after the French defeat, see Gladstone and Granville, i, nos. 293, 302, 303.
⁴ See p. 24, n. 1.
upon but his own good intentions & natural talents, for not one of all the Powers is entirely trustworthy.

I need hardly say that I shall do nothing intentionally to perplex Salisbury:¹ poor fellow he will, unless I am mistaken, have in all likelihood quite enough to perplex him already; so far as I can forecast the probable matter of my speech, I do not think it will be disagreeable to you.

I am very glad Aylesbury [sic] is to appear.

Pray remember me to your host and exhort him to follow the truly Conservative example of Lord Bath.

You recollect advising, & my agreeing, in September, not to point to Disraeli individually. It is now wholly unavoidable.

Evidently the bulk of the Govt party hangs together: but so did the bulk of the Liberal party at the last Election.

36. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Crichel, Wimborne. Dec 7/76.

Very sorry to miss you in town. I was out hunting yesterday with Portman, & met Wolverton, who hopes to see you.

When I came here I was not aware I was to have the honor of meeting the Prime Minister. Benjamin Beaconsfield as Big Ben² calls him.

He seems well in health—I do not know his usual manner, but he seems to me very silent & absent—with occasional attempts at forced gaiety.

I remember the suggestion I made to you to omit that which looked like a personal attack upon him, & I was consequently pleased at the universal reprobation of his attack upon you & the equally universal approbation of the dignified contempt which you showed.

I own it would be difficult to speak on the present aspect of the Eastern question without alluding to his sayings, if not Derby’s during the autumn. But if you cannot do this by a skilful narrative, without any vituperation or strong language, I shall feel I have miscalculated your powers.

We go to Normanton’s from here, and then straight to Walmer.

37. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Somerley, Ringwood. Dec 11/76.

I waited to hear some details, which I have since had from Evelyn Ashley & my brother, before I wrote to you my impressions gathered from the reports of the meeting on Friday.³

¹ Gladstone, speaking at the St. James’s Hall meeting, represented Beaconsfield’s Guildhall speech as damaging equally Salisbury and Britain’s proper interests; see The Times, 9 Dec., p. 8a.

² Lord Stanley of Alderley.

³ i.e. the St. James’s Hall meeting, 8 Dec., reported in 9½ columns in The Times, 9 Dec., pp. 7a–f, 8a–d.
These reports entirely confirm my impression of the great success of the meeting. I thought your speech excellent.

Did you hear that Lady Derby had expressed satisfaction at the holding of the meeting, and that Lady Salisbury had said that Paris & Berlin had opened her & Salisbury's eyes very much.

Dizzy at Crichell [sic] was much preoccupied, apparently well in health. He did not allude to politics before me.

I shall hear of you from Wolverton.

38. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

Many thanks for your last.

Malcolm Khan may not regard you as he regards me, namely as a man already dragged into the whirlpool, and in case he should not have sent you the very curious paper which is within, I now transmit it with his letter for your perusal.¹

Though overstated in language, I think it is mainly true in its practical upshot.

In answering him I express a great anxiety for the sequel.

How Derby will rub his eyes at such a paper.

Wishing you a happy Christmas I remain . . .

39. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Many happy Xmas' to you & your's.

Malcolm Khan has not sent me the curious and very able memorandum which you have forwarded to me, and which [I] kept for a few days in order to show it to one or two people, especially my nephew, who rather shaky in politics, is a strong anti-Turk.

What is the meaning of 'Islam'. I thought it meant Mohammedism [sic], or rather the congregation of those who hold that creed.

Malcolm Khan appears to apply it only [to] those Mahommedans who own themselves to be subjects of the Sultan, and Sir George Campbell denies that the great body of Mahommedans acknowledge the Sultan as a religious head.²

I am extremely curious to know what was the suggestion which M. K[han] an Armenian and Persian Minister made to the Porte, with any hope of acceptance.

¹ Not traced.
² Campbell had recently visited Turkey and verified charges of misgovernment, but discriminated between the Turkish people and their government; see his moderate speech at the St. James's Hall meeting, The Times, 9 Dec., p. 7b.
Do you remember Sidney Herbert's indignant and amusing stories of Blantyre.

I hope you will be in town two or three days before the meeting.

When do you go to Longleat?

40. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

Hawarden Castle. Jan 2. 77.

Never I suppose, were news-readers so put about by news-makers as during the last two or three weeks we have been by the tidings from Constantinople. Taking the whole proceedings together, they are surely unexampled, and there must be much detail at present unknown to us to account for them. I can perfectly well believe that Disraeli is busy counter-working as far as he can his 'man of flouts and jibes and jeers',¹ and that even, health & all things taken into view, he may be willing to risk his Government for his Judaic feeling, the deepest and truest, now that his wife is gone, in his whole mind.

I incline to believe that come what may the thing has now gone so far that Turkish independence can never again be brought upon the stage even as a phantom.

I do not know whether you have ever read Miss Mackenzie & Miss Irby's joint work on the Slavonic Provinces, published in 1867.² I am sorry to say it is only now that I have read it. It is immeasurably the most faithful and instructive description of the actual life of the Turkish provinces that I have seen.

Here too we have had floods of rain, which I suppose you greatly escape.

We go to Longleat on the 16th or 17th—and according to present plans I expect to be in town some days before the opening.

The Greenwich people are kindly promising me support at the next Election which may force me (this of course is private) rather prematurely to tell them I am not available.³

41. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Private.


The news⁴ from the East is serious today.


² A. P. Irby and Georgiana Muir Mackenzie, The Turks, the Greeks and the Slavons: Travels in the Slavonic Provinces of Turkey-in-Europe (1867); republished in 1877 with a preface by Gladstone.

³ Gladstone decided after the general election of 1874 not to stand again for Greenwich, rejecting an invitation, Jan. 1878, Morley, ii. 585; decision to fight Midlothian taken, Jan. 1879; see Gladstone to Spencer, 24 Oct. 1882, for retrospective account, Add. MS. 44309, fo. 187, see also p. 85, n. 2 and p. 90, n. 2.

⁴ i.e. of the inconclusive session, 4 Jan., of the Constantinople conference; reassembly,
Do you read the Morning Post’s violent attacks upon Salisbury, & formal declarations that he has exceeded his instructions.1

Dicky Doyle is here, and says that Harcourt told him that Borthwick saw Dizzy every day.

42. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville [P.R.O. 30/29/29 A]


We are staying here with a venerable relative, Lady C. [sc. A.] Neville Grenville, who is close upon eighty eight, fresh in mind & manner as a child, and living as if she were already in heaven. We are to be at Savernake on Wednesday and in town on Sat. or Monday following.

I have however a purpose in writing to you beyond this announcement. It is to tell you that to my great astonishment I have found the popular sentiment in Wilts and Somerset,2 these Tory Counties, even stronger on the Eastern question than in the North & North Eastern parts of the country. I have the utmost difficulty in getting rid of the Addresses & invitations, the gatherings at Railway stations and the like. We had a triumphant procession yesterday through the little rural town of Glastonbury headed by a band and flags from a village two miles off, with a long train in the liveliest enthusiasm as they ploughed along through the rain and mud. Now all this means simply the *Eastern question*. A life in the House of Commons as long as mine gives tolerably accurate means of gauging the public sentiment in its average condition towards one’s self. The whole excess above the average is due to a speciality. I never while moving about as a private person have seen anything in the faintest degree resembling it. And my upshot is this; that, while my own course is in principle perfectly clear and plain, I think that you and Hartington will soon have to make up your mind on a great question, namely the attitude you are to assume with reference to this great popular conviction.

On the other hand it is possible that there may be [a] section otherwise minded, besides the ‘vast and influential’ section represented by Lord Fitzwilliam. I believe the Manchester Examiner has (excuse the breakdown of my paper) had an article objecting to my speech at Frome because I declared we had not yet discharged ourselves of our responsibilities. Both there & at Taunton (where I was caught between two trains) I tried to speak within bounds strictly measured.

after adjournment to consider Turkish objections to the European demands, had been expected to end the tension of the last week; see *The Times*, 5 Jan., p. 9a.

1 See the *Morning Post*, leader, 5 Jan., p. 4b-c.

2 Between 17 and 27 Jan. Gladstone stayed at Longleat, Wells (with Bishop Hervey), and Dunster Castle; for demonstrations on the way and replies at Frome and Taunton to addresses at the railway stations, see *The Times*, 23 Jan., p. 6b; 29 Jan., p. 10a.
43. **Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone**

Harleston, Northampton. Feb 1/77.

I am very glad to hear confirmed by you, what I had read in the papers and been told by Freddy¹ about your reception in the West.

I suspect however you somewhat diminish the proportion of the enthusiasm excited by yourself. In the West they do not often have the foremost statesman, & the most eloquent, to visit them. What does Mrs Gladstone say on this point?

We go to town on Saturday evening. If I do not see you before Monday evening, will you & Mrs Gladstone dine with us at 8. I will ask Hartington, Forster, & Cardwell, and any one in or out of the late Cabinet, whom you would like to meet.²

Please impress upon Ailesbury that he must speak in the H. of Lords.

44. **Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville**

18 CHT. Feb. 18. 77.

I am so sorry to miss you, having brought the inclosed note³ for your criticism. If you approve of it perhaps you will kindly send it over to save time in coming back to you.

M[idhat] had little to say but that in his opinion war was certain & that it would be principally in Asia with an attempt to make Bulgaria into a protected state. I only said (I think) things repeatable.

45. **Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville**

73 Harley Street. Feb. 24. 77.

I called at your door yesterday with the letter, which appears in today's Times:⁴ but you had that moment flown.

When I was last with you there was not time to introduce the Bulgarian affair. And I must admit it to be most difficult to judge it, without having gone carefully through the whole of the evidence on it in the Blue Books.

I now send you in draft the sort of conception I have formed first of a question secondly of a motion which might follow upon a negative reply.⁵

¹ Frederick Leveson-Gower.
² For Forster's note of this dinner-party and the divergent attitudes on the eastern question which emerged, see T. Wemyss Reid, *The Life of W. E. Forster* (1888) ii. 165.
³ Not traced.
⁴ To the editor of *The Times*, denying that he had described (as Beaconsfield in the Lords had said) the failure of the Constantinople conference to consider the condition of the porte's Christian subjects, as 'an accident', *The Times*, 24 Feb., p. 8b.
⁵ Gladstone was dissuaded from making any parliamentary motion on Bulgaria then, cf. nos. 47-49.
It seems to me that the Government have placed themselves in a false position. They have brought the question fully within our province, and have pronounced a censure but not upon the right people.

I incline to believe we might even obtain some substantive result in the House: & that at all events a stroke would be struck in the country.

The question of the exact time is another matter.

But as to substance I found myself upon this: the conduct of the Porte, translated into speech, is saying to its meridions and its soldiery 'Do it again'. And this comes out so clearly as to be indubitable.

I am far from thinking this idea is one to be disposed of in a moment.

The Spectator says Gortschakoff is willing to take the 12 months delay with a contingent promise from us to coerce Turkey at the end of it; which our Govt. will not give. If this be true I think Russia has still further improved her position.

If my Bulgarian motion does not smile to you, I must set to work with my pen. You is dual.

46. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Kimbolton Castle. Feb 25/77.

I will call on you tomorrow to talk over what you propose. You know that I start with a great fear of a division.

Hartington will either write or speak to you.

We had a long day yesterday with moderate sport. As a sexagenarian I am ashamed of how much it amuses me.

47. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

18, Carlton House Terrace. Feb 27/77.

I saw Adam, Halifax & Forster yesterday. They all deprecate any motion. Adam will quietly make some enquiries, but he is convinced that it would not be safe to put the majority as low as 100.

Halifax & Forster are against any motion, & do not like the one proposed, if it were decided to have one.

When some little time ago you threw out the suggestion of a pamphlet, I did not express any opinion in favor of it, for the reasons I mentioned yesterday. But the case is different now. Northcote has deprecated for the present[,] Parliamentary action. Hartington has given reasons which have been generally approved, for our not moving at this moment.

1 See the opening sentence of the editorial 'News of the Week', The Spectator, 24 Feb., p. 233.

2 Gladstone's second pamphlet, Lessons in Massacre, published in March, was not a success; see no. 49.

3 i.e. Granville and Hartington.
On the other hand Derby last Tuesday again attributed the 'Horrors' to the feebleness of the Turkish Gov—whereas it was the only thing in which they have shown any energy.

Grey last night mentioned as exaggeration Argyll's account of the misgovernment of Turkey. It would therefore not be unreasonable to let the public know the real state of the case.

48. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Walmer Castle. March 2/77.

I have written to Adam to let you know whether further enquiries have materially altered his opinion as to numbers.

I have an opinion that it is better to let an enemy's wound fester, rather than probe it—but I should have no objection to a motion on which we could reasonably hope for a majority not greater than fifty.

But even such a division as that, would as you said the other day, throw the responsibility from the back of the Gov, to that of Parliament.

I believe a large majority would damp & not excite the country.

I quite admit the inference you draw from recent elections but with a qualification.

Having lost some 70 seats at the general election, owing to the unpopularity which a strong reforming Gov creates, and from other exceptional circumstances—after a short lapse of time we were sure to get back some of our normal majorities in boroughs.

The Gov soon will either have failed in maintaining peace, or in securing the good Gov of the Xtians. We can use indirect, but not direct influence upon them. I would keep the pot simmering, but not let it overflow.

Some would think it a mistake of you to publish another pamphlet—but you appear to me to have a locus standi consistent with all your previous course.

I will have a good talk with Wolverton on Monday, and let you know the upshot. When last I saw him, he was against Parliamentary action entailing divisions.

49. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

73 Harley St. Mch 6. 77.

From you I have nothing more—from Adam nothing—from Hartington a strong note in which he takes your opinion to be final & gives his own

1 3 Mar., on his strong conviction that liberals in the Commons did not want the eastern question to be raised, Add. MS. 44144, fo. 223, part printed, R. W. Seton-Watson, Gladstone, Disraeli and the Eastern Question (1935) 65; see also B. Holland, The Life of the Duke of Devonshire (1911) i. 193-4.
very strongly. Indeed he carries it on to the matter of publication, for
which I am far from seeking to make any one responsible except myself.

I am therefore going to Murray this afternoon to request him to adver-
tise\(^1\) tomorrow.

What a Chaos the papers\(^2\) are.

At some time I should like to have a few words with you about Enfield’s
answer\(^3\) in Aug. 72—It is I think a most awkward matter.

50. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

[Add. MS. 44171, fo. 48]

Parke House, Melton Mowbray. March 7/77.

I had nothing more to add to what I had written. I asked Adam &
Hartington to write to you if further enquiries had changed their opinions.

I directed my letter to Adam, at the Reform Club as usual, but got no
answer.

He must either have not got my letter, or hearing from H. that he had
written to you, thought that was sufficient.

I have found no one inclined for immediate action—Freddy Leveson
who has been rather chafing under inaction writes to me today ‘there is the
greatest apathy in the House of Commons on the Eastern question, every
one blames Courtenay [\textit{sc.} Courtney]’.

Wolverton thinks the House is opposed to any immediate action, though
circumstances might arise which would change the feeling. We both
chuckled over your answer to Colquhoun\([\text{u}]\)(—how do you spell the Corfu’s
man’s name).\(^4\) I will call on you as soon as I return to London.

It would be injudicious in Hartington to publish a pamphlet now, but
the argument does not seem to me to apply to you.

51. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville\(^5\)

[P.R.O. 30/29/29 A]

Private. 73 Harley St. Mch 17. 77.

Forster spoke to me the other day about Elliot, and said he could not

\(^1\) i.e. the second Bulgarian pamphlet, \textit{Lessons in Massacre}.

\(^2\) Further papers had been laid on the eastern question on 13, 22, and 23 Feb. but then
no more until 27 Mar.; see \textit{Parl. papers (1877)} xci, xcii.

\(^3\) i.e. in the Commons, 5 Aug. 1872, in answer to Sir John Grey’s question whether
Turkish reforms were being effective, that ‘as “a class” the Christian subjects of the
Porte have no reason for complaint’, \textit{Hans. Parl. Deb.} ccxiii. 454.

\(^4\) For Colquhoun (judge of appeal at Corfu during the British protectorate) to the
editor of \textit{The Times}, objecting to Gladstone’s remarks about Albania, and Gladstone’s
reply, alluding sarcastically to the narrow field of Colquhoun’s experience and referring
him to J. G. von Hahn, \textit{Albanesische Studien} (Vienna, 1853); see \textit{The Times}, 5, 6 Mar.,
pp. 6d, 8d; holograph draft in Add. MS. 44453, fo. 170.

\(^5\) Granville to Gladstone, 13 Mar., saying he believed the cabinet would agree that
day to the Russian proposal of a protocol, Add. MS. 44171, fo. 51, not printed.
stand his going back. This I heard with pleasure and understood to mean that others with him would resist it. Nothing can please me so much as to walk in the rear: but I think I ought to make known to you that my patience cannot stretch over this point & that if nobody else objects to Elliot I must.

52. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

18, Carlton House Terrace. March 18/77.

Sorry not to find you. My own opinion is not in favor of the proposed motion—but as you think it a necessity, Hartington believes it unavoidable in some way or other, and Forster, Lowe, Harcourt, Charles Howard, Freddy Leveson, and I am told Bright & Goschen, approve of it, there only remains to discuss tomorrow what will be the best way of bringing it on.

Forster wishes to bring it on, and believes there will be few defections.

53. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

18, Carlton House Terrace. March 20/77.

I send you the printed despatches. I presume Northcote may read from them, if he promises to lay them before the House, although this is not a fair proceeding.

I suppose, unless he promises to lay them before Parliament you had better not quote them literally. But they will enable you to state the substance.

I hear that Layard is to be sent. He was a philo Turk, but he is a very strong man with orientals, and I think will be faithful to instructions, if the latter are of the right sort.

54. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

Private. 73 Harley St. Apr 23. 77.

The Protocol, the refusal of Turkey, the insistence of Russia, have been

1 He was moved to Vienna, 31 Dec. 1878, but replaced at Constantinople by A. H. Layard, 31 Mar. 1877; cf. Gladstone to the editor of the Daily News, 19 Mar., stating that the liberals would have protested against Elliot’s return to Constantinople and carried the matter to a decision, Add. MS. 44453, fo. 213; see no. 53.

2 Possibly the confidential print containing consular reports of further atrocities (cf. publications in Daily News, The Times, 16 Mar., and Manchester Guardian, 16, 26 Mar.); see Gladstone’s speech, 23 Mar., on Fawcett’s motion on the reported atrocities and the need for ‘guarantees’ for the execution of promised reforms, and Northcote’s reply, not alluding to papers, Hans. Parl. Deb. cxxxiii. 420–70.

3 No. 54 printed by Morley, without the last two sentences, ii. 563.
followed tonight by the announcement that the Russian Chargé has suspended relations with Turkey.¹

Is not the moment now come for raising the rather stiff question whether a policy, or a substantive motion, is to be submitted to Parliament.

I hold back from a conclusion as long as I can that I may benefit by the views of others. But it is perfectly plain that Salisbury is at a discount and that the Govt. grow more Turkish every day—reasonably plain that some grave arguments against moving have now lost their force. My own inclination is towards a series of Resolutions with such points as are rudely indicated on the inclosed scrap²—please to let me have it again at some time, I have no copy.

I suppose they would be met by a vote of confidence.

I have taken no counsel: failing to see Bright in the House today, whom I meant to have consulted.

55. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville³


Unless I am misinformed the French have taken a step of great importance, attaching themselves to Russia in the act of giving notice to the Khedive that he is not to send troops by sea to aid the Porte for they will prevent him.

As you cannot have a meeting before Friday I hope every thing will be done to prepare the ground. It seems to me that time presses a good deal: & those who like me have gone ahead at former stages begin to feel the extreme difficulty of silence. At the same time I need hardly say nothing will please me so much as to fall into the rear.

I gave Hartington last night another scrap:⁴ which I think is probably better than the one which stood second in my previous inclosure. It was the outcome of a conversation with Bright.

56. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

18, Carlton House Terrace. April 27/77.

I was stopped going to you this afternoon by Wolverton, who told me that you wished to be quiet.

¹ Russo-Turkish hostilities lasted from 24 Apr. 1877 to the armistice of 31 Jan. 1878.
² Not traced; but for the five resolutions (complaining of Turkey, maintaining that she had lost all claim to support, insisting that Britain work for the self-government of the subject peoples and promote European concert for this purpose, and calling for an address to the crown) read by Gladstone to the Commons, 30 Apr., see Hans. Parl. Deb. Ccxxxiv. 101–2.
³ Granville to Gladstone, 24 Apr., proposing a meeting of the ex-cabinet on Fri. 27 Apr., Add MS. 44171, fo. 57, not printed; see no. 57.
⁴ Not traced.
I should not have begun any fresh discussion after your decision had been taken though I should have liked to talk over with you H[artington]'s line.

I must however now tell you that Bath came into the Lords at 7—& called me out—He said he wished me to use any influence I had with you to prevent your bringing on a motion. I asked 'Why should not he and why should you of all men object.' He said 'because having heard of the intention this afternoon, I made it my business to ascertain what the "highest authority" (using some other circumlocutions to designate without naming Salisbury) thought of it—He thinks it will be most disastrous, fatal to peace, and will place the ball at Beaconsfield's feet'.

I asked whether I was at liberty to repeat what he had said to you. He said it was for that purpose that he had told me.

57. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Private. 18, Carlton House Terrace. May 2 [1877].

Most of our ex colleagues met here today—to consider what course the opposition front bench should take on Monday.

They were of opinion that they could not change their previous opinion, that it was not opportune at this moment to move resolutions & thought that the least antagonist course as regarded you, would be to vote for one of the motions announced for the previous question.¹

Of course we know nothing at present of the tactics which the Gov will pursue, and another meeting will probably be necessary on Saturday.

Do not answer—as we meet at your hospitable board. I am afraid you will not find me a very cheery guest.

58. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

73 Harley St. May 4. 77.

This is a dreadful mess. Putting aside other matters, that publication in the Daily News of Wednesday was really—in my view—like an act of insanity. Wolverton will perhaps tell you what he thought of my part of the first three hours of today. I shall do my best to minimise the mischief; but I think it² serious. The worst of it is that I cannot help hitting indirectly those who will (some of them reluctantly,) vote with Hartington after having taken part in the autumn movement. In these I do not include Forster for he took part in it only to throw a wet blanket upon it.³

¹ Hartington and the liberals who opposed Gladstone's moving of his five resolutions, 7 May (see p. 35, n. 2), decided to 'move the previous question', thus preventing a vote on Gladstone's motion; see nos. 59 and 60.

² i.e. the split in the liberal party over Gladstone's resolutions.

³ See p. 12, n. 1.
It was not however to croak that I took up my pen but to point out that Northcote laid a false basis tonight\(^1\) for his action. He said my Resolutions did not impugn the policy of the Govt. This \textit{may} be said of the three first; but cannot of the fourth. I went to the House this evening to renew my challenge to the chivalry of England represented in the present Government: and unfortunately the House had been counted out at 8.

I reserve it to myself to consider how to do this on Monday\(^2\) and \textit{whether to raise a separate issue & division on the Fourth Resolution}. I mention this not to get a reply but that you may turn it over in your own mind as much or as little as you please.

\textbf{59. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone}  
\[\text{[Add. MS. 44171, fo. 65]}\]  
\[18, Carlton House Terrace. May 8/77.}\]

I was present during the first two hours of discreditable discussion.\(^3\)

The assumed laughter of the Conservatives showed their vexation, \& \textit{some} of the Radicals showed their cards—\textit{that it is not the Eastern question, but the hope of breaking up the party which really excites them}.\(^4\)

I do not know that Hartington could have done more than he did, but I do not understand why some of our people did not come forward.

Your last speech on the motion to postpone seemed to me to set everything right.

A public dinner prevented my hearing your great speech.\(^5\) I never have been more touched than by reading it.

I am told that the effect was wonderful. I wish you joy.

\textbf{60. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone}  
\[\text{[Add. MS. 44171, fo. 67]}\]  
\[18, Carlton House Terrace. May 16/77.}\]

I am so sorry to find you are flown without my having had an oppor-

\(^1\) When he was asked whether the conservatives intended to move the previous question (notice of amendments to Gladstone's resolutions had been placed upon the order paper, and amendments could not be moved after a motion for the previous question), Northcote stated that the government would not interfere since Gladstone's motion did not raise the issue of confidence; see \textit{Hans. Parl. Deb.} ccxxxiv. 321.

\(^2\) 7 May, when Gladstone's five resolutions were to be moved; last three resolutions (advocating a positive policy) withdrawn, since Hartington by adhering to his intention to move the previous question had split the liberals.

\(^3\) Provoked in the Commons by Trevelyan's question, from the liberal side, whether Gladstone would modify the second and withdraw the third and fourth resolutions, and turned largely on procedure; see \textit{Hans. Parl. Deb.} ccxxxiv. 366-410.

\(^4\) The second paragraph of no. 59 printed together with paragraphs 5-7 of no. 60, as if they made a single letter, by Morley, ii. 568.

\(^5\) Two and a half hours long, moving the first resolution, \textit{Hans. Parl. Deb.} ccxxxiv. 402-39.
tunity of talking over the great debate.¹ Wolverton tells me that you think if I had not been a teetotaller I should have moved further and earlier.

The only repartee I can think of, is that I might have done so, in consequence of the wine disturbing my judgment.

But I admit that good has been done by the debate—¹ by the speeches made by you and a few others—² by the declarations of the Gov—which show that for the time the First Ld² has been suppressed.

There is another advantage which is, that bad as the division³ was, it was infinitely better than any we could have had if it had not been for an accidental combination.

Of course if you had gone on alone—you would only have [had] either more or less than half the liberal party.

If Hartington⁴ had volunteered to move the first two resolutions, the Gov would certainly have had some 160, or 170 majority. All the malcontents behind the opposition front benches, were obliged to vote on Monday, in consequence of having so vigorously preached allegiance during the previous ten days.

As it is the party voted pretty well. Argyll will bring on a discussion in the Lords⁵ as soon as the holydays are over.

I presume you will not attend Chamberlain’s meeting.⁶

61. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

Hawarden. May 17. 77.

As Wolverton has betrayed me to you, I stand to my guns, and my reply to your defence is that I now understand why we mismanaged so the Treaty of 1871; it was because your judgment was so disturbed by wine!

Immediately after the division I wrote to Chamberlain accepting the Birmingham proposal. It is a burden to me personally: but I think the reasons are sufficient, & I hope you will think so.

1. I believe I can do some good there by minimising the difference which preceded the last debate.

¹ On Gladstone’s first resolution; continued, 8, 10, 11, 14 May; see ibid. 501–83, 623–708, 728–827, 864–973.
² i.e. of the Treasury; Beaconsfield.
³ The resolution was lost by 223 to 354 votes.
⁴ When Gladstone agreed to withdraw the last three resolutions, Hartington abandoned his intention to move the previous question but refused to go further; see B. Holland, The Life of the Duke of Devonshire (1911) i. 193–200.
⁵ Argyll did not raise a debate on the eastern question when the Lords reassembled, 4 June, after the Whitsuntide recess.
⁶ At Birmingham, 31 May, of delegates from local liberal associations to inaugurate the National Liberal Federation.
2. I consider the general position to be better than ever defined, and to be this, that the Government will only be kept even decently straight by continuous effort and pressure from without. The 'agitation' worked them up to the point of the Salisbury mission. Even all through that mission Dizzy showed his teeth as in the Guildhall speech: but it is highwater mark of the better influences. With it, & mainly by it, the agitation was effectually suspended. In the St James's Hall meeting,\(^1\) we frankly accepted it as a new point of departure. From that time, the agitation being still, the Govt. had gone steadily backwards until Cross's speech.\(^2\) They are now held perforce up to a certain height, but the 'seven devils' are not exorcised. I believe B[eaconsfield] is waiting for his opportunity, & the last state may be worse than the first. From the Birmingham meeting there will be a ramification, through the Liberal Delegates assembled there, stretching all over the country, and I wish to warn them against giving ground for a renewal of the statement which obtained so much vogue before the late Debate that 'the country' had repented.

Hartington's speech\(^3\)—given his point of view—was admirable: and exhibited, I thought, a further great advance in the faculty.

We are wet here but the spring grows beautiful.

Grey\(^4\) has dragged me into another correspondence, but my letters are \(\frac{1}{2}\) the length of his.

62. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

[Add. MS. 44171, fo. 71]

18, Carlton House Terrace. May 18/77.

It was not on account of the Eastern question that I should have been glad that you refused the invitation from Birmingham—and I trust your skill will enable you to prevent being associated in the public mind, with the scheme more or less possible at the present time of reorganizing the liberal party from Birmingham.

I have just heard what has destroyed my recent hope of the result of the debate in the Commons.

I gathered from the tone of the speeches from the ministerial bench, that they were impressed with the desire of the country, if not for coercion, at least for bonâ fidê neutrality—and that Beaconsfield had submitted to the better influences in the Cabinet.

---

1 See nos. 32, 33, 35.
2 A moderate speech from the conservative home secretary, reaffirming the policy of the strictest neutrality in the Russo-Turkish War; see end of the first night's debate on Gladstone's resolutions, *Hans. Parl. Deb.* ccxxxiv. 456–72.
3 On the last night of the debate on Gladstone's resolutions; see ibid. 923–38.
4 From Lord Grey, [?] 10 May, comparing the British destruction of a pirate fleet off the coast of Borneo with Russian and Turkish atrocities in Bulgaria; and reply, 11 May; from Grey, 15 May, asking to publish and, 19 May, stating that *The Times* had failed to publish, Add. MS. 44454, fos. 127, 146.
It appears that this is not the case. The fidelity of the party, and the large majority have given him the lead, of which he has not been slow to avail himself.

It is very serious.

We had a good night in the Lords\(^1\)—too good some think—We may have killed the hen that lays golden eggs.

We are off to Holmbury for a fortnight.

63. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

I send you a letter just received from Layard.\(^2\)

A passage in yours of yesterday is ambiguous. That with which I was not to connect myself at Birmingham I have always supposed to be the reorganisation of Liberal policy from that centre: but the party, i.e. the electoral, reorganisation I understood to be one of the things which is desirable to promote.

As I understand the matter, you are in great want of improved electoral organisation, and not likely to get it from any other source.

Moreover I am of opinion that improved electoral organisation will tend powerfully to promote the unity of action, in which we are still more deficient. Deficient now I think, after the party has been led with great judgment and caution for three years, to a degree even exceeding any thing I can recollect since 1866.

My opinion is & has long been that the vital principle of the Liberal party, like that of Greek art, is action, and that nothing but action will ever make it worthy of the name of a party.

You can muster them for votes of religious liberalism (so to call it) and for little else. And the party lukewarmness on the aristocratic side is about as injurious as, & less excusable than, the rampant disorderliness on the radical side.

You are not on a bed of roses, or if you are they are roses with the thorns, and I do not know whether my sermonising will much mend it. However it grew out of my desire to know your mind on the meaning of ‘reorganising the liberal party’: as I thought that when we talked of the Birmingham project the only element still in suspense was the Eastern Question.

I connect what you say on that question with the intimation of a ‘sommation’ to Russia about limits for her operations. But do you not think

---

\(^1\) The liberals gained a majority in the Lords in one division in the committee on the Burial Acts Consolidation bill and were equal in another, *Hans. Parl. Deb.* ccxxxiv. 1040–92.

\(^2\) To Gladstone, Constantinople, 9 May, on their common desire for good government in Turkey and his hope for constitutional government under the present sultan and parliament; deprecating Gladstone's agitation and urging scepticism about reports of atrocities; Add. MS. 44454, fo. 113.
the time may have come for a rather more distinct party action in the matter, if only on the grounds of neutrality, which if not virtue is abstinence from sin?

64. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone [Add. MS. 44171, fo. 74]

Holmbury, Dorking. May 21/77.

I return Layard’s letter. I gather from it, that you were right, and I wrong about him.

I find from your letter that I misunderstood you when some time ago you showed me Chamberlain’s letter. My recollection was that it was a very well written letter, in which he invited you to Birmingham, as an exception from their rule of not inviting strangers to their political meetings, that he stated that the object of the meeting was partly to keep alive the feeling of the country respecting the Eastern question, partly to re-organize the liberal party. But I only read it in a hurry, and may have misapprehended the pith of it.

I understood you to say that if you went, it would be to speak on the Eastern question, and to keep yourself aloof from the other portion of the programme.

I presume that Chamberlain’s object is not to reorganize the whole liberal party, but to strengthen the young liberal, and more advanced portion of it, & to secure you willing or unwilling as it’s leader.

I have no ground of complaint against Chamberlain for wishing to do this. But knowing as I believe I do, what your wish is, I am much afraid of misconception on the part of the public. I agree that our central organization requires great improvement.

65. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville [P.R.O. 30/29/29 A]

Hawarden May 23. 77.

Your letter quite clears up any ambiguity. I shall hope effectually [to] steer clear of any plan for the reconstruction of policy, though I may be tempted to carp, in a sentence, about economy, and cannot avoid perhaps saying something about reliance on the Liberal party for the promotion of the Eastern cause. The reorganisation of party machinery will of course deserve a compliment from me.

In all this, I do not see any difficulty, but it may be there without my seeing it. If there is any thing prophylactic which it occurs to you that I may say, pray let me know before the time, for you have a discerning eye.

1 To Gladstone, 16 Apr., as here described, Add. MS. 44125, fo. 3.
2 Printed to this point, but without the first sentence, Fitzmaurice, ii. 171–2.
What I of course regret is that the action of the party as a whole within the House does not come up to its action and feeling in the country at large. While there was a hope that the Tories would run true upon it, I for one could have no wish to make it a party question. But nothing is to be hoped from them, and, as in so many other cases, the Liberal party alone is the instrument by which a great work is to be carried on. In my opinion to carry it on freely would have been very beneficial to the party as such: but of this I am not the judge. I could wish that there were some other question of real magnitude likely to unite them: but I do not see any. On disestablishment they perhaps will be united some day, but plainly not yet. On the Eastern Question I feel that it is only by an unremitted action that we can in any degree keep Dizzy’s hands from mischief.

Bath has written me a strong letter of retractation about the Debate.¹

I have a letter to return to you: but it is in London. I expect to be back on the 4th.

66. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone [Add. MS. 44171, fo. 78]

Holmbury, Dorking. May 25/77.

If by chance you touch upon Argyll’s point of the Schouvaloff & Derby conversations, & the subsequent answer to Gortchakoff’s Circular, it may be worth your while to look at 2 despatches of d’Harcourts from the French yellow books, quoted in the Pall Mall of the 14th or 15th² in which d’Harcourt says that he thought the Russian declaration objectionable, but as it had been settled between Lord Derby and Schouvaloff, he did not think it necessary to interfere.

67. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone [Add. MS. 44171, fo. 79]

Holmbury, Dorking. May 27/77.

I have done my best to think of a suggestion for a prophylactick action on your part, but none occurs to me.

Lord Grenville said that ‘the person who showed most sport would always be the real leader of the opposition’.

If that person besides being an ex prime minister, is the ablest man in the House of Commons, who has during nearly fifty years accumulated an amount of experience, consideration and hold upon the country, which

¹ 18 May, acknowledging his mistake in having opposed Gladstone’s wish to give notice of his resolutions on the eastern question, Add. MS. 44454, fo. 140.
² See d’Harcourt to Decazes, 30, 31 Mar., agreeing with Derby that the Russian declaration defining conditions for Russian demobilization was fatal to the protocol, 31 Mar., containing the European proposals for a settlement with Turkey, Pall Mall Gazette, 14 May, p. 8.
no one else possesses, he cannot change by any disclaimer however sincere, what appears to every one to be the facts of the case, or avoid the responsibility which attaches to the position he has taken.

68. *Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville*¹

[PR.O. 30/29/29 A]

Birmingham. June 1. 77.

I apologise for troubling you again with these² but I am not sure of the proper *style* for the address & I cannot ascertain it here. If this finds you in C.H.T. I dare say you will kindly send them over.

I dine with the Mayor & go to Hagley tonight, to London as we expect early on Monday.

On some early opportunity I hope to talk over with you the scenes & operations here. The springs of action are a little complex and the task of disentangling them on paper would be far from easy. For myself I have I hope kept to my programme, at the same time the business of speaking to 25000 people is very formidable in ways that none would understand except those that have been exercised in dealing with large audiences. When I accepted the proposal to come here the intention was to go to the Town Hall which is a capital Building. The excessive physical strain limits and hampers the movement of the mind, makes due shading & free expression impossible, and tends to stiffen and formalise the whole affair. I commended organisation, spoke a few words of the Leaders of the party, counselled greater unity of action but not the stark rigidity of the Conservative Phalanx³ and then went off in my accustomed strain about the Eastern question, in which *nearly* every body here holds what I call the high doctrine. Today I have found myself launched unawares in divers speeches and I had an opportunity of pleading a little for rest.

I hope you may see a good report of the Speech of my host.⁴ It was notable in the first place for the great hold he seems plainly to possess. He had a reception uniting the freshness of our arrival from a distance, and the familiarity of one well known. He certainly endeavoured to turn the occasion to account in favour of an advanced policy generally and his reference to Hartington though guarded was not entirely genial. He is a man worth watching and studying: of strong selfconsciousness under most pleasing manners and I should think of great tenacity of purpose: expecting to play an historical part, and probably destined to it.

Bright is to appear at the dinner today.

¹ Gladstone to Granville, 27 May, thanking for the suggestion in no. 66, P.R.O. 30/29/29 A, not printed.
² Not traced.
³ The National Union of Conservative Associations.
⁴ Chamberlain.
The invention, so to call it, of applying the elective principle to local organisation for Parliamentary purposes seems to me very notable and such as may prove a great stroke in the interests of the party.

My earnest hope is that this Eastern Question is to reach a close or a resting place during the summer & that then I shall be a free man again.

I was prompted today to decline a lecture to the 'Irish party' which may irritate or sting them but which I thought my sidelong position warranted, & I think you will not disapprove.

69. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

18, Carlton House Terrace. June 5/77.

I asked Derby as he was coming into the House, whether I might ask him at once whether he would produce the despatch to Lord A. Loftus recording what had passed respecting the Suez Canal between H.M's Govt and that of Russia, to which allusion is made in the despatch to Lord Lyons laid before Parl today.

He begged me to postpone it till Thursday, & subsequently came across and told me that although he said so privately to me and not across the table, he could not produce the despatch, as it comprehended other things besides the Suez Canal.

70. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

18, Carlton House Terrace. June 6/77.

Godley appears to have made a very satisfactory analysis of the papers which you entrusted to him. He will make a further classification of them, if you should think it necessary, but I suppose it gives all you want, & indeed the Birmingham meeting covers the whole ground.

I am off to Canterbury this afternoon, and shall be back early tomorrow.


2 i.e. Derby to Loftus, 6 May, laid 21 June, in 'Correspondence respecting the War between Russia and Turkey', Parl. papers (1877) lxxxix. 135.

3 Derby to Lyons, 16 May, reporting the rejection of Lesseps’s project for neutralizing the Suez Canal and stating that Britain had warned Russia against any attempt to blockade it or interrupt its navigation; see ‘Correspondence with regard to the Suez Canal’, laid H.C. 4 June, H.L. 5 June, Parl. papers (1877) lxxxviii. 393.

4 i.e. some 400 letters from private persons and resolutions passed at public meetings on the eastern question, left by Gladstone in London; Godley, no longer employed as private secretary, did odd work for both Gladstone and Granville (see to Gladstone, 5 Feb. 1875, Add. MS. 44222, fo. 75); the analysis, 5 June, is in P.R.O. 30/29/26 Aii.
71. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

18, Carlton House Terrace. June 22/77.

I have just met Delane in the street—full of the Russians have [sic] placed without the loss of a man, 6000 troops on the other side of the Danube.

He says that the Gov mean to propose a vote for 5,000,000£ on Monday.¹ This can only mean that they will give notice, as there is a standing order against doing it without delay—

Do you remember what notice we gave on the outbreak of the Anglo-German [sc. Franco-Prussian] war.²

Shall we have a meeting of the excabinet on Monday at three, or on Tuesday at the same hour.

72. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

Sunday June 23. [1877].

I did not get your Telegram³ till after midnight.

I am free all Tuesday & all Thursday—not Wednesday.

Stanhope hoped we should have the papers on Monday—but I suppose better have them before we meet.

Two or later suits my book from this remote quarter; when convenient to you.

73. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

73 H[arley] St. June 23. 77.

I think unless something new happens Tuesday at 3 would be best:⁴ & I will enter it accordingly.

There is some alarm about Northcote's notice for Monday: but it seems to have been carried by the count-out.⁵

¹ i.e. 25 June; Derby, asked to support a vote of credit, temporized and the cabinet decided to put the army estimates to parliament first; taken on Mon. although Thurs. was the normal day for supply, see below, no. 73; Monypenny and Buckle, vi. 145–6, 149; see also F. H. Hill to Gladstone, 22 June, giving Delane's information and adding that Salisbury, Carnarvon, and perhaps Cross were expected to resign; and also Bath to Gladstone, 24 June, Add. MS. 44454, fos. 213, 217.
² See Gladstone and Granville, i, nos. 268 and note 3, and 269–74.
³ Not traced, but presumably proposed the meeting of the ex-cabinet as in no. 71.
⁴ To Gladstone, 24 Oct., accepting Tues., Add. MS. 44171, fo. 86, not printed.
⁵ On Fri. 22 June, the House was counted out just after Northcote had moved to go into committee of supply; when supply appeared as the first business on the order paper for Mon. Parnell ineffectually argued that the notice was too short since Friday's motion had been cancelled by the count-out; see Hans. Purl. Deb. cccxxv. 176, 203–6, 254–5, 321.
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Gortschakoff’s answer to Derby is excellent I think.\(^1\)
I cannot recollect the amount of notice we gave in 1870.
The bye-point on which I wanted your judgment was whether I ought
to go to the Cobden Club Dinner on the 21st July when Hartington will
be there?\(^2\)
I lean against it.

74. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

H of Lords. June 28. 77.

All counsel from you is acceptable but I do not desire to make you
responsible for my intention almost formed to write some letter of the
nature of that written for the purpose of impeding any proposal for an
increased military vote.\(^3\)
But in doing it I have occasion to recite what we did in 1870 and I should
not like to say any thing which was in discord with your recollections.
Would you therefore kindly read at any rate from the pencil mark p. 3
to the pencil mark p. 6.
I might perhaps put in a remark that had we asked the money on account
of the war, we should have done it sooner.

75. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

18, Carlton House Terrace. June 28 [1877].

I just missed you at the H. of Lords.
With regard to that part of your letter marked in pencil, I believe that
you accurately describe your motives in assenting to the demand for money
in 1870.
If I remember rightly the proposal was made at an earlier date in the
Cabinet, but combated by you until the Belgian Treaty gave you a ground
for agreeing to it.\(^4\)
I doubt that this treaty was exclusively the reason why the rest of the
Cabinet agreed to it.
As for myself the Belgian question was certainly a great inducement but
I was also greatly influenced by the belief that such a vote would strengthen

\(^1\) See Gorchakov to Shuvalov, 18/30 May, communicated to Derby, 8 June, laid,
21 June, Parl. papers (1877) lxxxix. 137–8.
\(^2\) Hartington was toasted as the leader of the liberal party in the Commons and the
country and Gladstone stayed away; see The Times, 3 July, p. 111.
\(^3\) See Gladstone’s reply, 30 June, to an address from Worcestershire Baptists, denying
that there was any comparison between 1877 and 1870, when a vote of credit was
justified by the obligations Britain had then undertaken in the Belgian treaties; published
in The Times, 3 July, p. 111; draft in Add. MS. 44763, fo. 89.
\(^4\) See Gladstone and Granville, i, no. 268, note 3, and nos. 269–74.
our hands abroad, and would enable us with more ease at home to pursue
the pacific course on which we were determined by showing that we were
not a peace at all price Gov.
With regard to the letter in it's entirety, is it possible for you to launch
it at once.
A meeting of our excolleagues was held on Tuesday, in consequence of
a query of your's.
After some desultory conversation, rather at cross purposes, you stated
strongly, & I supported you that it was inexpedient to decide anything,
till we were fully informed.
Hartington & the others agreed to this suggestion.
Will they not have reason to be surprised, if you now take the lead, and
without further consultation, do that which you proved to them to be
inexpedient.

76. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone  
[Add. MS. 44171, fo. 92]
18, Carlton House Terrace. June 29/77.
When I wrote to you yesterday evening, I wrote off hand without con-
sulting Hartington or others—So I did not represent them with any
authority, but I have a strong opinion that your letter would have been
a surprise to them.
The question of opposing a vote is very difficult. Any appearance of
disunion among us, would make the Govt all powerful. Full consultation
appears to be very desirable before every step we take, although it need
not fetter individual action after we have discussed it. Such consultation
appears to me essential, before publishing anything as to the views of the
Cabinet in 1870. I spoke to Cardwell this evening, and find he has a separate
version, which I think as far as it goes, is correct.
Shall I communicate with Hartington about a meeting.

77. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone  
[Add. MS. 44171, fo. 98]
18, Carlton House Terrace. July 15/77.
As soon as I got your note, I wrote to Hartington & saw him afterwards.
It is of course difficult to have a good whip without giving a party

---

1 The army estimates were to be taken again on Mon. 2 July, Thurs. having been
spent on the civil estimates, and only one vote having been agreed to on Mon. 25 June
(see no. 73); four more votes were passed, 2 July, but the fifth, for the army reserve,
owing to Irish obstruction, not until 5 July; no vote of credit for preparations for war
with Russia was proposed.
2 Granville to Gladstone, 30 June, saying he would call a meeting on Mon. 2 July
at 3 unless he heard from Gladstone; and 1 July, saying he had done so, Add. MS.
44171, fos. 95, 96, not printed.
3 Not traced.
character, but he promised to tell Adam to do everything he could to get a good attendance.

What a pleasant interesting trip you seem to have had.¹

People expect that the Gov will adjourn, & not prorogue Parlt.

78. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

[Add. MS. 44171, fo. 100]


There is a rumor which is by way of being founded on Montague [sic] Corry's authority, that a debate is to be got up in a few days, in order to give Dizzy an opportunity of making a great speech, which he has been preparing, on the Eastern Question.²

I am going to Walmer tomorrow & am rather puzzled. Whether, if the report should turn out to be true, I should remain there, or come up—and if I come up whether I should only remark upon the incongruity of the proceeding, & protest against anything dangerous which he may say, or whether I should speak on the subject.

I do not believe that he will announce anything dangerous. We are quite isolated. Austria has not the slightest intention of moving—and from what I hear the Cabinet have taken in, that they cannot go to Gallipolis, excepting either as an ally, or a foe.

It is reported that Richmond is to go to the Admiralty.³ Sandon to be Lord President, and Algy Egerton his vice.

79. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

[Hawarden Castle. Aug 7. 77.]

[P.R.O. 30/29/29 A]

My own idea, & recommendation so far as I could venture one, would be to meet speech with speech: especially as you cannot avoid speaking altogether. It will be to a bad audience but, being so, I would take advantage of the great superiority of your ground and topics over those of the Ministry.

I wrote to Derby⁴ on seeing the egregious papers received from Musurus, and the stuff sent home by Layard (who seems to be a pure Turkish jackall and will have to be spoken about like Elliot I am afraid) pointing out the one which gave details about six villages named & asking them to send

¹ A steamer journey from London to Dartmouth, see Morley, ii. 571.
² There was no debate in the Lords, see no. 80.
³ Ward Hunt died on 29 July and W. H. Smith succeeded him as First Lord of the Admiralty; see no. 81; for Lord President read President of the Board of Trade.
⁴ Not traced; but see Derby to Gladstone, 3 Aug., acknowledging and, 6 Aug., replying that Baring would not be sent, but that Elliot would be asked to establish the truth, Add. MS. 44141, fos. 36, 37.
Baring to inquire about the facts which were of a nature to speak to the eye. I did not obtrude, but by no means renounced, my right to make this suggestion public, and I stated my special reasons for making it. He sent a civil reply promising consideration & a further answer speedily.

If the Turks have forged false charges against the Russians, it is the only infamy with which they were not before effectually befouled.

I wish we knew more of the Russian reverses but whatever they are, they are much to be deplored. They may make the struggle one of life and death for her but it is very unlikely to be death. And if not death for Russia, must it not be all the worse for Turkey in the end.

I did not know the Army retirement vote was to be contested or I would readily have come up for it—as I would do again, but I suppose the occasion will hardly be given.

I should rather like if it were possible to have some M.P.s in a state of preparation to meet any sudden coup of the Government during the recess: for I cannot feel sure there will be none.

80. **Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone**


Many thanks—I really believe this is one of Dizzy's and Monty Corry's plots, which have been defeated by his colleagues. Corry's manner yesterday, when questioned by Hartington, convinced the latter that Dizzy was going to speak.

I got up with the larks this morning to start by the early train—and got a letter from Derby, volunteering to tell me it was not necessary for me to come up that Feversham would probably not come on, and that if he did, he (Derby) would only decline to enter into the question, & that there would be no attendance, and no discussion.

If things remain as they are, which is probable till the 28th, I feel great difficulty in deciding what is prudent to say on the Eastern question at Bradford.

1 For reports of Russian atrocities, communicated to Derby by Musurus Pasha or by Layard during June and July 1877, see *Parl. papers* (1877) xci. 821, 843, laid 24, 27 July; for Aarifi Pasha to Musurus Pasha, 23 July, on the six named villages, see ibid. 850–3.

2 Turkey stopped the Russians at Plevna, which they twice failed to take, 20, 30 July; see *The Times*, 6 Aug., on the Russian reverses and Turkey's capacity to prolong the war and so change its political results, p. 3a.


4 For a debate in the Lords on the eastern question; Feversham had given notice of a motion which he dropped on the government's intimation that it might 'seriously embarrass public affairs', ibid. 667–8.

5 See no. 83.
As we are, in a manner, next door to Bradford, we have some hope that you will remember us when you come into this country; with Lady G. as we hope. It is idle to talk of the 1st of September with the corn only just beginning to put on a yellow tinge; but Herbert would be here to make you company on that day were you so minded. If you were good enough to make a promise soon, we might bait a hook with you to catch somebody else.

I do not think you can well determine the precise form of what you will say till the time comes nearer; at least as regards the East. But the theme is tempting, for all who were, like you, European concert men. What consequences have followed upon the abandonment of that method of proceeding!

I have in return a question to put to you for advice. Sixteen hundred people from Salford are coming here on Saturday. These things were by way of being mere visits to the Park and the old Castle. They have now become most formidable. Yesterday week when the Bolton people were here, after all manner of notes & messages, I went out late in the afternoon, when we were regularly mobbed & hustled & my hand almost crushed into a jelly. The violence of English playfulness & caressing is not to be measured. I went off to my tree with Willy as an escape, & only made the matter worse by an exhibition.¹ Now these Salford people pray for ‘a few encouraging words’. If they get any, the words will be principally a lecture on their election; & I think it will be that or nothing.² All this week past I have had neuralgia, post hoc & perhaps propter hoc. What shall I do to them? I believe Agnew is coming. We have cut off all new engagements, so serious is the inconvenience: and we think of providing for a future year that no visits of this kind can be allowed after Aug. 1.—i.e. after our probable arrival.

The appointment of Smith³ is meritorious but I do not feel sure it will work well—can he look his professional Board in the face?

It seems as if the Turks did not dare to work except defensively in strong positions,⁴ & as if the question really was coming to be with what loss of life will the Russians have to take them.

¹ For the visit of the Bolton Liberal Association to Hawarden, see The Times, 6 Aug., p. 8c, and leading article, p. 7b.
² For the visit of the Salford Liberal Association and Gladstone’s address on the efficiency of the Birmingham electoral organization (the liberals had failed to capture the Salford seat in a by-election, Apr. 1877) see The Times, 20 Aug., p. 12a.
³ To the Admiralty; see no. 78.
⁴ i.e. in Osman Pasha’s continued defence of Plevna.
82. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Walmer Castle. Aug 15/77.

I should like very much to pay you a visit, and prefer finding you en famille, to a party. But we have engaged ourselves so neck deep, that I am much afraid of being [unable] to manage it.

The incident of the other day was a very natural & pleasing one, and could only be found fault with by persons determined to criticize everything you do or say.

The multiplication of them however appears to me to be undesirable. But if you cannot be absent at the time of the Bolton [sc. Salford] excursion and feel obliged to speak to them more than to express your pleasure at seeing them, and hoping that they will enjoy themselves, a little advice about their elections might be useful.

What do you think of the Queen’s speech. It was worded so as to make it difficult for Salisbury to oppose.

83. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Jervaulx Abbey, Bedale. Sep 4/77.

One line to thank you for your kind, but much too flattering allusion to me.

At Bradford the audience at luncheon were very civil to me, but slow, and obviously hostile to Forster. At the Hall, the audience was perfect as such. Much quicker and more intelligent than the middle class lunchers. But they do not care twopence about the Eastern question, County Franchise, or anything else but Miall and disestablishment—and it was wonderful they remained cheery and cheering to the end.

I am afraid chauvinism is rampant at this moment, & I believe if the Russians had been more successful Dizzy might possibly have had his way—my liberal mining agents are Turks. Johny Acton’s liberal agent told me that at Bridgnorth where there are some very intelligent manufacturers he could not open his mouth on the Eastern question[.] that he

1 14 Aug., closing the session, saying that neutrality in the Russo-Turkish War would last while British interests, as defined in the note to Russia, 6 May, remained unaffected, but expressing confidence in parliament’s aid to vindicate them if endangered, Hans. Parl. Deb. ccxxxvi. 820.

2 For Gladstone’s praise of ‘the courage, fairness, moderation and judgment’ of Granville’s Bradford speech, see his address to the Tyldesley Liberal Association, visiting Hawarden, The Times, 3 Sept., p. 11b.

3 For Granville’s speeches, deploring conservative extravagance with public money and economy with legislation, advocating an extension of the franchise to the agricultural labourer and a policy of working through the European concert on the eastern question, see The Times, 29 Aug., p. 9a.
did not mind the Tories, but thought it too bad of the liberals—Here they are all strong anti Turks, excepting that very dull pair the ‘Christians’.

Pray tell Mrs Gladstone that we are all charmed with her nephew Alfred Lyttelton.

84 Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville  [P.R.O. 30/29/29 A]

Hawarden. Sept 5. 77.

You do not give me your address, but you are at a pleasant place, so I give you credit for stopping there.

You must within these last 3 weeks have required a large fund of Christian charity not to give me up for a born fool.

I will not explain any more now about the repeated excursions, but only say I could not help myself: & have been obliged to be rather violent in defensive measures against about ten more tours which wanted to ‘go and do likewise’. Next year we must try to strike at the root.

Last Saturday, being in for it, I thought I had better notice your speech, and improve the occasion by speaking more fully about the atrocities real and pretended, which I rather thought from various signs was required of me.¹

With everything in your speech I agreed, except your pronouncing positively against the prudence of Russia’s having undertaken this war; if you did so pronounce. But I thought the speech as a whole in regard to Russia, thoroughly handsome.

For I agree with you—and I have considerable means of knowing—that chauvinism flourishes, and might prevail: though I am convinced that we have, at the least like the Turks, the means of making a true and good fight.

If the Bradford men are as you say about Miallism, why need Forster have run his head against the wall?

You have doubtless seen the D. Telegraph on my breach of neutrality.²

It is a pure mare’s nest. I have today got my letter from London. I have told Lawson privately that I want from his Correspondent a full apology, without coming into the field.

¹ In address, 1 Sept., to Tyldesley Liberal Association, The Times, 3 Sept., p. 11b; see no. 83.
² See Daily Telegraph, 27 Aug., 2nd edition, for dispatch from Constantinople describing (a) Gladstone’s letter to a Greek merchant, M. J. Negroponte (allegedly written after the beginning of the Russo-Turkish War), inciting the Greeks to join the Slavs against the Turks, (b) Negroponte’s dissent, and (c) a second letter; for to Negroponte, 9 Jan., copy (answering from Negroponte, 29 Dec.), and 21 July, copy, see Add. MS. 44454, fos. 106, 281; to Negroponte, 9 Jan., published The Times, 25 Sept., p. 6f; see also correspondence between Gladstone and Lawson, 27 Aug.–3 Sept., Add. MS. 44454, fos. 355–74 passim; see also nos. 86, 91, 93.
But I am better than last year: for I get say half my working day to myself.

Pray remember us kindly at Jervaulx.

I never expected to be so sincerely & deeply grieved at the death of Thiers, as I am upon reading it today. Your great D. News is as a war-paper.

85. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone  [Add. MS. 44171, fo. 112]

Jervaulx Abbey, Bedale. Sep 9/77.

The Ailesbury’s agree with you in thinking that I was wrong in saying that it was imprudent of the Russians going into this war by themselves. But I adhere to the opinion, and having said so, when they were apparently carrying everything before them in European Turkey, I am not influenced by the subsequent difficulties.

But I have been gnashing my teeth, at not having said, what you put so well, viz that their reputation must depend upon the use they may make of any victories.

But how are the Turks to continue the struggle—On what sort of security does the Ottoman Bank advance 1,000,000£ to them.

86. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone  [Add. MS. 44171, fo. 114]

Travellers Club, Pall Mall. Sep 29/77.

You seem to have been most successful at Nottingham. I wish you joy of your defeat of the Daily Telegraph. Is Layard the culprit.

The Daily News attacks Derby for his interference at Athens. Until one sees the papers, it is difficult to tell how far he was right or wrong, but in any case it must have been a clumsy intervention.

What do you think of Gov proposing a vote in aid for the Indian Famine, or of Bright’s proposal of a loan for irrigation purposes.

Is there not danger in both these precedents.

1 Where he laid the foundation-stone of Nottingham University College and addressed Nottingham Liberal Union, urging it to copy the Birmingham organization and not to believe the Daily Telegraph’s accusation or Layard’s reports of Russian atrocities, see The Times, 28 Sept., p. 8, and 29 Sept., p. 112–c.

2 See Gladstone to the editor of the Daily Telegraph and the editor’s apology on the Negroponte correspondence, the Daily Telegraph, 25 Sept., p. 5f; see also Negroponte to the editor of The Times, 15 Sept., p. 9f.

3 By summoning Greece, through the British minister at Athens, to disarm, Daily News, 27 Sept., pp. 5f, 4e.

4 Not traced, but cf. cartoon showing that the lord mayor’s fund to relieve distress caused by the Madras famine would be insufficient without government aid; Punch, 22 Sept., lxxiii. 127.
I was told in Yorkshire that more than half the room left the Cutlers Feast, when Roebuck made his attack upon you.¹

87. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

Thirty nine years ago Lady Meath who was more a sister than a friend to my wife married in Ireland. Since then my wife has been to see her once, and I not at all. A few weeks ago she raised the subject, and I could not deny what ought to be done. *Hinc illud iter.*² Papal, Home Rule, Protestant, Orange, parties have all their quarrel with me. I hope they will let me be; and there are few in Ireland whom these names as party names do not include. There is however a little stir, promoted by the Times,³ which is I suppose 'hard up' in the dead season & the momentary stagnation of the war. One great bulwark against speaking in Ireland is that I have not the smallest notion what I could say without giving mortal offence.

If within the terms of privacy I can do any good among Irish Members I shall be glad. But I do not expect it.

I send you however some letters between [me and] Mr Errington,⁴ whom I suppose to be rather an exceptional man. *My* first is wanting. I think they may be worth your perusal though no very definite indication can be gathered. Please to return them.

I shall be glad of any hint, negative or positive, that you can give me. Admitting as I do that Turkism prevails on the surface, I could detect no flagging at Nottingham in the best audience of 8000 or 10,000 that I ever addressed under cover in my life.

We go to Kilruddery on the 17th.

¹ Roebuck denounced Gladstone's agitation about the eastern question and ended with a jeer at his tree-felling in front of the Bolton visitors to Hawarden (see no. 81), The Times, 7 Sept., p. 8a.
² For Gladstone's tour of Irish country houses, his only visit to Ireland, see Morley, ii. 571.
³ See dispatch from Dublin, summarizing the speculations of the Dublin press about the reasons for Gladstone's visit, The Times, 9 Oct., p. 4b.
⁴ See to Gladstone, 21 Aug., justifying the breach between the Irish members and the liberal party; reply, 22 Aug., that the Irish university question was not sufficient ground for quarrel, Add. MS. 44454, fos. 344, 346; to Gladstone, 11 Sept., that this question concerned the principle that Irish views should be more regarded in Irish matters; and reply, 14 Sept., that by O'Connell's standards this was not enough, Add. MS. 44455, fos. 39, 149; from Gladstone, 14 Aug., missing.

I thought it probable that there was some such reason as that of which you tell me, for your journey to Ireland. But it is not surprising that the most has been made of it, particularly at this time.

Mr Luttrell said it was better for a man to commit murder in summer than to steal a button in autumn.

There will be great pressure on you to speak, possibly from some of the parties, who may a priori be expected to be most hostile to you. I agree with you in thinking that it will be difficult for you to do so, without giving offence to the different parties. But of this you will judge when you are there. But if you do not see your way quite clearly, I suppose you will either remain quite silent, or speak only on some question affecting the material prosperity, or artistic development of the Irish.

The correspondence which you enclose, and which I return, appears to be full of matter. In what a good spirit Errington's letters are written —& I am far from being sure that he has the worst of the argument.

But you hint in one of your notes, at the real difficulty of the case. The nonconformists are the backbone of the liberal party, and there is no doubt of their intolerance with regard to Irish Roman Catholics. It would be very difficult at the present moment to touch upon this point.

Was a letter forwarded to you from Harley St about a fortnight ago, in which I asked whether you had been thinking on the Indian question.1

Northcote's 'prosperity' speech is surely very rash.2 I trust it will not be followed by a financial smash, such as succeeded the 'prosperity' speech of 'Robinson'.

With the knowledge he obtains from the Departments, it was perhaps well to dissipate the alarm about the revenue. But his prophecies about improvement of Trade, and of an early & unexpected peace, are very unlike the caution, which I should have supposed was one of his characteristicks.

Do you know anything of Chinery, [sic] the new Editor of the Times. I am told that he is a man of great ability, and that his tendencies are liberal—that he has not any knowledge of the world, or of the political traditions of this Century, & that he is in perpetual alarm of dying of apoplexy. We are living on quietly here, alone. My chief occupation being the refusal of polite invitations to public dinners, and meetings.

I passed through London the other day, without knowing that Hartington was there. I hear he does not like the thoughts of Scotland.3

1 See no. 86.

2 On 8 Oct., to the Exeter Chamber of Commerce, on the revival of commercial prosperity if the wealth of the United States continued to rise and peace was restored in the east; see The Times, 9 Oct., p. 9a.

3 His intended visit to Scotland was published in The Times, 10 Oct., p. 11e.
'Thus far into the bowels of the land' I have advanced with much pleasure & comfort. Ireland is to me extremely interesting and I hope to return here. There is the Ireland of today, & the Ireland of a thousand & twelve hundred years back, strangely contrasted, the first [sic] an object of just veneration the second [sic] a great puzzle. Twice I have had to open my lips, not for more than five minutes either time and both times under compulsion: the first in Trinity College the second in a Roman Catholic Reformatory where I had to deliver a kind of short sermon at the request of the Priest! There has been a talk of moving the Corporation to give me the freedom but I said I could not consent to be an occasion of difference & dispute & as it appeared there was somebody, I believe a Nationalist, who was resolved to make a row about it, I shall escape this which is all the better & get back with my design of privacy fully accomplished. I have really seen & heard a good deal besides lovely scenery & profoundly interesting remains. Particulars are too long to enter upon except in conversation. The upshot is that with the social condition of Ireland & the prospects of its future solid happiness I am thus far quite contented, & this is the thing really important: but in its politics, the politics of the day & on the surface, I do not at present see any day-light. I think there is a sense of shame about them but they do not know how to mend their ways.

We go to Eaton on Saturday & are likely to cross the Channel on Saturday the 10th perhaps taking Panshanger Castle on our way home.

Your note opened many interesting topics. I will only say now it is my impression that the Govt. were deterred from proposing at once a grant for India on finding from Northcote that it would require immediate taxation. It is an impression only. No doubt as you say it is a most serious matter, and loan is little less serious than grant. Peel was fond of reminding us that we could not look upon Indian Finance with indifference: & with the temper that now prevails I fear the question is growing graver every year.

Satisfaction with the disestablishment is unquestionably spreading among the members of the Church. Both Clergy & R.C. Priests have received me very kindly. This is a most beautiful & a very fine place kept with great hospitality.

Private.

At one of the places I have visited the P. of Wales planted a tree. It has since been pulled up.

If you read my article on the Suffrage, you will not I hope be much scandalised.

1 'The County Franchise and Mr. Lowe thereon', Nineteenth Century, Nov. 1877, ii. 537; see also A. P. Martin, Life and Letters of the . . . Viscount Sherbrooke (1893) ii. 442-5.
90. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Walmer Castle. Nov. 7/77.

I was delighted to hear from yourself a confirmation of what I had gathered of your silent doings from a diligent study of the papers.

Your reception has been exceedingly creditable to the Irish, & your tour must have been pleasant. I have had some letters of regret from those whom you could not find time to visit.

I saw Harty Tarty in town. Honing and groaning over his six speeches in Scotland. The first seems very sensible, and he [seems] judiciously to have avoided topics which may be wanted for the others.¹

I think he will be sound & judicious on the Eastern question, and he may surprise people by his liberality on the Scottish Church question.

We are quite alone—very happy with the children. Leveson unlike his father, will be a scholar. I told him the other day that tergum was Latin for a back. ‘What gender is it?’ ‘Neuter’ But, papa, if it is a woman’s back it must be feminine.

91. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville²

Hawarden Castle. Nov. 20. 77.

I have been desirous on every day since my return from Ireland to report to you about my visit. But an average of fifty letters per diem has crippled & still cripples me. Today I thankfully record that it is down to about thirty.

And really the main thing I have to write is that I can hardly write at all with advantage. The subject is too wide. I wish I had a Telephone to Walmer. In the absence of such an instrument I will say that I shall have to go to London on Newcastle Trust³ business about the third of Decr. for a few days; for the chance of your being there or passing through about that time.

Nearer 60 than 50 years ago, the elder Mathews described an Irishman who wanted to take his pig to Kilkenny. With this view he drove the pig to Cork: for, he said, if the pig thinks I want him to go to Kilkenny, he will go to Cork of a surety: (You see how the Bulgarian pig-driver will come out!) I think my announcement of ‘strict privacy’ may in like manner have promoted a prosperous publicity. Which however in the strict sense of the term was confined to a single day.⁴

¹ For Hartington’s speech when he received the freedom of Glasgow, on economic problems and relations between capital and labour, two speeches at Edinburgh, and three on a return visit to Glasgow, see The Times, 6 Nov., p. 4a; 7 Nov., p. 6a; 8 Nov., p. 6a.
² Granville to Gladstone, 9 Nov., congratulating on the Dublin speech (p. 58, n. 3), Add. MS. 44171, fo. 127, not printed.
³ Gladstone was executor of the fifth Duke of Newcastle, and trustee for his heir.
⁴ i.e. 7 Nov., when he was presented with the freedom of Dublin.
I made it a study all along, as I had no hope of sensible good, to do no harm to the Liberal party. As far as I can judge no harm was done, and perhaps some little good, at least if I may judge from the views taken in ultra-roman & ultra-national quarters.

I entirely avoided in speech & conversation the one subject on which I am now in thorough accord with the popular party in Ireland. I think it a folly to prolong after ten years & more, the imprisonment of the men still confined for participation in killing Brooks [sc. Brett] at Manchester: & it is a question with me whether after the reception given by the Govt. to my mild speech last year I must not make a stronger one. I did speak to our old agent Mr Joynt on the subject & I find he entirely agrees with me. But I thought any public notice of it would be injurious.

Had the Home Rulers a real leader whom they were disposed to follow I cannot think it would be difficult to arrange a modus vivendi with them. As to any thing more than that I am not sanguine, even if I suppose my own opinions about Local Government to be those of the party, which they are not, for I go much farther than the 'average' Liberal. On this subject however my lips have been closed except as to a general declaration on receiving the freedom. I have no doubt it was well reported: I was struck with the good reporting in Ireland, as with many other things.

Nothing on the whole struck me so much as the apparent eagerness of the Parish Priests to meet me, & their warmth. I distinguish between them and those about Card. Cullen, who I should say were perfectly civil but nothing more. In my own mind I believe that in their own minds they do not look upon my writings about Vaticanism as a great offence.

Today Ld Derby has sent me a dispatch from Layard. You shall hear in due time all that passes.

I am going to deliver a parish Lecture on not against Forbes's notable article.

1 Five Fenians were convicted for the murder of Police Sergeant Brett at Manchester when they attempted to rescue two other Fenian prisoners, 18 Sept. 1867; three were hanged and the sentences of two commuted to penal servitude.

2 i.e. last session, 20 July 1877, favouring the release of the two Fenians, still in prison, but deprecating procedure by resolution where the prerogative was concerned, Hans. Parl. Deb. ccxxxv. 1614-19.

3 For Gladstone's speech deploring centralization and insisting on the unity of the three kingdoms and on the value of local self-government as the school of political wisdom, see The Times, 8 Nov., p. 7c.

4 See Tenterden (for Derby) to Gladstone, 19 Nov., enclosing Layard's account, 29 Oct., of his conversation with Negroponte and his report of it to the Daily Telegraph correspondent (see no. 84) and saying Negroponte's misrepresentations placed him in a false position, printed Parl. papers (1878) lxxxi. 687, laid 8 Feb.; see also Gladstone to Tenterden, 22 Nov., 11 and 28 Jan. 1878, seeking an apology, ibid.

5 See A. Forbes, 'Russians, Turks and Bulgarians and the Theatre of War', Nineteenth Century, Nov. 1877, ii. 561; for lecture at Hawarden, Fri. 23 Aug., accepting Forbes's evidence against Russian atrocities and on Turkish barbarity, but rejecting his indictment of the Bulgarians, see The Times, 24 Nov., p. 6c; see also Granville to Glad-
This is a great event at Kars. The sooner Plevna follows the better, I think, for the Turks.

I think I have an old question of yours about India unanswered: but I am not sure. You may like to read the inclosed from Butt.

I have not said half I wished.

92. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Walmer Castle. Nov 21/77.

If the half which you have omitted to write, is as interesting as that which you have sent me, I shall be very sorry to lose it.

How early could you be in London in the week after next, and how late shall you stay. I have an engagement but will contrive to meet you.

I can readily understand that some concessions might beneficially be made to the Irish in the matter of self Gov, and shall be very desirous to hear in what direction and how far you think it can be done.

Butt's letter, a fair one from his point of view, shows a wish to come on his own terms to an arrangement with the liberal party, or at least with a portion of it. But what with the disjointed state of the Home rulers, and the feeling of the nonconformists and others in England & Scotland, any understanding with him now, appears to me to be dangerous and premature.

The difficulties about Irish University Education are great, and must be felt by you more than by most people.

With regard to the Manchester prisoners, the thing ought to be done, if possible, by a Gov and not by an opposition. If I remember right, in our Cabinet, you Bright & I were the most inclined to leniency. I suspect if MacMahon, or the Emperor of Austria were exactly in the same position, public opinion in this country, would be entirely for their giving an amnesty.

I hear Dizzy has been using the most violent language telling the Ambassadors that he is desirous of peace, but that his hand will be forced by the national feeling, and that he will have to land 300,000 men in Turkey!!!

There is a crack regiment at Dover the 61st—the other wing is abroad, according to the recent organization, its turn to go abroad will not be for 18 months. It has been ordered to go to Malta in Feby.

I am told by a good authority on Court matters, that he is supposed not stone, 4 Dec., reporting that Forbes was correspondent not of the Daily News but The Times, Add. MS. 44171, fo. 136, not printed.

1 The fall of Kars, 11 Nov., ended Turkish resistance to Russia in Asia.

2 See Isaac Butt to Gladstone, Dublin, 14 Nov., against a mixed Irish university or an unendowed Catholic university and describing nonconformist hostility to the endowment of a Catholic university, Add. MS. 44455, fo. 244; see also no. 87.
only to have set the Queen violently against her late Gov, but that he has
done the same with regard to Derby and Carnarvon as well as Salisbury.
Did you read a sort of Communiqué, a short leading article in the Morning Post, of the 7th or 9th, criticizing the Cabinet & its way of doing business.¹
They on the contrary are angry at his having summoned them without
having anything to tell or propose to them.²

93. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone³

Hothfield Place, Ashford, Kent. Dec 5/77.

I return you the Layard correspondence.⁴ I am really sorry that an old
friend as Layard is of mine, should have written such a despatch, and have
had to say such things in it.
You have almost wasted too much much [sic] ink upon him.
I hope to be with [you] soon after 12 on Friday.

94. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

Hawarden. Dec. 17 77.

Will you kindly give me the benefit of your advice on the inclosed. It
is meant to be a Prefatory Notice to a reprint of an Address which I lately
delivered at Hawarden.⁵ In it I made a blunder in citing against Midhat
Pacha a charge, of which the author cannot for prudential reasons be
brought forward to support.
I may not implicitly believe Midhat Pacha's contradiction of it, but I am
bound, though I did not adopt it, to apologise for having given it circula-
tion.
There is nothing worse than a shabby apology. I thought no one could
have beaten in that respect the apology tendered to me by the Daily Tele-
graph. But my old chum Northcote has done this in his apology to Mr
Freeman, and has left it I think 'nowhere'. I would rather [not] say any
thing than be jointly bracketed with especially the latter of these apologies.
At the same time the matter is rather nice for considering that I have

¹ See leading article urging the cabinet to set aside minor questions and face the
eastern question, a matter affecting not only Europe but the world, Morning Post,
7 Nov., p. 4c; considered to be Beaconsfield's mouthpiece.
² Cf. Beaconsfield to the Queen, 1, 3, and 5 Nov., Monypenny and Buckle, vi. 103–5.
³ Granville to Gladstone, 24 Nov., 3 Dec., arranging to meet in London at 11.30 on
3 Dec. (cf. no. 92), and 4 Dec., Add. MS. 44171, fos. 134, 135, 136, not printed.
⁴ See no. 91.
⁵ See no. 91. The preface apologized for circulating an anonymous accusation (taken
from R. J. More, Under the Balkans, 1877) against Midhat Pasha, and explained that he
had expected to be able to give its source.
myself not cited but made far heavier charges against the Porte, and have
in print distinctly associated Midhat’s name with them, & that no answer
has been made, I cannot be understood to retire from the field.

The paper within is the result of the best consideration I can give the
subject & I think it sufficiently explains itself to dispense with further
details. I wish frankly to take the consequences of my error: but, on account
of the interests involved, nothing more.

If you see any palpable flaw such as can be remedied, will you let me
know. One thing I have to bear in mind is not to show up Mr Jasper More.

I hope the time is near when I may lay down this ‘fardel’ altogether.
Wishing you a happy Christmas all round . . .

[P.S.] I did not fail to note the tergum,¹ & congratulate you.

94A. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

[I return your preface which is very good. But I am doubtful whether
the apology will be considered complete, as it conveys the impression that
you still believe the charge, although you have not sufficient technical
ground for maintaining it.

Please read the third paragraph in the final page, and the beginning of
the 4th paragraph in the 1st & 2d page, & see whether it has not rather
this tendency.

I have a slight verbal criticism to make upon ‘far more flagrant’—ought
this to be in the comparative. It is difficult to compare the enormity of
these horrors, but if More’s story be true there seems to be no possible
palliation—whereas an oriental, and possibly a military tory, might say
that the public atrocities were a need of statecraft.²

I hope you will have written me your view of Ashley’s announcement,³
which turns out to be true. I stay in London tomorrow, for the hope of
seeing Hartington. The step appears to be foolish and dangerous in the
extreme. What is the wisest way of dealing with it requires consideration.

When people like Bass announce that their vote would be for immediate
war, it shows that a very dangerous feeling may be fanned into a fire.

I suppose that what the Cabinet agreed to yesterday, is that Parliament
should meet on the 17th, for the purpose of asking for money.⁴

¹ See no. 90. I owe this reading to Mr. Noel Blakiston.
² See revised version, in which Gladstone added that he did not adopt the charge,
though he held to the accusations made in his own Bulgarian pamphlet.
³ Granville to Gladstone, 7½ p.m. Tues. [18 Dec.], reporting Evelyn Ashley as saying
that parliament was to meet on 17 Jan., Add. MS. 44171, fo. 138, not printed.
⁴ Cf. Beaconsfield’s mem. for the Queen of the cabinet meeting of 18 Dec., Monypenny
and Buckle, vi. 206–12; the decisions to recall parliament for 17 Jan., to increase
the army, and to offer mediation were occasioned by the fall of Plevna and the resump-
tion of the Russian advance, 10 Dec.
95. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville


To you, as the leader, I give my first hasty construction of this proceeding.

Something more than calling Parliament to business on Jan. 17 was in agitation when the Queen put off her journey in an ostentatious manner, and when the Communiqué in yesterday’s Morning Post was penned.

This, I think it probable, has been accepted as a middle term on which the whole Cabinet might agree. It is perhaps capable of defence on general grounds were it not for the evil construction which Dizzy & Turkism will carefully fasten upon it, & apart from any fixed intention to follow it up.

When Parliament meets, he will renew his machinations in the worst form of which circumstances, as then developed, may admit.

Probably he will be obliged to be content with proposing to the Cabinet, or pressing on it, large votes of men & money to back our mediating character.

Very likely his colleagues may be weak enough to accept this as a middle term.

They will thus get rid of all special pressure from financial difficulties, & get an excuse for their new taxation.

The effect of all this—backed probably by secret & most unconstitu- tional communications1 (to the Turks) will be to induce Turkey to hold out, and postpone the hope of peace without altering the fortunes of war.

It will throw a great responsibility upon Parliament—an immense one on the Liberal party, such as it has not yet had to encounter.

I hope the country will not stand it: but much of course may turn on what happens in the interim.

I wrote to you at Walmer on Monday—but do not quite make out what was the date of the note you kindly sent me yesterday.

96. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

18, Carlton House Terrace. Dec 20/77.

Hartington has been here, & we have had a long talk. We have seen Harcourt, James, Freddy Leveson & Mundella.

I have also seen M. d’Harcourt—who has evidently a slight, and I should think groundless hope of remaining.

He tells me that the belief of the Corps Diplomatique is that Dizzy proposed an ultimatum despatch to Russia a fortnight ago—that it was rejected—that he pressed it again, with august support this week—that it was still rejected—but the moderate members made the compromise of the meeting on the 17th, and a demand for money.

1 Below Gladstone wrote: ‘See Daily News of yest[erda]y.’
That the terms of the Russians are the destruction of all the fortresses, autonomy of Bulgaria, territory not defined and the withdrawal of all soldiers on this side of Constantinople. Retention of Kars, & possession of Batoum.¹

He talked of Waddington² as an able & moderate man, with great self confidence, quite ignorant of Foreign Affairs, and likely to take unexpected steps.

H[artington] & I think that it will be better to wait a little to endeavour to find out really what is the policy of the Govt. Not to take any active steps in getting up meetings, which if they should take place, as they probably will, should be only a short time before the meeting of parliament—& that the object of these meetings should be as much as possible to deprecate, war, encreased taxation, the rise of prices, and encreased industrial distress, and not to be too violent against Gov, or to enter too much into the merits of Russians or Turks.

I hope you will be in town before the meeting.

P.S. I forgot to say that I had a letter from Bath,³ in which he expressed his fears about an ultimatum—offering his services in any way he can be useful. I hope to get from him the views of the moderate party, as we ought to strengthen their hands as much as possible.

97. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville [P.R.O. 30/29/29 A]


The letters thicken upon me fast. I am very glad to know so much of your sentiments. You will see from the inclosed copy of one I have written today to the Secretary of the Birmingham Association⁴—who had written to me in its name—that we are not, I hope, far apart. If there is any thing in mine that you disapprove, pray let me know.

Mundella spoke to me of a deputation to Northcote. It seemed to me dangerous if coming from anti-Turks. But if it could be simply in the interests of Peace from Chambers of Commerce well represented I incline to think then it would be a good measure.⁵

¹ Cf. bases of peace approved by the tsar, 9 Dec. (of which this is a fair, but attenuated version, only misleading in suggesting that the Turkish forces were to be withdrawn right back to Constantinople), B. H. Sumner, Russia and the Balkans (1937) 340.
² Appointed foreign minister in the new Dufaure cabinet, 14 Dec. 1877; see no. 98.
³ See to Granville, 19 Dec., saying that for the first time he was seriously alarmed about the danger of war with Russia and offering his services, P.R.O. 30/29/26 Aii.
⁴ To Schnadhorst, not traced; but cf. Gladstone to Forsyth, M.P., 22 Dec., and to H. I. Wilson, sec. Sheffield Liberal Association, 24 Dec., explaining his attitude against the warlike measures which the earlier summoning of parliament foreshadowed, Add. MS. 44455, fos. 334, 341.
⁵ For Mundella's co-operation with Harcourt in organizing these deputations, see A. G. Gardiner, Life of Sir William Harcourt (1923) i. 319.
I am very anxious to know if this bravado (such it is [,] taken with its comments) hardens like Pharaoh's the heart of the Turks.

We must be prepared I think for the contingency of a Dissolution if the H. of C. does not fully support the Government. B[eaconsfield] if he is to disappear would rather disappear in flame and stench, & I agree in thinking he would have a chance though not a very good one if every man does his duty.

As to the Russian terms what is the meaning of 'withdrawal of all soldiers on this side of Constantinople'? Does she mean to contend for liberating Hellenic Turkey also? Hardly.

Through a Turkish Channel it comes to me that she also asks the bit of Bessarabia—and the demolishing of the forts or armament of the Straits.

I hope not truly.

Please to send me back the inclosed.

I address to Walmer at a venture.

A happy Christmas to you & your circle.

Re Midhat I did not understand you to mean that I might alter my 'apology' for the better.

98. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Walmer Castle. Dec 22/77.

Thanks for writing to me, in the midst of all your work.

In re Midhat, what I said about certain paragraphs was in answer to the desire you expressed that the apology should be complete. I do not think that it will be considered so, unless you omit or alter some of the qualifications in these paragraphs. But apart from that objection, your preface appeared to me to be excellent.

I have heard from Bath again, but nothing new. He says that the Gov adhere to their note of May, that the early meeting was unanimously agreed to, & that the Gov disclaim any responsibility for the ravings of the Post, Pall Mall, & Daily Telegraph.

The speeches of Tavistock and of Whitbread will be very useful. They could hardly have done better, if they had read your programme which I return.

There was to be a meeting at Manchester of the Chambers of Commerce yesterday.

I hear that N. Rothschild (a red hot Turk) ridicules the notion of Dizzy

1 See no. 94A.
2 To Granville, 21 Dec., as here described, P.R.O. 30/29/26 Aii.
3 At Bedford, where they were entertained by the mayor as members for Bedfordshire and Bedford town, and expressed hopes for a speedy peace and the maintenance of British neutrality; see The Times, 22 Dec., p. 10d.
4 i.e. Gladstone to Schnadhorst; see no. 97.
intending war. He says that the Turks have placed themselves in his hands (a charming trust to have) and that Russia will yield.

He confirms the terms mentioned by d'Harcourt—but says they have not asked for Kars. He says that Austria objects to the Bulgarian Fortresses being dismantled.

I am told that Gambetta implored Lesseps to use all his influence to prevent the Marshall’s resignation— that it would totally disorganize the army.

There is a story that some intrigues have been going on between Gambetta & Bismarck about rectification of Frontiers.

99. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone  
[Add. MS. 44171, fo. 153]  

All possible good wishes to you and your’s.

As a Xmas present, I send you 5 good bits of news.

Salisbury is in high spirits, & considers the position [to] be exactly in accordance with his views.

Borthwick is in despair and indignant with the Gov.

Nat Rothschild declares that Dizzy does not mean to go to war against the straits being open to all vessels of war.

Adam writes that Scotland and the North of England are sound, against war, or measures tending to war.²

I do not know whether Dover is typical of other small & rotten Boroughs, but the feeling is against war, but also strong against attacks upon the Gov at so important a crisis.

The war clique of the Carlton are moving and sounding.

100. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone  
[Add. MS. 44171, fo. 155]  

I hope you are refreshed by Carnarvon’s speech.³ It appears incompatible with an announcement to Parliament of precautionary warlike measures. I am glad to see that the Times has clenched it today.⁴ I heard this morn-

¹ The French president, Marshal MacMahon, had submitted to the verdict of a general election and accepted, 13 Dec., a ministry under Dufaure. A constitutional right to appoint ministers of his own choice was not thereafter revived.

² To Granville, 22 Dec., asking for information on the course proposed when parliament reassembled and ending as here described, P.R.O. 30/29/26 Ai.

³ At the Colonial Office, 2 Jan., publishing his confidence that Britain would not ally with Turkey to make war on Russia, A. H. Hardinge, The Life of… Earl of Carnarvon (1925) ii. 360–71; The Times, 3 Jan., p. 10c; cf. Beaconsfield's comment that it might have been made by Gladstone, Monypenny and Buckle, vi. 214.

⁴ See first leader, pointing out the contradictions between ministerial speeches and actions and pleading for action in accordance with Carnarvon’s speech, The Times, 4 Jan., p. 9a.
ing that Chinery [sic] was quite of our way of thinking, but thought the
time for argument was gone by, that it was now a question of feeling, &
that the next fortnight would determine that—& rather indicating that the
Times must be governed by that result.

I hear also of extraordinary admissions made by Schouvaloff that Russia
is nearly at the end of her tether in money, & even in men, that a permanent
blockade, preventing ships coming out of the Black Sea would be fatal to
her Southern commerce etc etc.¹

From the Standard[,] Globe & Pall Mall, it is clear that the Cabinet
does not mean to treat Russia’s refusal as an insult.² But I still think it was
a foolish move, without any previous knowledge of the intention of Russia
not to give the snub which seemed inevitable.

I shall go to town on the 9th—When shall you appear there.

101. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

Hawarden. Jan 5. 78.

If matters remain pretty quiet I hope to remain here until early on the
16th: when I would call on you about five PM.

But if there are evil symptons, I shall probably, as a Bashi Bazouk on
this question and not of the Nizam, join the agitation in the interval: which
hitherto I have refused to do, while not discouraging local and spontaneous
meetings.

The appeal in the Times about three days ago³ to the Liberal leaders
to speak I do not understand in any way to include myself: it is to Harting-
ton and his corps, as I think.

It is plain that Dizzy is still brewing mischief. Carnarvon’s audience
at Windsor yesterday makes me fear that the Queen was trying to
persuade him to acquiesce in something bad that he had kicked
against.⁴

Otherwise & before this, I had inclined to believe that it was an Egyptian

¹ See Harcourt to Granville, 31 Dec., saying Shuvalov asserted Russia wished for
peace and repudiated territorial ambitions, and 1 Jan., adding his own comments,
P.R.O. 30/29/29 A. Hartington to Granville, 4 Jan., commenting that he did not believe
Russia would make peace and disagreed with Harcourt that anti-Russian feeling was
growing, P.R.O. 30/29/22 A.

² For Turkey’s acceptance of Britain’s offer of mediation and Russia’s repulse of
Derby’s inquiries, see B. H. Sumner, Russia and the Balkans (1937) 344-5; see also the
Standard, 4 Jan., p. 4e.

³ See first leader, pleading for guidance from recognized political leaders and especially
from those of the opposition, The Times, 2 Jan., p. 9a.

⁴ The audience was at Osborne and, according to Beaconsfield, at his request, to
enable Carnarvon to explain his attitude on the eastern question; see Monypenny and
Buckle, vi. 214-15; for its failure and the remonstrance about his speech which followed,
see Letters, ii. 588–9.
scheme that was brewing; the purchase of the suzerainty or something of that sort. Dizzy is of course looking for the weak side of the English people, on which he has thriven so long: and he must feel greatly encouraged by the decided way in which they accepted his tomfoolery in the affair of the Suez Canal.

This purchase of the Suzerainty would in my opinion be most unwise and would probably embroil us both with Russia and with France; but it might succeed.

The reality may be better, or may be worse. We are governed on Asiatic principles.

I quite agree with you that the late proceeding of the Government was unwise at the best. But Gortschakoff & Ignatieff are much too long headed to give them any advantage.

I look upon Carnarvon as decidedly the most trustworthy man, for this subject, in the Cabinet.

The Times has been doing, I think, admirable service. Two better articles than the first and third of yesterday I would not wish to read. I think you may like to peruse the inclosed from Waddington.

Acton comes here 12th—to meet Rustem.

102. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Walmer Castle. Jan 7/78.

I shall be most anxious to see you on the 16th.

As far as I hear things have been working well for us.

Hartington & I think that Forster, James, & Harcourt will be sufficient as exofficials to speak before the meeting of Parliament.

Carnarvon's speech came in the nick of time, Argyll writes that he knows that Dizzy is furious with him.

He went to the Queen about South Africa not about the Eastern question, and it is supposed that he is not likely to be asked again there for some time.

1 Cf. Monypenny and Buckle, vi. 252; for formal assurances to France that Britain had no designs on Egypt, see D.D.F. ii. 221; see also review of the print of Derby's dispatch, 6 May 1877, and Russia's reply, Quarterly Review, Jan. 1878, cxxiv. 271; and R. W. Seton Watson, Gladstone, Disraeli and the Eastern Question (1935) 309–10.

2 The first 'clenched' Carnarvon's speech (see no. 100); the third showed that the Turks could not succeed, however long they resisted, The Times, 4 Jan., p. 9a, c.

3 See Waddington to Gladstone, Paris, 3 Jan., saying that his ministry was a sign of the unity and firmness of the republican party and its respect for law, an assurance of a steady, quiet, foreign policy, and an advantage to the liberal cause, Add. MS. 44456, fo. 8.

4 For speeches of Forster at Bradford, James at Taunton, and Harcourt to the Oxford Liberal Club, using Carnarvon's speech in order to harden opinion against war with Russia, see The Times, 5 Jan., p. 9c; 7 Jan., p. 11a; 10 Jan., p. 7a.
His speech decided the Times to remain on the right tack.
I do not believe in Egypt. Dizzy does not wish for it. He told Münster last year that he would not take it as a gift. There are a great many foolish people who do wish for it.

If you think the late proceedings of the Gov unwise what do you think of their having agreed to recommend the Turks to seek an armistice from Russia on condition that it was to include Servia & Montenegro, which was a matter of course, and that it was arranged between Gov & Gov and not between the Commanders.

Can anything be more childish.

You will have been shocked at poor Ailesbury’s death. He had the greatest admiration and liking for you. He was an intimate friend of mine for more than forty years. It is another great link broken with the past.

My brother was delighted with his visit.

103. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

73 Harley St. Jan 26. 78.

Matters looked today like a motion on the Speaker’s leaving the Chair but nothing was said of a mover. I have a word & a word only to offer on that point. Whoever moves it, Hartington or any other, it should not be myself.

104. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

18, Carlton House Terrace. Feb 18 [1878].

I do not like boring you with a second letter, but Bath, and Shaftesbury (with his usual energy,) asked me to beg you in their names to avoid the meeting in the Agricultural Hall.

Northbrook[,] Wolverton[,] Ch[arles] Howard, in short everybody, whom I have seen, are of the same opinion.

1 Allusion uncertain; probably relates to a discussion among the liberal leaders about procedure when the House went into committee of supply, Mon. 28 Jan., on the supplementary vote of credit proposed by the government.

2 While the correspondence was interrupted the fleet had been sent to Besika Bay, a vote of 6 millions obtained from parliament, and the agitation in the country raised to a new pitch.

3 First letter not traced.

4 Convened by the Workmen’s Neutrality Committee; cancelled when the British fleet was withdrawn from Besika Bay; see The Times, 20 Feb., p. 11b.
I have been sorry to find, this morning, you had flown. It would be unavailing now to go back upon the reasons which led me to take the unusual and disagreeable step of consenting to attend the meeting at the Agricultural Hall if duly organised. Perhaps they may be summed up in this: the less others do the more I must do. But I should certainly have proceeded with less rapidity, had I anticipated that so many whose judgments I ought to respect would be averse.

None of these, however, would advise me to recede by an act of shabbiness, though I should be glad in this state of opinions to find myself released in a legitimate manner. I think, however, that the promoters will probably conform both to the conditions I have laid down for order, of which the most important is that the whole meeting shall be seated, and to my view of the Resolutions which is that they shall contain no matter properly controversial. If this be done and a reasonable prospect of order be established I think I am bound to go. All excuse for disorder will assuredly have been removed; and the real working men will I believe protest by their example against the reign of rowdyism and ruffianism. Will you be so good as to thank Spencer for his kind letter about Italy.¹

I was sorry not to see you today. Nothing could be better than the debate in our House—one sided—Derby with a power of which I was not aware—nothing damaged by an adverse majority.³

In your House the confusion of our party seems worse than ever. The exofficials unanimously decide against an amendment—the Radicals have a majority in that sense. You give your advice, and your reasons against an amendment stronger than I expected. A crotchety [sic] member insists upon an amendment, and as far as I can make out, it seems agreed that he

¹ Not traced. Spencer was in Florence in Dec. 1877, P.R.O. 30/29/29 A.
² While the correspondence was interrupted a Russo-Turkish peace had been signed at San Stephano, 3 Mar., and published, 22 Mar.; Britain had called out the reserves, sent troops to Malta, and discussed the taking of Cyprus; Derby had been replaced as foreign secretary by Salisbury, 27 Mar., who had opened negotiations with Russia on the basis of his circular dispatch, 1 Apr.
³ For debate, 8 Apr., in which Derby revealed that the calling out of the reserves had not been the only reason for his resignation and Beaconsfield carried support for the government's recent measures of precaution, see Hans. Parl. Deb. ccxxxix. 760–853.
is to have the power of compelling the rest of the liberal party to vote, some one way, some another.¹

Is there nothing to be done in this state of things.
Pray talk it over with Hartington and Bright.

107. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone²

18, Carlton House Terrace. April 11/78.

If your castigation was not more severe than is reported in the Times,³ Wilfrid Lawson will survive it.

Especially after having established the principle invaluable to a crotchety man, but destructive to the unity and influence of a party, that although a particular amendment is disapproved by large majorities of every section of the party, yet some of the best men in it, concurring in the objection, feel a personal obligation to vote for it, because it contains a sentiment in which they agree.

Is not Lawson in the position of an old Bailey lawyer, who successfully insists on a witness answering ‘yes’ or ‘no’ to a catch question.

It was probably an additional satisfaction to Lawson that he should have forced 29 liberals to vote against him.

108. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

73 Harley St. Ap 12. 78.

If I spoke of castigation of Lawson,³ it was a very bad word. His name was received with a burst of cheering. I expressed my regret that he had caused an unfavourable & untrue exhibition of the state of opinion, & had placed Hartington, after a valuable speech, in a difficulty which was real and not factitious.

I cannot see that men were to be blamed for voting in the minority. On these great questions, which cut so deep into heart and mind, the importance of taking what they think the best course for the question will often seem, even to those who have the most just sense of party obligation, a higher duty than that of party allegiance.

For myself I can say that I believe I never made so great a sacrifice to party, as last year when I gave up bringing forward the Bulgarian ques-

¹ For debate and division on Lawson’s amendment (condemning the calling out of the reserves) to Northcote’s motion, in which Gladstone voted with a minority of liberals and Hartington and others abstained, see ibid. 858–942, 964–1041.
² Printed, Fitzmaurice, ii. 176.
³ See an impromptu speech to a conference promoted by the Workmen’s Peace Association, which Gladstone attended at two hours’ notice, reported in The Times as in no. 108, without the word ‘castigation’, 11 Apr., p. 10d.
tion—especially as I was (& am) convinced that the negative decision of you all was a mistake in the view of party.

On this occasion (as I told H[artington]) I was by no means led into the lobby by my mere concurrence with Lawson’s words, but by my relation to the mass of feeling & opinion out of doors, in concert with which I have worked all along, & which would have been utterly bewildered by my not voting.

109. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

73 Harley St. June 20. 78.

I have presented two important Petitions on the Indian Vernacular Press Act—they will be printed & I had better send you a few copies.

The Parl. Papers have not yet appeared—though it is nearly ten weeks since the Act was passed. Ought they not to be pressed for.

I hope you will call together a few of those who take an interest in Indian matters to consider what should be done in this grave matter.

110. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

73 Harley St. Jul. 15. 72 [sc. 78].

I stupidly forgot, when I saw you yesterday, to tell you that an old contingent pledge of mine to make a speech in Southwark had unexpectedly revived; and they are going to claim what I believe the lawyers call specific performance.

I incline to think particularly since hearing from Hartington that Lord B[eaconsfield] is to make a statement on Thursday—that there is no

1 See no. 45 et seq.
2 Granville to Gladstone, 13 May, arranging to call when Gladstone should come to town and enclosing a letter from Huguesson, Add. MS. 44171, fo. 180, not printed.
3 During the gap in the correspondence, perhaps partly caused by the death of Granville’s 18 months’ old daughter, agreements were signed with Russia, 30 May, Turkey, 4 June (occupation of Cyprus), and Austria, 6 June; the Congress of Berlin, whose outcome was thus predetermined, opened, 13 June.
4 See undertaking, 19 Mar., to lay before parliament the Indian government’s law imposing press censorship in Bengal; Gladstone’s unsuccessful motion, 23 July, that proceedings under the act be reported to the secretary of state for India, and laid before parliament, Hans. Parl. Deb. ccxxviii. 1592; Stanhope to Gladstone, 26 June, regretting delay in the publication of the Indian Vernacular Press Act, and sending an advance copy, Add. MS. 44457, fo. 79.
5 See speech to the Southwark Liberal Association, 20 July, at Bermondsey, praising organization on the Birmingham model, attacking the acquisition of Cyprus and the Anglo-Turkish Convention, 4 June, The Times, 22 July, p. 10c.
reason for postponing the matter beyond the earliest day on which a meeting could be held which would hardly be before Saturday. I should not enter largely into the question of the Anglo-Turkish Convention but chiefly on the point that the nation ought to have something to say to its own responsibilities & engagements.

I am to see a Southwarker about this tomorrow at eleven & need not trouble you I think unless upon reading this you see cause to recommend any particular course.

I could not I think consistently with equity make a long postponement or one sine die.

I have shown this to Hartington.

111. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

[Add. MS. 44171, fo. 181]

CHT July 15/78.

I see no objection to your Southwark Speech. We shall try to get up a discussion on Dizzy’s statement, & you will have him & Salisbury to answer, and the advantage of some facts in a speech of Derby’s which he has evidently been taking pains to get up.

112. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

[Add. MS. 44171, fo. 182]

Private.

CH.T. July 19/78.

I saw Derby twice today. He was very low in the morning. But much relieved in the afternoon, having found his memorandum. This is a detailed account of the conversation in the Cabinet, written in the Cabinet Room.¹

A long report of what Dizzy had said, beginning with a declaration that the moment was come, when action must be taken, and the plan he proposed was a secret expedition of Indian Troops, to take Cyprus & Alexandretta. Cairns supporting, Salisbury do., urging that it would be fairer to the Turks not to ask their leave. Northumberland and others supporting the Prime Minister—none dissenting but Derby himself.

On the next day he requested Northcote to inform Dizzy that after the decisions in the Cabinet he must resign. This was answered by Dizzy in writing that he accepted the resignation.

¹ Supporting his assertion in the debate, 18 July, that he had resigned because the cabinet decided to take Cyprus by a secret naval expedition from India, printed Monypenny and Buckle, vi. 264-6; for Salisbury's denial that the cabinet of 27 Mar. discussed Cyprus, see Hans. Parl. Deb. cxxli. 1792-1816; for supporting recollections of Cross and Gathorne Hardy, see Lord Cross, A Political History 1868-1900 (privately printed, 1903); G. Gathorne Hardy, ... A Memoir, edited A. E. Gathorne-Hardy (1910) ii. 73-77; for Beaconsfield's letters to the Queen, 26, 27 Mar., reporting the cabinet meeting and proving Derby correct, see Monypenny and Buckle, vi. 262.
The denial of Salisbury and his colleagues was that it was untrue that there had been any resolution to that effect.

I asked Derby whether it was customary in this Cabinet to decide everything by written minutes. He said, he only remembered it once, when a resolution was passed, evidently intended to drive Carnarvon & himself to resign.

He does not like initiating a defence—He says qui s'excuse, s'accuse.

He seems inclined to lean on my advice.

What do you think[.] Would it be best for him to make a personal explanation on Monday, on the strength of having found his memorandum which he means at once to show to Northcote, or to wait for an incidental debate, which is sure to occur in the course of the week.¹

113. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

73 Harley Street. Jul 20. 78.

If Derby’s case is conclusive on the point of the contradiction, I cannot doubt that he would act wisely in taking the earliest opportunity of making good his position, rather than wait for an incidental debate.

At present he stands one unsupported witness against many, who support one another. His conduct at the time of resignation was beyond any thing considerate to his colleagues.

The ordinary rule as we all know is that a resigning Minister explains the cause of his resignation. As that cause was a resolution relating not to the moment but to the future, he was probably right in saying he would not state it at the time.

When he sat down,² Beaconsfield rose and made a statement which could have no other meaning than that Derby had resigned on the matter of the Reserves. After this he remained silent; and if on a subsequent day he said something, it drew very little attention. Lord B.’s lie carried the day.

All this I think strengthens an argument for his setting his conduct in a clear light now—and I suppose of course he has as usual the Queen’s letter.³

Your note just received (Noon). When I sat down to write this it had been dropped into the box.

¹ Cf. the Queen to Derby, 19 July, asking him not to make a further statement, and reply, 22 July, Letters, ii. 631–32.
² i.e. on 28 Mar., the day after his resignation, Hans. Parl. Deb. cxxviii. 100–4.
³ i.e. of the prime minister to the Queen, 27 Mar., reporting the cabinet meeting.
114. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

73 Harley St. July 30, 1878.

Please to read the inclosed letter:¹ and, as I hope you will not disapprove of any thing in it, I will ask you to replace it in its cover and send it on by the bearer who brings it.

I feel much both yours and Hartington's kindness.
I shall probably read my letter in the House of Commons today.²

115. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville³


Can I be of any use in the Forster-Bradford affair?⁴ I have scrupled to write to him, because he might find it difficult to refuse me.

But the cases stand thus. I have taken a strong public part on behalf of the organisation now miscalled Caucus.

On the other hand I think Forster absolutely & entirely right, & the rule of the association at Bradford wrong.

I write in haste and beg that unless you can make use of me you will not take the trouble to reply.

We only heard lately of your trip to the North—it would be very pleasant if you could include us in it. On Thursday we are to have the Bp of Bath & Wells, whom you would like.

116. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Bolton Abbey. Aug 26/78.

I was delighted to get your note, which I forwarded immediately to Forster, with a few lines from myself.⁵

¹ See to Beaconsfield, 30 July, asking for details of the offensive personal attacks which he was reported to have accused Gladstone of having made during the eastern difficulties; and reply, 30 July, in the third person, making two quotations from the Oxford and Southwark speeches, but excusing himself from further researches; and argumentative rejoinder from Gladstone, 30 July, also in the third person, but regretting the abandonment of the normal form of address, Add. MS. 44457, fos. 166–72.
² Done, in the debate on the treaty of Berlin, Hans. Parl. Deb. ccxlii. 672.
³ Granville to Gladstone, 31 July, congratulating on his speech in the Commons, Add. MS. 44171, fo. 187, not printed.
⁴ i.e. in disagreement between Forster, member for Bradford since 1860, and the new local Liberal Association, modelled on that of Birmingham, whose authority over the city's M.P. he denied.
⁵ Granville to Forster, enclosing no. 115, not traced; but see Forster to Granville, 27 Aug., thanking and expressing pleasure at Gladstone's approval, Add. MS. 44157, fo. 114; and no. 117.
An opinion from you on this point would be of public advantage, of
great use to Forster, & would please your friends.

Walter [sc. Colin] Campbell writes confident of a substantial majority.¹
You may remember a bit of gossip that I told you, of Lionel Rothschild
having told Fullerton that Dizzy had said that he had put off Dissolution
till next year, when he would be able to reduce the income tax.

Cross seems to allude to great economies.
Is it a possible thing that Northcote should agree to pay off debt, borrow,
and reduce taxation all at the same time.

Is it also possible that they will guarantee a Turkish loan for the pur-
poses of reform.²

We should have liked very much to pay you a visit, but we have already
pledged ourselves to short visits to Studley, Castle Howard, & my iron
works—which will take up all our time till that when we must be back at
Walmer.

I

117. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville  [P.R.O. 30/29/29 A]

Hawarden Castle. Sept 5. 78.

I am not sure of your address but will take my shot at Castle Howard.

I have had some communication with Forster,³ and have had a good
opportunity of writing a letter to Newcastle,⁴ which I think they will
publish, with an opinion on the organisation and on the obnoxious rule.

Forster is opposed to the organisation itself, in which I do not agree.
I am sensible of its dangers but I think it may cure the worst of the evils
that beset the Liberal party.

The promise of great economies is one thing and the economies them-
selves another—I do not believe in them unless under greater pressure
than any that has yet occurred. If the pressure be sufficient I can believe
in any thing.

They seem likely to play a wild game in Afghanistan⁵—but we do not
know the facts—nor the ground of the Russian proceeding.

¹ In the Argyllshire election, fought on the Scottish Church question with a local
conservative landowner leading the unsuccessful revolt against the Argyll interest,
Campbell won by a majority of 355, 27 Aug.

² For various projects for financial assistance to Turkey and their failure, see Lady
Gwendolen Cecil, Life of Robert, Marquis of Salisbury (1921) ii. 305-14.

³ To Forster, not traced; but see from Forster, 2 Sept., welcoming a proposed state-
ment of Gladstone’s views on party organization and stating his own, Add. MS. 44157,

⁴ I.e. to the Newcastle Liberal Association, declining an invitation and praising the
Birmingham organization which should not be condemned on account of the unhappy
operation of the local rule of the Bradford Association, The Times, 10 Sept., p. 7f.

⁵ The ameer’s reply to the British request that he receive a mission at Kabul was
awaited.
If the Russians confine themselves to simple wholesale negation as to
the Rhodopé, they will come second best off.¹

I do not see how the Govt can guarantee a loan on the Cyprus revenue;
for if they promise absolutely to make good a given sum, this commits
Parliament; & without that; what man will lend?

The Greek case is so abominably bad, that I think it is very likely they²
are giving in and endeavouring to arrange something with Waddington. If
they maintain their old passive attitude, which is virtual hostility to
Greece, it almost looks like a case for a motion at the opening of the
Session.

With kindest regards to Lady G. and to your (supposed) hosts.

118. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Walmer Castle. Sep 9/78.

I found your letter on my arrival here this evening. We were obliged to
give up our visit to Castle Howard.

I am glad you have written the letter to Newcastle.

Some of the rose leaves of the ministerial bed are getting a little crumpled.
They are in great difficulties with the French Govt. Nubar after getting
possession of the Viceroy’s property, throwing over England & France,
& France complaining of being thrown over by England.

I am much alarmed about Affghanistan. Lawrence & Northbrook think
the state of things most dangerous.

The revenue is steadily decreasing—& not a farthing in the Exchequer.
Trade not improving.

119. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

Hawarden. Sept 17. 78.

You have probably seen my letter to Newcastle, with which Forster is
pleased.³

You may also have looked at the article on England’s Mission, in which
I endeavoured to conform to the spirit of a conversation held at D[evon-

¹ i.e. on the European commission to devise remedies for the sufferings of the Rhodope
population at the hands of the Russian army, see ‘Report . . .’, Parl. papers (1878)
Ixxii. 507, laid 15 Aug., and ibid. (1878–9) Ixxix. 1, 31, laid 6 and 17 Dec.; cf. The
Times, 4 Sept., p. 3b.

² i.e. the government, in endeavouring to induce Turkey to execute article xxiv of the
Berlin treaty providing for the enlargement of Greece and the re-drawing of her frontier;
see nos. 129, 150.

³ See Forster to Gladstone, 15 Sept., thanking for the Newcastle letter, Add. MS.
44157, fo. 122.
shire] House before we left town, in which it was agreed to leave the Govt alone, as far as might be, in regard to their Asiatic Protectorate.¹

But it seems they will not let us alone & that foolish fellow² of the Daily News has, it seems to me, gone ahead outrageously in giving a quasi sanction to their proceedings about Affghanistan.

If you write pray give me the benefit of your memory on the following points relating to our term of office.

1. Russia disclaimed all influence in Affghanistan?
2. We, I rather think, disclaimed interference beyond the Affghan territory?
3. Has the Quettah business broken our pledge and released Russia?

The position of the Government is bad—and Dizzy, to whom I give credit for abundance of Parliamentary pluck & political daring, is just the man to play double or quits without limit. He may cover his deficit and every think [sic] else in a great Asiatic feat & he has incomparable instruments in Salisbury & Lytton.

Diplomacy is essentially irresponsible and I hold it to be the worst possible training for responsible, & a fortiori for despotic government.

The Truro Liberal writes that he thinks he will win.³

It seems to me that, especially if you win that seat, a good & full account of Election Statistics will soon become desirable.

Trade is bad, bad, bad?
A small tailor in Hawarden village has £200 owed him.

120. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

[Add. MS. 44171, fo. 194]
Walmer Castle. Sep 18/78.

I thought your Newcastle letter very effective for Forster, the points so lightly touched, and yet quite enough.

I fancied I had written to tell you how much I liked the article on England’s mission. I have only heard one opinion on it.

I saw a Daily News man, a friend of young Walter James, at Betteshanger last week. I took the opportunity of telling him what all competent men think of the new policy in Affghanistan.

I find that Derby is much alarmed (besides Lawrence & Northbrook). He thinks Lytton fantastic and impulsive. His only hope is Hardy, who

² The editor, F. H. Hill; but the leading article of 17 Sept., p. 4e, attacked Beaconsfield’s policy as likely to unite all the east against Britain.
³ Brydges Williams was defeated in the Truro by-election, 26 Sept., but only by a majority of 45, both seats being held by the conservatives; no letter to Gladstone traced; see nos. 123, 124.
he says has a much cooler judgment than would be imagined from his
speeches.

1 Russia disclaimed interest and influence in Afghanistan.¹

I must look at the papers before I give a definite answer to your two
other questions. I doubt however whether the inference you suggest would
be quite borne out.

The justification of Russia appears to me to be our threatening attitude
in Turkey. And the great mistake of the Gov after peace was established
not to communicate with her instead of with the hostile Ameer.

I shall be in London before the end of a fortnight. Let me know, if you
wish me to go at once, to look at the papers.

The new Times correspondent at Constantinople is Wallace who wrote
a good book about Russia.² I am told that half his letters are suppressed.
Some of those which are published, are well worth reading. Pray do not
overlook that of today Wednesday the 18th.³

I begged Adam to take up the challenge which Algernon Egerton threw
down in Lancashire last week.⁴ He boasted that the Gov had only lost
2 seats since the general election. They have won two, Worcester, &
Wilton. We have won ten since the Eastern question has been before the
public.

I do not understand Trade showing no gradual revival, with peace more
or less established, and a fair harvest.

I hope it is not you who have spent 200£ in coats—and cannot pay your
village tailor.

Do not believe the accounts of my doings with my miners.⁵

121. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville⁶

P.S. Private. [after 16 September 1878.]

Argyll is coming here on his way south—probably in mid-October. The
disestablishment affair in Scotland has taken very deep hold upon him—
so deep that it passes my comprehension: for, North of the border, it is
not a large question in any point of view. And I think his care about it is
wholly a Scotch care.

¹ By the agreement of Dec. 1872; cf. Gladstone and Granville, ii, nos. 772, 810, 818
and notes.
² Sir D. Mackenzie Wallace, Russia (1877); correspondent at Constantinople, 1878–84.
³ See dispatch from Constantinople, The Times, 18 Sept., p. 6a.
⁴ For Egerton’s speech near Bolton, in his constituency of S.E. Lancashire, see The
Times, 13 Sept., p. 4e.
⁵ The new manager at his colliery at Stoke-on-Trent was reported to have introduced
a system which reduced the miners’ earnings; see The Times, 14 Sept., p. 9f.
⁶ Incomplete scrap, wrongly placed in the Granville papers with a letter of 14 Sept.
1876; body of the letter, not traced.
Pray observe the Composition of the last Privy Council—in connection with 'personal Government'.

122. **Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone**  
**Confidential.**  

I am glad Argyll is going to you. The election must have done him good. His opinions are not very liberal on any questions connected with Scotch Establishment, or Scotch land. I have sent for a file of the Times to look up the ‘personel’ of the Council.

123. **Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville**  

Hawarden. S. 29. 78.

I received this morning the inclosed letter. We have a natural concern in the affair & I am disposed to accept unless you see objection. The celebration will I think do good for North Wales generally. Tomorrow I go with my son the Rector on a tour of a few days: probably to the Isle of Man, where I expect peace.

This Afghan business is terrible. We ought to know what were the demands the Envoy was to make, or at any rate whether they were compatible with Shere Ali’s independence. Do they mean to avoid immediate war? Or to call Parliament? Or to make war without consent? How is the occupation of Quettah, i.e. its cost, managed so as to be in harmony with the much discussed section of the Act?

The Truro Election is not discouraging. I inclose you a letter about it which is worth reading but I do not know the writer personally.

---

1 14 Sept., at Balmoral, attended only by the Queen’s son, her son-in-law, the head of her household (Sir T. Biddulph), and the minister in attendance; reported in *The Times*, 16 Sept., p. 9f.
2 Argyllshire; see no. 116.
3 The previous Privy Council, 14 Aug., was attended only by the lord president, the lord chancellor, and the Duke of Northumberland; see *The Times*, 15 Aug., p. 9f.
4 Inviting him to speak at a demonstration of North Welsh liberals, at Rhyl, 31 Oct.; speech reported, *The Times*, 1 Nov., p. 8a.
5 Gladstone was in the Isle of Man, 1–7 Oct.
6 The last news from Peshawar was that the ameer had refused to receive the British mission and forced it to turn back from Ali Mesjid at the entrance to the Khyber; see *The Times*, 23 Sept., and no. 117, p. 75, n. 5.
7 The Consolidated Fund ( Appropriation ) Act (1877) appropriated money to the occupation of Quettah.
8 From C. J. Hamilton, Londonderry, 27 Sept., suggesting that Gladstone in a letter to the editor of *The Times*, 26 Sept., had misrepresented the swing of opinion in favour of the liberals as shown by the Truro and other by-elections, Add. MS. 44457, fo. 317.
I recommend to your notice Wyllie's Essays on External Policy of India.¹
We expect our Argyll party Oct 10-14. I probably go to London 15th. Then we go to Latimer 18th for the marriage² & Woburn 21st. I give these particulars in case there should be any chance of meeting.

124. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone³

Walmer Castle. Sep 30/78.

I have been in communication with Lord Lawrence,⁴ who is in the Isle of Thanet, and coming here for a night tomorrow. He is in despair about Lytton—and his policy. He has written a letter to the Times, which I see is not yet inserted, they probably keep it back, in order to have an article against it.⁵

His opinion must have great weight, and is entirely free from the objections to which our utterances are liable. How the Russians must chuckle over the whole matter.

Do you agree with Fawcett in his letter to the Daily News.⁶ It appears to me unanswerable.

Halifax condemns the policy to the utmost, but insists on the necessity of chastising the Ameer.⁷ I must know a great deal more on the matter, before I commit myself to such an opinion. But I feel we may do much mischief, in saying too much in the other sense at present.

P.S. Since writing the above I have rec[eive]d your letter & enclosures. We have certainly a right to consider Truro a triumph.

You are the best judge as to the Welch [sic] meeting. In ordinary times it could only be for the good.

Is it or is it not desirable to speak about Affghanistan now.

I presume there is no objection to encouraging Lawrence, Northbrook & other 'Hommes spéciaux' to do so. I imagine the Gov do not mean to move at present.

¹ J. W. S. Wyllie, Essays on the External Policy of India (1875).
² i.e. of Lord Chesham's second daughter to the eighth Viscount Cobham, 19 Oct.
³ Printed, Fitzmaurice, ii. 179, without the postscript; cf. Granville to Argyll, 9 Oct., ibid. 178-9.
⁴ See Lawrence's reply, 26 Sept., that the government's Afghan policy was only right if Russia was behind the ameer, that a small expedition into Afghanistan would be useless and the advantages of success anyhow doubtful, P.R.O. 30/29/26 Aii; cf. Northbrook to Granville, 29 Sept., ibid.
⁵ See to the editor of The Times, 27 Sept. (printed 2 Oct., p. 8b), giving military, political, and financial reasons against forcing an English representative on Afghanistan; see also leading article, meeting Lawrence point by point, The Times, 2 Oct., p. 9a.
⁶ Arguing that the cost of war with Afghanistan should be borne by India, Daily News, 30 Sept., p. 2b.
⁷ See to Granville, 28 Sept., as here described, P.R.O. 30/29/26 Aii; cf. further letter, 15 Oct., with letters from Hartington in P.R.O. 30/29/22 A.
In the spring of 1869, Clarendon earnestly recommended the recognition of some neutral territory between the possessions of England & Russia which would be the limit of their possessions in Asia, & scrupulously respected by both Powers. It appears from despatches, records of conversation in Russia, and in England, and a private letter of Prince Gortchakoff that the Emperor and the Russian Gov. shared these views—Afghanistan was proposed by Russia & declared as entirely beyond the sphere in which Russia might be called upon to use her influence. The difference between the Russian Gov & ours was as to the proper limits of Afghanistan. Our Gov suggesting the line of the Oxus.

The Russians expressed apprehension of attacks on the part of Shere Ali, and insisted that if exercised, the influence of England was sufficient to check him. The English Gov. expressed confidence in Shere Ali's moderation, stated that all their advice was to that effect, but denied that their influence was paramount. No conclusion was arrived at by Lord Clarendon.

These communications continued in the same tone, whilst I was at the F.O. until Oct 1871, when the limits of Afghanistan approved by the Indian Gov were clearly laid down by a despatch to Lord A. Loftus. The idea of a neutral zone was abandoned—we stating that our advice had hitherto been attended to by Shere Ali, and would be much strengthened for the future, if the Russians would explicitly acknowledge the right of the Ameer to the territories which he claimed.

The Russian Gov. yielded all the points in connection with the boundary of Afghanistan. They pressed much for a guarantee from us of the Ameer's abstention from all hostile acts.

We declined giving a guarantee but gave assurances of our advice being in that sense.

The Russian Emperor gave assurances about Khiva, which were not carried out.¹

The papers laid before Parl. were presented in 1873/74 &/75.²

¹ Jan. 1873; see Gladstone and Granville, ii, no. 810.
² See 'Correspondence with Russia respecting Central Asia [1872-73]', Parl. papers (1873) lxxv. 603, laid 6 Feb.; 'Further Correspondence [1869-73]', ibid. 713, laid 10 Mar. 1873; 'Correspondence respecting Central Asia', ibid. (1874) lxxvi. 169, laid 19 Mar. 1874.
Your more authoritative account of the Central Asian communications is in accordance on all points with my recollections.

I had already before receiving yours formed and acted on the determination of giving no opinion in the present circumstances about Afghanistan. I think it would be a great mistake in any of us to commit ourselves to the opinion that the Ameer ought or ought not to be punished. It depends in some degree on the nature of the demands made or to be made upon him; and of that I know nothing.

I think the question raised by Fawcett is most formidable and though I am by no means clear what ought to be done I am in horror at the prospect of heaping the new load of debt upon India.

I have been trying to compose the Aberdeen University Contest by getting the field left open for Lord Aberdeen who has distinctly disclaimed party politics not only for the occasion of the election but for his own present self generally. Rosebery seemed at first disposed to make way but now after consulting Adam—who had however expressed to me a different opinion—he thinks he cannot so I can do no more in the matter.

I came here for five days of perfectly quiet & indeed secret touring—but the people of Man are very little accustomed to visitors about whom any noise can be made: a telegram was sent while I was in the steamer & the end of it is to my consternation a series of meetings. On the other side immense hospitality from the Governor & Mrs Loch who have laid hold on my son Stephen & me & brought us under their roof as my date shows. We return on Monday.

There are very curious & entertaining things here besides the history & institutions which well deserve that character. Land pays 4 per Cent.

127. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

[Add. MS. 44171, fo. 207]

Odo has sent me a copy of his letter to you about the Peerage.

I have told him that Hartington at the time asked my opinion as to his acceptance. I answered that he might accept it as a tribute to his professional services, but that he should make it clear that it did not affect his

---

1 See Marjoribanks to Gladstone, 9, 12, 21 Sept., Add. MS. 44457, fos. 261, 272, 315; Aberdeen was candidate for the lord rectorship of Aberdeen University, if the contest was not political, when the students invited Rosebery to stand as a liberal; Aberdeen withdrew and Rosebery was opposed by Cross whom he narrowly defeated.

2 Only that at Ramsey was reported, The Times, 5 Oct., p. 5e.

3 i.e. 8 Oct.; Odo Russell withdrew his acceptance of the peerage offered after his services at the Congress of Berlin, when he learnt that Gladstone considered it disloyal to the liberal party; Gladstone replied, 10 Oct., that he had been taken too literally, Add. MS. 44458, fos. 23, 45; for his acceptance of a peerage in 1881, see nos. 290, 370, 375, 388, 391.
political independence, stating what had taken place about Diplomatic Peers.

I added that I found that other friends of his took the same view as you had done.

128. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

[Add. MS. 44171, fo. 208]


I came from Calais to Paris in a Coupé with Sir H. Rawlinson. I always had understood that the policy which has been adopted in India was inspired by him, but he deplored the mess, and abused Lytton.

He confirms what Lawrence says, that Lytton will see no one, and hear nothing, excepting when in accordance with his own views, that he is insatiable in reading all that has been written, but has no judgment, and has taken to eat and drink much more than is good for him.

But he also criticizes Lawrence, and says that the campaign will be successful, and ought not to be very expensive. He believes the Gov will charge the amount half and half on England & India. He like Derby says the [sc. that] Hardy has a cooler head in Council than Salisbury.

I have seen nobody here but Lyons, who naturally was exceedingly reserved.

He says that the difficulty about Egypt is over. I should think in a way that those who think preponderance in Egypt for us is necessary, will not think satisfactory.

Conolly says that the army is much improved, that the French will have 1,500,000 men in two years—but that the Marshal has lost all influence, & that the politics of the generals, is [sic] very diverse.

I saw Broglie at the Club but not to talk to seriously.

I suppose I shall meet some of the members at the Embassy tonight.

Is there any possibility of your changing your mind about the music movement. I do not believe it would give you trouble, or take up time—the difficulty is to bring the old Academy, & the new School together, & authority seems to be the chief ingredient required to do this.

I am very sorry to have missed you.

1 For the khedive’s acceptance of the conclusions of the European commission of inquiry into his finances, Aug., and of a ministry under Nubar Pasha, Oct., including a British and a French minister, see Lord Cromer, Modern Egypt (1908) i. 61–63.

2 Granville sought Gladstone’s support for a movement to found a national institution for the promotion of musical studies, and negotiations were afoot with the Royal Academy of Music on behalf of the National Training School of Music.
129. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

[Add. MS. 44171, fo. 212]

Walmer Castle. Oct 30/78.

1000 thanks for 'Kin beyond the Sea'. It appears to me to be excellent. I trust you will have it reprinted in a separate form here.

The criticisms on your having given your opinion that the States will supplant us as the workshop of the world, appear to me absurd. But I am not sure that I agree with you. The States have immense advantages in the extent & fertility of the soil, their inexhaustible mineral wealth, and their free institutions, but is it clear that they will always remain united. If they separate, they may begin fighting each other with hostile armies, & hostile tariffs—& unless we go on conquering Affghanistans, & civilizing Asia Minors, I do not see why we should disappear like the Commercial populations of Holland[,] Venice & Genoa have done. I do not see why the latter place, should not even in competition with England & America, be again as flourishing in Commerce as she ever was.

As a rule our good sense is as strong as that of other people, & our prosperity may encrease at least as fast as it has done, notwithstanding the rapid development of other states.

There are some home truths about our constitution, which I am glad you enforce.

I forget whether I told you how much I liked your England's mission.*

After I wrote to you from Paris, I had a long conversation with Waddington. He is not quite at his ease, about commercial difficulties in France, and the adherence to sound economical principles. Freycinet, who I gather is a very able energetic man, is not perfectly sound—& has some imperial notions about finding work for workmen.

Waddington says that Gambetta's power is much exaggerated.

He told me that French Policy on the Eastern question was to maintain the Treaty of Berlin, that it had many faults, but was the best that could be patched up.

He looked to the Greeks as the only civilizing power, and that for that reason France supported them—that Salisbury agreed in principle, but wished to obtain time for the Turks.

He said he was about issuing a circular, but he did not tell me it's nature.

He evidently thought Affghanistan an immense folly.

---

1 Printed Fitzmaurice, ii. 180, as far as *, without the last sentence of paragraph 2.
3 See no. 119.
4 For French circular dispatch, 21 Oct., proposing a European summons to Turkey to agree with Greece on the cession of territory prescribed by the Berlin treaty, see D.D.F. ii, No. 357; see also 'Correspondence respecting ... the Greek Frontier', Parl. papers (1878–79) lxxvii. 231; cf. nos. 117, 222, and 224 et seq.
130. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

You distinguish most justly between the correctness of my surmise—it is less than an opinion—as to the future commercial Primacy of the world, and my title to write it down without offence.

We may hold all the ground we have (or its equivalent) & more than all, and yet America may be the Primate nation in trade. That is what I think likely. It may be soon: but that I think very unlikely. While she hugs Protectionism I think it nearly impossible.

I confess I have been grieved, not for myself but for my country, at the morbid effeminacy of my critics. I am glad it is no part of my duty to state publicly my opinion of them, either as to intellect or as to feeling.

On Thursday my Parish audience at Rhyl was very enthusiastic, and inconveniently large. I find it impossible in such an assemblage to maintain unfettered the action of the mind & the choice of language: at the same time I am not at this moment anxious of excess. The audience I observed never cheered any extenuating words, nor ever failed to cheer the strong ones.

On Afghanistan the Government keep us in the dark: in the East of Europe a dense fog appears to rest upon events. I hold that the Treaty of Berlin differed from the Treaty of Paris in this: that in 1856 the dominating motive was the restoration of peace—In 1878 this was mixed with & in some cases secondary to self-seeking views. In 1856 the only point dealt with in the spirit of the Berlin settlement was the point of the Danubian Principalities: & it hardly lasted a year. All parties are certainly bound in honour to maintain it: but it was impossible to devise a better plan for giving full scope to Russian intrigue than the establishment & present delimitation of ‘Eastern Roumelia’.

On the 30th I am to attend a kind of farewell banquet at Greenwich. I may perhaps take for my text ‘Who are the pro-Russians?’ and try to elucidate it by the method of retort.

The pot is beginning to boil. I hope it will not boil too fast. My belief has been pretty firm since the Anglo-Turkish Convention that the Tory party is travelling towards a great smash, perhaps a greater, & a more enduring, smash than ours. And this although it seems they are to have the support of the Papal party. It is well that the country should know thoroughly before the crisis comes the manner in which they are being governed. Still I should not wonder at seeing you in their place before a twelvemonth: and a pretty bed of thorns it assuredly will be.

1 See no. 123; Gladstone spoke in a hall, ‘crowded to excess’, and reputed to hold 5,000; see The Times, 1 Nov., p. 8a.

2 For which Gladstone had declined to stand again and new candidates, Stone and Saunders, had been adopted; see nos. 40 and 137.
Many thanks for your account of Waddington’s conversation. France has the opportunity, in the matter of Greece, of a great game & a cheap one. Dunckley’s paper on Personal Government is timely & I think, masterly.

I am going to republish the ‘Kin beyond Sea’ with other Tracts.

I feel sure that old Stockmar must have kept very secret from Peel and others the nature of the mischievous counsels which he instilled into the ears of the Queen & Prince. He certainly ‘made straight’ the ways for Dizzy.

I met your brother at Woburn and West; with much pleasure as usual. The Duke was very hearty. I declined meetings at Bradford & Cambridge. The University seemed to me a regular bee-hive of hard workers.

Judging from the general state of affairs, I should think you may before the Session have some rather stiff matters to consider.

Trade I fear worse than ever.

131. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Walmer Castle. Nov 14/78.

I send you three letters ‘par acquit de conscience’, but which it is hardly worth your while to read. If you do, I hope you will not disapprove my answer to Grey.

The Gov have I presume thrown over Lytton’s grand scheme—Dizzy looks to a military splash with a trifling result, but sufficient to be called an extension of the Empire.

I do not see how he is to shake off the financial difficulty.

The opposition speeches & letters up to this time have been excellent, & done much good. I shall be curious to read a certain speech upon ‘who are the Pro Russians’, the text is excellent.

132. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

Hawarden. Nov. 15. 78.

The Afghan Committee announced in today’s Daily News has asked me by Telegraph to join them in the endeavour to obtain the summoning of


3 Lord Grey wrote, 8 Nov., appealing to Granville to raise a demand in the country for the reassembly of parliament in order to prevent ‘the impending war’ with Afghanistan, P.R.O. 30/29/26 Aii; Granville’s moderating reply, not traced.
Parliament. Viewing the whole situation, the great expenditure, the chance of immediate war, & the Speech of the 9th, I am disposed to approve the proceeding but I want to know your views. If you join it, I am ready: and if you happen to telegraph your assent please to add mine.

You will remember that Hartington in 1876 demanded the meeting of Parliament. This is certainly a stronger case for it.

I shall answer to the Committee to the effect that I will consider & consult (not naming you) & let them know.

The Baths come here tonight, also Dodson. The Wests too are here.

I have had a growing idea that the wish was increasing for you Hartington or both to make some indications.

[P.S.] If you are able & disposed to answer by Telegraph (i.e. in words which would not tell any secrets) it might enable me to Telegraph to London tomorrow. But if you do it at once for us both, that of course is everything.

132A. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

[Add. MS. 44171, fo. 220]
Walmer Castle. Nov 15/78.

Grey writes¹ that he hears that the Promoters of the Northumberland Meeting are so much afraid of a division of the party, that they doubt its coming off at all—and he adds that he inclines to the opinion that it will be better to let the responsibility lie upon the Gov and give a little more time to the country to consider the folly of their proceedings.

133. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

[P.R.O. 30/29/29 A]
Hawarden Castle. Nov. 16. 78.

I return your inclosures. And on your letter to Grey I make the following observations

1. That Lord B[eaconsfield's] speech² on rectification creates a new starting point—to which some of the first opinions you quote will apply.

2. They were all first hand offhand & private. Northbrook's speech by no means goes up to the same point.³

¹ To Granville, 14 Nov., as here described, P.R.O. 30/29/26 Aii; Granville to Grey, 10 Nov., copy, P.R.O. 30/29/28 A, fo. 486.
² For Beaconsfield's speech at the lord mayor's banquet, 10 Nov., on the NW. frontier of India as 'haphazard and not scientific' and the hope that if its 'rectification was consummated' there would be no further danger to our Indian Empire, see The Times, 11 Nov., p. 10c.
³ i.e. at Winchester, asserting that the present NW. frontier 'was unassailable for purposes of defence and to advance it further into Afghanistan would be most unwise'. The Times, 12 Nov., p. 8c.
3. In 1876 the object was to get Govt to postpone its executive duty. To this the demand for calling Parliament had no relevancy. Yet even as it was it produced the Constantinople Conference. But here the demand is one of right as Grey’s draft has shown.

4. My view is that the meeting of Parlt will do good; & the refusal to let it meet will also do good (a.) by weakening the hands of the Ministers for mischief and (b) by further damaging them with the country which I am sorry to say that I think a considerable public good.

In making these observations I consider that they are rather collateral to your letter than opposed to it. You anticipated that D.’s speech might make a difference & it did.

Grey’s draft is good but the latter part I think too didactic.

Reflection confirms my leaning of yesterday but I shall in no case do any thing till I hear from you.

Dodson reports excellent feeling at Chester.

134. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone  
[Add. MS. 44171, fo. 221]

Walmer Castle. Nov. 16/78.

Your letter will have crossed one from me containing a correspondence with Grey. I cannot help thinking that the opposition made by persons supposed to have special knowledge will have more effect, if you Hartington & I do not at present join it. Dizzy’s answer to Lord Lawrence may oblige us to consider what course we should take. But a false move might do mischief at this moment. Every day must add to the conviction of sensible people that the new policy is wrong. On the other hand if the Ameer gives in and matters are patched up, our position would be a false one.

I encouraged Ripon to sign as he may be supposed to have special knowledge, & my brother, who has always taken an independent line on these matters.

135. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville  
[P.R.O. 30/29/29 A]

Hawarden Castle. Nov. 18. 1878.

I have written to the Affghan Committee, approving of the reasonable-

1 i.e. of memorial to Beaconsfield, asking for the immediate summoning of parliament.
2 Who dined and slept at Hawarden, Fri. 15 to Sat. 16 Nov., see Dodson to Gladstone, 13 Nov., Add. MS. 44252, fo. 61.
3 For Lawrence to Beaconsfield, 18 Nov., asking him to receive a deputation from the Afghan committee on or before 20 Nov., to prevent war upon Afghanistan until the facts of the quarrel were before the British public, see The Times, 20 Nov., p. 8c.
4 i.e. Grey’s Afghan memorial; see The Times, 19 Nov., p. 10a, for report of Ripon’s signature.
5 Formed by Grey and Lawrence, 15 Nov., to stop war upon Afghanistan.
ness of their object, but declining to join on the ground that my name would do more to impede than to promote its attainment, by favouring the construction that cavillers would put upon it.

A fortiori I admit the sufficiency of the reasons why you may justly decline signing, though I would freely have gone in with you. It is very difficult to judge in these cases where the reasons for, & against, are so very different in kind.

Bath has felt difficulty, & is consulting Carnarvon.

I cannot however help hoping, as I said before, that you & Hartington too may find opportunities for some early indication.

The Liberals under Macduff (who is I believe an invader) are moving agt. Sir A. Gordon in E. Aberdeenshire. And not unnaturally. But I have reason to believe he is prepared to vote the Govt out of office. Under these circs I wrote to Adam to get the matter stopped if possible: but he seems unable to effect it.¹

I am republishing Articles & Essays: and have read over my paper on the Franco-German War, which I think of including, with a few explanatory sentences on a part that criticises the two Countries.²

I intend to go up on Wednesday week.

136. **Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone**

Walmer Castle. Nov 20/78.

I am glad that you have not given your name, but have sent an encouraging answer to the Affghan Committee.

Working as they are without it's being possible to say that they are actuated by party spirit, they are the best instrument for forming a sound public opinion.

I find that different sorts of people all advised Hartington to keep aloof from the Committee.

I have told him that [sic] what you say as to the expediency of our soon giving an utterance.

The tone of Dizzy's answer to Lord Lawrence³ is offensive.

But unlike the Times, I gather that it means that he will summon Parlt,

¹ Gladstone to Adam, not traced but cf. Adam to Gladstone, 13 Nov., on the Liberal Association's inability to withdraw Gordon since he had not renounced the conservative party or stood as a liberal, Add. MS. 44095, fo. 66.

² See Gleanings of Past Years (1879) iv. 232–3, footnote, saying that both his strictures on the harshness with which Bismarck pursued the war and on French political instability in 'Germany, France and England' had been falsified since its publication in the *Edinburgh Review*, Oct. 1870.

³ Refusing to receive a deputation from the Afghan committee (see no. 134) and opening with a sarcastic allusion to the length of Lawrence's letters to The Times on Afghan policy, The Times, 20 Nov., p. 8c.
if war is declared. Is it clear that it will not be good policy on their part to do so, in the mess in which they have placed themselves.

137. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

[Add. MS. 44171, fo. 225]

18, Carlton House Terrace. Nov 30/78.

I was very sorry not to find you at home yesterday on my arrival in town. I will not trouble you before your great work today, unless you send for me.

I have a letter from Hartington this morning. He proposes Monday or Tuesday for a meeting. If I do not hear to the contrary from you I will fix Monday at 3.

He hopes, which no doubt is the case, that you will not commit yourself today to any particular line in Parl, until we have consulted.

Please remember as to tone that your place is not at the bar, but on the supreme Bench.

138. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

[P.R.O. 30/29/29 A]

N. 30. 78.

I should feel easier after seeing you—Here if quite convenient to you. Will wait till one if necessary. Or I can call on you about one if you prefer it.

139. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

[P.R.O. 30/29/29 A]

Hawarden Castle. Jan 11. 79.

I inclose for perusal copy of a letter written today to Adam. I believe you have been cognisant of the proceedings about the County of Midlothian, which are now beginning to bear a practical aspect. Generally, when one knows the tree is a large tree, yet on coming close up to the trunk it looks twice as large as it did before. So it is with this election. If it goes on it will gather into itself a great deal of force and heat, and will be very prominent. Thus far I am not sure whether I have put the matter pointedly

1 He undertook to do what the letter and spirit of the India Act (1858) required. The Times interpreted it as allowing the government to move without summoning parliament, leading article 20 Nov., p. 9a; parliament was summoned for 5 Dec.
2 For Gladstone's speech at Greenwich, see The Times, 2 Dec., p. 7a; see also no. 130.
3 To Granville, 29 Nov., as here described making the publication of the blue book of Afghan correspondence the occasion for the meeting of the ex-cabinet, P.R.O. 30/29/22 A.
4 Not traced; he replied to Adam's letter submitting a draft invitation from the Midlothian Liberal Association to stand for the constituency, it being likely to elect him, see copy of extract, Add. MS. 44095, fo. 74, and from Adam, 3, 15, 17, 28 Jan., fos. 68–78.
before you or have been content to assume your approval of what I found
Adam pressing strongly upon me. It will be a tooth and nail affair.
When I told you I hoped, as I do hope, to stay here until the 13th Feb.
or later, I meant unless wanted. I can obey an earlier call if needful.

140. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

[Add. MS. 44171, fo. 227]

You have done a very plucky & public spirited thing—& I feel sure that
Adam & Wolverton would not have allowed you to embark in it—unless
with a certainty of success.
Your friends must begin working the coach at once, but I should think
you had better not appear too early in the field—Act Louis XIV.
Bath for a wonder has no gossip.
We go to Bowood on Saturday. I will let you know our further move-
ments.
What possible modus vivendi is there with the reasonable Irish M.P.s.

141. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

[P.R.O. 30/29/29 A]
Hawarden Castle. Jan 18. 79.

1. Having received your approval I wrote on the same day to Adam
accordingly & I shall probably soon receive the formal invitation. Without
doubt it is desirable to postpone as much as may be my appearance on
the field. Will you kindly send me back the copy of my letter to Adam,
inclosed in my last, as I am desirous to keep it by me.
2. In the new Quarterly there is an Article on Party Government of
little power but with misstatements on the Black Sea Clause[2] & some other
matters which if you have a channel should I think be answered.
3. Mr Justin MacCarthy has produced two volumes of an interesting
and I think useful history from 1837 to the end of the Crimean War.[3] But
in it following Kinglake he repeats the old & untrue stories about constant
discord in the Aberdeen Cabinet and the causes of the Palmerston resigna-
tion. This is very unfortunate. I have told my story in an article some years
back of which I will shortly send you a reprint.[4] But I sometimes think

[2] Affirming the value of the neutralization of the Black Sea in 1856 and asserting that
it should have been maintained; 'Party Government', Quarterly Review, Jan. 1879,
exlvii. 277.
[3] Justin McCarthy, A History of our Own Times from the Accession of Queen Victoria,
2 vols. (1879); see McCarthy to Gladstone, 3 Jan., presenting a copy, and, 10 Jan.,
answering Gladstone’s criticisms, Add. MS. 44459, fos. 9, 32.
[4] See his review of Martin’s Life of the Prince Consort (1877) iii, Church of England
Quarterly Review, Jan. 1878; reprinted in Gleanings of Past Years (1879) i. 123; he
denies cabinet divisions and describes his being sent to ask Palmerston to reconsider
his resignation.
that we the few surviving members of the Aberdeen Cabinet ought to place upon record our contradiction to those stories for the sake of future history.

4. I am very glad you put to me a question about *modus vivendi* with the better Irish: for my opinion is that the ‘front bench’ has been all too stiff and cold towards them. I say this without being at all sanguine as to success. But I think efforts might and ought to be made. The rather priggish attitude of the Liberals about denominational education can hardly be maintained in the face of what the Tories have done & it has always been my opinion that the question of *Local Government* opened a road for giving a considerable amount of satisfaction to persons in any way amenable to reason.¹

5. I think you may like to read the inclosed—from a younger son of Stanhope.²
   I am eager about Norfolk.³

142. *Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone*  
[Add. MS. 44171, fo. 229]  
Jan 22/79.

Many thanks for your pregnant letter.
I return your letter to Adam, and Stanhope’s remarkably well written note.
I will look at the Quarterly. I stated the case of the Black sea clause, at Bradford last year [sc. 1877].⁴ I am not sure what will be the best way of calling attention to the fallacious description of what we did, which prevails. But will see to it.
I will certainly read MacCarthy’s book. Probably the best way of meeting any inaccuracy, would be in a letter to him. I shall be glad to see your article on the subject of the Palmerston resignation. I must have read it at the time, but it has escaped my memory. Both Halifax & George Grey have diaries of that time.

I was very glad to get your views of the Irish policy.

143. *Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville*  
[P.R.O. 30/29/29 A]  
Private.  
Hawarden Castle. Jan 24. 79.

Bath sent me the inclosed letter from Col. Colley to Col. Brackenbury with leave to send it to you if I thought it worth your reading, which I do

¹ Cf. p. 58, n. 3.  
² Not traced.  
³ See no. 143.  
⁴ See no. 83. Granville argued that Russia’s reputed diplomatic successes were hollow: she had denounced the Black Sea clauses which could not permanently have been maintained and had been compelled to withdraw the denunciation when a European conference revised the treaty.
think. As I understand Bath had it from MacColl, and Col. B. has given leave. Will you therefore return it either to MacColl 12 Chester Terrace, or to Colonel B. as you think best. It is a curious production. The account of the Peshwar conferences & some other parts are flatly in contradiction to the facts.

I am now going to write my draft acceptance of the Midlothian invitation & send it to Adam for his approval.

North Norfolk is a disappointment for which Birkbeck & Hastings do not sufficiently account—but qy Great Yarmouth?

I write to London as you do not give an Address after Bowood which you probably will have left. I do not mean to go up until February 18 unless sent for. You will probably have no dinners, & in any case except for business I may excuse myself.

144. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Private.

Althorp, Northampton. Feb 2 78 [sc. 79].

Dufferin called on me just before I left town.

He told me that He had rec[eive]d a letter in Ireland from Lord Beaconsfield, offering him the Embassy at St Petersburg, with the understanding that it was not to affect his political allegiance to his party in any degree, & adding that it would be useful to the public service that the person appointed should not be considered a tory, and that like Dufferin he should be known for his opinions in favor of the Xitian subjects of the Turk.

Dufferin gave me several reasons why the appointment was agreeable to him & to Lady Dufferin, and said that he accepted at once without any scruple suggesting itself to him.

That it was only the day on which he got Dizzy's rejoinder, and at the same time a letter about the dinner to be given to him at the Reform Club that a doubt crossed him.

He then came to England called on Lord Beaconsfield, told him of the Reform dinner at which he intended to be present, and asked his

1 19 Jan., sending Colley's letter to Brackenbury, to be returned to MacColl, on the change of policy towards Afghanistan having been long determined on and being necessitated by the ameer's conduct, Add. MS. 44459, fo. 41.

2 See Gladstone to John Cowan, 30 Jan., draft much corrected and final version, accepting his invitation to stand, Add. MS. 44137, fo. 388; see also Add. MS. 44763, fo. 142.

3 See The Times, 23 Jan., p. 6c, reporting that Birkbeck had held the north Norfolk seat for the conservatives against Sir T. F. Buxton and stating that Yarmouth had given the greatest support to the conservatives.

4 Dated on the docket, 'Feb. 2. 78', but contents show 1879 to be the right date.

5 Appointed ambassador at St. Petersburg, vice Loftus, Jan. 1879; for erroneous suggestion that Granville made the difficulty about Dufferin's acceptance, see Sir A. Lyall, Marquis of Dufferin and Ava (1905) 265.
permission to consult his political friends. Ld. B. said it was too late. He had taken the Queen's pleasure, and recalled Loftus—and it was only after much pressure, that he consented to Dufferin informing me confidentially of what had been settled.

Dufferin said that he was extremely anxious to know whether I disapproved of what he had done, & what I thought he ought to do about the Reform Club dinner, which he was most desirous to attend.

I said it was not of much use having my opinion after the fact was accomplished—that there was a shade of difference between accepting a continuance of the Governorship of Canada, or accepting another Colonial Post, and entering into the Diplomatic career under the party to which he was opposed, but that under all the circumstances of the case I did not disapprove of what he had done. But it was impossible that I could answer for the opinion of others.

He said that there was only one other person, about whose opinion he really cared, & that was your's. You were the person in the world to whom he was under the greatest obligation. He was restricted by his promise to Dizzy from going beyond me, but he hoped that when the time came, I would explain the matter to you. He said it would be known in 3 weeks, and he was to go in 6.

Dizzy is to let us have the heads of his statement to Parliament, on the previous evening.¹

I told Dufferin that he had certainly better attend the Reform Club Dinner, that possibly his reception might not be so enthusiastic, but that it would give him an opportunity of declaring that his appointment did not affect his political opinion.²

145. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

[Hawarden. Feb 3. 79.]

Thanks for your detailed explanation of a rather peculiar case.

I really do not know why Dufferin should conceive himself to be under any sort of obligation to me.

But though I cannot be glad he is in confidential relations with Lord B[eaconsfield] I feel with you that no condemnation of the act could properly be pronounced. And also that on the other hand after he had done it he was more than ever bound to attend the Reform Club dinner. When of course he will have to say a good word for B. It is odd I think that this should not have been transacted through Salisbury. But I imagine that in

¹ For Beaconsfield's statement, 13 Feb., on parliamentary business, necessary because the Queen's speech in Dec. had been sketchy, see Hans. Parl. Deb. ccxliii. 1041–8.
² Done at the Reform Club dinner, 22 Feb., to celebrate his return from Canada; see The Times, 24 Feb., p. 11a.
the matter of patronage he grabs all he can: and that this and the Eastern Question together with any matter touching Parliamentary Votes constitutes his whole share (besides matters with the Queen) in the business of the Government.

Inclosed is a copy of my Address, for such it is in substance, to the Midlothian folk.¹

I take for granted that faggot manufactures cannot be brought to bear effectively for the next register—otherwise, Adam has omitted from his calculations a very essential item.

My mind is to stay here if possible until the 18th—and to announce in the papers, for defence against evil tongues, that engagements keep me here.

The F. Cavendishes are here: I wish he were better fortified, at his time of life, against rheumatic liabilities.

We are in the midst of a slow and dismal thaw, and are painfully passing through snow to slush, on the way let us hope to more kindly weather.

Bright has been here—well, & exceeding pleasant.

There is another aspect of the Dufferin matter. I do not envy him his relation to Lord B[eaconsfield] who will use him to square Russia on the Afghan affair, and then treat him with respect to the Turkish question as he treated Salisbury at the Constantinople Conferences.

146. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville ²  

73, Harley Street. Mch 22. 79.

Whatever you decide upon I will follow.³ If it is to be admitted that the dispatches & the motion are identical, yet the dispatches are to carry no consequences, while the motion would carry them, & those who made it may avow them, & thus establish a sufficient difference in their position, without drawing the great disadvantage of the change of front. Also if dispatch & motion are identical the question still remains whether Parliament is simply to vote the millions, & give no word upon the cause of the mischief.

I do not however quite see the identity. Except as to the missionaries

¹ i.e. the reply, 30 Jan., to the formal invitation to contest the seat; see p. 93, n. 2. For the actual election address, 11 Mar. 1879, see much corrected draft and fair copy, Add. MS. 44764, fo. 16.

² Gladstone to Granville, 10 Mar., asking, after the fire, whether he might use the ground- and first-floor rooms of Granville's Carlton House Terrace house, P.R.O. 30/29/29 A, not printed.

³ In the Commons; for Lansdowne's motion in the Lords regretting Bartle Frere's unauthorized ultimatum to the Zulu king, and the beginning of the Zulu war without adequate preparation, see Hans. Parl. Deb. ccxliv. 1606–97; Lansdowne had given notice that he would add regret that Frere had not been dismissed despite the censure in the dispatch of 19 Mar. 1879.
the dispatches provisionally adopt the ultimatum. It has been virtually approved except as to the time. The motion I think does not. I am however rather stupified, & just awake, but my leaning is to doubt the wisdom of change unless you were to hear that there was a strong feeling for it in the party.

147. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

I quite agree with you and De Tabley.¹
On Friday evening I saw Hartington. He was very kind: he assented, and in a measure approved.
You may remember my telling you I thought of raising a conversation about Eastern Roumelia. The discussions about a mixed occupation lead to a likelihood that in one way or another any crisis of blood will be averted or at the least postponed. This being so I am inclined to be silent until after Easter.
I hope you make way.

148. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Do you think it worth while for me to ask Salisbury, whether, as the 3d of May is passed, which marked an important epoch in the execution of the Treaty of Berlin, he will present papers, or make a statement which will show what provisions of the Treaty have been executed, and which have been postponed.
I should be inclined to add that although there are mistakes in the Treaty I have not wish to disturb it’s execution, in the manner which will keep us free from unnecessary entanglements and which will provide best for the happiness of the populations in question.²
Salisbury has a way of letting sets of papers accumulate and then presenting them all together which is very inconvenient.
Pray let me know what you think.

149. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

The question seems to me to [be] just and opportune.
Were I, however, in your place, I would say nothing to compromise my

¹ Allusion not identified.
² The Russian military occupation of Bulgaria and E. Roumelia was to end on 3 May; for Granville’s question, asked, 5 May, without the softening, suggested by Gladstone in no. 149, and Salisbury’s reply, see Hans. Parl. Deb. ccxiv. 1674. 1874–83.
liberty for the future until I knew what our Govt had been about but
would only point to the fact of having carefully abstained from all proceed-
ings & remarks calculated to hinder or prejudice the execution of the
Treaty even in matters where it had not your approval.

150. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville  
[P.R.O. 30/29/29 A]

S. Audley St. June 13. 79.

Finding neither you nor your brother (whom I had hoped to employ as
Mercury) at this semi-sacred hour which marks the end of luncheon I
write to bring two subjects to your notice.

1. There is a strong movement, on which Dilke and others communicate
with me, about the Greek frontier. A desire exists and may take form for
a motion in the House of Commons to help forward the fulfilment of the
Treaty of Berlin. Dilke urges that a ‘private’ Member would not get a day.
He urges me, and thinks I should get one. I am of opinion there ought
probably to be a debate (there is a question not quite settled about trying
a City meeting) but that I ought not to be the mover. This matter will have
to be considered very shortly.

2. The answer about the Zulu War expences is scandalous[:] at the
time of year fixed by principle and usage for making provision for the
whole year Northcote finds or says that he has enough for three months
(of which 2½ have already passed) and has no intention of making any
prospective proposal. This is ruin to all principles of finance and to the
power of the House of Commons—Surely this cannot go by & the matter
must shortly again be stirred? So Childers seems to think. Pray ponder it.

151. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville3  
[P.R.O. 30/29/27 A]

H[arley] St[reet]. Jul 8. 79.

The inclosed circular which I do not mean to return shows much
activity among Conservatives as to the City. I believe they are right. It is
a kind of key-note in a General Election. I sincerely hope you keep in
view the possibility of an earlier vacancy. No amount of pain would be too

1 Caused partly by the government’s delay in producing papers; produced, 27 June,
 Parl. papers (1878–9) lxxvii. 231; but see Dilke’s motion urging the prompt execution
nos. 117, 129.

2 For Northcote’s answer to Childers, 12 June, that the charges had been met and that,
if the war was over by the end of June, the calculations of the present budget would not
be disturbed, see Hans. Parl. Deb. ccxlvi. 1695–7; see also further questions, 17 and
31 July and vote of credit, 4 Aug.

3 No. 151 is torn in two and kept as an isolated letter with unbound miscellaneous
correspondence.
great, for the stroke of carrying that seat. It would matter little who might hold it afterwards if now you could put up a winning man.

The occurrences last night in the H. of C. (which I did not witness) seem to have been unpleasant: though Hartington I believe had an enthusiastic reception given him today. I hope measures will be found to close this little breach: you cannot afford breaches small or great. Dilke who voted with Chamberlain told me he did not seem afterwards in ill humour.

152. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

14, South Audley Street. July 8/79.

Many thanks for your pregnant little note.

I will attend to the different hints. I am sorry to say that E. Baring has positively refused.

153. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

Harley St. Jul 24. 79.

I return with thanks Bath’s interesting letter.

On Saturday, at farthest, I hope to go to Hawarden: revocable, of course, in case of need.

The question of Dissolution seems to me uncertain: not long odds against it.

But in any case it seems to me that there will now be no long interval of tranquillity before it: consequently that you will have a serious question to consider whether you ought not to arrange for working the country by meetings in various quarters say from Septr; or thereabouts, onwards.

154. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone


I am following your example, and going to Walmer today, probably running up again for a night or so, which is not like you.

1 For Chamberlain’s attack, 5 July, on Hartington’s leadership of the liberal party, as partial and nominal, and demonstration, 7 July, by the liberal rank and file in Hartington’s favour, see Hans. Parl. Deb. ccxlvi. 1551, 1804-8.

2 To stand as parliamentary candidate for the city of London, see Adam to Granville, 16 July, P.R.O. 30/29/27 A. After his refusal Adam sought to persuade Sir John Lubbock or Francis Baring to stand.

3 Not traced among the letters from Bath scattered through the unbound correspondence for 1868 to 1891 in P.R.O. 30/29/22 A, 26 A, 27 A.
Hartington intends, & I have much encouraged him, to compare your Irish University Bill with the present compromise.¹

If he does not do so, I shall probably ask you to supply me with some materials for that purpose.

Allow me to commend to you Salisbury’s speech of last night at Hatfield.²

There will be several great meetings during the autumn, but I doubt whether we ought to discharge all our pistols till the decisive moment comes, which I still believe will not be this year.

155. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville³


On your incitement I have read Salisbury’s Speech: without much edification except on one point. It indicates and for several reasons I should believe that they intend sailing on the quiet tack. Having proved their spirit they will now show their moderation. In other words they want all the past proceedings to be in the main ‘stale fish’ at the Election. Except financial shuffling they will very likely commit no new enormity before the Election. In my view that means they will not supply any new matter of such severe condemnation as what they have already furnished. Therefore, my idea is, we should keep the old alive and warm. And this is the meaning of my suggestion as to autumn work, rather than that I expect a Dissolution. It seems to me good policy to join on the proceedings of 1876–9 by a continuous process to the Dissolution. Should this happen, which I think likely enough, about March, there will have been no opportunity immediately before it of stirring the country. I will not say our defeat in 1874 was owing to the want of such an opportunity but it was certainly I think much aggravated by that want.

My recollection is that my reasoning on the Irish University question such as it may have been, was packed bodily into my speech on introducing it. I see that I set forth strongly as its principle the restoration to the whole people of Ireland, of their one ancient and National University.

Adam had the freeest leave to fetch me up, and I beg you will do it if you see any occasion however slight. The journey, though a little over twice yours, is perfectly tolerable.

² Address to the London and Westminster Workingmen’s Constitutional Association, visiting Hatfield, on the obstruction of the government’s domestic programme by liberal eloquence on foreign policy, see The Times, 5 Aug., p. 4e.
³ First paragraph printed, Morley, ii. 587.
I do not think I could have voted in the majority for thanking Lytton. The alternative to the retrospective discussion before the constituencies would I suppose be a clear and strong programme. Is that forthcoming?

156. **Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone**  
[Add. MS. 44171, fo. 236]  

The consummate impudence of Salisbury’s Speech was my only reason for recommending it to your notice. How strong the old Saturday Reviewer is in him.

I fancy we agree—viz to keep the pot boiling, but not to let it boil over till the critical moment.

Ought we to have a more definite programme than that which has been incidentally brought forward. As far as it goes Hartington appears to have the best of it with Dizzy as to the land. What rubbish the latter talks on the subject.

The crops in this immediate neighbourhood are very fine though late.

157. **Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone**  
[Add. MS. 44171, fo. 238]  

If I had known you were coming to town for a function, I should have tried to run up & meet you. If for nothing else, to tell you how good I thought your speech at Chester, both for it’s local as for it’s general character.

I do not think there will be a lack of speaking this autumn. Dilke’s was a good speech the other day. Harcourt is to hold forth soon, and Hartington has to make two speeches, before he begins a regular set of them in Lancashire.

---

1 The Lords unanimously, and the Commons by a majority of 114, voted thanks to Lytton and the army for the Afghan victories, 4 Aug., *Hans. Parl. Deb.* ccxl. 2, 68–102.

2 Hartington, 4 July, criticized the system of land tenure which discouraged cultivators from also owning the soil, in debate on the appointment of a Royal Commission of Inquiry into the agricultural depression, *Hans. Parl. Deb.* ccxlvii. 1520–33; Beaconsfield replied at the lord mayor’s banquet, 6 Aug., The Times, 7 Aug., p. 10a.

3 Gladstone was guest at an entertainment given to old people at the St. Pancras workhouse, 21 Aug.

4 Commending the new candidate for the second seat, Beilby Lawley, to the liberal electors of Chester; recommending organization to the local liberals and making an all-round attack upon the government with the general election in view; see The Times, 22 Aug., p. 8d.

5 19 Aug., to his Chelsea constituents, attacking the government on its legislative record and on its foreign policy; see The Times, 20 Aug., p. 11d.

6 For Harcourt’s speeches at Southport and Liverpool, 3 and 6 Oct., see The Times, 4 Oct., p. 11a; 7 Oct., p. 9a.

7 For Hartington’s speeches in Radnorshire on the agricultural depression and Newcastle and for series of speeches at Manchester, see The Times, 6 Sept., p. 10a; 19, 20 Sept., pp. 8d, 11a; 24 Oct., p. 7f; 25 Oct., p. 6a; 27 Oct., p. 10a; 28 Oct., p. 9f.
I hear dreadful accounts of the harvest from Shropshire & Staffordshire. Here the crops, excepting potatoes, are good.

Iron has made a spurt, which whether permanent or temporary, is pleasant for us depressed Ironmasters.

I shall be most curious to hear your own impressions of Midlothian, whenever you make your first appearance there.

If you had time, there are some interesting memoirs of the Duc de Bassano.¹

158. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone


You have made me, not for the first time, do something for which I am glad; but it was [un]intentional on your part. I was told at Dover by the liberal candidate that you were going to attend Sir R. Hill's funeral.² I own I was surprised at your making so long a journey.

I came up from Dover yesterday with Lord & Lady Derby. He is very cordial, & inclined to think, though he does not know, that Dizzy will not face another Parliament. He says that Dizzy praises Salisbury as the man now—who has initiative and courage.

159. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

H[awarde]n. S. 5. 79.

I should like to have paid honour to Sir R. Hill at the last earthly stage, but London last week, London next week, & the near close of year No. 70, with my work here, deterred me.

‘London next week’ means that I am going abroad with wife, a son, & a daughter. We go straight to Cologne, where my sister still inhabits Disch's Hotel: thence to Munich,—the Dolomites—Venice; drawn at that end by the strong attraction of Lady Marian Alford, driven at this—I at least—by the repulsion of the correspondence which I mean to leave behind me. Nothing, unless it bear very special credentials, will be forwarded.

In confidence! I make known my address as follows

Cologne Hotel Disch S. 15  
Munich 17. 18. Care of Dr. Döllinger.  
(Dolomite country follows[)]  
Albergo Grande (says Lady M. A.)  
London 16.

¹ Baron Ernouf, Maret, duc de Bassano (Paris, 1879).
² Died, 27 Aug., at Hampstead.
Can you tell me anything of Acton? I wish much to see or hear of him. Rosebery & a few others have my address.

I do not think I shall be called back by Dissolution—Thank God the Zulu War seems near its end. I did not think Raikes was such a fool as at any rate the report makes him.1—Salisbury has his turn now—so, I think, had Bluebeard's wives?

I start hence on Monday.

160. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone


Godley gave me your message about the public dinner.2 I told him I thought you were quite right.

Today I have received a letter from Sam Morley, proposing himself and a Mr Verney to come to Walmer, to induce me to press you to reconsider your determination.3

I have answered that I should be happy to talk over his son standing for West Kent, and any plans for better organization in London, but that I cannot consistently help him in the subject of his letter.

I recapitulated the letter which I wrote last summer at your suggestion to George Howard. I said that I had seen you twice since your return from abroad, but we had not mentioned the dinner as neither of us were aware of the plan being still entertained. But that last week you had sent me word of the course you had just taken about the dinner, and that I had expressed my concurrence—that I knew of no new circumstances which would enable me to ask you to undertake more than you have now upon your hands.

I assume that you will approve. If you do not please telegraph me one line.

Adam expects 30 Forster 40 majority for us over the Disraelites, exclusive of Home Rulers.

I believe I mentioned that the conservatives expect a majority of 13.

---

1 He denounced Gladstone for rousing the liberals against the conservatives in Chester, a constituency with which he had no connexion and should not therefore have visited, see The Times, 2 Sept., p. 9b; see also no. 157.

2 See Samuel Morley to Gladstone, 18 Feb., on decision to invite Granville and Hartington in order to turn a dinner to be given by workingmen to Gladstone into a demonstration of liberal unity, Add. MS. 44459, fo. 114; Verney to Gladstone, 2 June, fixing for Gladstone's birthday; and, 22 June, on its abandonment; and Morley to Gladstone, 6 Nov., on his disappointment and approach to Granville, Add. MS. 44460, fos. 116, 179, and Add. MS. 44461, fo. 119.

3 i.e. to decline.
I have nothing to suggest upon your letter, as you describe it, in the way either of subtraction or of addition.

I shall be glad when Mr Morley publishes my letter which he will of course do. I sent it to him through Adam, with a private one. There is need of public explanation for the Echo had a statement in a recent number, which was fundamentally incorrect and which would be best corrected by my letter.

As you know there was never from me either encouragement or acquiescence. What I acquiesced in, so far as to leave it an open question, was my attending as an individual at a general festival of the party.

I am glad to see so many signs of renewed vigour in the party: they meet one at every turn; and the result of the Municipal Elections cannot be without importance for the Pall Mall Gazette suppresses it.

Do you happen to have at hand the particulars of the occasions on which the Powers except ourselves had before the War of 1870 spoken in favour of giving up the Black Sea restriction on Russia? Do not take trouble about the matter if it does not lie ready.

I cannot lay my hands on the 'pieces justicatives' as to the declarations of the Powers in favor of the Russian claims in the Black Sea.

But there is no doubt about Germany having at Paris, & subsequently always taken the Russian side on that question.

France made an intimation to the same effect, very soon after the conclusion of the Treaty. And Austria later. Italy did the same, but in not so decided a manner.

I do not think that you run any risk of contradiction in repeating what I have frequently said in public, that with the exception of ourselves & the Turks, all the cosignatories of the Treaty of Paris, had expressed views in favor of modifying the article, previously to Prince Gortchakoff's declaration, & that the Turks declared the substitute which we obtained for them was exactly that which they wanted.

Are you not amused with people's disappointment with Dizzy's speech.

1 See to Morley, published in The Times, 10 Nov., p. 11e; declining the dinner since a public demonstration outside Midlothian might disturb the organization of the liberals under their recognized leaders.

2 Cf. Gladstone and Granville, i, nos. 454 and note, 455, 462, 463.

3 At the lord mayor's banquet, 10 Nov., known for its catch phrase imperium et libertas, but avoiding all current agitations, see The Times, 11 Nov., p. 4e; and leading article, on the general disappointment, ibid. p. 7e.
Every one knows he is a clever conjuror, but so many of his friends & even foes, believe that he is a great magician which he is not. But he is intelligent enough not to let off any fireworks he may possess till the end of the performance.

My notion is that he intends if possible to go through another session.

P.S. I do not trouble you unless you wish to see [it] with a correspondence with Mr Verney, who appears to be, as Walter James tells me he is, rather an empty fellow.

I told him that I had had from you a letter confirming my opinion of your objections, & expressing a strong wish for the publication of your letter to Mr Morley. I said that the organization which had been energetically & successfully arranged, might be of a great use at a particular moment, but that I hoped it would not be put in motion without previous consultation with those concerned.

163. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Walmer Castle. Dec 18/79.

I was glad to hear from Wolverton of your being so very well after your exertions. But prosperity is wholesomer for the body, than adversity. My liver acts better since the improvement in the iron trade. Wolverton may have told you that our people were anxious about Sheffield & Barnstable [sic]. Mundella who had been sanguine about the election was much alarmed before he left London, saying that there was one word fatal to us at Sheffield. It was 'Constantinople' !!! But I see he has been doing good service.

I am glad to say I have had a letter from Portsmouth, (who had been in a great fuss), saying that Lymington was safe, even giving his opponent all the venal votes.

1 See to Granville, 4 Nov., stating the objects of the Gladstone banquet committee, P.R.O. 30/29/27 A; see no. 161.
2 Granville to Gladstone, 26 Nov., asking how to answer a letter inquiring whether Gladstone might be invited to sit for his portrait for the city of London, Add. MS. 44171, fo. 252, and reply, 27 Nov., refusing to sit, P.R.O. 30/29/29 A, not printed.
3 The first Midlothian campaign lasted from 24 Nov. to 8 Dec.
4 Sheffield at the by-election, consequent upon the death of John Roebuck, returned a liberal, Samuel Danks Waddy, 22 Dec.
5 Barnstaple, at the by-election rendered necessary by Waddy’s going to Sheffield, returned a liberal, Viscount Lymington, with a slightly increased majority, 12 Feb. 1880.
6 For Mundella's address to workmen at Sheffield, 17 Dec., after which the Irish party there 'resolved to give its voting strength to the liberal candidate', see The Times, 18 Dec., p. 100.
7 15 Dec., on the hope of winning Barnstaple, P.R.O. 30/29/27 A; cf. earlier letters, 16 Nov., 1 Dec., 7 Dec., ibid.
I feel myself to be a barbarian for not having written to thank you for your very kind letter. But in truth my slavery to compulsory correspondence has been such, since my return from Scotland, as to cut off whatever little strength might have been available for voluntary action.

I have heard of the cause of your detention at Walmer and I hope Lady Granville is going & will go on well.

As to the exhibition of Liberal feeling it would be hard to describe, impossible to exaggerate. Dalkeith was overboiling with enthusiasm from almost every house. In truth the difficulty was to find out where was the minority.

Rosebery has made a great impression, and is a hero not only in Edinburgh but in Glasgow. I think the Liberal aristocracy behaved extremely well.

Scotch disestablishment is for the present out of the running. The fanatics who do not see it are Establishment men. Most absurd is their conception of the scale of this rather Lilliputian question. They think it the hinges of the world and if a man does not talk much about it they take this as a proof that he must be thinking all the more. I am afraid Argyll has a faint touch of this in him.

It may seem ludicrous, but it is true that I was not able, from stint of time, to empty my Budget of charges. Especially I was anxious to show up Salisbury's preposterous pretence to be simply following the traditions of all former Ministries save one. There is much truth well said in an article of the last Spectator on this subject. The Tories from 1830 to the happy reign of Dizzy were the pacific party.

I cannot doubt that we shall win Sheffield even on this register. If we do not it is an ugly sign.

In the 'Statesman' a newspaper with Indian connections is an article with an extraordinary charge against the Beaconsfield policy.

I suppose you have seen the North American Review with the article some six weeks ago on the Slidell papers. If not, you should see it.

We heartily wish you a happy Christmas, & I remain. . . .

1 Granville was laid up with gout from 10 Dec.
2 'Mr. Gladstone's Conservative Side' discussed his maintenance of the conservative tradition of pacific policy inherited from Peel and Aberdeen, The Spectator, Sat. 20 Dec., lii, pp. 1597-8.
3 See editorial and 'Fighting in Afghanistan', asserting that events were treated as unexpected, although foreseen, in order to conceal blunders, The Statesman, 20 Dec. (published 1879-80 weekly in correspondence with the Friend of India of Calcutta) i, no. 4, p. 102.
4 O. F. Aldis, 'Louis Napoleon and the Southern Confederacy', showing, from diplomatic correspondence recently bought by the United States Government, how near Napoleon came to helping the Confederacy, North American Review (New York, Oct. 1879) cxxix. 342-60.
Selborne has written privately to me¹ to know more precisely than he does, what those who make a change of law, and of settlement a part of their programme, precisely mean by it. He feels some uneasiness, when questions of this sort (which according to his experience, it is not easy to lift out of the category of lawyer’s questions, without a very great overstatement of the probable effect of any proposed mode of dealing with them) are brought in this way to the front.

Supposing, as he does suppose, that nothing impracticable or unreasonable is intended, he fears a future collapse which is not good for any party. He thinks that to simplify the transfer of land, is practically the most important measure of this class, but to do this effectually, Local Registries at all events (which will cost money) would be wanted.

He says that experience has shown that no plan that is not compulsory will ever succeed. He believes the plan recommended by the House of Commons last year,² will encrease and not diminish the worthiness of the present system, & he is afraid that the benefit of the utmost possible simplification, even if compulsory, will be but slight for a long time unless the Gov which passed it, were strong enough to propose and carry simultaneously, some plan for a general verification & simplification of existing titles, which would also cost a great deal of money, and would be strongly opposed by landowners & by lawyers.

I shall not answer him immediately.³

I became a freetrader before I was of age, and at the same time I was convinced that the law, in England and France, with regard to the disposal of land after death, were [sic] both in the extreme.

I suppose every one is agreed that it is desirable to simplify the transfer of land.

Cairn’s [sic] act⁴ was on the same lines as Selborne’s⁵ bill, leaving out the part of Hamlet, and omitting compulsion. Selborne could not carry his bill on account of the compulsion which was distasteful to landowners and Solicitors.

Cairns act has had no effect, for the reason that there was no compulsion.

¹ 19 Dec., on changes in the law relating to entail and the transfer of land, P.R.O. 30/20/27 A.
² See ‘Report of Select Committee on Land Registration (Land Titles and Transfer)’, appointed, May 1878, Parl. papers (1878) xv. 467.
³ See to Selborne, 29 Dec., holograph draft, P.R.O. 30/20/28 A, fo. 511.
⁴ See Land Titles and Transfer Act, Parl. papers (1874) iii. 19.
⁵ See bill to simplify Titles and facilitate the Transfer of Land, introduced by Selborne, 28 Apr. 1873, and abandoned after the second reading, 23 May, L.J. 274, 388, House of Lords Sessional Papers (1873) iv. p. 183, paper no. (85).
I doubt whether the abolition of the present law as to the disposal of land, would have a great practical effect. It is a long time before an old custom changes in consequence of a change in the presumption in the law.

But I believe the system of entails and settlements is bad, unfair to the landowner to the occupier, & to the nation.

It is peculiar to ourselves, which though far from conclusive against it, shows that there are no abstract difficulties in another state of things.

But these old trees with wide spreading roots, are difficult things to move, and I should like to hear what experts like Selborne have to say as to how far we can go at once.

The bias of the experts is of course against complete measures & this is a case where I doubt half measures being of use.

166. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville


Selborne is one of the best of men, but as a legal reformer he seems to me to be like the vast majority of his profession.

I give him this credit that he has never much professed it: for in general the loud utterance of ‘reform in the law’ from the mouth of a lawyer means increase of public charge, and very little else. I speak of course only within the limits of my own experience.

I am not competent to give an opinion respecting the measures which with his usual perfect fairness of intuition he describes as costly.

As to the law of intestacy I agree entirely with you that the change proposed would have little effect on general practice among the gentry and peerage. Below that level the case might be somewhat different.

In desiring the abolition of entail and settlement, I leave open to the exercise of discretion in detail the question within what limits powers of charge should be allowed. As at present advised I do not see why they should extend to the unborn.

I leave the economical questions to others, and I take my own stand principally upon social & moral grounds. In this sense the change will be a very great one.

I am very doubtful whether we are right in all the particulars of our marriage settlements etc. as to personalty: but then there are not the same grounds of public policy for interfering, nor are settled fortunes of this kind a matter of notoriety: which notoriety it is that is the ruin of so many among our young heirs apparent.

I write feelingly this morning. I have just signed a Newcastle Trust cheque for £342. 13. 4 on account of the last Duke’s funeral: entirely ultra vires. I look on him as one of the many victims of the law of entail.
Though there is much to be said about Sheffield any victory there is at this time a great victory. I am well pleased with Northcote's reply\(^1\) = o. o. o. Again a happy Xmas.

167. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville\(^2\) [P.R.O. 30/29/29 A]


I accepted your good wishes, and conformed to your condition; but we now thank you heartily for them and thank you also for the considerate manner of them.

A letter from Mundella now obliges me to break silence. He asks me, on the part of the Committee, to take the Chair at the dinner to Hartington on the 14th of February.\(^3\) This is a matter in which my desire is, entirely to be guided by you and Hartington. I do not know what his address is. I therefore write to you as the Leader. Mundella (in London) is very desirous of an early answer. If you can send it directly to him, so much the better.

I suggest this because I have just had most unsatisfactory, indeed somewhat alarming, accounts of my sister's health. She is still in Disch's Hotel at Cologne: and it is not impossible that before your letter could reach me here I might be on my way thither.

We hear reports of you and Lady G. through Godley, now with us.

I have not adverted to your P.S. but it made a deep impression upon me. The strange account about the Inspector at Windsor also sets the mind agog.\(^4\)

168. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone [Add. MS. 44172, fo. 1]


I was very sorry to hear of your cold & depressing journey—I trust you will have found your sister better, and be able to persuade her to come back to England.

Before getting your last letter, I rec[eive]d one from Adam\(^5\) telling me

---

\(^1\) i.e. to Gladstone's attack, during his Midlothian campaign, on the government's financial policy; for Northcote's speech at Leeds, see *The Times*, 22 Dec., p. 109 and d.

\(^2\) No. 167 answers Granville to Gladstone, 29 Dec., sending birthday wishes, on condition that he should not reply, and 'confidential' gossip, that the Queen had had a stroke, Add. MS. 44171, fo. 263, not printed.

\(^3\) To Gladstone, 9 Jan., as here described, explaining that it was intended as a demonstration of unity, Add. MS. 44258, fo. 160; see p. 109, n. 2, and p. 111, n. 2.

\(^4\) See note 2 above.

\(^5\) To Granville, 9 Jan., as here described but mostly concerned with a proposal of a visit of Gladstone to Sheffield, P.R.O. 30/29/27 A.
that he had been requested by Hartington to prevent a dinner to him—
& asking whether I did not think it would be a good thing.

I answered that I concurred with Hartington.¹

But upon getting your letter, & also one from Mundella,² enclosing two
of your's to him & to Hayter, it appeared to me that the fact of your taking
the chair made a difference. I came to town & saw Hartington yesterday,
& Mundella today. I told Mundella that Hartington was the reverse of
keen for the dinner, but that there was no fixed determination against it,
that it would be better to discuss the pros & cons, with you and one or two
others.

He agreed to put it off for a time for consideration.

If you will let me know I will meet you in London on your return,
unless you find it convenient to make use of Walmer as an Inn for you or
any of your's.

169. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

Hotel Disch, Cologne. Jan 17. 1880.

My dear sister died here last night. Her illness had circumstances of
extreme severity; but all became most beautiful and peaceful at the last.
There is something, I should rather say there are many things, so won-
derful in death. She did not look half her age in the last two hours, and after
all was over. Few indeed are the women of greater mental force whom she
leaves behind. It is a great blessing to my brother & me, the one ten years
her senior and the other between four & five, to have been permitted to
attend her in her last illness. Three weeks sooner I could not have left my
wife, whom I would not suffer to come with me. My brother’s wife was
here.

I am now hardly a fair judge of the question of a dinner to Hartington.
Mundella represented it to me I think as a settled matter, & only the
question of the Chair as open. I readily wrote to put myself in your hands:
the summons & the uncertainties made the time unsuited for reflection.
Now, you will readily understand, I am under a strong bias to keep out of
politics and especially of all prominent and active politics, as long as I can.
We shall have much duty to perform here and elsewhere: and we are to
bury her in Kincardineshire. If I need not come up for the Address, I
shall be very glad.

When Lord Aberdeen took office, at 69 I think, he told the House of
Lords his was a time of life for other thoughts. I think this much more
deeply true of myself, nor has there been a day for years past when I have
not thought it.

¹ Not traced, but Adam’s answer, 16 Jan., expressing relief, is in P.R.O. 30/29/27 A.
² Not traced, but cf. from Adam, 19 Jan., and from Hartington, 25 Jan., hoping it
may be possible to get rid of the dinner without offence, P.R.O. 30/29/27 A.
We must be here till Tuesday night, at soonest. I fear I cannot come to Walmer as you kindly propose: but it would be better for me to give up the mail train & get another at Dover than giving you the trouble of coming all the way to London. But I of course could easily see you there if you like.

I hope you are in no discomfort about Lady G.

On Wednesday morning we all hoped this great attack had been overcome: the danger had been extreme on Sat. & Sunday.

170. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

[Add. MS. 44172, fo. 7]


You will be shocked to hear that there is no hope for poor Bessborough. I cannot say how sorry I am. His wife has been devoted to him, & without children, & having lost all her English habits, I hardly know what her future will be.

The Gov are determined to win game.

Freddy tells me that Hill of the Daily News has seen their bill for dealing with entails, and sale of settled estates.²

Cross has come to an agreement with the water Companies of London.³ & I see it announced that they are going to amend the Bright clauses of your Irish land bill.⁴

Derby has written to me⁵ that Ramsay has had an immense personal success, but that no one can come in for Liverpool as a liberal without the Irish vote.

West says that they bet at Manchester 5/1 on Whitley, but that it is freely taken.

To win Liverpool would almost settle the question. It is provoking to be so near it, and to fail.⁶

¹ Granville to Gladstone, tel. 19 Jan., and letter, 19 Jan., expressing sympathy on the death of Helen Gladstone and proposing arrangements for Gladstone’s visit to Walmer, Add. MS. 44172, fos. 4, 5, not printed.

² For the Settled Land bill, to allow those with life interests to sell, &c., in certain circumstances, see House of Lords Sessional Papers (1880) v. p. 273, paper no. (32); introduced, 23 Feb., read a second time, 4 Mar., dropped at the dissolution, L.J. 30, 47, 54, 113; for similar bill, passing the Lords, 1880, but dropped by the Commons, C.J. 461; enacted 1882.

³ Cross’s Metropolitan Waterworks bill, enabling a new Central Board to buy up the London Water Companies, was criticized as too generous to the shareholders, read a first time, 2 Mar., but abandoned, Hans. Parl. Deb. ccli. 222–38.

⁴ The Landlord and Tenant (Ireland) Act 1870 Amendment bill, a private member’s bill, was read a second time, 6 Feb., but abandoned, Hans. Parl. Deb. ccl. 145.

⁵ Not traced among letters from Derby for 1878 to 1891 scattered through unbound miscellaneous correspondence in P.R.O. 30/29/22 A, 26 A, 27 A.

⁶ By-election at Liverpool caused by John Tort’s death; Lord Ramsay appealed to the Irish vote by promising legislation towards self-government; Edward Whitley held the seat for the conservatives with a majority of 2,000; see The Times, 23 Mar., p. 10c.
I hope you got back to Hawarden without cold, & that you found Mrs Gladstone well.
I go to town on Saturday.

171. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Walmer Castle. Jan 30 [1880].

Poor Bessborough died of apoplexy—in a sort of sleep for the last 4 days—without pain.
Lady Bessborough told me last summer that he was anxious about his health, but she thought it was only nervousness about his remaining eye.
There was a rather mysterious fall from his horse a short time ago, which he only mentioned to his groom.
Poor Lady Bessborough never left his bedside day or night at the end, in the hope of getting a look or a word. I do not know what her future will be. She was absorbed in him & her own works at Bessborough.
He was a remarkable man doing his duty in a sphere smaller than his great ability entitled him to—It is a very sad loss for me.
I was very glad you were able to pay the visit to Ramsay. I suspect it will have an excellent effect.
We must hear what others say about any motion¹—Both Hartington & Adam are inclined against one.
We will not send for you unless it be necessary. But it is not likely that the respite will be long at least from a request for you to come up.
If I were you I should concentrate my speaking on Midlothian, Parliament & some special occasion like the dinner to Hartington,² but of this you are the best judge.
With regard to the land bill, I am not sure that the Squires will not at the present moment be rather glad of powers to relieve their embarrassments.

172. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

18, Carlton House Terrace. Feb 7/80.

From [what] Derby & others had told me, I was not sanguine about Liverpool.
But it is very annoying.
I am told that the House of Commons is exceedingly flat.³

¹ No motion was made in the Commons on Afghanistan after parliament reassembled, 5 Feb.
² See nos. 167 and 168. No report of the dinner has been traced and it was presumably cancelled.
Beaconsfield was very weak physically & mentally. Several of the strong Tory Peers have said so.

Argyll argued well, but got off upon some backstairs gossip, which enabled Cranbrook, to shirk the argument, and roll him over on the personal question. But I have no doubt Argyll will give him a severe gallop on the 19th.

Rawlinson declares that we are going to give Herat to Persia, which will be playing Russia’s game again, with or without the guarantee that is talked of for the northern Frontier of Persia.

173. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

Hawarden. Feb 10. 80.

I have not, as regards the Liverpool Election, any great consolation to offer. Evidently many of us had too freely discounted what would without doubt have been an enormous gain. I should say it would have been equal to an advance of three months in time towards the day of the Liberal triumph. After this, a small loss seems a heavy one, as I remember suffering horribly on Mount Etna from one degree of frost—after a roasting day down below in Catania.

But I think as an arithmetician we state the case too much against ourselves. The true position of the Government is indicated by the proportion of a voting constituency who support it. In 1874 a voting body of 37000 gave them (I think) a majority of 3500. Had that voting body sunk to one half, or 18500, they would have stood just as well with a majority of 1750. But instead of this it rose to 50,000, with this their majority ought to have risen to 4700. But as it was 2200 the Liberals improved not by 1000 but by 2500 (on the same numbers). I do not know whether this will be to you a glass of toddie—I hope it may—or a wet blanket.

I think you may find the inclosed account of Layard’s missionary row in Constantinople from the French Globe worth reading—the story is so nicely told—I cut it out of a paper, the Maritya, published at Philippopolis in the Slav interest, which is often interesting.

It is very singular that the Govt. will not be a little more communicative about Afghan Expenditure, & tell us what they have to say on that most awkward charge of keeping down the apparent expenditure by exhausting the stores of material.

I congratulate you on your return to your house. At latest, I expect, I will not say hope, to be in town on the 21st.

1 In the Lords’ debate on the address, 5 Feb., Argyll protested against the assertions that the peace of Europe was secured by the treaty of Berlin and that Lytton was for a forward policy on the NW. frontier, Hans. Parl. Deb. ccl. 50–61.

2 When he was to open a debate on Afghanistan with a motion for papers, ibid. 1021–97.

3 Not traced.
If the 'Empress' question raised in Parliament concerns more than a translator’s difficulty I am sorry the term was ever used. It savoured a little of brag, and brag is on the road to prestige, and prestige to jingo.

P.S. after receiving the papers
1. It seems odd that a man of Argyll's talent, loyalty, & very long experience in Cabinet should have given the Ameer a new title off his own bat.
2. I hope you will consider whether there should not be a very stout resistance to the Six Seats Bill. See the Four Seats Bill of 1852 though the cases certainly do not in all respects correspond, but in some.

174. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

Hawarden Castle. Feb. 18. 80.

Liverpool except upon the surface was bearable enough. Southwark is a disgrace as well as a defeat.

Affecting to have the 'Birmingham organisation' in play, and with (I believe) 2000 added to the constituency, they have brought to the poll, it would seem, fewer voters by 2000.

My opinion is that the Birmingham organisation is a good thing and goes straight to the root of the evils which afflict the Liberal party. But it is like a tonic good at a certain stage of recovery from disease, and inapplicable to other stages.

What I fear is that in Southwark (and in many other places) there has been engendered a counterfeit of the Birmingham organisation; that there is no real representation of the party, but that certain mobile sections of it get together, dub themselves representatives of Ward A, Ward B, and so on, send out circulars of which none but the quicksilver section take any notice, and then go through a mischievous farce in choosing candidates.

Such fears are much corroborated by observing the very large abstention in Southwark.

---

1 9 Feb.; for allegations that Argyll as secretary of state for India, 1868-74, addressed a tel. to the Indian government, referring to the Queen as Empress of India, and then opposed the Royal Titles bill, 1876; and reply that he had not opposed the bill and that the phrase translated into Persian 'supreme governor,' see Hans. Parl. Deb. ccl. 254-8.

2 The bill to redistribute the six seats freed by the disfranchisement, 1870, of Bridgewater, Beverley, Sligo, and Cashel (33 & 34 Vict., c. 21 and c. 38) was not introduced owing to the dissolution; for Gladstone's defeat, 10 Mar. 1852, of a proposal to redistribute four seats when St. Albans and Sudbury were disfranchised, also on the eve of a conservative dissolution, see Hans. Parl. Deb. cccxi. 434-66.

3 In the by-election caused by the death of the radical, John Locke, the liberal vote was split between two candidates; a conservative, Sir Edward Clarke, was returned as the second member; see The Times, 3 Feb., p. 10d; 16 Feb., p. 11a, 19 Feb. p. 6e; the liberals won the two seats in March.

4 See p. 44, n. 1 and nos. 115-17.
I think of seeking an interview with Chamberlain on this important subject.¹

I do not often pay much attention to anonymous letters, of which I receive a large number. But I think there is a good deal in the inclosure as to the general sentiment it expresses.

Do you know whether Mr Russell, now standing for Aylesbury, on whom Sir N. Rothschild has taken the first opportunity of throwing dirt, is a desirable Candidate?² Do not reply unless you chance to have knowledge in the case.

175. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone  
[Add. MS. 44172, fo. 16]

House of Lords. Feb 20 [1880].

Thanks for your letter. I agree generally about Southwark.

It is a great moral blow, & gives people the notion that we are the losing & not the winning party. But I doubt it being anything of a test.

Herschel went to speak for Dunn at one of his meetings, & said he was lamentable as a candidate, & evidently looked down upon by all present. The 200 behaved as foolishly as possible.

The Publicans is [sic] a serious difficulty for us. Their organization is complete.

Russell is a very respectable candidate a son of Lord Charles—But without tact—He attacked Dizzy as a Jew, a Jingo & something else beginning with a J.

He was told it would not conciliate Rothschild, so he went to the Conservative newspaper to beg that Jew might be changed into a fourth word beginning with a J—which the editor showed up.³

I hope to see you soon.

The Speaker thinks they mean to dissolve.⁴

¹ No interview, as far as can be discovered, was sought.
² George W. E. Russell, nephew of Lord Russell, son of Lord Charles Russell; captured Aylesbury's second seat at the general election and represented the borough with Sir N. M. Rothschild until, in 1885, the borough was absorbed in the single-member constituency of mid-Bucks. and represented by Ferdinand James de Rothschild.
³ See the conservative Bucks. Herald's report of Russell's summons to 'Liberals to unite against Jingoes, Jugglers and Jews' and editorial, 24 Jan., pp. 4g, 5g. The liberal Bucks. Advertiser, 24 Jan., p. 5b, omitted the passage and on 31 Jan. published a letter accusing the Herald of misreporting, p. 4d.
⁴ The cabinet decided, 14 Feb., against a dissolution, reversed its decision, 6 Mar., but the Queen's opening of parliament in person caused it to be unexpected; announced, 8 Mar., took place, 24 Mar.; see Monypenny and Buckle, vi. 511-14.
176. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

[P.R.O. 30/29/29 A]

H[arley] St. Mch 10. 80.

I made a serious mistake though perhaps the total effect is not worse. The report from Taylor was Govt to lose England 5 and the Irish 'of no good to any body' which I apprehend means a large loss.

177. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

[P.R.O. 30/29/29 A]

Dalkeith. Mch 19 [1880].

After speaking 1½ hour to many thousands1 I sit down on the platform to write a hasty line. Please to consider as well as you can whether I ought to make a struggle to come up & help Herbert for a day or so;2 & if so when. No time for more. Many thanks for all your kindness. Meetings here more enthusiastic than ever.

I don’t think the Tories here expect to win.

178. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

[Add. MS. 44172, fo. 19]

Keele Hall, Staffordshire. March 21 [1880].

I will telegraph 'yes' or 'no' to your question whether you should come to Middlesex—as soon as I get back to London.3 Your presence would create great enthusiasm & the only doubt is whether the name which Herbert (who is a real trump) bears is not sufficient to make all sound liberals vote, & whether your presence might not deter some of the pseudo liberals.

There is another important consideration, to which you would not pay much attention. Your strength is marvellous, but after all you are human, & there are limits to human powers of endurance.

We shall gain 2 in the Potteries, and one in the Northern division. Fanshawe4 is spending much against Freddy at Bodmin.

179. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

[Add. MS. 44172, fo. 22]

House of Lords. March 22 [1880].

I have only been a short time in town but I learn that all your friends think for various reasons that you had better not come south again before you are M.P. for Midlothian.

1 The second Midlothian campaign lasted from 16 Mar. to 2 Apr.
2 On 17 Mar. it was decided that Herbert Gladstone should contest Middlesex.
3 Cf. Granville to Gladstone, tel. 22 Mar., 'No. I write by post', Add. MS. 44172, fo. 21; and next letter.
4 Read Farquharson, see index.
The feeling everywhere seems good, but there are large classes going against us. Liberal country gentlemen, Jews & Catholics.

Your name was rec[eive]d in the Potteries with deafening cheers.

180. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville  

120 George Street, Edinburgh. March 26. 80.

I find the Middlesex polling day has been fixed at the same date as ours: has G. Hamilton¹ had a hand in this? for he has a finger in the Midlothian pie, and he may know by this time that our Tories here are sadly down in their expectations. Our people have not a doubt of winning.

I shall not suppose—unless I hear it—that this state of facts alters your opinion as to my coming to Middlesex next week. I do not think the journey need be a difficulty.

Rosebery has a desire that I should go & speak in Wigtonshire. Some friends there say it would act materially on four elections.

I do not believe this. I do not believe any of these speeches act materially at the moment in the place—though I believe they have a good deal of silent & slower effect on the tone of the public mind generally. Moreover I have never been as a stranger into a County, & do not like the precedent.

Moreover I think it might & would be resented as in excess, & might be turned against us.

In short my balance of mind is against it. On the other hand I feel that Rosebery’s wish is entitled to carry especially with me the greatest weight which any wish as such can carry—and on the whole I should be very glad of your opinion.

Rosebery has seen what I have written thus far. I must add a word about him. He is very decidedly a remarkable man, not a mere clever man: and is to be evidently the leader of the Liberal party in Scotland, & that in a sense beyond any, I should think, in which they have heretofore had a leader. From the first time I ever saw him I liked him & thought highly of him: but he has opened out upon me marvellously. I could heap many epithets upon him, & I must say upon her also: but the subject must keep until we meet.

181. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone  


Your conjecture about the day of the two great county elections is probably correct. George Hamilton is sharp enough, and up to any dodge.

I wrote yesterday to Rosebery about Wigtonshire.² He will probably tell you what I said.

¹ He had represented Middlesex since 1868, and was Herbert Gladstone’s opponent; polling date in Middlesex and Midlothian was Sat. 3 Apr.  
² Not traced.
Sir Walter James wrote to me¹ that Strafford was supposed to be hostile to Herbert. I wrote immediately to him, & he answered that every vote he could influence would be given to Herbert, but that he did not see how it was possible to pull down the 6000 majority which went against Enfield.²

I hope he does not take sufficiently into account the difference of Non conformists when lukewarm or when in earnest. I hear nothing but praise of Herbert.

Lubbock, & Shuttleworth are in some danger, & there are even doubts about Harcourt and Dilke. We shall gain several seats in Kent.³

All you say about Rosebery is very satisfactory. We certainly monopolize the ability of the Scotch Peerage.

Good luck.

182. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

[Add. MS. 44172, fo. 26]

Walmer Castle. April 5/80.

I have just received the bad news from Middlesex.⁴ It was too much to hope that such an enormous majority could be pulled down even as much as has been the case.

There are two things which please me—1° that you did not come to Middlesex—you would not have reversed the figures, & there would then have been something of a political and personal check. The 2d which really delights me, is that Herbert has woke, and like Lord Byron, has found himself famous. Your son in one short fortnight has placed himself on a position which it takes most men half their best years to attain.

There is no liberal constituency who would not like him as a candidate, & his success in politics is assured.

We hope to hear of your victory tonight.

183. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

[P.R.O. 30/29/29 A]


I received the Telegram,⁵ which you sent in your usual kind considerate

¹ Not traced.
² In 1874 Lord George Hamilton polled 10,343 and O. E. Coope 9,867 votes for the conservatives; Lord Enfield 5,623 and F. Lehmann 5,192 for the liberals, The Times, 6 Apr., p. 6a.
³ Lubbock lost Maidstone and sat for London University; Shuttleworth lost Hastings and had no seat until 1885; Harcourt was just returned for Oxford University, but was beaten when he sought re-election after appointment as home secretary; Dilke, despite the publicans' opposition, was returned with a good majority for Chelsea.
⁴ Herbert Gladstone, who polled 8,876 votes, was defeated by Hamilton with 12,904 votes and Coope with 12,328, on 3 Apr., poll declared, 5 Apr., The Times, 6 Apr., p. 6a.
⁵ Granville to Gladstone, tel. 6 Apr., congratulating him on his election for Midlothian, announced, 5 Apr. p.m., not traced.
way. At Dalmeny the pressure was great from the incessant rush of people, letters, Telegrams: but though great, I admit very soft and gentle. We have wonderfully few subjects of regret.

You will have seen my letter devised for the purpose of avoiding a tumultuous journey southwards. We kept our movements a strict secret and got here by a night journey quietly without our servants. There were only 200 or 300 suddenly gathered in Edinburgh, and at other places in the night a score or two. In the village of Hawarden Herbert is to have I believe a triumphant entry here tomorrow morning. He wanted to come by night but we have telegraphed to him to come by day. He must be victimised instead of us, for we disappointed, indeed cheated them this morning, and got quietly into our nest.

This will never do about a trial speech for Leeds! They are not bound in any way to him, but I have written in anticipation to show that he ought not to go there on trial. In this I cannot doubt you would agree. His youth may be a good reason for not taking him, it is none for his being put in a false position; after what he has done in Middlesex especially. I am very sorry for Rathbone’s defeat. He would have a good claim for Leeds: but they are not perhaps likely to take a Liverpool man. I must own to admiring Herbert’s speeches after his defeat very much. That is a severe test of a man as to his real pluck.

I have declined going to Worcestershire, in conformity with my son’s & Charles Lyttelton’s feelings—the Committee has considerately withdrawn the request.

I was greatly embarrassed about a ‘reception’ in London, which was made known only by newspapers & then by Telegram, and yet seemed impossible to dispose of by a sharp & sudden negative, which is what I should have wished. On the whole & till I heard more, I thought the best thing I could do was to come here instead of going to London & this I decided on accordingly.

The Lancashire people were very sanguine about the S.W. Division as I came through this morning. I think the failure, and the majority so much larger than that which beat me in 68 (only two hundred and odd), rather

1 See Gladstone to the electors of Midlothian, 5 Apr., announcing that he proposed ‘to desist from any further reference to his indictment . . . of the policy of the existing administration’, The Times, 6 Apr., p. 5e–f.

2 i.e. of Herbert Gladstone whom the Leeds liberal committee decided to adopt provided he satisfied it about his suitabilit; vacancy occurred because Leeds had elected Gladstone himself and Gladstone chose to sit for Midlothian.

3 i.e. in SW. Lancashire, 6 Apr., where R. A. Cross (11,420) and Col. Blackburne (10,905), conservatives, defeated Rathbone (9,666) and the Hon. H. Molyneux (9,027), The Times, 8 Apr., 6a; see from Rathbone, 9 Apr., thanking for commiseration, Add. MS. 44453, fo. 84; Rathbone was returned for Carnarvonshire, Dec. 1880.

4 E.g. at the City liberal club, 5 Apr., The Times, 6 Apr. p. 7d–e.

5 William Gladstone, elected with G. W. L. Hastings for E. Worcestershire, 12 Apr., thus gaining the two seats for the liberals, The Times, 14 Apr., p. 12a.
a blow to Derby. But two large R.C. proprietors1 which I had are now hostile or indifferent. I wait here for the present.

184. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone  
[Add. MS. 44172, fo. 28]  
Walmer Castle. April 7/80.  

I hear on first rate authority that Dizzy expected a majority of 20—(which tallies with what Barrington told me before the dissolution was Beresford’s opinion) and that Dalkeith would win by 500.  

What are your movements?

185. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville  
[P.R.O. 30/29/29 A]  

I am here, driven as into a harbour of refuge by my anxiety to escape the London reception and to escape it in a proper manner.  

To judge of this, under the circumstances, required being on the spot, and this was just what I could not be. I appointed Wolverton my Pleni-potentiary, without his leave: he has kindly undertaken it and will I have no doubt carry me through.  

Another difficulty is on my hands about my son Herbert at Leeds. He is invited to go and address their Four Hundred2 and though we are assured in what seems a credible way that he would certainly be taken yet, be it punctilio or what it may, I cannot stomach the notion of sending a young man, or any man, to speak on trial, as if he were in an examination at Oxford. It is quite another thing to retire if unacceptable. I would rather have had you at hand, than any man alive, to advise me on this delicate matter. If you think me over particular pray let me know. I have suggested to them that some of them might invite him as Candidate & then he would take his chance.  

I heard him for the first time on Thursday3 and was greatly pleased. His facility is remarkable. His temper is superlative; what shall I say? I think it is nearly as good as yours.  

I have no doubt about the Disraeli expectations. They agree with Taylor’s report to Knowles. Who, in this connection, is ‘Beresford’?4 Abergavenny I am told was quite misled.  

Dalkeith behaved like a gentleman through the fight:5 but showed temper in his farewell address.

1 i.e. Thomas Weld-Blundell of Ince Blundell and Lord Beaumont.  
2 Name given in the Birmingham electoral organization (see above, nos. 115–17, 174) and its imitations to the deliberative committee, which elected the small council or managing committee; for the proposed trial speech, see no. 183.  
3 On his arrival at Hawarden; see no. 183.  
4 Probably William Beresford, see index.  
5 In Midlothian, where he was Gladstone’s opponent; for farewell address, see The Times, 6 Apr., p. 5e.
I think Rosebery a very remarkable person: but have not time to talk about him. The post of this morning brought me 140 arrivals.

I conceive the losses of the Govt. will touch 100 seats.¹

The inclosed² is from Stillman well known as ‘Special Correspondent’. I have marked a part touching Crete and Cyprus which I fear may be too true.

We have fixed no time for going up;³ nor should we, I think, even if the ‘reception’ were disposed of: unless you should wish to see me and then I would at once arrange about our coming.

Who will now say ‘There is nothing new under the Sun’.

186. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

18, Carlton House Terrace. April 13/80.

I was late for the post yesterday, partly so from a conversation with Wolverton. He seems to have been useful to you, as he is always ready to be, about the triumphal reception.

Everybody without exception is pleased at your having taken the reasonable, dignified and nondiva[r]ci[li]sh⁴ course in the matter.

Wolverton told me that you were to see the Liberal chairman of Leeds. I have no doubt you will settle about Herbert. I should be sorry, if he lost this chance.

I am glad you come up on Friday. I return here on that day.

The inference from a note of Lord Cairns about appeals in the H. of Lords, would be that they do not mean to resign at once,⁵ but this may have been done on purpose.

Hartington, Wolverton and the successful Adam are all gone, to come back again at the end of the week.

187. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Walmer Castle. April 15/80.

It is monotonous wishing you joy (though I suspect these bye elections touch you more to the quick even than Midlothian) & I should not do so, if I were not sorry to hear you will not be in town tomorrow.

¹ When the elections ended, 27 Apr., the position of the two parties was reversed, except for 8 seats won by the Irish home rulers: conservatives 240 (from 350); liberals 347 (from 245).
² Not traced.
³ Gladstone went to London, Mon. 19 Apr., not Fri. 16 Apr., as suggested in no. 186; cf. nos. 187, 188.
⁴ A concocted word. O.E.D. gives: Divaricate 1. to stretch or spread apart; to branch off or diverge from each other or any middle line . . . .
⁵ For the cabinet’s decision, 14 Apr., to resign at once without meeting parliament, see Monypenny and Buckle, vi. 536.
188. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

18, Carlton House Terrace. April 17/80.

You are a rural profligate. I sympathize with your tastes, but deplore your morals.

Seriously, you ought to be in town on Monday.

Wolverton came back yesterday.

189. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville


Notwithstanding the inhibition in the postscript I send this note for your eye also. This is the age of chivalry still, of true chivalry. Determine for me, referring however to Hartington also (without the inclosure) whether I shall try again.

190. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

Ap 29. 80. midnight.

Russia.

I propose a slight addition.

Austria

I think generally excellent.

1 Granville to Gladstone, 22 Apr., enclosing FitzWilliam to Granville, requesting office, with comment that it was not worth reading, Add. MS. 44172, fo. 35, not printed.

2 Beaconsfield resigned, 21 Apr.; the Queen summoned Hartington who declined to form a government, 22 Apr., and confirmed his refusal, when Gladstone refused to serve under him, 23 Apr.; the Queen summoned Gladstone, on Granville's and Hartington's advice, and appointed him First Lord of the Treasury and chancellor of the exchequer, evening, 23 Apr.; cf. Ponsonby to Granville, 23 Apr., on 'frank but not painful' communication between the Queen and Gladstone, P.R.O. 30/29/37.

3 From Harcourt, 24 Apr., conveying Dilke's refusal to be foreign under-secretary, unless Chamberlain was in the cabinet, not traced; cf. Hartington to Granville, proposing Chamberlain for the Board of Trade with the cabinet, and Gladstone to Hartington agreeing to this which Chamberlain accepted, 27 Apr., P.R.O. 30/29/131; see also S. Gwynn and G. M. Tuckwell, The Life of . . . Sir Charles W. Dilke (1917) i. 306-9.

4 Part printed, Fitzmaurice, ii. 205.

5 See to Dufferin, No. 172 confidential, 30 Apr., urging friendly relations and the execution of the unfulfilled clauses of the treaty of Berlin, without Gladstone's addition, F.O. 65/1076.

6 See to Elliot, No. 187 confidential, 30 Apr., recording that Gladstone would discuss Austria's 'misapprehension' of his views and Karolyi repudiate for Austria any wish for Balkan territory, F.O. 7/985; for Emperor's observation that Gladstone's return to power would endanger Anglo-Austrian friendship, see Elliot to Salisbury, 8 Jan., 22 Mar., F.O. 7/988 and 989; for Gladstone's denunciation of Austria at Edinburgh, 17 Mar., The Times, 18 Mar., p. 11b, Fitzmaurice, ii. 200-7; for exchange of notes between Gladstone and Karolyi, 1, 4 May, G. P. Gooch and H. Temperley, British Documents on the Origins of the War (1933) ix. 773-4; Add. MS. 44464, fos. 10, 46.
But

1. I do not think I can, at present, volunteer a declaration.

The Austrian official press has interfered between English parties.

The Austrian Emperor has been stated to have done the same, in a published statement (Standard) which must have been known at Vienna, especially at the English Embassy—and which was never contradicted.

The aggressive views imputed to Austria are believed to have been encouraged by Lord Salisbury.

Much 'good indignation' has been bestowed upon me but not (as far as I know) one word vouchsafed disclaiming these aggressive views.

From independent quarters I receive assurances that I did not (when a private person) speak too much or too soon.

In all that you say affirmatively for the Govt I concur.

2. I would propose to read 'and that if another Power entertained ambitious views I hoped the near presence of Austria as a power without such views might be able to check them,' or something of that kind.

I do not see why a distinction is to be taken between the 2 Powers, both of which as matters stand should it seems to me be viewed with vigilance in the interests of the one only sound principle—the local liberty of the populations.

See the drafts respectively.

191. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

18, Carlton House Terrace, April 29 [1880].

I appealed indignantly to my wife, whether my note was not clear—but she thinks it is not more so than ditch water.

Please submit Lansdowne’s name to the Queen—and ask Cowper, I do not know whether he will accept.

Carlingford will not go to Constantinople. It is unlucky that the announcement has been made in the Times.

And the announcement of Cork is premature.

I see no objection to your plumping for Kenmare.

1 Granville to Gladstone, 27 Apr., enclosing Carlingford’s refusal of the lord lieutenancy of Ireland, and expressing Hartington’s, Forster’s, Ripon’s, Wolverton’s, and his own pleasure at it, Add. MS. 44172, fo. 36, not printed.

2 Not traced.

3 Lansdowne was named under-secretary for India; Cowper was offered, 29 Apr., lord lieutenancy of Ireland, which he accepted, Add. MS. 44463, fos. 260, 262.

4 Cf. nos. 1384, 1386.

5 Offered mastership of the buckhounds, 1 May, and accepted, 3 May, Add. MS. 44464, fos. 5, 36.

6 Offered and accepted lord chamberlainship of the household, 29 Apr., Add. MS. 44463, fo. 273.
Stansfeld is an honorable man, and will I expect act up to his word. What are your plans for the day. I go to the House of Lords at 1.45. Do you want me?

192. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

[P.R.O. 30/29/29 A]
Harley St. May 2. 80.

Instead of pressing C[arlingford] which I think was a decided mistake—and really the practice of pressing by those who have not primary connaissance de cause is a great mistake—I should have been disposed to press Goschen: whose reasons appeared to me very weak.

Monck may be newer to the subject matter even than C. but he is a very sound & a strong man—who has done extremely well whenever tried.

Is there not a question whether the ‘Extraordinary’ may not finally carry the Ordinary in its train without leaving any liberty of choice?

Blachford has I suppose the proper substance but not the circumstantial accompaniments.

It sometimes crosses me what is to be done with Harcourt if he lose his seat & after a time does not get another? As was my case when Sec. of State in 1846.

[P.S.] I send a draft for your free consideratio. Although I have taken pains with it, it may probably be very bad.

Also a Telegram.

193. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

[P.R.O. 30/29/123]
May 4. 80.

I have despatched the letter to Karolyi despite Elliot’s Telegram of yesterday: for I fully believe in Karolyi’s sincerity. But the Telegram is very bad: and it suggests to me whether a question might not properly be put to Haymerle in what way he proposes to give effect to the provisions of the Treaty of Berlin respecting the frontier of Montenegro.

1 See Gladstone to Stansfeld, 25 Apr., offering the deputy speakership; and Stansfeld to Gladstone, declining, because of other work but promising support to the government, Add. MS. 44463, fos. 195 and 281.

2 i.e. to take the Constantinople embassy; see Goschen to Granville, Sun. [25 Apr.], declining, on the ground that he needed to nurse his constituency, P.R.O. 30/29/180; for later appointment as ambassador extraordinary, see no. 195.

3 See above, no. 181; after his defeat at Oxford he found a seat at Derby.

4 i.e. of circular dispatch, to Lyons, No. 452, Russell, No. 183, Elliot, No. 195, Paget, No. 195, Dufferin, No. 176, 4 May, proposing an identical note summoning Turkey to fulfil the treaty of Berlin, F.O. 65/1076.

5 See p. 121, n. 6, and Elliot to Granville, tel. 47, 3 May, reporting Haymerle’s wish to delay action for the fulfilment of the Montenegrin clauses of the treaty of Berlin, F.O. 7/998.

6 See Granville to Elliot, No. 220 secret, 8 May, referring to tel. 47 and recording this question put to Karolyi, F.O. 7/985.
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If the Turks summon their Chambers, ought they not to remove some of the hideous anomalies of which Salisbury wrote such a scathing exposure?

194. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville [Add. MS. 44544, fo. 3] [Copy] [4 May 1880.]

I have never yet seen my way to reduction\(^1\) below 1/=, or to an uniform rate.

*At present we have not a sixpence to give away.*

I do not like bargaining away revenues for Treaties, or buying over again from France what has been bought already, if the matter is to be considered as founded on this basis at all.

In my view the Treaty of '60 was expentional; it was as to form an accommodation to the exigencies of the French Emperor's position. *We never proposed to be exchanging concessions, but only allowed him to say he had done it.*

I am of course open to argument, but must say, as at present advised that I see but very little room for what is called negotiating a commercial treaty.

195. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone [Add. MS. 44172, fo. 49]

18, Carlton House Terrace. May 4/80.

Edmund [sic] Fitzmaurice accepts.\(^2\)

Goschen will call on you to accept. Remember that my interview with him was to sound him, not to offer the post from you. Please offer him the post having been told by me, that he was likely to accept.

196. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone [Add. MS. 44172, fo. 50]

18, Carlton House Terrace. May 4/80.

I believe Carrington & Dunraven refuse Lordships in waiting, & possibly Ilchester.

I suppose you give the choice of Clarendon[, Zetland, Listowell [sic],

Lyttelton, & Sandhurst.\(^3\)

\(^1\) i.e. of the wine duties, to be lowered in the budget; see also no. 207 and p. 132, n. 3, and p. 133, n. 1.

\(^2\) Appointment *vice* Drummond Wolff to the European Commission for E. Rumelia, which after the promulgation of the E. Rumelian constitution, 27 Apr., had been re-organized to frame organic laws for other parts of European Turkey under article xxiii of the Berlin treaty.

\(^3\) Listowel, Methuen, Ribblesdale, Sudeley, Torrington, Wrottesley, Zetland were appointed, 10 May, and Enfield added, 20 May; Carrington, Ilchester, Dunraven, and Clarendon refused offers; Carrington made a groom-in-waiting.
I think you had better see this communication, with all the effusion that marks its various points. The proposition is a serious one. It is I suppose very desirable that we sh[ould]d at length secure some official channel in the East of Europe, thro' wh[ich] we can become responsibly informed as to feeling on the Slavonian side—but the appointment of Mr. Evans at Ragusa w[ould]d doubtless be a measure.

I send the inclosed outline to start the subject of a possible modus vivendi with Russia—there is nothing in it about Merv, nor was there so far as I recollect in the original ‘understanding’. And our moral position with respect to it is altered for the worse since we for our part began to cut and carve Afghanistan.

I was obliged to allot the Cabinet to 4 in consequence of a command to B. Palace at 3.30.

Dufferin’s letter of the 5th is admirable. I suppose we may in dealing with Russia now encourage their minimising military questions as we on our side must desire it for ourselves.

Enclosure

Copy. Most Private.

1. That neither country has any desire to extend its present possessions.
2. That any proceedings which either may take beyond its frontier will be limited by the necessities of peace and order; of which necessities each must for itself remain the judge.
3. That both countries desire the independence, as well as the peace, of the states and districts lying on their respective frontiers in Turkestan & India.
4. That Russia renounces the exercise of influence in Afghanistan, and England in like manner renounces the exercise of influence in the states beyond the Oxus and among the Turcoman tribes.

1 Untraced; for Evans’s difficulties with the Austrian government which would have rendered his appointment a hostile measure, see p. 420, n. 1.

2 Drafted as a reply to Russia’s overture for a closer understanding, see Granville’s mem. of conversation with Lobanov, 30 Apr., P.R.O. 30/29/143; discussed in the first cabinet meeting of the new government, 3 May, see Add. MS. 44642, fo. 2; for modus vivendi, drafted by Hartington, see also P.R.O. 30/29/143.


4 To Granville, No. 199 confidential, 5 May, recounting the language of Kalnoky about Austria’s preference for co-operation with Britain to alliance with Russia, F.O. 65/1080.
5. That the northern boundary of Afghanistan remains understood as in 1873.

6. That both Russia and England desire to respect & maintain the independence of Persia.

199. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone [P.R.O. 30/29/143]


I like your sketch, and think that it is a reasonable arrangement between the two countries. But I do not know the answer to the following questions—

a. What are our present possessions? (Cabul, Candahar etc.)
b. Are we both to leave Herat to take care of itself.
c. How are we to deal with the threatened attack upon Merv which does not really signify much, which is not contrary to the letter, but rather to the spirit of the Clarendon Granville agreement¹ and which would greatly excite public opinion here.

Query whether we could say that we exact no pledge about Merv, but that if Russia attacks it, it will [show] a want of those ‘procedés’ to which Lobanoff attaches importance on both sides, & may lead to a very disagreeable state of feeling |

Is there much use in number 2.

200. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville [P.R.O. 30/29/143]

Private. 10, Downing Street. May 12. 80.

(a) Our possessions in Afghanistan are I suppose only military occupations, from which we desire to retire as soon as our duty to Afghanistan itself permits us. We wish I apprehend for no possessions beyond what we have.

The new frontier I understand has never been defined & I suppose it will remain for consideration whether it ever should be defined.

Our desire to establish an independent substantive Afghanistan includes the essence of this answer so far as the case admits one?

(b) In like manner with regard to Herat, what we want is, I suppose, that it should remain part of Afghanistan & accordingly we wish to keep the old frontier to the north.

(c) Have the late Govt recorded any warnings to Russia about Merv?²

¹ For Clarendon’s agreement of 1869, see Parl. papers (1873) lxxv. 727–8; for Granville’s agreement of 1873, see ibid., pp. 690–711 and Gladstone and Granville, ii, no. 810 and note; cf. p. 78, n. 1.

² Marginal comment here by Granville: ‘Yes.’
Was it ever threatened by Russia during their term of office, notably last year?

Can we go far in warning Russia as to Merv, without receiving warnings, or expecting them, as to Afghanistan?

201. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

10, Downing Street. May 12. 80.

I am not quite sure to what words of mine Sir H. Layard refers in his very interesting letter of the 4th. I think they alluded to him in conjunction with Sir H. Elliot and as in the same category. Whatever they were, they had for their foundation a passage in one of Sir H. Layard's published dispatches in which according to my recollection it was stated that in the last resort to prevent the fall of Turkey England would for her own interests have to interfere. I write from memory only: but you will see at once the point of junction between this recollection of mine and Sir H. Layard's statement. I never supposed we had given it to be understood that we should interfere on any other ground.

202. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Foreign Office. May 13/80.

All that you propose to say I concur in, and think very good to be told to Musurus, though I am afraid he will not report it. Is it not a little early to speak of Tribute. Lowe's answer is very like himself—I suppose we

---

1 For outcome see mem. by Granville, circulated to the cabinet, combining no. 198 with Hartington's proposal of a Russian pledge not to communicate with Afghanistan except through Britain; mins. from several members of the cabinet against, P.R.O. 30/29/143; no reply was based on the mem. but Dufferin was told to confirm anything friendly said by Lobanov, and, 24 May, to mark letters about improving Anglo-Russian relations 'personal' to avoid their being sent to the Queen, P.R.O. 30/29/209.

2 To Granville, private, correcting Gladstone's error that 'I encouraged the Turks to persevere in the war against Russia', 1877–8, in the hope of British support, Layard papers, Add. MS. 39132; Salisbury had drawn his attention to Gladstone's statements, Layard to Salisbury, 31 Mar., ibid.

3 i.e. Layard to Derby, 30 May 1877, Parl. papers (1877) xcii. 374.

4 See mem. of Gladstone's proposed language to Musurus Pasha, original undated, warning Turkey against expecting British aid in the last resort, P.R.O. 30/29/123; printed Temperley and Penson, Foundations, 398, and misdated 23 May; cf. Granville to Goschen, No. 47 confidential, 3 June, enclosing the mem. as record of Gladstone's conversation with Musurus Pasha, 14 May, F.O. 78/3074.

5 To Gladstone, 13 May, declining the unpaid headship of the civil service commission, because if there was work it should be paid and he had accepted Gladstone's view, on the formation of the government, that he was too old for office, Add. MS. 44302, fo. 198; cf. notes exchanged between Gladstone and Granville in the cabinet, 12 May, agreeing to make the offer, Add. MS. 44642, fo. 10; Dasent was a commissioner under Ryan, 1870–5, and with Walrond after Ryan died; Enfield was appointed unpaid head, May 1880.
I ought to have anticipated it—but it is unlucky as the matter is rather difficult to deal with—Dasent says that Walrond does not encroach upon his duties as Commissioner, but that he does encroach upon the duties of the secretary corresponding with the Treasury etc etc, which makes the latter believe that he is the sole commissioner. He adds that in your letter to him (Dasent), it was held out as an inducement to accept the office, that Ryan was old, & would not retain the first place long.

Of course Walrond may have another story to tell.

203. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

Please to send me the Musurus Memorandum.

I will keep within it—

The case with Lowe is a little hard. It was the awkward arrangement which he made (I deferring to him on account of his great work & service[)] which made Lingen think a third man shd be appointed as head.

204. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

I forgot to mention a point.

The Speaker opened it to me last night: and it has often been on my own mind, to say something about the three continuous cases of Resignations in 68, 74, & 80 without any vote of Parliament: not to blame any one in the slightest degree, but to point out that they are only to be justified by their peculiar circumstances & that the normal mode, wherever the public interest permits it, is to take the sense of Parl as in 1841 & 1859. This I think of doing.²

205. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

This letter from Dr Washbourne³ is important and raises matter for consideration. An attempt to precipitate the union of B[ulgaria] with E[astern] R[oumelia] would in the present state of things be most dangerous. What I should like first to inquire would be whether there were any

¹ Lowe himself, while chancellor of the exchequer.
² See Gladstone's speech in the debate on the address, arguing that this proceeding was justified to prevent a shortening of the parliamentary session, but hoping that the more strictly constitutional course would be resumed, Hans. Parl. Deb. cclii. 147.
³ Dr. Washburn, Robert College, Constantinople, to Forster, forwarded in Forster to Gladstone, 21 May, Add. MS. 44158, fo. 8; Michell was transferred from Phillipopolis to Oslo (then Christiania), 4 Nov.
means of possibly inducing Turkey to view such a change, or such a
development, with good will. I conclude we should view with displeasure
any such attempt as Dr. W. mentions to bring it about by force—Could
he be useful in averting this?

I think there is great force in his observations about Mitchell [sic] &
that it would be very desirable to effect a change.

[P.S.] Please to read Otway's letter to Bright1—and let us speak on it.
What was the actual cause of his leaving the F.O.?2

Cogan is an Irish P.C.

206. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

18, Carlton House Terrace. May 22/80.

I entirely agree that it is desirable and probable that the Union be made.
But it would be a most unfortunate complication that any attempt
should be made at present—and I should think that it would be very danger-
ous even to sound the Porte at present, respecting anything but the fulfil-
ment of the conditions of the Treaty of Berlin.

It is possible that if the project of abrogating the Anglo Turkish Con-
vention makes any progress,3 that might put the Porte in such good humour,
as to enable us to do more.

I hope Forster will ask his correspondent to use his influence to keep
the Bulgarians & Roumelians quiet.4

I have already given Michell leave of absence, & announced sending
another secretary to perform his duties.

207. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

10, Downing Street. May 24. 80.

The fuss that the Portuguese make about their miserable little market
recalls the 'tempest in the tea-kettle': I do not see how if Wine is to be
handled fiscally it is possible to keep our operations depending for the

1 A complaint that he had not been given office; cf. Gladstone to Bright, 23 May,
explaining that Otway was at a disadvantage in leaving a government so early in his
career and now, having once served, only being eligible for high office, Add. MS. 44544,
fo. 11.

2 i.e. in Dec. 1870, ostensibly because of British policy over the abrogation of the Black
Sea clauses of the treaty of Paris, but Granville was not sorry to see him go, Gladstone
and Granville, i, nos. 379, 414, 426, 433.

3 Draft instruction to Goschen to propose to Turkey to buy 'the fee simple of Cyprus'
and to abrogate the convention of 4 June 1878 (see p. 71, n. 3, and no. 110) was put before
the under-secretaries, Tenterden and Dilke, for comment, 22 May, P.R.O. 30/29/143;
for further progress see no. 208, and p. 134, n. 1.

4 See Gladstone to Forster, 22 May, returning Washburn's letter and quoting
Granville's comments, Add. MS. 44544, fo. 10.
details of a negotiation with Portugal: but I should be glad to know by Telegraph from Mr Morier what are the limits of alcoholic strength within which it is that Portugal thinks herself to have a special interest in the matter.¹

(I think the mode of arranging the Wine Scale proposed in Mr Morier’s letter on the part of the Portuguese inadmissible).²

208. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

I have made one or two suggestions as to wording on the margin of the draft,³ & I add on this sheet one or two suggestions. But the whole subject is so large & thorny, that I w[oul]d be glad if, before anything very definitive is written we were put in possession of a general sketch of the transactions up to this time as to Reforms in Asiatic Turkey, & if we had the report wh[ich] Baker Pasha, of evil name but I suppose adequate capacity, is to make.

This w[oul]d not prevent the transmission to Goschen of ideas wh[ich] might guide him in conversation, but query whether we can yet authorize him to speak in a binding form.

Enclosure

Suggestions on Draft Despatch

1. I do not feel sure that the transfer of the Fee is a necessary preliminary to the negotiation of a loan.

2. A small number of years’ purchase of the revenue payable w[oul]d probably be accepted by the Sultan.

3. With regard to particular reforms, are they not one & all illusory unless & until the administrative link with Constantinople is broken by the appointment of Pachas irremovable at least for a term of years.

209. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

Musurus Bey has shewn me the Telegram⁴ which he will carry to you & perhaps you will kindly send a joint reply⁵ if you think fit.

¹ No. 207 is marked ‘done’ by Granville; see to Morier, No. 11 commercial, 25 May, traced only in confidential print, ‘Commercial Relations between Portugal and Great Britain 1880–81’; and reply, tel. 26 May, proposing to lower the duty on wines up to 36° of alcoholic content to the 1s. duty paid by those up to 26°, F.O. 63/1095.

² See to Granville, No. 22 commercial, 17 May, proposing a reclassification of the wine duties so that a conflict of negotiations, if those with France were reopened, might be avoided, F.O. 63/1095; most-favoured-nation treatment was gained from Portugal, 22 May 1882, but no budget of this administration altered the wine duties.

³ i.e. of instructions to Goschen on Cyprus, see p. 129, n. 3, and p. 134, n. 1.

⁴ ⁵ Footnotes on next page.
210. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

10, Downing Street. May 31. 80.

There was a discussion, or a series of discussions on the Secret Service Vote last week, which we got through without scandal: but I think it looked ill for the future. Forster made a kind of promise to look into the question for Ireland, as he could fairly plead that since taking office he had not had the matter under his notice. This averted a division on the principle.

It may seem ridiculous, but it is a positive fact that in this my twelfth Parliament & after twenty years of office I have never had any such knowledge of secret service as to enable me to form any original judgment whatever on the question of its necessity.

I assume its necessity however, in regard to foreign States: I am not so sure of it with regard to the United Kingdom & the Empire.

However it would not surprise me if there were an outbreak in a future year & perchance a refusal of the Vote in some thin House.

It appears to me not beyond the bounds of consideration whether we might substitute, for the Vote in anticipation, a system of payment out of Civil Contingencies, to be subsequently ratified by a vote upon the actual amount which had been found needful.

You may remember that there is another sum of £10000 per ann. charged to the Consolidated Fund. This under the Aberdeen Government I wanted to put upon the Votes; but the Cabinet would not agree.

Nothing is required at present, but I mention the subject as new Estimates will be prepared towards the close of the year.

211. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone


I shall be very glad to talk over the S.S. question with you.

I do not see the advantage of spending the money first, and going to Parliament afterwards.

4 Musurus Pasha (recalled to Constantinople in view of Goschen's arrival there) to Musurus Bey, his son and chargé d'affaires in London, announcing the sultan's satisfaction with British policy and intention to co-operate in the execution of the treaty of Berlin, F.O. 78/3165.

5 See to Goschen, tel. No. 18, 1 June, reporting that Musurus Bey had been asked to express respectful thanks to the sultan on Gladstone's and his behalf, F.O. 78/3102.

1 See debate in committee of supply, 28 May, on the vote of £17,200 for 'Foreign and other Secret Services', when the Irish members asked how much was spent in Ireland and a general discussion developed, Hans. Parl. Deb. cclii. 671-700.

2 For Forster's speech, 28 May, see ibid. 678-79.

3 Gladstone's proposal was disliked by Tenterden and dropped; see mem., P.R.O. 30/20/123.

4 Under Burke's Civil Establishment Act of 1782; paid out of the Civil List to the Treasury for political purposes; abolished by Lord Randolph Churchill in Oct. 1886.
The present system is good as far as convenience and secrecy go.
In the nature of the thing there may be an abuse, but I do not see how
it is possible to provide any Parliamentary check upon it. I see that last
year the whole sum\(^1\) was spent, but this is rarely the case. The remainder
is returned to the Exchequer.

212. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

[Add. MS. 44172, fo. 65]

You will see\(^2\) that the majority of the Cabinet are very hot against the
Anglo Turkish Convention.
There is no great antagonism excepting between your view for moving
rather slowly, and the opposite one for clinching the nail as soon as possible,
and between the opinion of Hartington, that we should not appear to
admit the possibility of Russia being allowed to advance and of the other
line held by some that we commit ourselves too much to a warlike policy.

I began to have some doubts, about a point which all seem to approve
viz, the tenure of the island of Cyprus—

I will speak to you before the Cabinet, as the matter had better be
settled.

213. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

[Add. MS. 44172, fo. 67]
18, Carlton House Terrace. June 7/80.

I have sent your answer to M. Say’s vague no 4.\(^3\) I suspect it will puzzle
him how to rejoin. He is evidently instructed to dance on the edge of a
razor, which for a person of his ample proportions is difficult.

I gather from him that the Govt are sincerely desirous to reduce the
duties on some of our products, especially iron & cottons, but that they
are afraid of using expressions which may shock the polite ears of pro-
tectionists, and which may tie them down to accept a treaty which may be
rejected by the chambers.

But we shall see what he replies.

In the meanwhile how much may I say to a deputation of the amalga-
mated Chambers of Commerce, who come to see me tomorrow afternoon,
about the Treaty with France.\(^4\)

\(^1\) £15,000.
\(^2\) i.e. from mins. on the draft instruction to Goschen on Cyprus, see p. 129, n. 3,
and p. 134, n. 1; circulated to the cabinet on 27 May and a later date, P.R.O. 30/29/143.
\(^3\) i.e. the amelioration of the status quo in the direction of the development of trade;
last of four bases proposed by Léon Say to reopen the commercial negotiations; see
Granville to Léon Say, 8 June, that this could only mean a reduction of duties on British
manufactures, F.O. 27/2470; see nos. 194, 223, 292, 489.
\(^4\) For list of deputations and mem. by Charles Kennedy, 8 June, on their possible
views about a commercial treaty with France to replace those of 1860 and 1873, see
F.O. 27/2470.
214. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

House of Commons. 7 June 80.

It would be much more easy for you to speak freely to the Chambers of Commerce after Thursday.¹ But I suppose you may tell them that we have said to France we are not disinclined to alter considerably our duties on wine in the sense of reduction if they are able to meet us on their side in a satisfactory manner.²

215. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

House of Commons. June 7. 80.

Shall I answer that part of H.M.s letter which relates to the H[ouse] of C[ommons]?³

If so please to send me a copy of so much of it.

216. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Foreign Office. [7 June 1880].

Considering that so large a portion, including the Queen and Prince [Leopold], of those few who have seen the instructions to Goschen have hit what seemed to them a blot as to ‘careful abstinence from menace’⁴ it might be as well to let it run

‘present careful abstinence from menace’.

Do you object?⁵

217. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville


Besides a couple of merely verbal notes in pencil on the Convention draft, there is a serious point on which I am anxious to be quite safe.

¹ i.e. 10 June, when Gladstone was to make his budget statement and propose a lowering of the wine duty from 1s. to 6d. a gallon on the light wines imported from France (20° alcoholic content) and the revision of the scale of duties from between 20° and 35° and above 36°, Hans. Parl. Deb. cclii. 1629, 1708–9; proposal dropped.
² i.e. by reducing duties on British manufactures; no. 214 repeated the gist of Granville’s reply of 8 June to the French overture.
³ See to Granville, 5 June, complaining of the meddling and interfering of the Commons and urging that Gladstone should curb questions, P.R.O. 30/29/31; and Gladstone’s reply, undated, Letters, iii. 107–10.
⁴ See the Queen to Granville, 5 May, commenting on Granville to Layard, No. 187, 30 Apr. (F.O. 78/3073) that the phrase weakened the assertion that Britain would adhere to her intentions; reply 8 June, reporting the addition of the word ‘present’ to the phrase when used in Granville to Goschen, No. 1, 18 May (F.O. 78/3074); both letters, P.R.O. 30/29/37; and further letters, 10 June, P.R.O. 30/29/31.
⁵ Marked by Gladstone ‘no’ and returned.
Can we safely give up the stipulations on behalf of the subjects of the Porte throughout Asia upon consideration of Art. 61 Berlin for Armenia & the Sultan's will and intention for reform?

Ought not this to be covered by some reference however general to the concern which we felt after the Treaty of Paris for all the subjects of the Ottoman Empire, so as not to renounce such general rights as belong to civilised Powers to take cognisance in extreme cases of misgovernment & misery?

This is a matter of delicacy as well as weight and I am not suggesting any particular form of expression.

This is the only point I have to raise.1 The letter to the Q[ueen] I think excellent.2

218. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

[P.R.O. 30/29/123]

10, Downing Street. June 10. 80.

My words in the House of Commons have not in any way indicated a collective inquiry in E Roumelia & Bulgaria, so that we are quite free;3 & I can conceive that such an inquiry might seem like the setting up of a separate authority & might shake a young & feeble government.

But the language of Novikoff, reported by Goschen (who replied so well) appears very unsatisfactory.4

I would do every thing to spare the reputation of the local Government in the face of its subjects but I think that as our friendship to the Sultan is conditional upon the relief of his subjects from misgovernment, so we ought to make known to the rulers of the emancipated Provinces that our friendship and sympathy with them is contingent upon their making effective arrangements for defending the rights of the minorities, & that the want of such arrangements may form an insurmountable bar to the extension of liberal institutions in Turkey.5

1 This reference was inserted in the 5th paragraph from the end of the instruction to Goschen on Cyprus, No. 71 very confidential, 10 June, F.O. 78/3074, printed, Temperley and Penson, Foundations, 400-5; for mins. and drafts, suggesting that Granville rather than Gladstone resisted the pressure for a denunciation of the Anglo-Turkish convention, see P.R.O. 30/29/143. Cyprus was transferred from the F.O. to the C.O., but no change in its status took place.

2 i.e. from Granville, 9 June, explaining that the intention of the draft to Goschen on Cyprus was to release Britain from the obligation to defend Turkey under the Anglo-Turkish convention, P.R.O. 30/20/37, Letters, iii. 111-12.

3 See answer to Ashmead Bartlett, 27 May, that Goschen had been instructed to send someone to investigate allegations of ill-treatment of Moslems in Bulgaria and E. Rumelia, Hans. Parl. Deb. ccli. 531; see also Granville to Goschen, No. 5, 18 May, F.O. 78/3074.

4 See to Granville, No. 6, 31 May, reporting Novikov's cynicism about the inquiry, F.O. 78/3087; to Granville, private and confidential, 1 June, the postscript, drawing fresh attention to this cynicism, P.R.O. 30/29/188.

219. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville


What a singular light letters¹ of this kind throw on recent associations and experience.
The level of intelligence is certainly not raised.

220. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

18, Carlton House Terrace. June 14/80.

I have written to Argyll² in the sense which is most likely to influence him. If you want me at one o'clock, I shall be at Carlton H[ouse] Terrace.

221. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

10, Downing Street. June 17. 80.

I propose to reply to Mr Gibbs³ in conformity with Selborne's opinion but I wish you to see the papers and judge of them.⁴

222. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

10, Downing Street. June 17. 80.

I do not know whether the Foreign Office has a fixed & readily available tradition on the meaning of the word 'mediation': but it may be worth while to mention that I have a recollection of an exposition by Lord Palmerston on the subject and of a broad distinction which he drew between mediation, and good offices, to which the Turks seek to reduce it.⁵

¹ See the Queen to Gladstone, 11 June, objecting to his budget proposals and referring to offensive criticism in the Commons, *Letters*, iii. 113–15.
² See copy, 14 June, arguing against Argyll's proposal to resign because he could not share responsibility for the Compensation for Disturbance (Ireland) bill adopted by the cabinet, Sat. 12 June, P.R.O. 30/29/148; Argyll withdrew his resignation.
³ See to Gladstone, 13 June, seeking government support for a private bill to create a cathedral chapter at St. Albans, Add. MS. 44464, fo. 246; Selborne to Gladstone, 16 June, agreed as long as the endowment was made out of private funds, but said an act of parliament would be necessary, Add. MS. 44297, fo. 49; and no. 225.
⁴ Granville wrote: 'I have no objection to make but I have never considered these questions.'
⁵ See Goschen to Granville, tel. No. 43, received 11 a.m., 16 June, summarizing the Turkish answer to the European summons, 13 June, to fulfil the outstanding terms of the Berlin treaty and reporting that on the Greek frontier question Turkey was ready to accept the mediation of the powers, but could not allow them to 'decide' or 'judge', only to examine, recommend, and discuss, F.O. 78/3105; see also mem. by Tenterden, 19 June, on the difference between mediation and good offices, P.R.O. 30/29/361.
I rather think it was in the Greek business of 1850 when we accepted the good offices of France.

Arbitration is as I understand compulsory but is founded on the invitation of the parties. Between this and good offices, there is room for an authoritative definition of mediation.

Do not forget the money at the proper moment.¹

223. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville  
[Add. MS. 44172, fo. 72]  
[Copy]  
10, Downing Street. June 17, 1880.

M. Leon Say was supplied with a copy of the proposal respecting the Wine Duties, to which Parliament has given a preliminary but not a final sanction.² The proposal will have to be accompanied with some collateral provisions; & its form may be subject in certain respects to change.

1. It would be necessary to provide for a contingent power of raising the duties on Wine in the Event of our finding it necessary to raise the duties of Excise upon other alcoholic liquors with which Wine competes; but only in a just proportion to such increase. This proportion might be fixed by a ratio between the duty on wine at 20% & the duty on the alcohol in Beer of the standard specific gravity & on spirits per gallon.

2. We take power in the Bill³ to exercise the power conferred on the Crown as to Wine up to 20%, without exercising it for the upper part of the scale; & vice versa.

3. We are desirous to have the best information about bottled wine that we may run no risk of putting the trade out of any natural channel. I do not think that the analogy stated in M. Say’s letter of June 12 is perfect; but I think we should be disposed to accede to his proposition that 25/- per gallon should be stated as a maximum charge.⁴

4. The mode of charging the wine by a scale varying with single degrees as we have taken it is I think in principle the best. But it is as yet doubtful whether we shall have to consult the convenience of the trade by a change to what I may call a Tariff of Steps. If however we make this change, in

¹ Cf. Dilke to Granville, 7 June, reporting that the king of Greece, then visiting London, had told him that he could and would pay ready money to Turkey and/or Albania in order to secure the Berlin frontier, P.R.O. 30/20/121.

² See p. 133, n. 1; for acceptance, 11 June, in committee of ways and means, of resolution No. 10 which dealt with the proposed alterations in the wine duties, see Hans. Parl. Deb. cclii. 1708-9, 1763-4.

³ i.e. the Customs and Inland Revenue bill, to enable the crown, by order in council, to alter the wine duties, as proposed in Gladstone’s budget; for decision, before 1 July, not to alter them and the lapsing of the French overture, see Hans. Parl. Deb. ccliii. 1239.

⁴ See Léon Say to Granville, 12 June, proposing as reported and arguing against the proposal for an alteration of the duty on bottled wine in Gladstone’s budget; a similar discrimination between bottled and casked wine, in levying the duty on wine entering Paris, had resulted in its being bottled in Paris; he supposed that Gladstone did not wish to transfer bottling from Bordeaux to London, F.O. 27/2470.
any case we shall endeavour to shape it that the general effect on wines shall be as nearly as possible the same, & further we shall adhere to 20% as the pivot of the scheme with the small fixed duty of 6d for all wines below it.

I would beg you to make known this letter to the French Govt.;¹ but they will at once perceive that the results & explanations I have set forth do not narrow the scope of the concession wh[ich] Parl[it] has empowered us to make in the event of their meeting us in an adequate manner.

224. **Memorandum by Mr. Gladstone for Lord Granville**

(P.R.O. 30/29/123)

Private. 10, Downing Street. June 18. 80.

1. **Collective action in E. Roumelian inquiry:**—I doubt whether desirable. It seems like putting the Govt. on its trial. What we want is simply authentic information in the first instance.

2. Language of Russia at Berlin, as reported by Elliot, most objectionable: Austrian reply quite sound I think.³

3. I suppose that in the Greek frontier question⁴ we have to consider
   a. Natural defence
   b. Facility of police
   c. Natural lines of traffic
   d. Especially, Ethnography
   e. Most of all, the Treaty.

But in interpreting the Treaty there will be questions of equity, as well as of convenience under the heads already named, and in this business of interpretation it is almost a necessity that there should be more favour to one party than the other.

Here it is that there seems to me to be room for introducing at the proper time the question of a liberal price to be paid⁵ to Turkey if as is probable

¹ No letter on this subject to Léon Say after that of 15 June, promising consideration to his letter of 12 June, F.O. 27/2470, has been traced.

² See p. 134, n. 5; and Goschen to Granville, tel. No. 51, received 10.15 a.m., 18 June, reporting that collective action in E. Rumelia had proved impossible, but that he had obtained a promise from the powers to facilitate Wilson’s inquiry, F.O. 78/3105; reply, tel. No. 105, 18 June, approving his proposed course and agreeing to a separate inquiry, F.O. 78/3102.

³ From Elliot, No. 321, recording tel. No. 79 secret, 18 June, reporting that Saburov had said that if the Berlin treaty were broken on the Greek question it would be easier to alter other provisions, and Austrian reply, F.O. 7/991.

⁴ A revised Greco-Turk frontier had been agreed upon by Britain and France, and was submitted by them for agreement to a conference of ambassadors at Berlin (16 June to 1 July) which adopted it; for map, see W. N. Medlicott, *Bismarck, Gladstone and the Concert of Europe* (1956) 234.

⁵ See nos. 222, 269, 272, 288.
and perhaps desirable the interpretation of the Treaty while conformable to its spirit should be in favour, materially speaking, of Greece.

4. Is it not time to consider the question, though there are several ifs between, what would be the best & most available means of compulsion actual or indicative, in case Turkey be recalcitrant.

225. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville [P.R.O. 30/29/123]


As the matter¹ is of some interest, but not complicated, I trouble you again.

The rule I think is rather strict against any surrender of Crown Patronage.

In the case of Colonial Bishoprics founded & endowed from voluntary sources a claim was I think made to the appointments but virtually or formally withdrawn.

The case of Deans is not so strong: for the Bishops appoint them in Wales.

The Bishops appoint Canons in Wales, & in most of the English Cathedrals.

Under these circumstances I think it will be right to answer Mr Gibbs as I propose.²

226. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone [P.R.O. 30/29/123]


I am anxious to have your advice about Armenia. I am inclined to think that the Armenians are right in thinking that a good Xtian Governor irremovable except by consent of the powers, would with a few simple reforms be the best mode of beginning improvement of administration. A fixed sum only to be remitted to Constantinople.

Let me know your opinion on this and the limits of such a province or provinces.³

¹ It had been proposed that the right of appointment to the new capitular body at St. Albans (see no. 221) should belong to the bishop unless the chapter was endowed by the ecclesiastical commission when it might pass to the crown.

² See docket, 26 June, on Gibbs to Gladstone, 13 June, for Gladstone's reply that he thought the crown's right might be waived, Add. MS. 44464, fo. 246; see also Granville to Gladstone, 19 June, asking whether Gladstone should not ask the Queen's approval for his answer, Add. MS. 44172, fo. 76, not printed.

³ See Goschen to Granville, private, 14 and 15 secret, 16 June (on which no. 226 is Gladstone's min.), asking for instructions, advising against trying to stop the activities of the Bulgarian church outside Bulgaria, asking for final authorization for Wilson's inquiry in E. Rumelia (nos. 218, 224), and advising to press for only small substantial gains in Armenia, P.R.O. 30/29/188.
227. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

10, Downing Street. June 25. 80.

I am sorry to say Goschen's small handwriting & hair strokes are now hardly within the compass of my eye-sight.

Zohrab says Armenia may be managed with something like the Lebanon scheme, only a little more independence in the Govr.

I suppose you will advise the E. Roumelians to keep within the law—it is a good law.

Forster's speech to-day was admirable.¹

228. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

10, Downing Street. June 25. 80.

I am truly sorry to learn that the C[rrown] P[rincess] is responsible for such a farrago as this.²

The devil, when he quotes Scripture for his purpose, I presume quotes it correctly: but this writer only misquotes & mangles it.

229. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

10, Downing Street. June 29. 80.

I am struck with a notion which Dilke communicated to me last night about our separate Smyrna quarrel with the Porte. He seems to think that that matter is ripe for being driven to an issue & that while it would not absolutely commit us on other points it might do something to convince the Sultan.³

The Sultan is using both fraud and underhand force against us at every point and we have nothing to expect but from his fears.

Four years ago, before the example of sham concert had been set at Constantinople, I think Turkey would have yielded in every case to an united voice. Now that it has imbibed the idea that union is not real, I do not feel so confident, Bismarck’s expectation notwithstanding.⁴

I dare say you have thought over this matter well. Mine is only an impression at first sight.

² Ponsonby to Granville, 24 June, forwarded on the Queen’s instruction, a letter from the crown princess (not traced), P.R.O. 30/29/37.
³ See p. 140, n. 2; Turkey had announced, in advance, her rejection of the proposals of the Berlin conference on the Greek frontier, Russell to Granville, No. 41 confidential, 23 June, F.O. 78/3183; see also Granville to Dufferin, No. 272, 21 June, reporting Russia’s proposal for coercion, F.O. 65/1076.
⁴ Russell to Granville, private, 26 June, reported Bismarck’s agreement with Granville that Turkey would yield before the powers resorted to force, P.R.O. 30/29/177; printed Knaplund, Letters from Berlin, 151.
I shall be very glad to talk over Smyrna with you, but I do not see my way to taking action on the subject at present. We are at present cooperating with Austria & Italy in the matter, making the same representations.

If Austria will not go as far as we wish, in general pressure, she will show the same reluctance in pressing with us & Italy a separate object. Our principal object ought to be, to maintain the general concert of Europe.

France will not like to lag much behind us, and Italy will probably be ready to join us—Austria promises not to give any hint of her unwillingness to move, as does Germany—the former power, will not like being left in the cold, if we are obliged to move. Russia as yet seems disposed to move with us.

But if I am wrong, & the Concert breaks up—then I presume we shall not consent to act as a policeman to enforce general European objects, & we might then properly say, we will attend with all our firmness to our own special interests.

I have asked Childers & Northbrook with technical advisers to come here tomorrow (Wednesday) at three o'clock, to talk over possible means of coercion. Shall we tell you the result or could you drop in— or should I bring them over to you—

I hope you will send a stout telegram to Goschen today to let the Porte know that we have our eyes upon the desires of Albania for self-government, which are so strong that they have even found expression to

1 No. 230 printed, Fitzmaurice, ii. 216.
2 On 1 May the Turkish authorities closed the free quay at Smyrna, the use of which Britain had since 1868 refused to surrender and she now paid the excessive dues exacted by the Smyrna Quay Company, the merchants to be reimbursed when an agreement was reached; for account of representations made together with Austria and Italy, see from Goschen, No. 21 commercial, 20 Aug., F.O. 78/3499; see also nos. 280, 356.
3 Not traced.
4 Not sent; for Goschen’s urging earlier that the Albanians should not be divided by the new Montenegrin frontier, see from Goschen, tel., and private letter, 16 June, P.R.O. 30/29/188.
us in unusual forms, upon the movements of a character really aggressive that are taking place, and upon the apparent origin of these movements: and that we are extremely anxious that the Porte should appreciate the full significance of these facts as they may lead to serious results. I do not doubt you have supported the attitude which has been assumed by the Ambassadors about the Dulcigno frontier.¹

233. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

P.R.O. 30/29/123

10, Downing Street. July 1, 80.

It seems difficult to regard the Turkish Telegram² of today apart from the sister proceedings on the Montenegrin frontier.

1. There, it is indisputable that the Porte broke its engagement to give up the territory.

2. As to the Greek frontier, it now³ appears that Turkey was privy at the Berlin [Congress] to the indications given by the Powers, and did not protest, but had in her mind all along an intent to nullify them by withholding Prevesa, Janina, and Larissa.

Under such circumstances should we not throw back on her the responsibility of what may happen on the Greek frontier, on the Montenegrin frontier in the event of her withholding or delaying assent, and in Albania itself.

I am just going down to the Bradlaugh business.⁴

234. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

[Add. MS. 44172, fo. 81]


I have got your note as to throwing the responsibility upon the Turks. Ought we not to be careful to avoid individual arguments or menaces, as long as the concert continues unimpaired—the other powers will be too happy to throw upon us the burden, which they feel weighs on us all.

¹ In identic note, 28 June, proposing to Turkey to draw the Albanian-Montenegrin frontier so as to give Montenegro the port of Dulcigno and territory east as far as the river Boyana, from Goschen, tel. No. 84, 29 June, F.O. 78/3105; reply approving, tel. No. 199, 30 June, F.O. 78/3102; for map, see W. N. Medlicott, Bismarck, Gladstone and the Concert of Europe (1956) 75.

² See the porte to Musurus, tel., 27 June, communicated 30 June, ‘declining the responsibility of the consequences’ if the cessions to Greece and Montenegro were enforced and appealing to the justice of the powers; to Goschen, tel. No. 203, 8 p.m., 30 June, F.O. 78/3102.

³ The porte’s tel. justified this inference.

⁴ For the atheist Bradlaugh’s claim to affirm, instead of taking the oath as a member of the new parliament, and for Gladstone’s carrying of a resolution, which allowed Bradlaugh’s claim, subject to any liability by statute, see Hans. Parl. Deb. ccliii. 1267–1342; see no. 639.
We proposed words for an answer to one of the previous protests of the Turks—they were approved, but the powers thought we had better delay the answer. Your argument will be very useful, when the powers will have to consider an answer to the collective note.¹

235. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

[H. of Commons. July 1. 1880.]

I am quite of your mind that there should be concert, and I would not press upon you even steps in concert if you think the time has not come for them.

It struck me, however, that the declaration of the Turk, in casting the responsibility on the Powers, is a grave one to lay by in our drawers and to let—

The sooner you can cast back the charge the better I shall be pleased, but I would on no account [wish] to urge you to action beyond your own calm judgment.

236. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

[10, Downing Street. July 2. [1880].]

For consideration:

How many miles is Cattaro from the mouth of the Boyana and may it be presumed that Austria in a common or approved operation would allow the use of it to allied vessels?²

237. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

[Foreign Office. July 2/80.]

The answer is excellent.³ But he has a very strong will. I will try to see you this evening.

¹ 15 July, communicating to Turkey the new Greco-Turk frontier decided upon at the Berlin conference (p. 137, n. 4); see Goschen to Granville, No. 121, 15 July, F.O. 78/3090; for Turkey's announcement of her intention to refuse, see p. 139, n. 3.
² i.e. to compel Turkey to execute the Dulcigno cession (p. 141, n. 1); for Granville's proposal to Austria, 2 July, to send ships and marines to enable the prince of Montenegro to seize the territory, occupied by Albanians, see to Elliot, No. 362 secret, 3 July, F.O. 7/986.
³ To Lansdowne who, 2 July, offered to resign as under-secretary for India, since he disagreed with the principle of the Compensation for Disturbance bill, urging delay, since neither his department nor his house of parliament was concerned, Add. MS. 44465, fos. 49, 51; see no. 242.
238. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

[Add. MS. 44544, fo. 30]

[Copy]

7 JULY 1880

5 July/80.

1. You will see that Lansdowne suspends. All that we could expect.
2. The inclosed from Phillimore is worth reading. Perhaps it should not be seen in your Dept.; but the references will be useful.

239. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

[P.R.O. 30/29/123]

10, Downing Street. July 7. 80.

I have the inclosed from Lord Wrottesley. You will see that action can be postponed. I am not sure whether the matter of non-residence may indispose you to take a Lord Lieutenancy in which you must feel great interest. In any case I am sure you will advise. Sutherland I suppose is hardly in question, as he has his own county. But what as to his son?

Ld. Hatherton—in Dudley’s & Lichfield’s present state—is almost the only liberal name.

240. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

[P.R.O. 30/29/123]

10, Downing Street. July 7. 80.

1. Is the inclosed a proper abbozzo of a reply to Wolff’s question?
2. Karolyi has called here & had a long conversation on the Montenegro & Greek Frontier questions.

Of course I differed on nothing with him: but only hesitated to follow or reserved my judgment especially twice—

1. His judgment was that we might have a naval demonstration for the Dulcigno plan, in support of the Prince of Montenegro, which might lead to the use of material means by the ship-forces, without being absolutely pledged to see the plan carried through.

---

1 See to Gladstone, 4 July, Add. MS. 44465, fo. 57.
2 Not traced.
3 Resigning the lord lieutenancy of Staffordshire, not traced; Lichfield had resigned it in 1871; Dudley had opposed the disestablishment of the Irish Church.
4 Granville owned iron mines in Staffordshire.
5 See to Gladstone, 6 [sc. 7] July, urging the acceptance of Wrottesley’s resignation, since he had only stayed last year to oblige Granville; refusing for himself and suggesting Sutherland or his son, or Hatherton; and min. by Gladstone that Sutherland was already lord lieutenant of county Sutherland; and Granville’s reply, 8 July, suggesting Sutherland might transfer to Staffordshire, Add. MS. 44172, fos. 84, 88, not printed; see no. 253.
6 For Gladstone’s reply, 8 July, refusing to inform parliament about plans to coerce Turkey, or to undertake to request parliamentary sanction before coercion, see Hans. Parl. Deb. cccliii. 1907–8; for Gladstone’s draft, see Add. MS. 44764, fo. 92.
7 Cf. Karolyi to Haymerle, 9 July, quoted Medlicott, op. cit., p. 142, from Wiener Staats archiv, 57 A-f.
2. He was inclined to object altogether to Russia’s having any share whatever in the Hellenic frontier-question. On this I went no farther than to express an opinion, without arrière pensée, that Russia would never be able to establish any dangerous influence over any part of the Hellenic population, except in the now impossible case of their being abandoned by all the other Powers.

I did not say but I rather think, that the historic position of Russia as a Protecting Power of Greece makes it difficult to determine absolutely upon her exclusion.

Cattaro I find would be at our service.

241. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

[Add. MS. 44172, fo. 86]

Foreign Office. July 6/80 [sc. 7 July].

Your answer to Wolfe [sic] appears to me excellent.

I told Godley that the last sentence had made me laugh.

‘So it did Mr Gladstone’.

I do not see much to object to in Karolyi’s No 1. Practically, if we land marines in support of the Montenegrins, it would be impossible for us to run away.

No 2. appears to me an inadmissible condition—though we should take care that Russia had no preponderating force.

242. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

[Add. MS. 44544, fo. 31]

[Copy]

8 July 1880 noon.

Can we push expostulation further? ‘We’ means ‘you’ for I think it would scarcely be seemly for me.

243. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

[Add. MS. 44172, fo. 89]


I saw him yesterday, and it was at my request that he offers to see you.

It is possible, but not likely, that you might have an effect upon him—and at all events, a few kind words eschewing argument, might be very useful for the future.

1 For the large terms in which Gladstone said nothing.

2 For Austria’s amendments (designed to prevent the landing of troops and to preclude Russia’s participation) to the British proposal for a naval demonstration to aid the prince of Montenegro in taking possession of Dulcigno, see to Elliot, tel. No. 293, 8 July, F.O. 7/986; see p. 142, n. 2.

3 See Lansdowne to Gladstone, 7 July, renewing his wish to resign (see p. 142, n. 3) but offering to see Gladstone, Add. MS. 44465, fo. 81.

4 See Gladstone to Lansdowne, 8 July, agreeing to see him at 3.45 that day, Add. MS. 44544, fo. 32; for resignation 9 July, see Lord Newton, Lord Lansdowne (1929) 18; Letters, iii. 116; see p. 149, n. 6.
244. **Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone**

18, Carlton House Terrace. [8 July 1880].

In order to avoid the chance of the difference in answering questions, which marked Northcote's & Beaconsfield's answers—I send you what I propose to say in answer to Dunraven.¹

Please return.²

245. **Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville**

10, Downing Street. July 12. 80.

I congratulate you on the happy event of yesterday³ & I hope all goes well this morning.

In regard to the movement for union between Bulgari & E Roumelia, I heartily concur in our present efforts to repress it.⁴

But I suppose that if we are driven to *voies de fait* with Turkey, not only will these efforts prove vain, but the movement may extend much beyond those two provinces, and casting legality wholly aside may become a military enterprise for reconstituting the Bulgaria of San Stefano. If this should happen may there not be great fear that the concert will be broken up by a collision between Austria and Russia.

Taking into view the greatness of such a danger for Europe as well as Turkey, and the evil plight of the Turk all through even his Asiatic Provinces, I have been thinking whether the Queen might not possibly, if so disposed, be of great use by writing a letter to the Sultan to urge his compliance.⁵ I have thought this just worth mentioning to you.

246. **Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville**

H. of C. Jul 14. 80.

I think that Goschen should explain what he says about Janina.⁶

¹ For Granville’s refusal, 8 July, to anticipate the Turkish reply to the presentation of the Berlin award on Greece, in answering Dunraven’s request for information about the course proposed if Turkey declined it, see *Hans. Parl. Deb.* ccli. 1876.

² Gladstone returned no. 244, writing on it his reply, 9 July: ‘The main point I cannot amend—I might *crib* a little [from his own answer to Wolff]. Might you note how you virtually shut off so improbable a notion as any liability of Greece to Russia.’

³ See nos. 205, 206.

⁴ For tel. ultimately sent by the Queen to the sultan, 18 July, see *Letters*, iii. 118–20; for two drafts of the letter which the Queen refused to send, and Ponsonby to Granville, 15 July, doubting whether the Queen ought to enter the fray at all, see P.R.O. 30/29/37; see also no. 248.

⁵ i.e. in to Granville, private, 5 July, asserting that ‘if the Balkan peninsula is in flames within the next two months it will be because the Powers are determined to give Janina to the Greeks’, asking whether ‘the game was worth the candle’ and suggesting Albanian nationality should be more regarded, P.R.O. 30/29/188; cf. no. 285.

⁶ i.e. in to Granville, private, 5 July, asserting that ‘if the Balkan peninsula is in flames within the next two months it will be because the Powers are determined to give Janina to the Greeks’, asking whether ‘the game was worth the candle’ and suggesting Albanian nationality should be more regarded, P.R.O. 30/29/188; cf. no. 285.
1. That Janina (not Epirus) is the point which if any will cause Turkish resistance. Where have we read that Turkey though not ready to cede Janina, is ready to cede Prevesa, Arta, and the rest of Epiros?

2. That Janina can be reserved to Turkey in consistency with the Treaty of Berlin. Independently of the fact that we have now to deal with an authoritative judgment of Europe, I think it a thing not to be assumed, but rather to be proved that Janina can thus be reserved in consistency with keeping the line of the Kalamas.

Further, Goschen seems to expect more particularity of instruction than the sleeping character of the circumstances permit. As to Albania, my idea is that while the Treaty of Berlin is favourable to local government there as well as elsewhere in Europe, its special title to have its case put forward, depends upon & should vary with the opportunity of making it serviceable towards the settlement of the Greek and Montenegrin questions.¹

247. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

[P.R.O. 30/29/123]


No 99²

I do not gather very clearly from this dispatch whether the attention of the Porte has been called to the likelihood that in the event of its resistance the Balkan movement may not be limited to the object of uniting the two provinces of B[ulgaria] and E[astern] R[umelia], but may rather aim at re-forming something like the Bulgaria of San Stefano.

It seems to me also worth considering what the position of the Porte, and of the Albanians would be, if Greece, assured on the side of the sea, were to concentrate its movement on Thessaly & for the present let Epirus alone.

248. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

[P.R.O. 30/29/123]


The restricted offer of the Queen³ is still of value: there is no doubt

¹ See Granville to Goschen, private, 15 July, denying that he deserved Goschen's scolding about Albania, continuing as in paragraph 3 of no. 246 and then as in paragraphs 1 and 2, using Gladstone's words, P.R.O. 30/29/210.

² i.e. to Granville, No. 99, 2 July, on the consequences of Turkey's rejection of the Berlin award: if Turkey fought Greece, E. Rumelia would proclaim its union with Bulgaria; if Turkey left the Albanians to fight the Greeks, the Greeks would expect European protection at sea, F.O. 78/3089.

³ See to Granville, 16 July, declining to write the letter to the sultan as drafted (see p. 145, n. 5), but offering to telegraph in general terms, according to precedent, advising submission to the powers; Ponsonby to Granville, 15, 16 (2 letters) July, explaining the Queen's reasons, P.R.O. 30/29/37.
therefore that the Cabinet will agree to it, and even if the Queen were willing to go on at once, little time would be gained.

I think you might very well add to your letter, if you approve, an explanation that you were anxious to make the most of the Queen's influence in this case, because the Sultan appears to be so little aware of the dangers he is incurring, and that a clear indication of these dangers from an unsuspected quarter would be of great value to him—This only in an apologetic way.

The pithy part of the letter¹ might perhaps go to Goschen. Having our 'text' in the European concert does not I suppose prevent a little commentary of our own: a little harmony, as well as melody.

249. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

[Add. MS. 44172, fo. 90]

I dine at Windsor.

Please let me see the whole account you give of the Cabinet.²

The Queen the last time I saw her showed me your account of what had been done in the H of Commons.

I could not conceive why, until it struck me that it was meant as a lesson how such things should be done.³

250. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

[F.O. 7/992]

Sir H. Elliot No 385⁴


This letter in its last page may be construed as binding us to an understanding that the ship-force shall in no case land.

In conversation with me Count Karolyi seemed even to admit that this might become necessary.

At the least the matter surely remains open.

N.B. As to the Boyana, I apprehend it is far from certain that it could not be available when the water is high enough—I understand there are small trading steamers which ply upon it.

¹ i.e. to the Queen, 16 July, accepting her offer, provided the cabinet agreed, with the addition of the paragraph suggested by Gladstone, ibid.
² i.e. to the Queen; for Gladstone's own note of the cabinet, 17 July, which discussed the Montenegrin frontier, agreed to the Queen's form of tel. to the sultan, and decided parliamentary business, see Add. MS. 44642, fo. 54.
³ The Queen had complained that Granville's reports of the Lords' proceedings were too brief.
⁴ For No. 385 confidential, 10 July, on Haymerle's having accepted the proposed naval demonstration on the understanding that forces would not be landed, see F.O. 7/992.
251. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

[Add. MS. 44544, fo. 36]

[Copy]

19: July/80.

Rosebery writes¹ from Salzburg that he is absolutely barred by health. His Doctor said to him that 3 months of office would do him more harm than 10 years hard work hereafter. Please consult with Hartington as to the next step.

[P.S.] He kept back his letter for a day in a vague hope of reconsideration which evaporated.

Rosebery’s P.S. ‘Cardwell is here, very feeble I am told, wheeled about in a Bath chair.’

252. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

[Add. MS. 44172, fo. 96]

18, Carlton House Terrace. July 21 [1880].

I have spoken to Hartington & Wolverton about Aberdeenshire.²

We all think that Huntly cannot be passed over.

Both he and Aberdeen are loyal supporters of you, and both a little sore at having no office. But Huntly is the senior, the highest in rank, and has been the longest a member of the party. Hartington thinks it would drive him away from us, if he has not the offer.

I suppose you would say a word of explanation to Aberdeen.

253. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

[Add. MS. 44172, fo. 92]

10, Downing Street. July 21, 80.

1. I am quite willing to recommend Huntley [sic] as Lord Lieutenant of Aberdeenshire—(I have seen Wolverton)³

2. If the two Lords in Waiting are gone,⁴ there should be a list to send to the Queen. Former names not taken were Aberdeen (his willingness uncertain)

Lyttelton
Sandhurst
and Ribblesdale

¹ 14 July with PS. 16 July, refusing to act as under-secretary for India vice Lansdowne, Add. MS. 44288, fo. 56; cf. p. 151, n. 3.
² No. 252 answers Gladstone to Granville, 20 July, asking whether he should offer the Lord lieutenant of Aberdeenshire to Aberdeen vice Kintore, and suggesting Huntly as a doubtful alternative, P.R.O. 30/29/123, not printed.
³ See p. 149, n. 7 and no. 267.
⁴ The name is illegible in the original and has been inserted from Add. MS. 44544, fo. 37.
⁵ i.e. Lords Zetland and Listowel, who were thought to have resigned their lordships-in-waiting, owing to their disapproval of the Compensation for Disturbance bill; see nos. 254, 259, 260, 270, 271.
What do you say? I ought not to lose much time as the resignations are talked of.

3. I hope you may be able to suggest a solution for the Staffordshire difficulty: or shall we ask Lord W[rottesley] to wait a while.¹

254. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone²

[Add. MS. 44172, fo. 98]


I wrote immediately after seeing you, to Zetland asking him to call on me.³ But the Messenger who took the letter found he was gone out of town. He has not answered me from the country—and as he had not answered your appeal, had you not better postpone telling the Queen.

Is it quite clear yet, that the bill will pass the Commons with a majority sufficient to enable it to be sent to the Lords.

I am afraid that the majority there will be overwhelming.⁴

255. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

[P.R.O. 30/29/123]

10, Downing Street. Jul. 22. 80.

1. Please add to the names for con[sideratio]n as Lords in Waiting that of the new Ld Dalhousie.

2. If nothing can be got at about Zetland I had better announce his resignation as probable & the other as certain?⁵

3. Am I to recommend Enfield as U. Secretary?⁶

4. Huntley [sic] will be recommended.⁷

5. As to the majority on the third reading of the Disturbance Bill, I have not as yet any reason to suppose it will be feeble.

¹ See no. 239; Granville returned the letter, having written on it his reply: 'I do not think these names were objected to. It was rather that others were preferred, but I hope you will not replace Zetland till we are sure. Wrottesley was not in the House yesterday. I have asked him to call on me. If he cannot suggest a good solution, I will ask him in your name to postpone for a time'; Wrottesley remained until 1887.

² Granville to Gladstone, July, asking for a benefice for a Mr. Street, Add. MS. 44172, fo. 94, not printed.

³ To Zetland, not traced; but see from Zetland, 21 July, agreeing to call on him, but adhering to his intention to vote against the Compensation for Disturbance bill, P.R.O. 30/20/147.

⁴ For third reading of the Compensation for Disturbance bill, 26 July, passed by 304 to 237, the Parnellites abstaining and 16 liberals voting against the government; and for its defeat on second reading in the Lords, 3 Aug., by 282 to 51, see Hans. Parl. Deb. cccliv. 1452, ccclv. 110; Morley, ii. 49-50.

⁵ See nos. 259 and 271.

⁶ See to Enfield, 24 Aug., offering under-secretaryship for India, vice Lansdowne, resigned, 9 July, Add. MS. 44544, fo. 47. Enfield held office until Kimberley replaced Hartington as secretary of state which made it necessary to have a commoner as under-secretary; see p. 470, n. 1.

⁷ Not recommended, Granville possibly explaining that his financial affairs were too involved, see p. 154, n. 5; Aberdeen appointed, 18 Sept.
256. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Zetland has consented to see me. Dalhousie would be excellent, but I should think would refuse. Is it necessary to fill up the Undersecretaryship for a short time—ingrat, 10 mécontents.

257. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

I have some doubt of sending this draft. The Austrians seem to begin to funk, and may be glad of any excuse to back out. We admit that landing of troops is excluded by the present arrangement. But there is nothing to prevent us reopening the question when the ships are there.

258. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

Ponsonby told me yesterday H.M.'s arrangements for Ministers at Balmoral; which seemed very good, & so I said. But I have bethought me, as I dare say you have whether a month or six weeks hence Foreign Affairs are likely to allow you to go so far.

Lowell this morning gave me his plan for the Fishery difficulty—that we, Newfoundland freely consenting, should cede the Island. I said that in England we had many superstitions.

Gladstone returned no. 257 having written on it his reply: 'You are the best judge. For "excludes" I should read "does not include". A private hint to Elliot might be useful if you do not send the dispatch.' Granville did not send the proposed draft, after also consulting Dilke, who wrote: 'I agree with what you wrote to Mr. Gladstone. Elliot might be told to sound Haymerle confidentially on the steps to be taken'; see also Granville to Elliot, private, 21 July, on his dislike of the delay in giving the assurance asked for by France that the same steps would be taken for Greece, P.R.O. 30/29/197.

Cf. Ponsonby to Granville, 25 July, asking whether a date between 4 and 14 Sept. would suit him for Balmoral, P.R.O. 30/20/37; and p. 177, n. 8; and Granville to Gladstone, undated, with the note of the cabinet, 24 July, doubting whether he could go to Balmoral on 12 Sept., and regretting Selborne's concurrence with the law officers over the Newfoundland fishery dispute, Add. MS. 44642, fo. 58, not printed.

See nos. 424, 425; a claim of the United States for damages against Britain, arising out of an incident of 16 Jan. 1878, when American fishermen at Fortune Bay, Newfoundland had been forcibly compelled by British men to observe the alleged rules of the treaty of Washington; see F.O. 5/1823.
259. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

18, Carlton House Terrace. [23 July 1880].

Ponsonby heard from the Queen last night asking if it was true about Listowel [sic] & Kenmare’s resignations.

He met them at the bachelor’s ball—Kenmare was indignant, & denied that he had ever thought of it.

Listowel [sic] said ‘he intended to do so’. These were the words which they agreed were to be told to H M. because he had told you, as you had mentioned to Ponsonby.

Ponsonby says Listowel [sic] does not consider this as his official resignation ! ! The Queen asks Ponsonby ‘whether he can be stopped. Can he be excused voting’.

He has not made up his mind whether to vote against, but cannot vote for.

The Queen tells Ponsonby that it is all in consequence of ‘this dangerous bill’.

May I telegraph to say, that in your opinion, it will be better to postpone for a time the acceptation of any household resignations, at all events till the bill is in the Lords.¹

I hope you do not object to my having scolded the Austrian Charge d’Affaires.²

260. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

10, Downing Street. July 23. 80.

You are the best judge; but I am apt to think that delay in filling appointments vacated by hostile resignations (so to call them) is bad as a sign of weakness and difficulty.

If Enfield is taken, now or shortly, we may I suppose have three Lordships to provide for.³ But it is a sound rule to notice & reward good service.

P.S. Your note received as to Lords in Waiting. If you think we can venture to say we will receive no household resignation till the Bill is in

¹ See no. 253; see Ponsonby to Granville, 23 July, as here reported; reply, tel. 23 July, ‘Mr. Gladstone will delay dealing with resignations for a time’, P.R.O. 30/29/37; Kenmare did not resign the lord chamberlainship, but Listowel resigned his lordship-in-waiting (see no. 271); cf. the Queen to Granville, 18 July, recounting a conversation with Listowel, P.R.O. 30/29/31.

² See to Elliot, No. 458, 22 July, recording conversation in which Granville asked sharply whether Austria’s delay in giving the assurance about the naval demonstration, asked for by France, was deliberate, F.O. 7/986.

³ i.e. lordships-in-waiting; Enfield, being appointed under-secretary for India, was replaced as lord-in-waiting by Thurlow, 14 Sept.; cf. Catherine Gladstone to Granville, undated, but docketed 24 July, saying that Rosebery would accept under-secretaryship for India if pressed, P.R.O. 30/29/123; for Rosebery’s refusal, see Lord Crewe, Lord Rosebery (1931) i. 136.
the Lords, I should like to have from you the words I may use if questioned again.

I think it far more rational that they should postpone if willing.

261. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville  
[P.R.O. 30/29/123]

Most Private. 10, Downing Street. July 23. 80.

I cannot help wishing that we had fuller military information about some of the points at which action may be requisite in certain contingencies. Those which especially occur to me are Prevesa, Salonica, and Smyrna; and the question to which information should go is, I think, how far each of these places is open to a coup-de-main.

Might it be worth consideration how far, as all these have relation to the Turko-Greek question in which France takes the more special interest, the subject should be prosecuted from Paris by a common arrangement, if we have good Military & Naval Attachés there, or whether it must be done or rather directed here.

Although the occasion for action is not immediate or proximate, yet it may come suddenly. And I am struck in the Montenegrin case by our actual want, so far as I am aware, at this moment, of sufficient information about the Boyana.¹

262. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone  
[P.R.O. 30/29/123]

Foreign Office. [Probably 23 or 24 July 1880].

We should in the first instance find out what the ‘Intelligence Dept’ War Office or Admiralty know, and require to know about these places.

They did know about the Boyana.

263. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville  
[P.R.O. 30/29/123]


1. It may be worth your while to bear in mind that the Turk owes the Exchequer £60000, & owes France I presume the same, on account of the Guaranteed Loan.²

This might at some proper juncture give an opening for smart action, joint yet not collective?

2. Unless something urgent comes up before Saturday, I think we

¹ Cf. nos. 236, 240, 250.
² i.e. of 1855, held in Britain and France, secured on the Turkish tribute and the Smyrna and Syrian customs, and on which the Treasury had paid out £61,000 in execution of the guarantee; see mem. on the Turkish Debt, June 1880, F.O. 78/3171.
might postpone our Cabinet until after your Debate, when one will probably be wanted.¹

264. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

[P.R.O. 30/29/123]
Jul 26. [1880].

If the Austrians are (properly enough) anxious about the Union,² that should make them try to avoid the crisis, which would give the opportunity for the Union, by making the pressure in the Montenegrin case (as No 1) a reality & not a sham?

265. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

[P.R.O. 30/29/123]
Private.
10, Downing Street, Jul 29. 80.

With reference to Mr Goschen’s of Jul 15–20, I am not one of those who build with strong confidence on the surrender of the Turk, though I rather lean towards expecting it.

What seems to me [established], as at present advised is pretty much as follows
1. The bad faith of the Turk, e.g. in the spring about the Corti arrangement has destroyed all confidence.
2. He must give way to Europe.
3. If he has a real alternative to offer for any portion of what Europe asks he must offer it, a. in plain language, b. with definite limits, c. with the Sultan’s plenary authority.
4. In all these capital particulars the crawling offer of Abedin Pacha is absolutely defective.
5. Had he entirely fulfilled them, a question of difficulty might have been raised, as to which, while a pure contingency, it is hard to see one’s way.³

Do not reply. I dine with you.

¹ There was no cabinet between 24 July and 3 Aug., see Add. MS. 44642, fos. 57–62; for cabinet of 4 Aug., not attended or recorded by Gladstone, see no. 268; for Lords’ debate, 2, 3 Aug., and the defeat of the Compensation for Disturbance bill, see Hans. Parl. Deb. ccliv. 1839–1936, cclv. 3–110.
² i.e. of E. Rumelia with Bulgaria, see Elliot’s No. 412 very confidential, 22 July, F.O. 7/992; see nos. 205, 206, 245, 247.
³ See from Goschen, tel. No. 120, 15 July, reporting that Abedin Pasha had proposed a compromise and said Turkey would yield Dulcigno to a naval demonstration, but would, without this, persuade the Albanians to give up two-thirds of cession proposed by Corti in Apr. and compensate for the rest in the neighbourhood of Dulcigno, without surrendering the town itself, F.O. 78/3105.
266. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

When I began to write out the note, which you had begun, it struck me that it would never do to ask Goschen what the other Ambassadors thought of giving up Janina.

They would have telegraphed all over Europe that we were trying to fly away from the Berlin agreement and the previous agreement with France.

The bad news from India makes any move more unadvisable at the present moment.

I told Montebello today, that as soon as the answer came from the Porte, that [sic] I should be glad to have some confidential communication with the Fr. Gov. as to the next steps about Greece.

I had better write to the Q, that you and those members of the Cabinet I have seen, (Hartington, Forster, Kimberley & Selborne) think it out of the question to change at this moment.

267. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

1. About Aberdeenshire I have asked H.M. for a little time. I should be very glad if you would inquire.

2. I have no doubt your answer about Goschen & Janina will do.

3. Is not Mr. Blunt worth circulating.

1 Untraced, but see the beginning of a draft to Goschen, warning Turkey of the danger of declining the decision on Greece, 24 July, in Gladstone's hand, Add. MS. 44642, fo. 60; see Musurus to Granville, 29 July, for answer to the note of 15 July (p. 142, n. 1), F.O. 78/3166; see also no. 246.

2 Of the defeat of General Burrows at Maiwand, 27 July, by the Afghans.

3 See to Adams, No. 1020 confidential, 29 July, recording conversation with Montebello as here reported, F.O. 27/2422; for instruction to Adams to consult France, see Granville to Adams, No. 1022 confidential, 29 July, ibid.; p. 150, n. 1.

4 The Queen wished to accept Goschen's advice to abandon the Berlin award and accept a territorial equivalent for Janina; see Ponsonby to Granville, 26 July and from Goschen, tel. No. 143 secret, 25 July; cf. no. 246; to Ponsonby, tel. 28 July, promising to consult his colleagues; the Queen to Granville, tel. 29 July, renewing pressure and tel. 30 July, saying that Granville's letter to Goschen, 29 July (see p. 164, n. 3), had not altered her opinion, P.R.O. 30/29/37.

5 See p. 148, n. 2, no. 253, and p. 149, n. 7; Gladstone replies to Granville's letter, 29 July, reporting that Huntly's financial affairs were now arranged, Add. MS. 44172, fo. 100, not printed; for his later difficulties see no. 504 and p. 281, n. 8.

6 See note 4 above.

7 See Wilfrid Blunt, Memoir on the position of the Ottoman Sultans towards Islam, 24 July, F.O. 78/3171.
I have asked Godley to see you about a cabinet for 12 or any other hour tomorrow, at which I am sorry to say there is not the faintest chance of my being able to attend. A short time back I exchanged some words with Forster about the sort of language which might be proper to be held after the rejection of the Disturbance Bill by the Lords. We were very much agreed as to its general character. I now put down what occurs to me as a contribution to the raw material of your conversation in Cabinet: but I shall be perfectly satisfied with whatever you may decide on.

I had thought we might express ourselves somewhat as follows—

Begin with stating great regret at the use which the Lords had thought it their duty to make of their undoubted & rightful power in this instance. But it is obvious that a vote of that description cannot dispose of the question. The question can only be disposed of by, & must depend upon, the state of Ireland. The vote w[oul]d evidently impose upon the executive govt a greatly enhanced responsibility of observation in the first place, & possibly, of action which must depend upon the coming harvest. If its best promises be fulfilled a great enlargement of the means possessed by the occupiers of the soil may dispose of a great portion of the difficulty and may help to bring about that improvement of feeling between classes which in some districts of the country is so much to be desired. But we cannot exclude from view another contingency; or refuse to meet it at the proper time if it sh[oul]d arrive. We shall uphold with a firm hand the course of law in Ireland and we shall also watch with anxiety the exercise in extreme cases, such as those which the Bill was intended to provide for, of proprietary rights. Should that exercise become dangerous to the public peace & security of the country & sh[oul]d it have the effect of strengthening the hands of those who appear to be engaged in an effort to subvert the principles of property we shall not scruple at however short an interval after the prorogation of Parl to advise that it sh[oul]d be re-assembled & to make such proposals as the case may then seem to require. In the meantime we invoke the aid of all good citizens, of whatever class[,] party or condition in the maintenance of good order & good feeling, & in encouraging the people of Ireland to rely on the wisdom of Parliament as their surest aid in meeting the peculiar difficulties of their position in connection with the recent failure of the crops.
269. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

10, Downing Street. 11th Aug./80.

I noticed to you the other day that the King of the Greeks had expressed a great readiness to give money to the Sultan for Janina; & money is the only instrument perhaps, the force of which has never been fairly tried with Turkey.²

It occurs to me however to ask whether, if Turkey is to be paid for acceding to the line of the recent conference, the payment should not be made in respect of that part of the concession demanded which is least obviously within the terms of the Treaty of Berlin. That portion I suppose to be not Janina, which it appears hardly possible to exclude from any decent construction of the Treaty, but rather the southern slopes of Olympus. I only put this on record for recollection in case of need, if approved.

270. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

10, Downing Street. 11. Aug./80.

Here is a letter from Lord Ribblesdale.³ He seems to leave the door open for the chance of keeping his Lordship in waiting, but hardly to expect it; and in any case I suppose it cannot be done?

This being so & with three Lordships in question, has not the time come when I should write to Lord Zetland & Lord Listowel in the sense which we agreed upon.⁴

I have done nothing as yet, since I saw you on the other matters of appointment.

271. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Foreign Office. [11 ? August 1880].

Please do nothing about the Lords till you see me. I wrote to the Queen in the sense we agreed upon. But I have not yet received her answer.⁵

¹ Nos. 269, 270, 274 were written by Hamilton, but signed by Gladstone.
² See p. 136, n. 1, and no. 224.
³ 9 Aug., resigning his lordship-in-waiting as his regiment had been ordered to India, but saying that at the end of the year he was due to take up appointment as aide-de-camp to the Duke of Connaught, which would bring him home, Add. MS. 44465, fo. 104.
⁴ See to Listowel and to Zetland, 16 Aug., accepting their resignations with regret and expressing the hope that the incident would not affect their general attachment to the liberal party, Add. MS. 44544, fos. 43–44.
⁵ Granville's letter not traced; for reply, 12 Aug., that the Queen hardly hoped to retain Listowel, Ribblesdale, and Zetland and, if they stayed, it should be made clear that it was by Granville's wish, P.R.O. 30/29/37; Dalhousie and Sandhurst replaced Zetland and Listowel; Ribblesdale remained; see nos. 253, 255, 259, 260.
Ribblesdale is in great hopes of being kept on. If the Queen consented, I should think he might be kept till the end of the year.

272. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone


Many thanks for the hint about the money from Greece. I have not forgotten it. You saw that the great Greek Banker had bought all the Sultan's property in Janina & two other places. The Turks are evidently playing with great energy the game of brag, and I am sorry to see how completely Goschen is taken in by it.

The French are coming round again. You will see Adams's account—and there is a good article in the Republicaine.

273. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville


We expect to be in D. St. by 11 tomorrow—and I can come down to the Cabinet or not as may be convenient.

I have advanced greatly & am more sensible of fatigue in the brain than of any bodily ailment.

As you do not expect any thing urgent I hope Childers has no enlargement of establishments to propose. It would I think be open to great objection.

It appears to me that the Sunday Amendment in the Burials Bill is hard to uphold if the objection of inequality be pressed.

This letter is curious. I certainly shall not betray the signature for I cannot read it.

1 See to Goschen, tel. No. 449, 30 Aug., reporting that the Greek banker, Zaifri, had done this, F.O. 78/3103.
2 See from Goschen, tel. No. 169, 10 Aug., announcing Turkish military preparations and repeating the assertion of the Turkish foreign minister that Turkey would not yield, F.O. 78/3105. Goschen's comments had been continually pessimistic.
3 To Granville, No. 706 secret, reported at length on Freycinet's eastern policy as he had found him 'somewhat less passive than previously'; and No. 717, 10 Aug., enclosed an article from the République française, marked 'important' by Granville with note by Dilke that it was written by Barrère, F.O. 27/2433.
4 Cf. Granville to Catherine Gladstone, 13 Aug., saying that there was nothing urgent to bring Gladstone to the cabinet, that Childers had a proposal to make, and Hartington wanted to talk about amendments to the Burials bill, Add. MS. 44172, fo. 112.
5 Amendment excepting Sundays, Good Friday, and Christmas Day from the permission for dissenters' funeral services in churchyards; enacted with the amendment, 7 Sept., as 43 & 44 Vict., cap. 41; for introduction into the Commons, 25 June, and second reading, 12 Aug., see Hans. Parl. Deb. ccliii. 29-30, 285-91; cclv. 989-1071.
6 Not traced.
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274. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville [P.R.O. 30/29/123]

10, Downing Street. 13: Aug.:80

I send you herewith a Memorandum which I have written with regard to the 14th clause of the Burials Bill. It is not complete but I think it is tolerably accurate. Without taking the trouble to read it, pray refer to the last page, where you will find the matter summed up in five short propositions.

If there is likely to be trouble given in the House on the subject, I think it might be well that I should see two or three of the leading non-conformists about it, before the committee on the Bill.

The Memorandum might easily be printed for the Cabinet if you think this desirable.

275. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville [P.R.O. 30/29/123]

10, Downing Street. Aug. 17. 80.

I find it difficult to understand Mr Macdonell’s No 103 in which the French Chargé at Rome is made to report that Freycinet is for accepting the Turkish maimed proposal about Dulcigno with a view to afterwards claiming the two places which it excludes.

However this may be it seems to me we cannot have a stronger ground for a kind of united sommation to Turkey than she is now supplying by her impudent bad faith & interminable delays.

276. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville [P.R.O. 30/29/123]

Holmbury, Dorking. Aug 17. 80.

It will probably be wise to make a concession to the Queen as you propose. It would however be preferable, I think if instead of simply omitting

1 On the Aid of Convocation in Legislation, holograph, 11 Aug., Add. MS. 44764, fo. 95; the clause dispensed the clergy from the statutory penalties for reading the burial service over unbaptized children and for failing to read it at all, by reference to resolutions passed by convocation. It was proposed to strike out the reference since the consent of crown and parliament was needed before such resolutions had force; see nos. 279, 280.

2 Printed copy of the mem. in P.R.O. 30/29/123 and Add. MS. 44465, fo. 237.

3 Tel. No. 103, 16 Aug., reporting a French overture on these lines which Italy had accepted, and min. by Tenterden suggesting the report be ignored, F.O. 45/409, P.R.O. 30/29/123.

4 The cession of Dulcigno and neighbouring territory less the villages of Dinosisi and Gruda, after a further delay to allow for execution, Goschen to Granville, tel. No. 173, received 4.54 a.m., 14 Aug., F.O. 78/3105.

5 See Granville to the Queen, copy, 13 Aug., justifying ‘the strength’ of the dispatch to Goschen, explaining his assertion that the difficulty of finding a successor to the sultan was not insuperable, but agreeing to substitute Gladstone’s proposed passage, except that he used ‘dangerous’ instead of ‘perilous’, P.R.O. 30/29/37.
from this excellent dispatch1 the words 'but the difficulty is not insuperable' you could say something to the effect that it would be a perilous error for the Sultan to suppose that on account of the difficulty mentioned Europe would allow him to set at nought the engagements bound upon him by the Treaty of Berlin.

I quite agree about the Italians and it even occurs to me whether it might be well to administer to them some mild expression of dissatisfaction or surprise.

277. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

Roadside Inn, Gomshall.2 Aug 18. 80.

The Austrian proposal as I understand from this draft3 is to give up the two villages for a prompt execution of the rest of the Dulcigno arrangement.

I do not see how to agree to this without knowing what the two villages are—one it seems Montenegro is willing to dispense with—but Dinoschi was I think reported by Mr Green to be important.4 How then can we agree now to this Austrian proposal?

The French proposal5 is to take what Turkey offers and that 'the Powers should maintain the rights of Montenegro' to the villages. This I do not clearly understand.

In a Telegram of to-day6 some idea of the same kind seems to be proposed at St Petersburgh & that seemed to me to embody the best form of the proposal.

The whole proceeding of the Turks is impudent beyond description. Were I the Six Powers I should say in a loud voice 'No more nonsense if you please: execute, in one or other of the approved forms, without delay, the Treaty of Berlin on the Montenegrin frontier'.

At the same time I am so completely in unison with you in the whole

---

1 To Goschen, No. 378, 12 Aug., F.O. 78/3076; see also to Goschen, tel. No. 412, 19 Aug., instructing him to make the alteration in the dispatch which had been sent off before the Queen saw it, F.O. 78/3102.
2 Gladstone is said to have been on his way from Holmbury to see Lord Arthur Russell at The Ridgeway, Shere.
3 To Elliot, No. 550, 17 Aug., recording Austria's readiness to go beyond the Franco-Italian proposal and to refrain from insisting even on the eventual cession of Dinosi and Gruda, F.O. 7/96.
4 To Granville, tel. No. 60, 15 Aug., reporting Prince Nicholas's categoric assertion that the fresh proposal of the porte was unacceptable if Dinosi was to be withheld, F.O. 103/10.
5 See to Adams, No. 1132A, 16 Aug., recording the proposal as in no. 275, now made to Britain, F.O. 27/2423.
6 i.e. from Dufferin, tel. No. 131, 16 Aug., that Russia wished the powers to state forcibly that they adhered to their original demands, but that if Turkey ceded Dulcigno that would be so far satisfactory, F.O. 65/1085.
of this matter that if you see your way clearly, with a view to the main-
tenance of the concert, I am ready to agree to what you may decide in
what has become rather a nicely complicated matter.

278. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone [Add. MS. 44172, fo. 114]
18, Carlton House Terrace. Aug 19/80.

The Persons who composed the Cabinet yesterday in the Chancellor’s
room, were Selborne, Argyll, Kimberley[,] Northbrook, Hartington[,] Chamberlain and Bright (Harcourt subsequently agreeing.). I put before
them clearly the disadvantage of departing at all from the collective note,
which chiefly consisted in our giving a false keynote to subsequent negotia-
tions and encouraging the Turks to believe that they can succeed by
dilatory negotiation.

The chief arguments on the other side, are the rather shaky state of the
concert of Europe at this moment; the evident wish of Italy[,] France, &
Austria (though she has not given an official answer) to settle the Monte-
negrin question in the sort of way proposed by France, the strong opinion
of Northbrook that the naval demonstration should be revived for the
Greek Frontier question, where he believes it may be of real use—the
false position of the fleet on the coast, after that portion of the territory
which alone they can command, has been agreed to be ceded, while the
village which they cannot reach is the sole cause of quarrel—& the great
advantage of a speedy settlement by the concert of Europe of one of
the questions in dispute.

The Cabinet were unanimous in favour of the compromise, if it were
clearly defined, promptly carried into execution, and of a definite character.
They thought the Austrian proposal to have a complete closing of
the matter, much preferable to leaving an open sore. It appears that one of
the villages named was never included in the proposed cession—the other
is commanded by the Montenegrins, and is in ruins. It was occupied by
Mussulmans who are now at Scutari.

I had to see Lobanoff[,] the Austrian & the German representatives today.
I told them all that I could give no official answer, as I had not got your
opinion, but that while I thought there would have been a great advantage
in adhering to our programme, yet I thought if all the other powers were
agreed, we might favorably consider the Franco-Italian proposal, as modi-
fied by Austria, on the 3 conditions which I have named above.¹

I asked Lobanoff telling him that it was not for the purpose of quoting
him, what was his personal opinion of what Russia would do. He thought

¹ See to Dufferin, No. 400, 18 Aug., recording this language to Lobanov, F.O.
65/1977; the Austrian proposal, to include Gruda but not Dinosi, was put before the
powers, 24 Aug., and, Russian hesitation being overcome, presented in a collective note
to Turkey, 16 Sept., Medlicott, op. cit. 148–9.
she would agree to the course which I had indicated which he thought much the best.

But I have not yet the Russian official answer, since they have been made aware of the Franco Italian proposal.

If it is favorable, and as you give me discretion in the matter, I should like to assent, making the conditions very clear & precise.

But please telegraph to me, if you dissent.

All the powers have now agreed to our proposed answer to the Turkish reply, about the Greek Frontier.¹ However much some may feel their knees shake, they do not like to avow being the first to break up the concert.

Shall you be back on Friday. We propose having a cabinet on Saturday at noon.

279. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville [P.R.O. 30/29/123]


I am sorry my absence should have given you so much trouble in writing but your letter received by Messenger gives me a very clear view of the situation.

Were my opinion more adverse than it is I should scruple to offer any objection to the conclusion you announce in favour of the Austrian form of procedure. The necessity of keeping the team together is a prime element in the case. Moreover you tell me that the village² in question

1. is in ruins
2. is commanded by Montenegrin territory— which seems to be a correction of an earlier account from Kirby Green.

These two statements remove all doubt from my mind.

About the Cabinet, your brother so overflows in kindness that he wishes me to stay here over Sunday, and I could come up probably via Dorking and come back.

I should however be guided partly by what stood for consideration— the chief questions I anticipate are

1. Whether the House shall adjourn rather than now finish the business — on which I have given conditionally my opinion.³
2. The amendments on the Burials Bill.

It seems to me, as at present informed, a little difficult to maintain, on our own principle, the Sunday amendment.

As to my print,⁴ I am in correspondence with H[artington] & Bright, and I hope to write something definitive this evening or tomorrow morning.

¹ See to Goschen, tel. No. 415, 19 Aug., containing the answer (that Europe adhered to the Berlin award) to the Turkish rejection, 26 July, of it, F.O. 78/3102.
² Dinosi. ³ Cf. no. 268. ⁴ See p. 158, n. 2.
280. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

Immediate.


Your brother’s inexhaustible long-suffering presses my being his guest till Monday.

I am perfectly available for Cabinet if needful.

At the same time I do not suppose you are likely in Foreign Affairs to have as yet any new and serious turn. The question of adjourning the House seems to have been decided or postponed—and as regards the Burials’ Bill I have written to Bright1 that after what I have learned about the views of the University members my personal and separate obligation no longer weighs on me, & I am quite satisfied with the simple intention already adopted viz. to endeavour to keep the terms of the Bill as they were settled with the Abp. of C[anterbury].

I ask Godley to get from you an Aye or No as to my coming up tomorrow.

281. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

No 2. Secret.


Burn this note if I have already conveyed to you the purport: as to which I cannot get my memory to give me a clear reply.

To be prepared for all contingencies, I should like our being in possession of the best military information [that] can be had as to the facility or difficulty of seizing any points, on the Turkish coasts, which may be the most eligible for the purpose—especially

Smyrna
Salonica
Prevesa
Arta.2

282. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone


Hartington would like to see you, and I should be glad of your presence

1 19 Aug., that he would fight for the reference to the resolutions of convocation in the 14th clause (see no. 274) if he found the clergy, through their representatives in parliament, the members for the universities of Oxford and Cambridge, wished it; 20 Aug., that opinions being diverse (see Add. MS. 44465, fos. 223, 235) he would let the clause take its chance, Add. MS. 44113, fos. 132, 134; it was struck out.

2 No. 281 was sent by Granville to Northbrook, with a note ‘I understood from you that we knew all that is necessary’, on which Northbrook wrote that he had all information ‘as to the Dardanelles’ and naval attack, but proposed a committee to get more military information, P.R.O. 30/29/123; Gladstone’s fresh interest in strategical considerations arose from the negotiations (about instructions to the commanders of the European ships assembled for the naval demonstration to enforce the last demands on Turkey over the Montenegrin frontier), opened with Granville’s circular dispatch, 13 Aug.
to settle our answer to the Porte. The answer of the Turks, 1 is not the same as their verbal communication, and I think this quite justifies us in proposing to the Powers to stick to our note, and to our naval demonstration.

283. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone  
[Add. MS. 44172, fo. 131] 
Foreign Office. Aug 21 [sc. 20]/80.

I should like you to give your opinion on the enclosed correspondence between Hartington & me, 2 which I will afterwards circulate.

Lansdowne’s minute queers the pitch of the Russo Affghan correspondence.

Hartington would be glad if you could attend the Cabinet tomorrow, 3 without inconvenience to your health—of which I am glad to hear excellent accounts.

I have given a hint to the Italians that we know what they are about.

284. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville  
[P.R.O. 30/29/143] 

The question relating to Kauffmann is indeed a very grave one. I send back the papers because there is a portion of the subject which seems to require some further examination before any positive step can be taken.

Perhaps I should first state that my impressions are very unfavourable as to Kauffmann’s conduct for many years past.

But it surely would not do to enter into this matter without being sure of our ground all round.

You say you have proofs of K[auflmann]’s hostility and duplicity ‘since the signature of the Treaty of Berlin’. 4

Are you prepared to hold and to show that the whole language & proceedings of the late Government towards Russia since the Treaty of Berlin has [sic] been friendly?

1 Goschen’s tel. unnumbered, 19 Aug., summarized the porte’s written reply to the collective note of 3 Aug., refusing to assist Montenegro to take possession of Dulcigno, demanding further delay, but not mentioning Dinosi and Gruda, F.O. 78/3106; for verbal reply, see p. 158, n. 4.

2 See to Granville, 18 Aug., urging a remonstrance to Russia against General Kauffmann’s correspondence with Abdurrahman and the presence of Russian officers with the Afghan army at Maiwand (reported by Dufferin, tels. Nos. 130, 132, 16 Aug., F.O. 65/1085); to Hartington, 20 Aug., enclosing draft remonstrance to Lobanov; mins. by Hartington, Lansdowne, and Kimberley, P.R.O. 30/29/143.

3 Cf. Seymour to Gladstone, 20 Aug., on Hartington’s wish that he should attend so that parliamentary business could be arranged, Add. MS. 44172, fo. 124; Gladstone attended; held, 21 Aug., showing correct date of no. 283.

4 The material part of Granville’s draft remonstrance to Russia began with this assertion and ended by laying stress on Britain’s wish for friendly relations with Russia.
My impression is that they have not.¹
I will not say that I am able from memory to justify that impression.
It may be erroneous.
What I would most earnestly urge is that the point is of vital importance.
The assumption seems to be made alike by you, Hartington & Lansdowne.
A controversy of recrimination, plausibly supported on the other side, would be most painful & mischievous.
I am most desirous to see K[aufmann] got rid of—but I am sure you will agree that before preferring an indictment, we should be sure it cannot be met by a counter indictment.
Your assurance if you can give it will be enough for me.²

285. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

10, Downing Street. Au. 21. 80.

I am still surprised at Goschen’s language with regard to the vague proposal of compromise on the Greek frontier.³
For Abedin Pacha to ask ‘whether any compromise was possible’ was a palpable snare.
I think it an entire mistake to entertain such a question unless the proposal be of a defined compromise.
It seems to me that the putting such a question as A. P. put should at this date be regarded as in itself an obstacle & an offence.

286. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville


Our affairs are prosperous: only Lacaita giving way; prudentially, rather than from actual suffering, he goes on shore at Falmouth. We are to go up the Irish Channel, not round by the West. Our points of contact are recorded in Downing Street.

I witness with much concern what has been going on in the House of

¹ Cf. mem. by P. Currie, 21 Aug., on Anglo-Russian correspondence about Central Asia, since Sept. 1878, which bears out Gladstone’s view, F.O. 65/1103.
³ In Goschen’s tels. secret and personal, 1, 3 July, reporting Abeddin Pasha’s proposal that Turkey should retain Janina and Prevesa and cede Thessaly or an island; strongly supported by a private letter, 15 July, P.R.O. 30/29/188; see also Granville’s reply, 29 July, explaining reasons for rejection, P.R.O. 30/29/210; and Goschen’s report, 13 Aug., of his rejection adding that Abeddin had wished only to know whether this was worth proposing, P.R.O. 30/29/188; cf. no. 246 and p. 154, n. 4.
I do not at all suppose that I can mend it. But when it has reached a certain point, it may be unseemly that I should not take my share in encountering it. Pray recollect therefore that I am easily revocable. A Telegram to Steamer Grandtully Castle, Kingstown, Dublin, tomorrow would catch me.

The prorogation I am afraid gradually recedes into the distance.

The recommendation about the Garter was met as you prepared me to expect. On all grounds I am sorry: but you will I think approve of my having withdrawn it for the moment, in as shapely a manner as I could, at the same time laying the ground pretty distinctly for its renewal.

I am very much grieved about the Employer's Liability Bill on which I send you a short ciphered Telegram with reference to today's probable Cabinet.

287. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

Among the Hebrides. Aug. 31. 80.

We are actually going round Cape Wrath and back by the East Coast: and although this is with the full intention, weather permitting, of reaching London on Saturday morning or forenoon, yet as I am not yet certain what convenient means of communication with you I may have after today, I have prepared the rough skeleton of a speech and send it to you by this early post for consideration.

It will serve at any rate to raise the points so far as I know them. And some of them are serious.

I have advisedly adopted rather a stern tone about Turkey, and I hope you may approve of it[,] but you will have plenty of time to consider the matter. I can hardly hope any amended proceedings of the Turk will come in to affect the case.

I have also advisedly put high the doctrine of concert: partly encouraged thereto by the recent Telegram about the German Emperor.

---

1 For proceedings in Committee of Supply, when the Irish members obstructed the Law and Justice, Education, and Public Works votes and the Commons sat continuously for 21 hours, see Hans. Parl. Deb. ccclvi. 126–351, 398–467.

2 Gladstone to the Queen, submitting Derby's name for the K.G. vacant by Stratford de Redcliffe's death, not traced, but the Queen had written to Granville, 25, 26 Aug., that it was impossible for her to consent to give it to Derby, P.R.O. 30/29/31; see nos. 465, 471, 479, 480, 850, and p. 469, n. 2; see also no. 290.

3 Tel. Falmouth, 28 Aug., 'speaking with reserve while absent, I rather presume Cabinet and Commons will not accept changes in Employers' Liability Bill' (returned from the Lords and in its last stages in the Commons), P.R.O. 30/29/123.

4 See Godley to Granville with min. by Hartington; Granville to Gladstone, tel. 31 Aug., asking for Gladstone's draft of the Queen's speech, closing the session, to be settled at the cabinet of 4 Sept., which he need not attend, P.R.O. 30/29/123; Gladstone attended, see Add. MS. 44642, fo. 64; for speech, see p. 167, n. 2.

5 Not traced.
Please let F. Cavendish see the Harcourt Paragraph: he will probably consult Welby.

Please let the Irish, Indian, & Colonial Paragraphs go at once or early to the respective Ministers.

The Irish one is delicate in subject-matter. The Colonial vague & general. K[imberley] will know whether it should have more point, or less. Viewing the importance of each 24 hours as to probable tidings from Afghanistan I simply leave a blank for any notice of the military situation.

We are going now to Tobermory where I hope to hear more definitively whether you make the speech on Saturday.

It will have more meaning perhaps than conclusion. Speeches usually have: and I am anxious the Cabinet should not be in any possible embarrassment from my absence, though you have most kindly and considerately absolved me.

If you fail with the Employer’s Bill, or submit to the Lords’ Amendments, I rather suppose you may have to notice the subject in the Speech.

288. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

[Add. MS. 44172, fo. 134]

Foreign Office. Sep 1 [1880].

I dare say you are annoyed with me for not having written more but I have purposely abstained. I have had nothing however particular to say.

It looks at last as if the Montenegrin question would be settled—leaving Dinosi and 30 square Kilometres to the Turks, but giving them nothing of Cuci Kreina. All the Powers have agreed to the instructions to our Admirals, excepting France from whom we are waiting to hear.

The Tory Peers are angry with their front bench about the Rabbits bill. They rejected the Irish [sc. Voters] Registration (Ireland) bill this afternoon. Dizzy voted with them, but did not speak and looked angry. Redesdale has sent out a private whip, which will probably be attended to, with a view to stopping the amendments of the Commons on Burial &

1 Granville to Gladstone, tel. 2 Sept., acknowledging the draft speech, reporting Hartington’s general acceptance of the Indian part, and his wish for some ‘specification of meaning’, and Granville’s own wish to ‘soften part of the passage relating to foreign affairs’, P.R.O. 30/29/123.

2 See map, W. N. Medlicott, Bismarck, Gladstone and Concert of Europe (1956) 75; see also Granville to Elliot, No. 577, 31 Aug., F.O. 7/986.

3 For proposed naval demonstration, see p. 142, n. 2, p. 162, n. 2; see also Admiralty to F.O., 5 Sept., enclosing final instructions to Admiral Seymour, commander-in-chief of the European fleet, F.O. 78/3172.

4 The conservative leaders negotiated the passage of the Ground Game bill through the Lords in opposition to their own supporters; see Hans. Parl. Deb. cclvi. 949–51, 1022–3.

5 For failure of this bill to facilitate the registration of parliamentary voters, see Hans. Parl. Deb. cclvi. 962.
other bills. We have made the best whip we can, but I do not know with what result. Hamilton believes you are coming to town for the Cabinet. We shall be glad to see you, but I regret your cutting short your holyday—and there will be much to do.

I do not like the outlook for the Greek Frontier question—the bright spot is the proposal of M. Mallet, a man of high character at Paris, and of some Greek Merchants to find 2,000,000£ as a bribe from the Greeks to the Turks—the money to be applied to European Reforms. I am afraid that this exclusive application to public purposes will not tempt the Turks much. But Greek Merchants are likely to know how to set about it. The plan may have originated in your hint to the King.¹

289. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

off Montrose. Sept 2. 80.

I send herewith a formal paragraph² always included in the Speech at the end of the Session. It escaped me until I had sent off the draft.

We have seen much & suffered nothing: getting East wind for the West Coast and West wind for the East.

I expect to get a Telegram at Leith this afternoon—& probably to reach London Saturday forenoon.³

290. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

10, Downing Street. S. 5. 80.

The Speech is approved.⁴

Childers comes to me at 2.15. I should like a conversation with you before that time, or after the Cabinet on various matters of arrangement.

Odo Russell Peerage⁵

¹ See nos. 222, 224, 269, 272; see also to Adams, No. 1214 secret, 3 Sept., authorizing him to encourage Charles Mallet in his proposal without committing Britain, F.O. 27/2424.
² The paragraph of formal thanks, addressed to the Commons only, for its 'liberal provision' for the public service; for speech, 7 Sept., see Hans. Parl. Deb. cclvi. 1335–9.
³ 4 Sept.; see also Granville to Gladstone, tel. 2 Sept., saying that the date of prorogation had become uncertain, that the cabinet was still fixed for 4 Sept., and some alteration of the draft speech was desirable, P.R.O. 30/29/123.
⁴ The Queen to Granville, tel. Balmoral, 4 Sept., approved, but suggested an allusion to General Roberts's Afghan victory, P.R.O. 30/29/37; the speech referred to the renewal of hostilities in South Afghanistan and hoped that the ‘brilliant victory’ at Mazra, 1 Sept., would make an end possible.
⁵ For Odo Russell's refusal of a peerage from the conservative government out of regard for Gladstone, see no. 127; for the Queen's agreement and its bestowal, Mar. 1881, see nos. 370, 375, 388, 391.
Derby & the Garter
Enfield's unpaid office
Adam's successor
Vacant G. C. B.

and the like.

We cannot come to decisions at the Cabinet tomorrow about next year's Legislation but I will ask our Colleagues to turn over in their minds the choice between certain important groups of questions for the pièce de resistance of the next Session.

I accept Lobanoff for the 8th.

291. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

10, Downing Street. Sept. 6. 80.

I do not know that I have any occasion to trouble you further this afternoon.

But one thing I beg, that whenever you see the smallest occasion for us to meet in London you will make no scruple about writing to summon me.

I have no chance of moving before Friday.

All joy go with you.

292. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

S. 7. 80.

According to the report of Sir C. Dilke the French Govt. has shown a retroactive disposition in the matter of the Wine Duties as well as in the E. Question: wh[ich] further justifies Ld Granville.

2 See Enfield to Gladstone, 28 Aug., asking whether he might retain his unpaid headship of the civil service commission, despite his acceptance, 24 Aug. (no. 255), of the under-secretaryship for India, and note on docket that agreed with Granville to let it stand over; Add. MS. 44465, fo. 20; and reply, 7 Sept., that he should retain it temporarily, Add. MS. 44544, fo. 51.
3 Appointed governor of Madras, Oct., and replaced as chief commissioner, Board of Works, by Lefevre, see no. 366.
4 Vacant, like the K.G. accepted by Bedford, by Stratford de Redcliffe's death, 14 Aug.; see nos. 297, 391.
5 For note of cabinet, Mon. 6 Sept., additional to the meeting on 4 Sept., see Add. MS. 44642, fo. 67.
6 See Dilke to Challemel Lacour, 23 Aug., enclosing a statement about the Anglo-French commercial negotiations and expressing Britain's readiness to discuss French duties on British manufactures and British wine duties, whenever France was ready, F.O. 27/2472; to which France had not replied.
293. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

8 Sept.: 80.

Here is a Treasury Memorandum on the important subject of the Turkish Guaranteed Loan; and a suggestion of F. Cavendish that it should be referred to Goschen.

Goschen however can do nothing in the matter as to getting the Turks to provide for this portion of their debts.

Were you about to impound Smyrna or take any very strong measure of that kind the case would be different.

I think it is quite open to us to proceed at once & from here if you think it possible.

The financial case is so bad that it cannot long go unnoticed.

Individually, I agree in the opinion that the Cyprus revenue ought to be set off against the Turkish default. That however you may not think proper to decide without the Cabinet, of course not without Kimberley.2

But is not the time come in making a new demand on France for this dividend, to invite her to consider some joint, prompt & intelligible measure in the way of demand upon Turkey.3

You will know whether this might or might not have a secondary valuable use in serving as a test of the real disposition of France (if she has one) about the Eastern Question.

294. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Walmer Castle. Sep 8/80.

It is certainly charming being in the country again.

I came down on Monday night. Dilke & Sanderson arrived yesterday. Hartington comes today.

If you had come we should have been prepared to deal with anything.

I am glad the Austrians have snubbed the French about the instructions.4 Everybody has probably done the same.

I enclose a note from Lobanoff.5 I hope you approve of the answer which I immediately sent by telegraph.6

1 2 Aug., proposing to use the Cyprus revenues (above the amount assigned to the Turkish tribute) plus the Egyptian tribute in order to pay the interest on the Ottoman guaranteed loan of 1855 (see p. 152, n. 2) and establish a sinking fund to pay off the loan itself in 44 years; see précis, 2 Nov., F.O. 78/3076.

2 i.e. as colonial secretary, Cyprus now being under the C.O.; Goschen advised against Britain's appropriating the surplus Cyprus revenue, Goschen to Granville, No. 410, 28 Sept., F.O. 78/3609; see p. 212, n. 4.

3 Representations had been made to Turkey on 1 Mar. and 18 Aug., see Granville to Musurus Bey, communicated to Paris, F.O. 78/3609.

4 To the admirals engaged in the naval demonstration.

5 See Granville to Dufferin, No. 452, 9 Sept., recording Lobanov's note accepting the Austrian proposals if the other powers did so, F.O. 65/1077.

6 See to Lobanov, tel., 9 Sept., that all the powers had agreed and the prince of
Halifax writes to suggest our financial year beginning on the 1st of July. Did you get a rejoinder about Kandahar.

295. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

10, Downing Street. Sept 9. 80.

I entirely concur in your Telegram and at Lobanoff's last night I clearly gathered that while preferring their own course the Russian Govt. were prepared to concur in the omission of Dinosi from the scheme.

I found the Grand Duke clear, extremely conversable, full of good words as to relations with England.

The temptation to telegraph about Candahar came upon me but I resisted it.

At present we stand to go to Hawarden tomorrow sleeping one night at Mentmore on the way.

The Baroness still hankers after an interview with my wife or me. It seems Selborne has been at Holly Lodge—Knowles (of Nineteenth Century) thinks it just possible the thing may go to the ground. It would be a mercy.

296. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone


I have read Welby's scheme for dealing with the Cyprus Tribute & have asked for more information on it.

I see no objection in principle, but it takes away the inducement we proposed to hold out to the Turk to get rid of the July [sc. June] Convention.

Montenegro was ready to conform to their wishes and stating that it was hoped instructions would go at once to the Russian ambassador in Constantinople, Add. MS. 44172, fo. 140; see p. 160, n. 1.

1 To Granville, 7 Sept., making the suggestion as a means of avoiding the piling up of business for the Lords at the end of the session, P.R.O. 30/29/150.

2 i.e. to his answer to Ponsonby's request, 3 Sept., for opinions on Candahar since the Queen thought military opinion favoured its retention, P.R.O. 30/29/37; see Ponsonby to Granville, 9 Sept., on the Queen's fear that the decision to evacuate Candahar was hurriedly reached and wish for further military opinion before she could approve it, P.R.O. 30/29/37.

3 Grand Duke Constantine.

4 See the Baroness Burdett-Coutts to Gladstone, 6 Sept., two letters, seeking for an interview with him or Catherine Gladstone in order to speak of her approaching marriage to W. Ashmead Bartlett (took place 12 Feb. 1881), Add. MS. 44466, fos. 48, 52; answered refusing, 9 Sept.

5 See p. 169, n. 1.

6 i.e. the payment of a lump sum (raised by a loan on the security of the Cyprus revenues) in lieu of the annual tribute; see p. 129, n. 3.
Montenegro seems now in ship shape.¹
I do not understand the Foreign Press criticisms on your speech about Turkey.²
I wish you joy of getting back to Hawarden.
[P.S.] I have just rec[eive]d two telegrams from you.³ I have tele-graphed to Currie to send to you the answer I propose.⁴
The message about the loan, referring to something which Elliot has sent is unintelligible, as I have not yet rec[eive]d Elliot’s message.⁵

297. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone  
[Add. MS. 44172, fo. 143]  

On reflection it appears to me that the best thing to do with the red riband⁶ will be to keep it open for Goschen.
It may be necessary to confer such an honour at any moment without delay.

298. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville  
[P.R.O. 30/29/123]  
Mentmore, Leighton Buzzard, Sept. 11. 80.

I am not sure that I gather correctly the meaning of the unwillingness to make further representations⁷ but I hope it is that you think the time for words is past.
I should be for instructing Goschen to move the Ambassadors to send the Porte a sommation to execute the Treaty and to signify that it would in case of failure be responsible for all consequences.
If they did not execute it would then only remain to arrange with Montenegro for the time of execution.
I am afraid that we are in danger of new mockeries worse than before—with this for the ultimate plea of the Turk that he has done his best, and cannot execute.

¹ i.e. since Russia’s abandonment of her counter proposal (including guarantees to the Mussulman landowners of the c ded territory) and the general acceptance of the Austrian plan (p. 169, n. 5); see Granville to Goschen, tel. No. 511, 10 Sept., F.O. 78/3103.
² See nos. 300, 305. ³ Not traced. ⁴ Not traced. ⁵ See from Elliot, tel. No. 148 secret, 9 Sept., reporting E. Rumelia’s request for a loan of 2½ million francs from Bulgaria, F.O. 7/994; and Gladstone to Granville, tel. 10 Sept., hoping Granville would prevent it, P.R.O. 30/29/123.
⁶ For vacant G.C.B., see p. 168, n. 4; for offer to Goschen on his return from Constantinople, see no. 391.
⁷ Relates to Granville’s deprecatory comment (not traced) on Goschen’s tel. No. 210, 9 Sept., asking in view of reported Albanian seizure of the land promised to Montenegro, for some strong immediate collective action towards the porte, F.O. 78/3106.
Considering the enormous difficulty we have had in getting the powers to agree about the collective note, and the naval instructions, I should have preferred trusting to the effect of these without starting a fresh hare, which I am not at all sure the Powers will agree to hunt, but as you are anxious that we should do so, I have telegraphed to Goschen, that with reference to his telegram, I hope that the Ambassadors will have presented the collective note at once, and that he is authorized to inform the Porte in addition, that immediate action is expected, and that we disclaim all responsibility for the results arising from delay—and that he may concert with his colleagues the language that he should hold.

I have informed the other powers.¹

Hartington & Dilke went away this morning. I have some Foreign Secs of Embassy here, but they have told me no news.

¹ See to Goschen, tel. No. 518, 12.30 a.m., 12 Sept., replying in the words of no. 298 to Goschen's tel. No. 210, F.O. 78/3103; repeated to the five capitals.

² 4 Sept., in a debate raised by Joseph Cowen, on a Sat. afternoon, just before the prorogation, Gladstone having arrived that morning from Hawarden and attended a cabinet at noon; see Hans. Parl. Deb. cclvii. 1318–27.
but the gravity of the Candahar affair put it out of my head—I wished to ask our Colleagues to turn over in their minds before we meet the relative advantages and disadvantages of the greatest legislative subjects before us for the chief work of next Session—such as, Land, suffrage, local Government. It is an important and not a very easy choice. I think it should not be suffrage.2

There is no doubt a relation between the Guaranteed Loan and the Cyprus Territorial Sovereignty: if possible we should combine them.3

I go on to Hawarden today.
Rosebery is greatly better: but he is *physically* rather too self-conscious, perhaps, for his health.

301. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville [P.R.O. 30/29/123]
Hawarden Castle. Sept. 16. 80.

I am rather surprised at the importance which Goschen seems to attach to the fact of a change in the Turkish Ministry.4 To my mind it is only one in the long series of blinds and frauds used with ingenious variation of form by the Sultan to evade the fulfilment of his engagements.

If it is true that he has really told us he means Riza Pacha to persuade but not to use force,5 this is I think the most impudent of them all and ought to have no [other] answer from the United Powers (if united, and if not then I hope we shall always take care to know who breaks the union) than a peremptory summons to execute.

I see it stated that after two or three weeks it will not do for ironclads to remain off that coast.6 If this be so it is an additional reason for promptitude. And the keen anxiety of the Turk to show that the naval demonstration will do harm makes me more hopeful of its doing good. I confess however it will not surprise me if we find that in order to succeed it is necessary to employ the ship force on shore. This Karolyi in his first conversation fully admitted as common sense, before his Govt. had put in a caveat against it.7 I do not suppose *you* will be for shrinking if it comes to this, but it would probably fail to command unanimous assent.

---

1 For the decision of the cabinet, 6 Sept., not to retain Candahar, see p. 170, n. 2.
2 Ireland prevented the treatment of these questions; for cabinets intended to discuss the legislative programme for 1881, but prevented, see p. 212, n. 3.
3 See no. 263 and p. 169, n. 1.
4 See from Goschen, tel. No. 224 confidential, 13 Sept., on Said's succession to Kadri as prime minister simplifying diplomacy, since Said as a creature of the sultan would not be overruled by the court, F.O. 78/3106; Assim Pasha succeeded Abeddin as foreign minister.
5 See from Goschen, tel. No. 225, 14 Sept., reporting the sultan's intention that Riza Pasha should so proceed with the transfer of territory to Montenegro, F.O. 78/3106.
6 The allied fleet, 4 British, 4 Austrian, 3 Italian, 2 Russian, 1 German, and 2 French vessels, assembled at Gravosa (Ragusa) on 14 Sept.; see Admiralty to F.O., 14 Sept., F.O. 78/3173.
7 See p. 144, n. 2.
302. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Walmer Castle. Sep 16/80.

I send you some private letters.¹

I am in the middle of a correspondence with the North—I got a cyphered pro Turkish Message.² I sent a rejoinder in cypher,³ and have now rece[ive]d a telegram announcing a letter from H.M.

I will write to you as soon as I receive it.⁴

Dilke has had another operation. It will keep him in bed for a fortnight but he is going on well.

I am not sure that it is a bad thing having Said in a tangible position.

Server Pacha⁵ is supposed to be Russian, & very anti English because he attacked Lord Beaconsfield in a conversation with the Correspondent of the Daily News. He was then dismissed at Layard's instance.

I am assured that he really is a sharp fellow, who knows Europe, & would work to conciliate it. But is likely to act entirely with a view of currying favour with the Sultan & Said.

303. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

S. 18. [1880].

May not G[oschen]'s suggestion in letter of 10th⁶ as to Finance be a reason for putting a demand forward on acc[oun]t of the Guaranteed Loan? without plans or prospects.

These⁷ have been read to me: some words not decipherable.

¹ From Goschen, 7 Sept., on the relations between British consuls in Turkey and the ambassador at Constantinople; and, 10 Sept., one letter on finance, another about the relations of Mackenzie Wallace to Novikov, of Calice to himself and Italian intrigues, P.R.O. 30/29/188.

² The Queen to Granville, tel. 14 Sept., on her anxiety lest the naval demonstration should lead to war with Turkey and her determination that, if the other powers then withdrew, Britain should not be left alone with Russia, Add. MS. 44172, fo. 147.

³ Granville to the Queen, tel. 14 Sept., agreeing and showing the unlikelihood of either war or isolated action with Russia, ibid. fo. 148.

⁴ Not traced; see no. 304.

⁵ A member of the new Turkish ministry; for his attack on Beaconsfield, see the Daily News, 7 Feb. 1878, and Hans. Parl. Deb. cccxxvii. 1249–51, 1303; for his dismissal at Layard's instance, see R. W. Seton-Watson, Disraeli, Gladstone and the Eastern Question (1935) 354–5.

⁶ To Granville, private, 10 Sept., advising action on the 18th protocol of the Congress of Berlin, recommending the porte to set up a commission to investigate the grievances of European investors in Ottoman loans and propose remedies (B.F.S.P., 1877–8, p. 1068), P.R.O. 30/29/188.

⁷ Enclosures in no. 302.
304. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Confidential. Walmer Castle. Sep 18/80.

I send you 3 telegrams, a letter from Ponsonby, and my rejoinder to the Queen.¹

My first impulse (auxquels il ne faut jamais céder, car ils sont ordinaire-ment bons) was to get on my high horse. But I thought a more or less argumentative statement would be better.

It would be more logical, if she were to object before the thing is done, but it would be more inconvenient to us, and would deprive her of the proud position of 'I told you so' if things go wrong.

I quite agree with your last letter, and trust there may be no further delay. I telegraphed privately to Elliot telling him not to put the question, but to try & ascertain the opinion of Haymerle, supposing the opposition in Dulcigno territory is serious—and what we ought to do.

Shall I, if he fails, tell him in a public despatch, to ask the question confidentially.⁴

I am going to town tomorrow, for a few days.

I am ordered to be at Balmoral on the 25th. It may turn out to be impossible, but I suppose I had better go, if there is no certain inconvenience.

I feel much better than when I left London, which was beginning to tell on me.

Dilke is going on well.

305. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

Hawarden Castle. Sept. 18. 80.

I am obliged, very unexpectedly and unwillingly, at once to trouble you respecting Sir H. Elliot's public dispatch No 554.⁵

¹. He proceeds upon an unauthorised report of a speech of mine, which I do not impeach for I have not seen it, but the accuracy of which should

¹ i.e. from the Queen, tel. 14 Sept. and second tel. 15 Sept. (no. 302) and third tel., not traced; see also from Ponsonby, 15 Sept., further on the Queen's anxiety about the naval demonstration, P.R.O. 30/29/37.

² See to Ponsonby, 17 Sept., pointing out that three powers and even France as well as Russia were supporting Britain in the naval demonstration and enlarging on the value of the European concert in executing the Berlin treaty, P.R.O. 30/29/37.

³ 18 Sept., telling him to find out what Haymerle thought should be done if the resistance to Montenegro proved serious, P.R.O. 30/29/197.

⁴ Not done.

⁵ No. 554 confidential, 11 Sept., noting after Gladstone's speech of 4 Sept. (no. 300) the 'profound difference' between Austrian and British policy towards Turkey. Gladstone's object was administrative reform, Austria-Hungary's, European peace; she agreed that Turkey must shift for herself, if this meant that no foreign aid was to be given either to the sultan or to his subjects, F.O. 7/994.
surely have been ascertained by a British Ambassador before founding on it an announcement of a 'profound difference' of policy with an allied Government acting in concert with us at this moment.

2. I desire however to know in what part of this speech, or report, Sir H. Elliot learns that according to me 'Foreign aid' is to be given to the subjects of Turkey against their Government?

If I say to a man 'shift for yourself' it is not an interpretation of that phrase, but a sheer caricature of it, to say that it signifies I mean to assault him. *And it reminds me, I am sorry to say, how on a former occasion, when I contended that the official & governing Turk should go out of Bulgaria, I was construed by Sir H. Elliot as saying that the Ottoman Power, indeed I believe that all Turks, should be turned out of Europe.*

3. The assumed opposition between Austrian policy and my speech is founded upon my having been (truly) stated to say that the introduction of reforms in Turkey ought to be our primary object in Turkey.

Am I then to understand that the Austrian Government holds the negative of this proposition, and is prepared to support the Turkish Government such as it now is?

Unless that is the view of the Austrian Government there is no antagonism between its policy and my language.

But from a passage later on I find that Austria thinks with me that Turkey must shift for herself 'unless the Porte tolerably discharge its administrative duties': so that this profound difference is apparently no difference at all.

I must ask your attention to this disagreeable business and I remain . . .

306. *Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville* 

No 2. Private.

It is with great & unfeigned regret that I send you the inclosed letter but I think you will feel with me that I cannot pass without notice Sir H. Elliot's dispatch No 554.

I am not a fair judge, but it appears to me that to write such a dispatch was an act of extraordinary indiscretion.

The matter will require all your tact and consideration to deal with. I have a sincere respect for Sir H. Elliot as a gentleman, but one does not reckon on having to engage in controversies of this kind with our own Ambassadors on matter prepared by them for submission to Parliament.

1 i.e. after his pamphlet on the Bulgarian atrocities, see nos. 4, 6.

Gladstone to Granville, tel. 18 Sept., expressing pleasure at Sale's announcement (tel. No. 3, 16 Sept., received 17 Sept., F.O. 97/532) that the admirals proposed to act as soon as the consuls had been evacuated since 'delays for persuasion had really been delays for resistance', and announcing the complaint about Elliot, P.R.O. 30/29/123, not printed; see no. 310.

3 i.e. no. 305.
If you send the inclosed to Sir H. Elliot please to leave out the passage in pencil brackets.¹ I wish to bring it to your mind, but not to revive the subject as he made a perfectly proper explanation when challenged upon it.

I hope that as this is the first so it may be the last time of my troubling you in such a way.

307. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville [P.R.O. 30/29/123]
No 3. 
Hawarden Castle. Sept. 18. 80.

I have read today the Memorandum received yesterday about the Slav Provinces of Turkey signed by Mr Bertie.²

Besides your most proper remonstrance³ about the vessel, the Loan, the large number of Russian officers, and the non-demolition of the Fortresses might[,] I should suppose[,] be properly made the subject of remonstrance at Sophia and Philippopolis.⁴

But more especially would it not be right that Goschen (if he has not done it) should—perhaps in answer to the Sultan’s request for a proof of our friendship—point out at Constantinople this state of things and urge that it, and all that may follow it, are principally due to the delays and evasions of Turkey in the non-execution of the Treaty of Berlin.⁵

I agreed in your remarks about the H. of Lords. But I have thought since of what seems to me a rather powerful instrument⁶ in the hands of the H. of C. for working on the H. of Lords, and certainly within its competence.

308. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville [P.R.O. 30/29/123]

I have yours of yesterday⁷ and I now address you in London.

If you are to be at Balmoral on Saturday, I hope you will take us on your way.⁸

¹ See starred passage in no. 305; Granville to Elliot, No. 630, 27 Sept., asked for an explanation, without sending Gladstone’s letter, F.O. 7/986; and Elliot replied, No. 618, 5 Oct., that he meant by ‘foreign aid’ aid from other powers than Britain and that his aim was to improve Anglo-Austrian relations, F.O. 7/995.
² Not traced.
³ About the loan reported to be sought by E. Rumelia from Bulgaria (no. 296) see to Lascelles, No. 115, recording tel. 11 Sept., F.O. 78/3116; for communication to Lobanov of mem., 14 Sept., on the number of Russian officers in Bulgaria, see F.O. 65/1095.
⁴ See to Lascelles, No. 116, 15 Sept., and No. 122, 27 Sept., on Bulgaria’s failure to demolish fortresses in the Balkans in accordance with the Berlin treaty and on the number of Russian officers, F.O. 78/3116; no remonstrance in Philippopolis traced.
⁵ See to Goschen, No. 496A, 20 Sept., recording Granville’s telling Musurus Pasha that much of the agitation in Bulgaria was due to this delay, F.O. 78/3076.
⁶ Allusion not identified; but see no. 310.
⁷ i.e. no. 304 above, enclosing correspondence with the Queen.
⁸ Granville was at Hawarden from 22 to 23 Sept., and at Balmoral, 25 to 28 Sept.
An excellent train at 2.45 reaching Chester 7.25 would bring you here to dinner before 8.30 and there are very good trains from Chester and Liverpool to the North.

Your letter is [sic] inclosed is I think as admirable—and it is saying much—as the occasion & matter which called it forth is deplorable.

I find it now more easy to understand certain rumours which used to circulate to the effect that B[eaconsfield] found it hard to keep his pupil in order. He has over-educated the said pupil a little.

I think Goschen’s Tel No. 230 (or 290) admirable & hope the prompt answer he desires may have been practicable.¹

Your going to B[almoral] may entail some inconvenience but you could not well avoid it: you will be useful there: and I hope that wonderful climate will thoroughly set you up after your hard & anxious work.

As to sole action with Russia, or rather dual action, I have never, in 1876 or now, said a word for it: or for such action with any other power. But it would not be warrantable to ask any abstract pledge of us on the subject.

If Astin [sc. Assim] Effendi is an honest man his conversation is important: in any case his words are true.²

309. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Walmer Castle. Sep 19/80.

I have rec[eive]d the enclosed reply from the queen³—the greater part of which is beside the question.

I told Leopold that the Queen need be under no apprehension about Foreign affairs—that we were not going to destroy the Treaty of Berlin, but to carry out it’s provisions.

What she means about my having asked her to invite you not to reverse the policy, I cannot imagine.

I send you my rejoinder.⁴ But probably you had better keep out of the difficulty—and appear later, if necessary as a ‘Deus ex’.

¹ Tel. No. 230, 17 Sept., urging that Turkey be told that if Dulcigno were not surrendered within two or three days, the European fleets would sail from Ragusa, F.O. 78/3106; and reply, tel. No. 563, 21 Sept., withholding instruction which might ‘take away all discretion in communicating with the Admiral’, F.O. 78/3103; for resulting misunderstanding, see no. 317.

² See St. John’s mem. of conversation with Assim Effendi, who said European firmness in insisting upon the execution of the treaty of Berlin was the only hope for Turkey, forwarded to the Queen in Granville to Ponsonby, 17 Sept., P.R.O. 30/29/37.

³ Tel. 18 Sept., protesting against a reversal of the conservative Turkish policy especially because Granville had twice told Prince Leopold there would be no reversal, Letters, iii. 141; P.R.O. 30/29/37.

⁴ To the Queen, 19 Sept., denying that there had been any reversal, ibid. 141–2; Add. MS. 44172, fo. 162; P.R.O. 30/29/37.
I hope you do not object to my hint as to a Cabinet.\(^1\) If we succeed at Dulcigno, the matter will blow over. If there is a fiasco, it may be very troublesome.

310. **Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone**

[Add. MS. 44172, fo. 165]

Foreign Office. Sep 19/80.

I have found on my arrival in town, your letter marked no 3, on Bertie's memo.\(^2\)

Hamilton in forwarding it to me says, that he should have expected 2 other letters,\(^3\) but that none have arrived.

It is probable that your minutes on Captain Sale, and on finance\(^4\) are the two others.

I will attend to the 2 questions you raise.

Hamilton adds that in a letter which is to go [to] a home ruler, MP,\(^5\) you have spoken possibly inadvertently of 'the recent short sighted action of the House of Lords'.

I should be extremely obliged, if you would consent to omit this sentence. The letter is sure to be published. Anything like nagging the House of Lords can do no good—& is perhaps hardly dignified in your great personal and official position, and would weaken rather than strengthen any instrument such as that to which you allude, when the proper occasion arises.

Please do not blow up Hamilton for the indiscretion of his suggestion.

311. **Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville**

[P.R.O. 30/29/123]

Hawarden Castle. Sept. 20. 80.

I never read in my life a better letter than the one you have last sent to Balmoral.

We must not palter, nor hesitate even as to a Cabinet if needful.

I replied to you by Telegraph this morning—including both your letters.

\(^1\) See ending of Granville's letter to the Queen that he would have asked Gladstone to summon a cabinet, if it would not have created alarm at home and abroad.

\(^2\) See no. 307.

\(^3\) i.e. nos. 305 and 306.

\(^4\) For min. on Sale, see copy of tel. No. 3, 16 Sept., on the back of which is min. as in Gladstone to Granville, tel. 18 Sept. (p. 176, n. 2), P.R.O. 30/29/123; for min. on finance, see no. 303.

\(^5\) To Capt. O'Shea, 19 Sept., thanking for his letter which reported support for Gladstone after the Lords' rejection of the Compensation for Disturbance bill, Add. MS. 44544, fo. 60.
'Willingly give up short sighted1 also the rest if you think it necessary. Have just read your second letter not less admirable than the first, from end to end.' [']

As I appear in this part of the correspondence I shall be glad to have copies of the letter and of that to which you reply but I return these in the meantime lest you should have no others.

I may mention now a few words which I found occasion to use in the quasi-Cabinet after the Prorogation Speech about the Candahar Telegram. They were to this effect 'Depend upon it that in all our discussions upon serious and critical matter there is one thing that we should not wholly exclude from our minds: namely that H.M. may turn round upon us and say she has no further occasion for our services; a most serious affair. I am far from saying this will happen, but it is a point which should not be left wholly out of view in our thoughts.' [']

I need not say that, rightly or wrongly, this was not spoken in haste. The present case carries us back to George III and the pledge he demanded from the Whigs not to stir the R.C. question. You will have found the explanation of my 1. 2. 3.2 and will not I hope have thought me thin-skinned in the Elliot matter. I had written to you in the sense of Kallay's representations about the Pro-Turkish Berlin stipulations.3 There are however some obvious observations to be made. 1. That it is the right of Turkey to raise the question of coercion against those under her Suzerainty, and not very much the business of anyone else. 2. Her not doing it cannot be pleaded in bar of any of her obligations. 3. We have nothing to do with Turkey's rights as creditor, [any] more than with her obligations as debtor (to other folks).

312. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

[Hawarden Castle. Sep. 22. 80.]

I was delighted to receive your Telegram promising a visit.4 It is rather blind work but I cannot help hoping good from the change of Ministry in France.5 Yet even if this be so as to results, it may be unfortunate in its bearing upon time, at a juncture when time is all in all.

1 i.e. in the letter to O'Shea; the rest of the tel. referred to Granville's two letters to the Queen, see P.R.O. 30/29/123; Granville asked, 20 Sept., for the omission of the whole passage, which was done, see Add. MS. 44172, fo. 168.

2 i.e. nos. 305–7.

3 See no. 307; for Kallay's reference to the E. Rumelian loan (p. 171, n. 5) and proposed remonstrance to Bulgaria about the failure to execute these stipulations, see from Elliot, No. 552 confidential, 9 Sept., F.O. 7/994.

4 See p. 177, n. 8.

5 Barthélemy St. Hilaire replaced Freycinet as foreign minister in the new ministry under Jules Ferry, 21 Sept.; see no. 379.
It may be difficult for a newly constituted Cabinet to act at once, especially where as in France the men even more than the combinations are very new.

My impression would be

1. That if France for the moment is in abeyance we should not on that account consider the concert as impaired.

2. That if Austria declines all land action under whatever necessity we should not on that account consent to run a serious risk of seeing Europe befooled by the Sultan at Dulcigno.

3. Neither would I consider the holding back of Germany fatal, if Russia & Italy are willing to act, and if what has to be done is approved by the commanders on military grounds.

4. Nothing would surprise me so much as to see Montenegrins routed by an equal number of Albanians. It could only happen through some monstrous defect of generalship, if the arms as I take for granted are any thing near equality. It is a literal fact that even down to 1878 the Montenegrins have usually held their own against the Turkish Armies, and, frequently, when 1 against 4: & in these Turkish armies Albanians must have been very often serving; besides, how many non-Albanians are now figuring as Albanians under the inspiration of the Sultan & Riza Pacha?

313. Memorandum by Mr. Gladstone

Conv[er]s[ation] with G[ranville]


Those of us who sit in the House of Commons (and we are in thorough agreement with the Ministers who are Lords) were certainly not returned to Parliament to carry forward the Foreign Policy of the last Government.

And this was known throughout the country, and beyond it.

Nevertheless, sensible of the expediency of maintaining as far as might be a continuity in Foreign Policy, we sought for a ground of action which might be common to both political parties.

We found this ground in the unfulfilled Clauses of the Treaty of Berlin which for all reasons it was urgent to press forward.

We had an international title to demand as a single Power the fulfilment of those Clauses.

Probably, a perfect international title; evidently a far better one than the title of the late Government to conclude the Anglo-Turkish Convention.

Instead of using this liberty we placed ourselves under great restraint by endeavouring to organise an European concert.

Our policy thus was only as follows: to require what Europe had decided, and to require it through the agency of Europe.

All besides this has been expressly reserved. No Power is pledged, by any thing that has taken place since April to any kind of action except unanimous action.
If the existing unanimity should not continue, a new question arises, namely whether the decision of Europe shall be pressed by only a portion of the Powers: as in 1853, with the full approval of the nation, the public law of Europe was finally vindicated by the action of England and France alone.

But on the other hand [sic] we have never said on the one hand that the Treaty was to remain unfulfilled because some one or more Powers might not be prepared to use decisive means in case of need for procuring its execution; or on the other hand that such a burden ought to be borne by England single-handed.

314. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville [P.R.O. 30/29/123]

I do not write to reopen the subject of this morning’s Telegram—which will have explained itself—but to refer to you a question of honours for the Lord Mayor and Sheriffs.2

In no instance do they seem to have been given for a minor European Sovereign. We have had such here but probably they, for the most part, have not been entertained.

I shall be very glad of the aid of your judgment.

If you are clear & strong in the affirmative, perhaps you will kindly consult H.M.

315. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville [P.R.O. 29/123]
Hawarden Castle. Sept 25. 80.

1. All the Telegrams today look like action in the matter of Dulcigno. The Turks have done everything in their power to remove doubt and difficulty, and reduce the question to its true proportions, do we mean any thing or nothing.

Two contingencies occur to one’s mind.

(1) The Albanians may leave the town and shift to heights behind it or fall back upon the lake with Scutari for their supplies.

(2) Riza and his regulars may oppose the Montenegrins. With these we have to take into view the lapse of the season.

1 To Granville: ‘Goschen 253 [i.e. tel. as in n. 3]. I conclude nothing remains but action unless Admiral hears from Constantinople that Porte complies’, 11.30 a.m. 24 Sept., P.R.O. 30/29/123; Granville had not answered, see p. 184, n. 4.

2 None was offered on account of the Queen’s opposition since Gladstone had refused to make the lord mayor a baronet when the king of the Belgians visited the city of London, to Granville, 26 Sept., P.R.O. 30/29/31.

3 See from Goschen, tels. Nos. 254, 257, 24 Sept., reporting the uncompromising Turkish refusal to cede Dulcigno except on conditions, presuming that matters must now take their course and reporting instructions to the admiral, F.O. 78/3106.

4 Dulcigno.

5 Turkish commander, who announced on 26 Sept. that he would attack the Montenegrins if they attempted to seize Dulcigno; see W. N. Medlicott, Bismarck, Gladstone and the Concert of Europe (1956) 154.
Is it endurable that, with or without the rising of a gale, the ships (with 7000 men on board?) shall simply retire to Cattaro and leave the Montenegrins aux prises with the Turks—the Albanians.¹

Such a case might arise for a limited use of the ship-force of a limited combination, as I suggested in my letter of Wednesday.²

2. The violence of the Turkish demands³ will I hope be helpful with the Queen.

3. There has been such a labyrinth of Turkish frauds and evasions ever since we came in, always covered with such plausible and innocent professions, that, as it seems to me, if the crisis has now come, or when it comes, you may require the preparation of a Dispatch setting out the whole story, in the manner, except as to honesty, of Hardy's Afghan dispatch of 1878.⁴

4. I have been examining Hahn about Albanian geography,⁵ but this will keep.

316. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

Hawarden Castle. Sept. 25. 80.

I have received this morning the printed sheet with the Mallet Loan project set out⁶ & I offer two or three suggestions on the detail.

a. Par 1. Is it expedient for the parties to lay down as the basis an equitable compensation to Turkey for the ceded territories, and might it not be safer to substitute some other words—query

‘for those portions of the ceded territories as to which a question has been raised by or in the interest of Turkey whether they fall within the terms of the Acts of Berlin.’

b. I question whether policy will not require that a certain portion (say i/4?) of the money to be raised shall be handed over freely to the Sultan. I mean that he will attach comparatively little value to money the issue of which is subject to the controul of the Powers.

¹ See Admiralty to F.O., 23 Sept., F.O. 78/3173. ² i.e. no. 312.
³ i.e. conditions for the surrender of Dulcigno: the abandonment of the naval demonstration; European guarantees for the lives, property, rights, and honour of the inhabitants of the ceded area; and an undertaking to make no further demands on behalf of Montenegro; see from Goschen, tel. No. 253, 24 Sept., F.O. 78/3106.
⁴ See Cranbrook to Lytton, 18 Nov. 1878, giving an historical account of British-Afghan policy on the eve of Lytton's ultimatum which precipitated the Afghan war, Parl. papers (1878–9) lvi. 634.
⁵ J. G. von Hahn, Alhanesische Studien (Vienna, 1853); see p. 33, n. 4.
⁶ See mem. by Charles Mallet, proposing to hand over to the powers for transmission to Turkey, under proper guarantees for its beneficial application, a sum up to 2½ million sterling (held by a group of Greek merchants) to induce Turkey to cede the Berlin award to Greece; enclosure in Adams to Granville, No. 786 secret, 27 Aug., F.O. 27/2434; copy printed for the cabinet, P.R.O. 30/29/123; cf. from Adams, No. 849 secret, 14 Sept., F.O. 27/2435; see nos. 222, 224, 269, 272, 288.
c. Ought not the Project to set out that the limitations on that issue should be determined beforehand so that Turkey might know how when & for what it would be available.

d. Might not certain duties of Customs be positively affected to an organisation of receivers not dependent on the Greek Government & would not this be an economical arrangement as securing better terms for the loan.

I throw out these suggestions simply as amicus curiae.

317. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone  [Add. MS. 44172, fo. 176]
Balmoral Castle. Sep 25/80.

I was frightened out of my 17 [sic] senses, when I got Goschen’s telegram, saying that the Ambassadors thought that my telegram about discretion changed the situation. I immediately fearing that your doubts were being realized, telegraphed to the F.O. to tell them to inform Goschen that the discretion could only be applied to a conclusive & practical arrangement, in accordance with the decisions of the powers.

From Goschen’s subsequent telegram, this was superfluous.

I got your telegram at Blairgowrie this morning. I was miserable at not being able to decipher it. Tried again at Balmoral with the proper book H—but also in vain. I have since received your admission that there were some mistakes—which has made me a prouder, if not a better man. There is nothing now to stop the Admiral.

Ponsonby wrote to me confidentially that Leopold had been much alarmed by the seriousness of my answers, and especially by the threat of summoning a Cabinet. The same effect but not to the same degree has been produced in higher quarters.

The Queen did not send for me before dinner, as Captain Edwards announced to me, but Prince Leopold came to my room, abundant dans mon sens, advising me how to speak to the Queen, & after hearing what I had to say recommending me to lay great stress, upon the Montenegrins having conquered Dulcigno, and having retired at the request of the

1 To Granville, tel. No. 248, received 23 Sept., reporting communication to his colleagues of Granville’s tel. (see p. 178, n. 1) refusing to take away discretion from Goschen in communicating with Admiral Seymour, F.O. 78/3106.
2 To Goschen, tel. No. 578, 24 Sept., F.O. 78/3103.
3 No. 258, 26 Sept., replying to Granville’s No. 578 that no suggestion had been made likely to lead to a practicable arrangement, F.O. 78/3106.
4 See tel. alluded to in no. 314; Granville went from Hawarden to Holker, N. Lancs., 23 Sept. and was in the train to Balmoral during the night 24–25 Sept.; the tel., missing him at Holker, was sent on; see tel. to Gladstone, Blairgowrie, 11 a.m. 25 Sept., that he had just received this tel. but could not decipher it until he reached Balmoral that afternoon, Add. MS. 44172, fo. 173.
5 22 Sept., P.R.O. 30/29/37.
6 19 Sept.; see no. 309.
Powers, and upon my conviction that we should not be abandoned by all
the Powers during the Naval Demonstration.

But I had no opportunity of following any advice, for the Queen rather
gracious, and much enquiring after your health, said little more after
dinner, than that the state of affairs was anxious.

318. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Balmoral Castle. Sep 26/80.

It was very sad arriving at Holker to hear of that excellent fellow George
Cavendish's death. It is a dreadful blow to the Duke, who however was as
sensible and natural about it, as possible.

H[artington] approved of all we had done in Foreign Affairs. Is short
about India—reticent about home affairs, but merely on account of his not
having made up his mind. He has probably not thought much on the
matter.

It will not be your impulse to do so, but I should think you had better
consult Harcourt a little about the office of Chief Baron, after you have
heard from Selborne.¹

In any case he might be useful in the personal question with H. James.²
It is quite on the cards that the latter does not wish for the place.

319. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville


1. I think you should direct an inquiry about the Telegram: it is I
believe for the receiver to do so. My paper was written with great care, in
the presence of my son Harry, and I have ascertained from the postmaster
here that it was perfectly clear. It must have been 'transferred' 1. at Chester
2. at Carke in Cartmel,³ and [confused] at one of these places. I return to
you your transcript (as I assume) of the blundered Telegram, in case you
should not have kept it.

2. Your suggestion about Harcourt is very good, he having been Law
Officer, but as yet I have corresponded only with Selborne. James I am
told thinks we ought not to fill up the appointment but create a puisne
Judge.

¹ See Gladstone to Selborne, 20, 21 Sept., proposing not to replace Sir E. Fitzroy
Kelly as president of the exchequer division of the high court (the office of chief baron
of the exchequer had been suppressed, 1873, under the Judicature Act), Add. MS.
44544, fo. 62; and reply, 27 Sept., agreeing that another puisne, but no chief, judge be
appointed, Add. MS. 44297, fo. 77.

² As attorney-general he was thought by Gladstone to have a traditional claim to the
chief judge-ship, but was reported later to be against filling the place, which was allowed
to lapse, see Gladstone to Selborne, 27 Sept., Add. MS. 44544, fo. 65.

³ The telegraphic and postal address of Holker Hall.
3. I am very sorry for the death of that kind & good man George Cavendish. The Duke must feel lonely having now lost both his juniors. I wonder how you thought him in health. The political importance of his life is great.¹

320. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

Hawarden. Sept. 27. 80.

Sale’s Telegram² reporting a hitch from Cettinje is serious. What if it means, which seems to me the best guess, that Riza Pacha intends to use the Turkish forces against the Montenegrins.

The Montenegrins are the Mandatories of Europe. Should not the Porte be told that we so regard them and warn it in grave terms demanding an immediate reply.

Unless the reply be favourable the two Turkish ships of war ought to be sunk or seized if still there: I hope this would be within the instructions —Of course after warning Englishmen & others on board.

All this is intended not to urge you beyond your convictions but to give you to understand that I am against receding and ready to concur in onward measures.

We have I suppose more ships which can be sent to the spot if necessary in the ulterior stages.

I am cutting before the mark in these anticipations but they will do no harm if the case does not arise, and as the concert abroad takes so much time the home concert should take as little as possible.

321. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

Immediate. 5½ Pm. Hawarden Castle. Sept 27. 80.

The interpretation of the Sultan’s dream goes even beyond what, in the inclosed letter,¹ I had supposed possible when I wrote it this morning.

I have now telegraphed to you suggesting a Cabinet for the measures that suggest themselves to me are beyond any other competency.⁴

The Prince of Montenegro is quite justified in his demand⁵ and I imagine we ought to reply not less than that we will at once consult upon

¹ No. 319 is unsigned, but according to the copy, Add. MS. 44544, fo. 65, complete.
² To Granville, tel. No. 11, 26 Sept., announcing that the prince of Montenegro was sending his minister for foreign affairs to Admiral Seymour to seek a fresh understanding ‘because of new events’, F.O. 97/532.
³ i.e. no. 320.
⁴ i.e. 27 Sept., proposing this in view of Montenegro’s demand, P.R.O. 30/29/123.
⁵ i.e. to know what support, beyond what the allied fleet could give him, he might expect against the Turkish commander who had declared he would resist the Montenegrin seizure of Dulcigno; see Sale to Granville, tel. No. 13, 27 Sept., F.O. 97/532.
the means of giving effect to the Treaty of Berlin in fulfilment of which he is to move.

If he is to be supported the sooner he is supported the better.

After this insulting declaration from Turkey why should we not first of all (if as I presume it is lawful) issue a proclamation requiring all British subjects to quit the (military and naval?) employment of Turkey?

Many more things suggest themselves as proper for consultation with the Powers. e.g. ¹

1. If a Turkish soldier cross the Montenegrin Frontier, it is a casus belli
2. or if a subject of any of the Powers be injured in giving effect to the Treaty of Berlin by the occupation of Dulcigno & its district. (or of Montenegro—query?)
3. To reinforce the armament or move a force to the East of the Mediterranean
4. In the last resort, to offer Albania to the Kalamas (where the country inhabited by Greeks begins) its formal or practical independence. I wait anxiously your reply to my Telegram.

322. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Balmoral Castle. Sep 27 [1880].

I have telegraphed to Austria to know what they will agree to. ²

The air has given me too good an appetite—but I shall be right again tomorrow.

323. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville


1. I am obliged to telegraph to you succinctly because you have I fear no one to assist you with the cipher. ³ But for this instead of my short telegram of this morning I should have sent my meaning as within (A). ⁴

¹ Cf. mem. in similar terms, and including the point to order all British subjects to quit the sultan's service, in Add. MS. 44764, fo. 105.
² See to Elliot, tel. No. 666 confidential, 27 Sept., F.O. 7/986; and non-committal reply, tel. No. 162, 29 Sept., formulating as desiderata: agreement among the powers, avoidance of war with Turkey, avoidance of encouragement to Montenegro to take dangerous steps, F.O. 7/904.
³ See to Granville, tel. 28 Sept.: 'Quite ready to join in responsibility of any question to the powers as suggested yesterday' [i.e. whether prepared for additional support to Montenegro], P.R.O. 30/29/123.
⁴ 'A) As Powers will wait our initiative query ask at once from each Government whether it thinks, as we two believe Cabinet thinks, 'Treaty must be fulfilled notwithstanding the Ottoman contumacy, leaving open the question of means', P.R.O. 30/29/123.
2. It was with great concern that I heard of even your slight indisposition: and the moment of the Turkish contumacy is most unfortunate. But I take the case to be one of the very highest order. Unless effective and prompt support is given to Montenegro within the limits of the Treaty there is an end to all beneficial action of Europe and the Eastern Question will be left to pass into chaos and unlimited bloodshed.

3. I have taken upon me to telegraph this forenoon to Northbrook as follows in cipher 'cannot doubt we should quietly provide that Mediterranean fleet if at Malta be ready to move eastwards at short notice.'

As this is only private and preparatory I have done it rather than lose the day by ciphered telegrams to and from you.

4. I have been reading Ardagh’s Report on the seizure of the Dardanelles as a means of coercing the Turks. It is rather a big job. Probably you have seen the paper.

5. I do not yet know whether you will leave today or tomorrow. Before you go I dare say you will have considered whether to advise the Queen once more to address the Sultan in terms of warning.

6. I find Hahn’s Book abounds in interesting & important matter about Albania. e.g. when the S. Albanians have been disorderly the N. Albanians have been freely employed by the Sultans to put them down; and vice versa.

P.S. I have your note of yesterday: a similar affection soon after arrival is not unknown to me.

---

324. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

[Add. MS. 44172, fo. 196]

Balmoral Castle. Sep 28/80.

I hope to be in town early on Thursday morning.

I was in bed all yesterday, not a pleasant place in which to receive constant telegrams.

I have asked Austria to what she will agree in the present circumstances.

I have told Tenterden to talk alternatives over with C. Key and with Adye, and to tell Munster who asks my opinion, that I think the crisis grave—

---

1 See to Gladstone, tel. 28 Sept., that he was staying a day longer at Balmoral, owing to indisposition, but could attend a cabinet on Fri. or Thurs.; and reply, that the cabinet would be summoned for Thurs. at 12, Add. MS. 44172, fo. 195.

2 Ardagh had been at the Congress of Berlin and the Berlin conference on the Greek frontier as adviser on strategic matters; mem. not traced in F.O. or Ardagh papers.

3 Cf. p. 145, n. 5, and p. 146, n. 13; there is no record of any such advice.

4 i.e. 30 Sept.

5 See above, no. 322 and to Elliot, tel. No. 669 confidential, 28 Sept., explaining that the inquiry about the next move was made because the weather might drive the allied fleets from the coast, F.O. 7/986.
that Europe cannot succumb to Turkey, & shall be desirous of having Bismarck's opinion.¹

I am rather alarmed at the interview I am to have at 3²—but I have hitherto no right to complain.

325. Memorandum by Mr. Gladstone

The British Govt, hoping for a satisfactory solution, feel it necessary to be prepared for the contingency of some new illusory proposal or mere shift on Sunday the 3rd as the result of the Sultan’s last overture.⁴

In such an event, they deem it impossible⁵ for the United Powers either to abandon their declared purpose, or to prosecute it by merely diplomatic pressure, the resources of which have notoriously been exhausted.

They think that action ought to take place, & that it ought to be so directed as to obtain from the Porte⁶ by material means, in the case that moral means sh[oul]d unhappily [sic] fall short, the immediate settlement of the question of the Montenegrin frontier; & it is their intention to exert themselves with this [in] view.

On the other hand they anxiously desire to pursue such a course as will be the least likely to reopen the Eastern Question generally with all the risks besetting its final settlement.

In the selection therefore of a point or points at which material pressure might be applied, they w[oul]d decidedly prefer those which would probably not inflict a general shock upon the Empire of the Sultan.

This advantage belongs in a considerable degree to local action at Dulcigno. The British Govt clearly understand the indisposition of the Austrian Govt to share in this local action by landing a force on the coast: & they have before them the present refusal of the Prince of Montenegro to act without some extension of the aid already promised.

Such an extension might be found if the whole, or a larger portion of his army were liberated for the active duty of clearing the Dulcigno district.

¹ Cf. min. by Tenterden, 30 Sept., asking Granville whether he still wished Russell to be directed to ascertain Bismarck's views as Münster suggested; and reply 'leave it alone', F.O. 64/957.
² i.e. with the Queen.
³ No. 325 is a mem. for the cabinet of 30 Sept.; for outcome see to Elliot, tel. No. 688, 1 Oct., proposing to Austria that, the naval demonstration having failed, the powers should go beyond local action; and tel. No. 692, 2 Oct., asking whether Austria would guarantee the new Montenegrin frontier, while a force from the ships or 'even some troops' were landed and suggesting the seizure of a material guarantee, F.O. 7/987.
⁴ Goschen reported in tel. No. 264, 28 Sept., and dispatch No. 408, 28 Sept., an offer of an unconditional settlement of the Montenegrin question by 3 Oct., F.O. 78/3095.
⁵ Currie copied an alternative reading: 'unadvisable'.
⁶ Currie's alternative reading: 'Sultan'.
H.M.'s Govt are desirous to learn from the Govt of Austria-Hungary whether, if in other respects satisfactory arrangements could be made, that Govt w[oul]d be disposed to push forward a force for the temporary purpose of securing the Montenegrin frontier against invasion while the army of Montenegro was engaged in giving effect to the decision of the Powers under the Treaty of Berlin.

In speaking of satisfactory arrangements it is meant to imply 1. that no objection should be taken by the Powers or by the Prince to the presence of an Austrian force in Montenegro. 2. that a plan presenting the requisite conditions of success should be framed & adopted for the more active operation.

If Austria should entertain such a proposal as has been suggested, the British Govt think it possible that means might be found for supporting the Montenegrin operation by an occupation of Dulcigno, & they w[oul]d be prepared to consider how far they themselves could contribute to such means.

But without the concurrence of Austria they do not see that there could be any satisfactory method of local action on the Albanian coast. It will probably depend therefore on the Austrian reply whether, in the event of another failure by the Sultan to fulfil his engagements, they further prosecute or altogether abandon this idea.

Should they have to abandon it, they w[oul]d then consider of some other method of procedure, bearing in mind in the first place the policy of maintaining the European concert, & [in] the second of avoiding if possible the danger of reopening the European question at large in the Balkan Peninsula.

It may be that the Austrian Govt sharing the anxiety of the British Govt to avoid a general disturbance may be prepared to suggest such a method: & if it be so the British Govt will at once give to the suggestion their friendly & careful consideration.

326. Memorandum by Mr. Gladstone¹

[P.R.O. 30/29/123]

[30 September 1880.]

In pursuit of the common object, and subject to the self-denying engagement, and after we have concerted with the Prince of Montenegro the means of applying force to drive the Albanian invaders from the district of Dulcigno, I am of opinion that we ought not to refuse his application.²

¹ No. 326, a mem. for the cabinet, printed Temperley and Penson, Foundations, 408–9; see Gladstone's report of the cabinet to the Queen, 30 Sept., communicated to Granville, copy, P.R.O. 30/29/123; see also Gladstone's note that the cabinet was not disposed to go beyond the European concert but to stimulate it as far as it would go and had decided to collect the fleet at Malta and to propose the seizure of Smyrna, Add. MS. 44642, fo. 71.

² i.e. for effective assistance in the event of war with Turkey; see p. 186, n. 5.
And that if we can arrange for an active concert of at least three of the Powers, together with the approval or acquiescence of the rest, we ought to prepare for proceeding, either locally or otherwise, with the limited object at present of fulfilling the Treaty of Berlin on the Montenegrin frontier, and subject to the self-denying engagement already entered into.

Should there be further contumacy it might be right to consider how far the settlement of the Greek frontier should be combined in the same arrangement.

1. The Cabinet has to consider whether it will endeavour to make arrangements for concerted military action (local or otherwise) in support of the obligations imposed by the Treaty of Berlin as to the frontier of Montenegro.

2. Assuming a) that the decision is affirmative
   b) that the self-denying engagement remains in force
   Query whether to proceed as follows—
   1) acquaint Austria, and inquire whether she would so far enter into it as to put forward a force for the defence of the S. and S.E. frontier of Montenegro (so as to liberate the whole Montenegrin army: N.B. the occupation of the Principalities during the Crimean War)¹
   2) acquaint Italy, and ask whether she will at once endeavour, with England and any other Power which may concur, to agree upon the best means of repelling any military action of the Sultan directed against the Prince of Montenegro to prevent his occupation of the territory due to him under the Treaty of Berlin.²
      (acquaint Italy confidentially that if she agrees to the use of ships, and of the ship-force by land under proper conditions, we should not understand her as binding herself to send a land-force).
   3) Collect the fleet at Malta—and announce³ it.

327. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville⁴ [P.R.O. 30/29/123]

10, Downing Street. O. 2. 80.

I wrote before receiving your note or the Telegrams⁵ which are not

¹ See to Elliot, tel. No. 602, 2 Oct., F.O. 7/987.
² No communication to Italy traced.
³ See to Goschen, tel. No. 612, 1 Oct., announcing that the ironclads of the Mediterranean fleet, other than those in the naval demonstration, had been ordered to Malta; and tel. No. 605, 30 Sept., after the cabinet, instructing him to allow the delay until 3 Oct., in the hope that ulterior measures might yet be avoided; F.O. 78/3103.
⁴ Gladstone to Granville, 1 Oct., asking whether he had done wrong in speaking to Münster, and if not proposing a dispatch recording his conversation, P.R.O. 30/29/123, not printed.
⁵ i.e. from Goschen, tel. No. 274 secret, 1 Oct., complaining of Austria, and tel. No. 275, 1 Oct., reporting Austria's instructions to her ambassador at Constantinople, which said 'Turkey was to 'remettre' Dulcigno to Montenegro, and suggesting that the powers might be satisfied without transference of possession, F.O. 78/3106.
good. Is there not rather an awkward hitch indicated by the remettre? It seems that when we thought Austria was advancing she was, in this view, preparing to draw back. And Germany seems to play into her hands. Unless I hear to the contrary I will come out sooner, between eleven & twelve.

My things will go by 4.20 and we can settle about 1.50 when we meet.

328. *Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone*  
[Add. MS. 44172, fo. 198]

Foreign Office. Oct 3. 80. 5 PM.

Challomel [sic] Lacour told Dilke that the French Gov had received the Turkish answer—Cession of Dulcigno, 2 months to settle Greece, 3 Armenia.

I have written to know whether this is official. I have my doubts.

329. *Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville*  
[P.R.O. 30/29/123]

10, Downing Street. 4 October/80.

Hengelmüller has been here. I thought him pleasant and frank. He wished to congratulate me on [my] recovery, and to talk over the situation. He evidently had a wish to know at what point we thought of taking a material guarantee; but this of course I did not gratify.

I said that in our opinion a suggestion could be made which would be safe in a military sense, which would probably work without bloodshed, which would be within the naval means now gathered in Austrian harbours, and which would work somewhat powerfully on the Porte by the double engine pecuniary and political.

I said I believed we were as anxious as they to avoid precipitating the fall of Turkey by disturbing the Balkan peninsula, that they were as anxious as we to fulfil the Berlin Treaty, and that with these conditions known it would be a great pity if we found any cause to differ between the limits which they mark out. He asked whether we should feel sure of other Powers. I told him that we had a very great confidence as to practicability & success, if we had the concurrence of Austria. He described their Parliamentary situation, and understood from me that ours was a little different—that if we did not go forward, we should have to shew it was not our own fault.

You will have heard exactly from Chalamel Lacour what it was that Tissot learned at Constantinople.¹

¹ Cf. Goschen's tel. No. 284, 4 Oct., reporting a refusal to yield Dulcigno except on the conditions of 24 Sept. (see p. 182, n. 3 and p. 183, n. 3) and insistence on the fulfilment of the provisions of the treaty of Berlin favourable to Turkey, F.O. 78/3106; see also dispatch No. 423, 5 Oct., F.O. 78/3095.

² No. 329 written by Hamilton.

³ See no. 328.
330. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville [P.R.O. 30/29/123]
10, Downing Street. Oct 6. 11.50 A.m. [1880].

I suppose that Jomini’s answer, suggesting that an ulterior arrange-
ment should now be made, need not be a test or sign of the answer from
Livadia but I presume you will think that any attempt to argue upon two
steps at once, & the second one so formidable, would be ruin to our whole
proceeding: might it be worth while to telegraph at once to St Petersburgh
to express our hope that Russia will consider Smyrna by itself and not
introduce a new mode of action at this critical moment?

331. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville [P.R.O. 30/29/123]
10, Downing Street. Oct 6. 80.

Münster who has been here scouted the notion which he had I think
got from Lobanoff that the Turks might send to Smyrna the ironclads they
are supposed to have in the Bosporos. Were they so inclined, it might I
suppose be well to strengthen, or be ready to strengthen, the allied Fleet:
and so far as we are concerned from Malta. It is most improbable that the
Turkish Fleet should be ready. But might it not be well at once to Tele-
graph to Goschen that he might let us know whether they are in a condi-
tion to move at short notice?

Possibly you may be informed on this already—if so I am sorry to give
you the trouble of reading this—

Thanks about the Telegrams.
Münster seemed pretty hearty.

332. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville [P.R.O. 30/29/123]
10, Downing Street. Oct. 7./80.

With reference to Prince Lobanoff’s letter it strikes me that
1. It is highly improbable that Turkey should attack Montenegro.
2. She has not given Turkey a _casus belli._

1 From Plunkett, No. 451, 5 Oct., No. 455, 6 Oct., reported Russia’s unconditional
acceptance of the British proposal (circular tel. to the 5 capitals, 4 Oct., e.g. to Elliot,
No. 702, F.O. 7/998) that ‘the allied fleet should proceed to Smyrna’ and hold the port
and Jomini’s urging preparations to seize Constantinople if the seizure of Smyrna
proved unavailing, F.O. 65/1082.
2 Not done.
3 Tel. No. 649, 6 Oct., asked whether the Turkish fleet could be sent at short notice
to defend Smyrna, F.O. 78/3103.
4 i.e. to Granville, enclosing a tel. from Livadia, asking what assistance could be given
to Montenegro when the fleet had left for Smyrna; Granville replied in accordance with
Gladstone’s points 1 to 5 and 9; to Plunkett, No. 516 confidential, 7 Oct., F.O. 65/1077.
3. Turkey has the most deadly experience of her prowess.
4. I do not believe in the separate offensive action of the Albanians.
5. We must remember that only a fortnight ago Montenegro thought herself strong enough with only naval aid for the offensive against both.
6. It might be well to learn her condition as to men.
7. Is it worth her while[,] considering the rapidity with which she arms[,] to keep an offensive force upon the ground?
8. Some regard should be had to division of labour, and England seems marked out for more or less of a special share in the naval work before us which is likely to be the principal.
9. If Montenegro requires aid, does not the duty of giving it seem specially to belong to Russia by her traditions & to Austria by her recent action & present interests?

333. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

[Add. MS. 44172, fo. 200]

Foreign Office. [7 October 1880].

The Dips know nothing—But Hengel Muller’s personal opinion is that they will agree.¹
I am sorry that the Pall Mall was told about Smyrna.²

334. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

[P.R.O. 30/29/123]

10, Downing Street, Oct 7. 80.

Thanks for your report. How tantalising the delay is. I have not an idea how P[all] M[all] G[azette] got hold of Smyrna. But the thing had been talked of at the War Office before the Cabinet. I hope nobody told.

335. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

[Add. MS. 44172, fo. 201]

18, Carlton House Terrace. Oct 8. 80.

I called early on Munster this morning.
He and Alfred Rothschild looked rather sheepish at being found together. I asked what did R. want to know. Munster said he came to tell me that he knows it is Smyrna.

Might not Northbrook order one of the Malta vessels to leave that port

¹ i.e. Austria, Germany, and France whose replies to the Smyrna proposal had not yet been received.
² The Pall Mall Gazette, late edition, published the Smyrna proposal; ordinary edition of the evening of 7 Oct., p. 8, carried only the announcement that fresh proposals had been made to the powers; on 8 Oct. it reported the Standard version that some ports in the Aegean were to be seized.
without saying where she was going, with orders to lie opposite in order
to protect the Consul in case of disturbance.
In that case, I should inform the Powers tomorrow or next day, that I
had done so as a means of precaution as the delay was allowing the secret
to ooze out.
I enclose a note just rec[eive]d—the Jews are pretty sure to be right.
The Austrians are not likely to act without the French.

336. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

10, Downing Street. O. 8. 1 Pm. [1880].

This news about France—which is also in the papers but I could not
believe it—makes it still more important to represent if you can at Paris if
not elsewhere the extreme, and possibly ruinous mischief of delay. It is
almost due to ourselves I think now to make some representation.
In your naval suggestion I would only suggest two instead of one—for
there is the question of letting Turks out of the Dardanelles—and I would
have them call for instructions at some convenient point—Syra? Cerigo?
or elsewhere.

337. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

10, Downing Street. O. 8. 80.

Misericordia! Patience is a great virtue, but really the heavy going
Teuton is too slow and the dangers of the oozing out manifestly increase.
I do not know if [you] can safely give a jog direct or mediant but if you
could how pleasant it would be: nor is this all—The Porte is nearer
Smyrna than we are and there is one awkward element in the Consul's
report.

Contents of the Standard today most encouraging.

1 Rothschild to Granville, not traced.
2 For the French refusal to join in the seizure of Smyrna unless all agreed, see
Barthélemy St. Hilaire to Challemel Lacour, 9 Oct., and circular dispatch, 24 Oct.,
D.D.F. iii, Nos. 271, 281; from Lyons, No. 964, 9 Oct., F.O. 27/2436; cf. Newton,
Lord Lyons, ii. 230; and no. 338.
3 See from Russell, tel. 7 Oct., reporting that the German reply to the Smyrna
proposal would depend on the Austrian, F.O. 64/964.
4 See Consul Dennis to Granville, tel., Smyrna, 7 Oct., received 8 Oct., that there
were no preparations for defence, the port was not crowded, but 10,000 men could be
mustered at short notice, F.O. 78/3106.
5 The Standard, 8 Oct., p. 5c, reported that all the powers had unanimously agreed
to the British proposal to seize several of the Aegean ports.
338. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

Immed. 10, Downing Street. Oct. 9. 80.

I have read Elliot. I assume the French Cabinet [meets] today. Can any thing be said usefully by Lyons at the last moment before it to represent the mischievous effect likely to be produced on the Sultan’s mind if France as well as Austria should become a mere by-stander and the extreme disgrace of failure to Europe which it now seems only a portion of the Powers are to have the honour of averting? Might Lyons himself refer to the former co-operation of France & England for the Lebanon, and for Greece? (Of course not the Crimea). I merely place these things before you without venturing to give a strong opinion but it is just possible that the Austrian defection may give France a turn our way.

Don’t reply.

339. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Foreign Office. [9 October 1880].

Odo telegraphs that Bismarck asks why we do not go to Constantinople and settle the matter at once—Odo agrees—

I am rather inclined to the rash or timid extreme. Smyrna à trois would certainly not make the Turk yield.

Shall I ask Hengel Muller to ascertain whether the Austrian encouragement to us to proceed, while abstaining herself from force, extends to any other pressure, to which she might give moral but no physical support?

I am rather tempted to run down after dinner to Walmer to be back before breakfast on Monday. I do not propose it to you, as it would be too tiring.

340. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

10, Downing Street. Oct. 9. 2 Pm. [1880].

I do not receive a statement of B[ismarck]’s opinion without misgiving,

1 To Granville, tel. No. 170, 8 Oct., announcing the Austrian refusal to join in the seizure of Smyrna, F.O. 7/995.
2 See from Lyons, No. 962, 8 Oct., reporting that France would not give a definitive answer to the Smyrna proposal until after the council of ministers had met, F.O. 27/2436.
3 See to Lyons, No. 1340, extending tel. 8 Oct., asking for the French reply as soon as possible, but adding no further arguments, F.O. 27/2444.
5 i.e. Italy, Russia, and Britain.
6 He asked whether Austria meant the powers, who might act at Smyrna, to be the mandataires of Europe, as in the occupation of the Lebanon in 1861, and whether she would share in representations to accompany the seizure of Smyrna; see to Elliot, tel. No. 726, 10 Oct., F.O. 7/987.
and I am sensible of great risks in the measure he irresponsibly recom-
mends (should he not be asked what support it would have from him?).
But such is my sense of the disgrace involved in the acceptance of the
Turkish non possumus that I say for the present no only to what seems
to lead straight in that direction.¹

341. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

10, Downing Street. Oct 10. 80.

I shall be out from 11 to one or a little later.
The next point of turning in this long lane will I suppose be the Austrian
reply² to your Telegram of yesterday.
I am glad that I suggested the reference to 1860:³ because there the
mandate was under a treaty to which Turkey was a party (under virtual
coercion) and therefore complete. Without a complete assumption of
moral responsibility by her, I do not at present see how we can go on.

342. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

10, Downing Street. Oct 11. 80. 3.30 Pm.

This mockery continues. Query telegraph to Goschen ‘Press for answer,
as we cannot further delay’ or something of that kind.⁴

343. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

10, Downing Street. Oct 12. 80.

Query repeat at once to all your Ambassadors with order to com-
municate the pith of Goschen’s Telegram and especially the passage about
a firm front.⁵

¹ Cf. Gladstone to Granville, tel. 9 Oct., proposing that tel. (No. 106 secret, about
resistance at Smyrna, F.O. 64/964) be sent to Northbrook, Key, and Adye, which was
done, P.R.O. 30/29/123.
² See to Elliot, tel. private, 11 Oct., reporting Austria’s reply that she could not give
a mandate for a measure with which she did not associate herself, F.O. 7/995.
³ See p. 196, n. 6, and no. 338.
⁴ From Goschen, tel. No. 297, 9 Oct., received 3.40 a.m., 10 Oct., reported that
Turkey, having heard of the Smyrna plan, had announced a formal note for 10 Oct.
agreeing to cede Dulcigno; Turkey having failed to deliver the note, the proposed tel.
was sent to Goschen as No. 668, 4.50 p.m., 11 Oct., F.O. 78/3103.
⁵ See from Goschen, tel. No. 303, 11 Oct., received 12 Oct., reporting that the formal
note would be delivered, that the porte understood wrongly that France, Austria, and
Germany were also to join in seizing Smyrna and asserting that ‘a firm front’ on the part
of the powers would settle the question, F.O. 78/3106; see to Lyons, No. 1352, 12 Oct.
(and to other ambassadors), repeating the tel. for communication to the powers, F.O.
27/2424.
I for one should be ready in these astonishing circumstances to tell Goschen that unless the promise of Saturday night\(^1\) is confirmed this very day by delivery of a corresponding note (which requires very few words) we should make a further proposal to the Powers. (That proposal being the one we left *pendant* last night, to go *en trois* [to Smyrna] without mandate or opposition).\(^2\)

344. *Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville* [P.R.O. 30/29/123]

Hawarden Castle. O. 13. 80.

1. I think you will be of opinion, especially from Goschen’s No 305, that reserved and rather stern language and attitude may still be requisite with the Turk.\(^3\)

2. I suppose also that the time which may pass before Dulcigno is actually given over will afford you a good opportunity for your proposed representation to the French Government.\(^4\) It seems not impossible that the success obtained in the Dulcigno case may dispose that Government to be a little less cortier\(^5\) as to Greece.

3. I think we are entirely at one in the opinion that we ought not to allow the other Govts to make us as a matter of course their beast of burden. The ridiculous language held at Constantinople by the Austrian Ambassador\(^6\) about our chestnuts is a reason in the same direction. Still I suppose we must feel that in one way or the other the main part or a considerable part will come to us. So that now is the time I think to assure ourselves as to our basis in the Hellenic question. I do not mean as to the instruments, any more than the mode. Russia, which has been warm, will here probably become cool; and, unless France warms a little, the position will be difficult.

\(^1\) i.e. 9 Oct.
\(^2\) Rendered unnecessary by the arrival of the Turkish note on 12 Oct.; see Goschen to Granville, tel. No. 304, 12 Oct., F.O. 78/3106, dispatch No. 461, 12 Oct., F.O. 78/3096.
\(^3\) See from Goschen, tel. No. 305, 12 Oct., describing as flaws in the Turkish note of surrender that it insisted on the peaceable transfer of Dulcigno and on the signature of a Turco-Montenegrin convention, F.O. 78/3106; see also Gladstone’s retrospective account, *Memorandum of Proceedings in 1880* . . . , secret, Hawarden, 8 Apr. 1895, Add. MS. 44776, fo. 145.
\(^4\) See no. 346 and to Lyons, No. 1351A, 11 Oct., protesting that the French reply on Smyrna had differed from Barthélemy St. Hilaire’s language to Lyons in Paris, F.O. 27/2424.
\(^5\) An adjective made from Corti, Italian ambassador at Constantinople, the author of the first compromise proposal departing from the strict letter of the Berlin treaty on the Montenegrin settlement.
\(^6\) In an ‘uncomfortable’ conversation with Calice, who deplored Austria’s being a tool of England in the eastern question, and asserted his view that she should ‘square’ Russia, Goschen to Granville, private, 5 Oct., P.R.O. 30/29/188.
4. I take these things to be clear: first that the question cannot drop, secondly we cannot be sure it will bear postponement to any other question, thirdly the Turkish offer is inadmissible. But there remains behind the question[:] is the Berlin interpretation\(^1\) of the Treaty line so indisputably just that we are to aim or to feel free to aim at pressing it as we pressed the case of Montenegro?

5. I am far from saying it is not; but it appears to me first that the doubts have been ruled against Turkey in the case of Thessaly secondly that in the case of Janina the sense of the Treaty was clear, yet there remains this difficulty that though the division of Epiros is linguistically (as they say) just either wholly or in great part, yet it cuts in twain the Southern Albania. I should like to know whether Goschen had in his head any distinct notion of an alternative form for the plan at the time when he intimated some desire to alter the plan of the Conference as to Janina.\(^2\)

I dare say you are out of town by this time, and I hope we may both be able to keep out for four weeks or little short of it.

The most sensible part of Calice’s conversation with Goschen seems to me to be that in which he more or less anticipates a ‘squaring’ arrangement between Austria and Russia.

---

345. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

[Add. MS. 44172, fo. 208]

Private.

We have certainly been in luck.

The only options left would have been to act alone, or to have backed out.

It is provoking to find how the proofs accumulate that fear will make the Turks assent—& at the same time the powers are afraid of exciting that fear.

We had better conceal from friends and foes what we should have done, if the Turks had not yielded—and it is the more easy, as we did not come to any decision.

It is amusing to see the fury of some of the opposition papers with the settlement.

I hear that Dizzy in answer to the application of some MP’s for leave to go abroad this winter, begged them not to go, saying that we were on the brink of the most serious events, and in all probability should be driven to a dissolution. This I know.

---

\(^1\) For the Berlin conference on the Greek frontier, see p. 137, n. 4, and for map, W. N. Medlicott, Bismarck, Gladstone and the Concert of Europe, 234.

\(^2\) See no. 246; Granville did not revive the matter with Goschen.
Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville


1. My conversation with Lacour began with references to the promise of Saturday and the doubt cast upon it by the subsequent delay, and the circumstances, known to us, to which it seemed probable that that delay was to be ascribed. I said to him it was likely that the French answer had become known after the promise, & that the knowledge had done much mischief.

He then said there was no answer, and proceeded to preciser this by saying Lyons was inexact in his closing passage for he (Lacour) had no instruction to make a communication to H.M. Govt.¹

This was the assertion which you put sadly out of joint by showing Sale's Telegram² and his statement that the French Admiral had told him of the French reply.

I really had told him when you came in 1. that Smyrna was sufficient for success 2. that there were ulterior measures between it and war, such as stopping Turkish ships from acting against Greece; but you quote him correctly.

On the other hand I do not think he said the comedy would be an insult to Europe. But when I said it he did not deny it & when I asked whether it would be borne he said if it were this would certainly not be for love of the Turk.

So much for your drafts—my remark applies only to C.—³

2. It is I imagine our duty to say nothing of the recalcitration of the three Powers: for out of the old Jade ‘Concert’ we must still get what good work we can.

3. I am pleased with Jomini for saying Russia had doubts as to the propriety of her dual action with England.⁴

Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone


You will have seen that at the last moment, I took upon myself to con-

¹ See to Lyons, No. 1349A, 11 Oct., reporting Gladstone’s observations to Challemel Lacour on France’s refusal to join in the seizure of Smyrna after the false report of her agreement had helped to frighten the sultan into surrender, F.O. 27/2424; see p. 197, n. 5.

² Not traced; missing from F.O. 97/532.

³ See Sanderson’s note on the docket of no. 346 that dispatch No. 1349A to Lyons had been altered to meet Gladstone’s criticism; the draft attributed the words to Challemel Lacour in replying to an observation of Granville who was also present; see no. 354.

⁴ From Plunkett, tel. No. 196, 12 Oct., and dispatch No. 478 confidential, extending tel. 15 Oct., reported Jomini’s statement to the German chargé d’affaires that Russia would not have gone to Smyrna without at least one other power in addition to Britain, F.O. 65/1085, F.O. 65/1082.
15 October 1880

fine our instructions to Sir B. Seymour, to ordering him to wait for instructions, unless the necessity arose for his acting upon his previous orders. It seemed dangerous to announce a future demonstration till Dulcigno was actually handed over.

Shall I address the 2d part of the instructions to all the Powers, or in the first instance to France viz that they will authorize separate cruizing, and find place of call for orders. Shall the rendezvous be proposed as fixed for any date, or left quite open—

P.S. Shall we in answering the Turkish note, give credit to the Sultan for loyalty and good will & express our hope that the same enlightened views may cause the early fulfilment of the other conditions of the treaty, to which we look for the strengthening of the military position, and the happiness & prosperity of his country.

348. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville


1. I think you are right in what you did about the instructions. I would not let the fleet disperse (with our assent) until the Turk has acted: at any rate not until he has made his convention and fixed the day and hour, if then.

2. When that time comes, will it not come for all the Powers alike? Perhaps you mean to ask whether you should at once communicate with France by anticipation. I am afraid of causing confusion by any attempt at detail. But it seems worth your consideration whether as France required an engagement about the further demonstration you might not properly ask her (at once) to develop her idea—We cannot too distinctly, thus far at least, put the initiative on her back, and if it makes her bones ache a little so much the better after the way in which she has proceeded.

3. No doubt she will throw it back but our case is as good as possible

1 See to Lyons, Macdonell, Russell, No. 555, Elliot, No. 676, Plunkett, No. 520, recording tel., 13 Oct., proposing to tell Seymour to await further instructions before dispersing after the handing over of Dulcigno, F.O. 65/1077.

2 See to Lyons, No. 1423A confidential, 14 Oct., asking for French views on the proposal, if Dulcigno were handed over, to instruct the admirals not to disperse but to cruise in the neighbourhood, F.O. 27/2424.

3 Answered in Gladstone to Granville, tel. 15 Oct.; that he had answered by anticipation that the language should be not entirely stern, but mixed and reserved, P.R.O. 30/29/123; Add. MS. 44172, fo. 213.

4 A Turco-Montenegrin convention was signed on 26 Nov. and the cession was completed on 28 Nov.; the European fleet dispersed, 4 Dec.

5 To Lyons; no action was taken on Gladstone's proposal which related to the undertaking exacted by France, that the same method should be used in the Greek as in the Montenegrin question, before she would join in the naval demonstration.
for not resuming it unless we see a good opportunity. The likelihood of such an opportunity seems small. Our initiative, not strong enough in the Montenegrin case, would be far feebler in the Greek as matters now stand. We know not what cards may turn up but from present appearances one would say an opening will only come if the Greeks take the matter into their own hands and draw the sword.

4. Pray consider whether on account of their very special interest in the matter it might be well to let the King, or any trustworthy person of the Govt if such there be, know the *dessous des Cartes* in the Montenegrin case—as a help in forming a judgment for themselves.

5. I have only today read Macdonell of Sept. 28. Unless there is some reason to suspect a 'dodge', I think the Italians deserve a civil word. And they *may* be useful in the Greek case. I put the Powers thus far in order of merit, as judged by their *acts* only, thus—

1. Russia
2. Italy
3. 4. {Austria} {Germany}
5. France.
6. Argyll gives up Balmoral by reason of gouty symptoms. It will not I imagine break his heart.

349. **Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone**


The Queen hopes we shall be able to regain the confidence of the Sultan. I have answered that I hope our firmness may recover the confidence, which has been entirely withdrawn since the British Plenipotentiaries proposed to give Bosnia & Herzegovina to Austria.

The Queen is put out at Kimberley having declined to see Sir Bartle till November, and hopes that he, you, Hartington & I will be civil.

I have pointed out why Sir B ought to be grateful to you especially, and also to Kimberley.

I already much miss not having you at my elbow. It was the only relief last week, being able to discuss every little detail with you.

---

1 From Macdonell, Nos. 439, 440, 28 Sept., on Italy's desire for good relations with Britain, her 'natural ally', F.O. 45/407.
2 See to Gladstone, 19 Oct., recounting his failure to go to Balmoral and the Queen's excusing him from going at all, Add. MS. 44104, fo. 220.
3 See to Granville, 13 Oct., hoping the Turk would abide by the concession and continuing as described, P.R.O. 30/20/31.
4 15 Oct., copy, thanking for her letter and continuing as here reported, P.R.O. 30/29/37.
18 October 1880

350. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

H[awarde]n [Castle]. O. 17. 80.

I return your brother’s letter.1 Viewing his report of the state of feeling among his constituents on the E[astern] question, (I have no doubt an accurate account) I send you a report of another character from the North, Cowan notwithstanding.2

351. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone


I am rather disappointed by Dilke’s account of Gambetta’s conversation—although it seems favorable for future commercial & political understandings.3 But the wily Genoese seems to have had the best of it, as to not letting out a word as to what is to be done at present with the Greek question or any other—& he objects to finance which would have been a good stop gap.

I have telegraphed to ask Dilke whether he cannot get more out of Gambetta, and if not have asked him (as a great phi1 Hellene[)] to give me his own views.

Many thanks for your letter of Friday. I quite agree.

352. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

10, Downing Street. Oct 18. 80.

I need not say that it would have given me much pleasure if I could have done what you wished with regard to Mr Wetherell.4

I have, however, received a very strong representation to the effect that, by the appointment of a gentleman, already in the service of the Inland Revenue, to the vacant Commissionership, the maximum of efficiency will be obtained together with a considerable saving of public money: and I do not see how I can disregard it.

1 Not traced; F. Leveson-Gower sat for Bodmin.
2 Not traced; the vol. of Gladstone’s correspondence with John Cowan, Add. MS. 44137, has no letters between Sept. 1880 and Sept. 1883.
3 See to Granville, 16 Oct., private, and 17 Oct., dispatch and private letter, reporting Gambetta’s indifference about Greece and interest in Salisbury’s assurances about Tunis, P.R.O. 30/29/121.
4 Granville had recommended Wetherell, his private secretary 1871–4, whom he did not wish to employ again, for a commissionership of Inland Revenue vice Lord Sudeley; for Granville’s difficulties with Wetherell, see P.R.O. 30/29/28 A passim.
Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

10, Downing Street. Oct 20. 80.

The recent Telegrams\(^1\) give food for reflection and for suspicion. One thing I should like to know is the state of the military measures adopted at Smyrna under cover of the recent concession.\(^2\) He may have blocked us out of it. You probably saw in the P.M. Gazette of Tuesday an account of the Turkish army, according to which there are 11,000 men in and about Salonica. However if a question of that kind [arises,] it will not be for want of material avenues that we shall fail.

I suppose it would be difficult to learn any thing at present from Austria as to her mandate or from Italy as to her co-operation in view of the contingency of a new breach of faith by the Sultan. The evidence of foul play in the conditions offered to Montenegro, and the return of the Turkish Envoy to Scutari, is I am afraid considerable: but the ball has been so to speak blocked by the prudence of the Montenegrins.

I am glad we have a man of Goschen’s energy and courage in Constantinople at this juncture.

With regard to Greece and Gambetta, I assume that we do our best to get France to own and resume her initiative, and that we fail. In that case it rather seems to me as if there were but two alternatives that could enable us seriously to move on—1. a change in France next summer—2. war made by the Greeks for themselves.

If then as is probable the Eastern Question were to become stagnant as to Greece and Armenia after a settlement at Dulcigno (\textit{quod faxit Deus}) I should not be sorry to see Goschen’s idea of the finance, and the European reforms, worked diplomatically for a time.\(^3\)

Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone


I have altered the account of the conversation with Challomel [sic] Lacour according to your note.\(^4\)

I have invited Falbe to come here—the K of Greece mentioned him as a medium of personal communication.

Lobanoff & Lacour have been here two nights.

I fancied, but this may be unjust, rather pleased than otherwise, when I read them a telegram, which looked bad about Dulcigno.

\(^1\) i.e. from Sale tels. Nos. 34, 35, 19, 20 Oct., on negotiations at Rejka, lying between Cettinje and Scutari, between Turkish and Montenegrin commissioners, missing from F.O. 97/532; but see Goschen to Granville, tels. Nos. 320, 321, 18 Oct., received 19 Oct., F.O. 78/3106.

\(^2\) Cf. Gladstone to Granville, tel. 21 Oct., urging him to make these military inquiries, P.R.O. 30/29/123.

\(^3\) See no. 303.

\(^4\) See no. 346.
Lobanoff gave me a message today, approving of the question as to progress being put by the Ambassadors, but suggesting threats of ulterior measures.

I told him that all the Powers had agreed to the first part—but that as to threats, although we had warned Musurus that any ultimatum on our part would be acted up to, we had abstained from threats—that to begin using them would rather weaken than strengthen us, particularly if the other powers used a different language.1

It is clear that we shall get nothing out of France for the present, and Gambetta is playing his own, and not our game. I quite agree, if Dulcigno is over, that we must shove the French Gov up to the wall.

I shall be curious to hear from Odo how much difference there is between the language to him of Bismarck, & that of the report to the Emperor, the description of which seems genuine.2

What do you think of pushing the financial question?3

Dufferin is as prejudiced as I am against Madam Novikoff.4

355. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville5


1. I have answered you by anticipation about Turkish finance.6

2. Doubt still hanging over Dulcigno, I long to know whether Smyrna is still open to the ships or what other enterprise might in a military sense be available.

3. Might not the Ambassadors at Constantinople with some advantage address themselves to the two points

   a. of a time for giving over Dulcigno

   b. of a demand on the Sultan to prevent Albanians from crossing the Boyana by the Bridge or elsewhere.7

1 See to Plunkett, No. 542, 20 Oct., recording Lobanov’s message that Russia agreed that Turkey should be asked what progress had been made towards the cession of Dulcigno and suggested a warning of ulterior measures, and reply as here described, F.O. 65/1077.

2 See from Russell, No. 473 secret, 12 Oct., reporting Bismarck’s advice to the emperor ‘to take up a neutral position’, F.O. 64/662; cf. no. 359.

3 See no. 303; see also from Goschen, tel. No. 339, 24 Oct., suggesting communication to the powers on the financial question, as the porte proposed a meeting of bondholders in Constantinople, F.O. 78/3106; and reply, tel. No. 718, 25 Oct., offering to propose to the powers the summoning of the financial commission prescribed in protocol 18 of the Berlin Congress, F.O. 78/3103.

4 Relates to Madame Novikov to Gladstone, 13 Oct., reporting from an ‘utterly reliable source’ Elliot’s pro-Turkish, pro-Austrian policy at Vienna and his hostility to Gladstone, Add. MS. 44268, fo. 221; marked ‘send to Ld G with copy of reply O 18’.

5 Gladstone to Granville, 21 Oct., on the Prince of Wales’s expenditure (incurred on behalf of the crown), and reply, 26 Oct., Add. MS. 44172, fos. 223, 239, not printed.

6 See no. 353.

7 See to Goschen, tel. No. 714, 7.40 p.m., 23 Oct., asking whether there was any advantage in making the demand Gladstone proposed, F.O. 78/3103.
4. What a curious rumour reported by Elliot about your requiring [the] Sultan to guarantee the territory after cession.1 Probably put about by the Turks.

5. Will Italy co-operate—will Austria mand? These may come to be the questions. I am pleased with the Russians for disapproving dual co-operation.2

6. If it is Madame Novikoff that you distrust you may rely upon my saying to her 1. but little, 2. nothing—as has always been my rule—except what I have proclaimed, or am ready to proclaim from the housetops.3

356. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone  
[Add. MS. 44172, fo. 224]  

Thanks for your note. I have telegraphed to know whether we can do anything more than has been done to ascertain how matters stand at Smyrna. Goschen has sent St John. I have suggested General Biddulph going there on his way to India.4

The intelligence Dept. know about Salonica.

I have telegraphed to Elliot to ask Haymerle what he proposes, if the Turks throw us over about Dulcigno.5

Shall I consult the French yet—I think not.

The messenger is just off.

I puffed Bessborough to the Queen as an excellent head of the Commission.6

She desired Ponsonby to write and ask his opinion about Ireland.

P. says the answer was excellent. But the Queen does not think he is aware of the dangers.

357. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone  
[Add. MS. 44172, fo. 228]  

From what Admiral Key said the other day, he contemplated the chance

1 See to Granville, private, 13 Oct., on Haymerle’s relief at the improved appearance of the Montenegrin question, and his nervousness about a rumour from Paris of Granville’s insisting upon the sultan’s guaranteeing Montenegro against the Albanians, P.R.O. 30/29/155.
2 See p. 200, n. 4.
3 See to Madame Novikov, copy, 16 Oct., expressing his entire reliance on Elliot’s honour and devotion to duty, Add. MS. 44268, fo. 223.
4 See p. 204, n. 2; see from Goschen, tel. No. 314, 16 Oct., announcing his having sent St. John, first secretary in the Constantinople embassy, to Smyrna, ostensibly in connexion with the Anglo-Turkish difficulties over the harbour dues (p. 140, n. 2), F.O. 78/3106.
5 See tel. No. 775, 21 Oct., instructing him to ask Austria confidentially what should be done if Turkey failed to keep her engagement under the note of 11 Oct., F.O. 7/987.
6 i.e. of Inquiry into the Conditions of Irish Land Tenure, of which Bessborough became chairman; for report, 4 Jan. 1881, see Parl. papers (1881) xviii, xix.
of torpedoes being laid down at Smyrna, but he did not seem to think this a matter with which Seymour could not deal. Sale reports\^{1} that it was always considered that Smyrna might be defended by torpedoes. If he means successfully, it soon becomes a question to what use our enormous fleet can be applied, excepting to convoy vessels. Blockades generally tell more against us than the enemy.

But I have written to know the opinion of the Admiralty as to Smyrna now that they know there are torpedoes there.\^{2}

Is there any half way measure between Smyrna, & Constantinople? I doubt it. But I will enquire of the military & naval authorities.

In any case, it looks as if we should want a landing force, if we go to Smyrna.

It seems from the last telegram from Goschen that the Sultan has named 7 days—(much too long a time)\^{3}

I have telegraphed to Goschen, to know whether he thinks it would be well to press the Porte to prevent passage of Albanians—or whether it is better to press for cession, without going into the particular details.\^{4}

Menebrea [sic] comes here today. I will try to pick his brains, without committing ourselves too far.\^{5}

I do not like asking Austria a fresh question till we get some answer to the last.

What day shall you be in London.

Tissot told Goschen that the Turks have got our cypher. They have delayed some of our telegrams, which looks as if they were puzzling over them. One cypher was sometime ago stolen from the F.O. It was withdrawn from the Embassies. I have amused myself by concocting a message to Goschen, in this cypher—Telling him in a message in another cypher, that he need not mind, if he cannot decipher it. The Sultan if he succeeds in reading it, will not like it.

358. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville


I have fixed no day for London but, apart from special calls, I might struggle to remain here until the 8th.

If the Sultan has, so improperly, asked seven days, might not a word be said—if communications are going on—to the effect that that term would

---

\^{1} Cf. to Granville, tel. No. 31, 14 Oct., received 15 Oct., already reporting that Smyrna was being defended by torpedoes, F.O. 97/532.

\^{2} Not traced.

\^{3} See tel. No. 327, 22 Oct., reporting a new categorical instruction to Riza Pasha to effect the surrender of Dulcigno within 6 or 7 days, F.O. 78/3106.

\^{4} See p. 205, n. 7.

\^{5} See no. 360.
be taken as the *ultimatum* of time within which the proceeding was to be completed.

I suppose Salonica might be considered as a half way measure—or, possibly, sending the *fleet* to the Cretan waters, once used for the purpose by the late Govt.

359. **Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone**

Walmer Castle. Oct 24 [1880].

I send you an interesting but not satisfactory letter.¹

I thought it not unlikely that Bismarck might use language to Odo, inconsistent with the report which Odo told us he had sent to the Emperor. But this is not the case.

His language however particularly as commented upon by Odo, gives a bad look out.

The telegrams from Green this morning are bad.²

360. **Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone**


I propose when Hengel Muller comes, to tell him that the pressing thing is to know what the Austrians will agree to do, if Dulcigno remains in the hands of the Turk.

That as to the future, we decline to change our policy, & drop everything—that we desire to maintain the concert, and that we do not despair of it, because it is still so strongly the interest of all—that we make allowance for the difficulties of others, and are willing & indeed anxious to consult with Austria, & that supposing Dulcigno is ceded, we have no wish to hurry coercive measures. Such would probably not be necessary, if all the Powers would show a good front.³

The Italian Ambassador is most satisfactory—as far as he himself is concerned.

He told me that he had written to tell his Gov that the only policy was

¹ *i.e.* from Russell, private, 18 Oct., reporting Bismarck's aversion from measures of force against Turkey and forecasting an attempt by him to break up the concert of Europe, P.R.O. 30/29/177; printed Knaplund, *Letters from Berlin*, 164–9; Granville had instructed him, 13 Oct., to go to Friedrichsruhe to sound Bismarck about further measures of pressure, P.R.O. 30/29/206 and Knaplund, op. cit. 162–4.

² Tels. Nos. 132–6, 22–23 Oct., reporting Montenegrin refusal to agree to the draft convention containing the detailed arrangements handing over Dulcigno, and his conviction that Turkey was playing for time, F.O. 103/10; see p. 201, n. 4.

³ See to Elliot, No. 718 confidential, 28 Oct., recording a conversation at Walmer, in which Hengelmüller had evaded the question of future action if Dulcigno remained in Turkey’s hands, Granville had spoken as here described, and both agreed to take the Greek frontier question next, F.O. 7/987.
to adhere to us—that it was the best means of securing peace—that as long as 3 Powers remained together, the others would be loth to separate.

I sounded him as to whether he was as keen about a mandate, supposing the others would not give that, but were ready to approve. He said as far as he was concerned, he thought the approval came to nearly the same thing, & left us more at liberty.¹

I am more puzzled how to deal with Odo’s report of Bismarck’s conversation.

Whether to complain of it, or whether to make the most of the promises limited as they are.

I can agree that there is force in some of his objections to coercion, but not in his proposal that the remedy is laissez faire, or that despatch writing will obtain the object.²

Can the loan which is mentioned as having been raised by the Greeks be independent of that one proposed by our friend Mallet?³

361. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone [Add. MS. 44172, fo. 241]


I send you a telegram (unnecessarily huffy) from Goschen—and my answer.⁴

I have written to Chenery this morning,⁵ but I do not know whether it will have any effect. If I send him some information and a brief, he will generally put it in, but not always—and as to the general policy, I do not know that he himself is allowed to dictate it.

As to Goschen, I am not sure what he requires. Whether it is merely that we should not abandon our policy about which there can be no doubt, or whether he wishes us to carry everything by heroic measures during his short stay of office, which will be difficult if not impossible.

Unless the danger of an attack upon Smyrna is greater than I suppose (I expect to hear immediately about it from Northbrook,⁶ & am glad to see that Seymour has an officer there watching the Turks), I infinitely prefer

¹ See to Paget, No. 585 confidential, recording a conversation in these terms with Menabrea at Walmer, F.O. 45/401.
² See no. 359; Bismarck undertook not to assist Turkey, if, despite Germany’s holding aloof, the other powers proceeded to measures of force.
³ See nos. 222, 224, 269, 272, 288, 316.
⁴ See personal tel. 24 Oct., complaining of articles in The Times on the eastern question, since they were thought in Constantinople to mark Britain’s abandonment of further pressure on Turkey; and reply, personal tel. 26 Oct., that he would pass the complaint on to Gladstone, but The Times had not been inspired; Add. MS. 44172, fos. 245-8, 255-71; P.R.O. 30/29/188 and 30/29/210.
⁵ 26 Oct., complaining of the articles in The Times, P.R.O. 30/29/153.
⁶ Northbrook, 27 Oct., sent Granville Admiral Seymour’s reply (not traced) to his questions about Smyrna and the Dardanelles, P.R.O. 30/29/137.
it to Salonica, or to Crete—the bank parlour is more attractive to me than waiting outside in the Street.

We should settle whether [sic] the moment we know of the cession of Dulcigno, which I suppose will come, 1° whether we send the proposed instructions to the fleet, first to the French, or simultaneously to the other powers, and 2° whether these instructions should contain the suggestion of places of call for orders, and a place of general rendezvous, or only the places of call for orders.

Please telegraph to me an answer on this point.¹

362. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

[P.R.O. 30/29/123]

Hawarden Castle. Oct 27. 80.

1. I thought I could send Goschen an anodyne letter.² I have done it at once not to lose tomorrow’s post. I think you will not disapprove of it: copy herewith. It is not every one whose temperament is balanced as yours is.

2. I am glad to see the Telegrams look better today.³

3. Do you think there is any reason for my going up before the 8th—Have you accepted the Lord Mayor?

We expect your brother & nephew on Friday—with other friends.

363. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

[P.R.O. 30/29/123]


1. I agree with all you propose to say to Hengelmuller.⁴ You may think it too delicate a matter to go further. But I think that while you are luring them onward by rather severing Greece from Dulcigno, it might be fair to hint to them that we have strong reasons for going forward but that our going forward will be less safe for their interests and policy in the Balkan Peninsula in proportion as they lag behind us and cause us to lean towards those who may actively co-operate.

¹ See to Granville, tel. 27 Oct., agreeing that instructions for the fleet should go to the French first, and suggesting they be provisional to allow time to ascertain the position, P.R.O. 30/29/123; see no. 347.

² Of 27 Oct., explaining that The Times could no longer be regarded as ‘a leading journal’, that he wished to avoid a pause after Dulcigno, except to advance more firmly, and completely agreed with Goschen, P.R.O. 30/29/123 and Add. MS. 44544, fo. 84.

³ From Green, tel. No. 143, 26 Oct., indicating that the negotiation of arrangements for the surrender of Dulcigno would be resumed with Turkey, F.O. 103/10; and from Goschen, tel. No. 332, 26 Oct., reporting that the Turkish delegate had been peremptorily ordered to meet the Montenegrin on 28 Oct., F.O. 78/3106.

⁴ See no. 360; Gladstone wrote afterwards a footnote: ‘I return for your convenience (possibly) that part of your letter.’
I begin to think now that we ought to have dwelt more on the affirmative than on the negative side of the Austrian reply and its 'admits' with the suggestion as to disposal of the revenues, treating it as an approval and working forward from it accordingly.¹

Odo's singularly lucid report of Bismarck is as interesting as disheartening: but there is one little ray of light in that (however inconsistently) he does not absolutely limit himself to moral means as regards Dulcigno and promises not to withdraw. The reporter's interpretations are the worst and I fear the most trustworthy part of the whole.²

I hope you will soon be able to get replies to any unanswered questions which may have been put at Vienna.

364. **Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone**

[Add. MS. 44172, fo. 252]


I return your letter to Goschen with thanks, and send you a copy of mine.³ They appear to run in the same groove.

I have had a civil answer from Chenery admitting that his articles founded upon what Foreigners here, and Correspondents abroad told him, were perhaps too encouraging to the Turk. He professes a wish to support us—and suggests movement on Turkish finance.⁴

My draft to Elliot⁵ will show you all I got out of Hengel Muller—I believe him personally to act cordially with us—but Sanderson says that Montgelas was always promising in the name of Austria things to the late Secretary of State which his Gov never performed.

Poor Hengel Muller was set upon as a radical the other day, because he announced that having seen all the leading statesmen of Europe, your's was by far the most attractive manner. I shall go to town on the 6th or 7th. Lady G. & I have accepted the Lord Mayor—Your Speech would be difficult for any one a less consummate master of the art than yourself.

365. **Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville**

[Hawarden Castle. Oct 30. 80.]

¹ See from Elliot, No. 628, 8 Oct., reporting the Austrian answer to the original proposal for the seizure of Smyrna; while refusing participation, Haymerle 'admits' the demonstration and proposed that part of the Smyrna customs revenue be given to Montenegro pending the cession of Dulcigno, F.O. 7/995.

² See no. 359.

³ See no. 362; see also to Goschen, 29 Oct., private, denying that The Times was inspired, but admitting that he placed greater value on its support than Gladstone did and should be sorry to alienate it, P.R.O. 30/29/210.

⁴ 28 Oct., writing as here reported, P.R.O. 30/29/153.

⁵ See no. 360.
Bismarck’s report to the Emperor. It is certainly very bad: and seems to explain both Odo’s late interpretations and the violence of the German press against us. If the Allgemeine Zeitung, or any other violent paper, is really a Government organ, might not some complaint be made, or notice taken of the effect of such writing upon ‘concert’?

2. Nothing it seems to me could be better than your conversation with Hengelmüller which I have just read. By suspending his answer as to what is to be done if the Turks again break faith in re Dulcigno, Haymerle ought to mean something more than diplomatic pressure: ‘resignare, ripurgare, riclysterare.’

3. In asking for plenty of notice, Goschen seems hardly to be aware of the conditions of action in which we are placed, having ourselves, from our dependence upon others, to work from hand to mouth as to actual measures, although fixed enough in principles. Would it not be difficult, if he came away from Constantinople, to divest the change in persons of the appearance of a change of policy.

366. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

Hawarden Castle. 31 Oct: 1880.

I. I have assumed, rather than attempted to decide, that the meeting in London after the Lord Mayor’s day would be the beginning of a series which might last say for three weeks, more or less. There will be

a. a review of the position of Foreign affairs

b. a review, pretty stiff! of the position and prospects of Ireland, where some people are travelling towards the idea of coercion faster than altogether pleases me.

c. To make an outline of measures for the next session & perhaps start the framing of some of them.

All this will I suppose take up say the rest of the month.²

2. With reference to Goschen’s dispatch of Oct 8 on Turkish Finance, from which it appears that the Porte thinks of pledging the Cyprus tribute, might he not do well, if there be any proximate indication of such a plan, to remind the Porte that the dividends of the Guaranteed Loan are not fully paid, and that unless and until they are paid we must reserve a free discretion with regard to the tribute.³

¹ Of 12 Oct.; see p. 205, n. 2.
² i.e. the bachelierus’s bogus Latin ‘resignare, repurgare et reclisterisare’, Molière, Le malade imaginaire, troisième intermède. I am grateful to Mr. Noel Blakiston for reading and placing this quotation.
³ For cabinet meetings, 10, 12, 15, 17, 25 Nov., following the programme sketched above, but mostly concerned with Irish coercion, see Add. MS. 44642, fos. 73 ef séq.
⁴ No. 436, 8 Oct., reported an agreement between Turkey and representatives of the bondholders and the assets pledged to them, F.O. 78/3609; see no. 293, for representations on the Turkish failure to pay the interest on the guaranteed loan of 1855 and
I am very glad you will see Odo tomorrow.
It was a great disappointment his not coming here on his way from Berlin. I enclose a memo of Tenterden.  
You will have to speak on Foreign affairs at the Guildhall. It is not unlikely that they will couple me with the H of Lords, or with the Lady Mayoress. Let me know whether you think it will be better for me to say anything or not in addition to what you say on Foreign affairs.
I once said to you that I had not done enough with the Press, when last in the Foreign Office. We are not very successful at the present moment.
The Times which has lost its influence at home is still powerful abroad. It is friendly but does not ride to orders. The Daily News is supposed to represent you, but it is not handy and its attacks upon Bismarck & Austria, do mischief. I will talk to you when we meet about this, but I do not see the remedy.
I am a bad hand at it. I am civil to some of the press, but what they want is constant information and briefs. I am always inclined to be reticent, and have no fertility. You of course have no time.
Lyons telegram about the fleet and finance, is satisfactory as far as it goes.

368. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

Hawarden Castle. Nov 1. 80.

I have sent you a Telegram with a small suggestion about asking the dismissal of the Official Mussulmans who principally compose the Albanian Committee at Scutari.

Proposal to appropriate the surplus Cyprus revenue to pay the debt consequently owed to the British Treasury; see also p. 205, n. 3, and no. 384.

1 Granville to Gladstone, 22 Oct., enclosing Adam’s application for a peerage on his appointment as governor of Madras and resignation as chief commissioner, Board of Works, Add. MS. 44172, fo. 251, not printed.
2 i.e. of conversation with Russell, about Bismarck’s fear of the consequences of Gladstone’s Turkish policy, see copy, Add. MS. 44464, fo. 242; printed Knaplund, Letters from Berlin, 170.
3 Tel. No. 118, 30 Oct., reported French agreement to the proposal that the ambassadors at Constantinople should raise the question of the Greek frontier as soon as Dulcigno was handed over, F.O. 27/2436.
4 Tel. 1 Nov., P.R.O. 30/29/123.
2. I have talked over with R. Grosvenor the Adam vacancy and shall be glad to discuss it with you when we meet in London.

3. I presume from your silence on the point that you think it will do if I go up on the 8th: the first thing will then be to talk over the matter proper to be said on the 9th.

4. If I refer to the Foreign Policy, it must be upon lines strictly determined on with you: but I am by no means sure whether it would not be better that you should take it altogether, and if you think so I am quite willing to leave it safe in your hands, in which case I should say nothing except a word of generality.

5. If you are a bad manager as to the Press, I certainly am worse. Within the last six months I doubt if I have done anything on as many as six occasions, and these have been mostly to Mr J. Morley with whose handiwork, considering his difficulties, I am a good deal struck. No doubt under the late Govt there was a continuous action—My very imperfect practice has been chiefly to express a readiness to be asked, and I find they do not ask. And various causes, eye sight a main one, cause me now to read the papers very inadequately.

6. Tenterden's Memorandum is very curious. I will keep a copy.

[P.S.] I shall be quite ready to go up on Saturday if you think it needful.

369. **Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone**


I shall go up to town on the afternoon of the 7th—Rather hoping that you will be in London in the middle of the day on the 8th. I shall be completely at your orders, as to my saying anything about Foreign affairs or not.

I hear that Derby says that it is impossible to reconcile Salisbury's speech, with his position of Berlin Plenipotentiary.¹ He thinks it fell flat. He believes we can do what we like about Turkey, if we keep out of war. He believes Ireland to absorb public attention. He does not think the prosecution² will succeed but approves of their being tried.

The Conservative Walmer Brewer is pleased with the result of the repeal of the malt tax—Good for the malster, brewer & farmer.

¹ For Salisbury's speech at Taunton, 26 Oct., ridiculing the ineffectiveness of the naval demonstration (6 washing-tubs with flags) and insisting on the uselessness of the concert of Europe for diplomatic pressure, see *The Times*, 27 Oct., p. 10a.

² Of 14 Irish leaders, including Parnell; proceedings began, 2 Nov., the trials, 28 Dec., and the Irish jury disagreed, 23 Jan. 1881.
In a luxurious way of life I should not make my appearance on Monday in D. Street until 4.15. But I can if needful be there an hour or two sooner. We dine I believe at F. Cavendish’s and if you are at home the evening would be a good time for talking over the business of the Guildhall.

I have many things to touch upon with you—among them, the O. Russell and Adam Peerage questions. I think that O.R. wishes it now—he offered, without wishing, to retire upon it.

He has been here, the most agreeable perhaps among a very agreeable party—your brother & nephew, the Baths, O. Russells, Dufferin, MacColl, & one or two more: nearly all I am sorry to say, gone off today.

In order to supply the defect of my memory about the Dover Harbour plan in the time of the former Govt, I applied to Sherbrook: he confirms what you say but puts it later, and says I was Chancellor of the Exchequer and dissented from my colleagues.

Argyll very keen for coercion in Ireland—

A note from F. C[a]avendish entirely supports you as to proceedings on Dover Harbour in May 73.

I send you another minute from the north.

I have answered that it will be more satisfactory to reply after I have seen you, & some of my colleagues. It is rather difficult to know what to say. She does not state that she objects to my conversation with Hengel Muller, and she has approved of the Naval Demonstration and of the draft about Smyrna.

1 See Granville to Gladstone, 2 Nov., enclosing correspondence on Adam’s application for a peerage, Add. MS. 44172, fos. 276-8, not printed; see also p. 213, n. 1, and no. 375; for Russell’s peerage, see p. 167, n. 5, and no. 391.

2 See to Sherbrooke, 26 Oct., asking why the cabinet assented to an expensive plan for improving Dover harbour in 1873, Add. MS. 44544, fo. 82; and reply, 30 Oct., as here reported, adding that the purpose was to enable larger boats to make the channel crossing, Add. MS. 44302, fo. 200; see Gladstone and Granville, ii, nos. 848, 885.

3 See to Gladstone, 3 Nov., arguing that a new land bill for Ireland was not necessary and that the failure of the Compensation for Disturbance bill had made no difference to the land question, Add. MS. 44104, fo. 232.

4 See from Cavendish, 3 Nov., saying that Sherbrooke’s recollection was faulty, the scheme was prepared in 1873 by a committee of the cabinet of which he, as chancellor of the exchequer, was a member, Add. MS. 44124, fo. 92.

5 From the Queen, Loch Muich, 3 Nov., commenting on the draft to Elliot, No. 718, 28 Oct. (see p. 208, n. 3); and reply, copy, 4 Nov., as here reported, P.R.O. 30/29/37.
You made 2 suggestions upon which I have not yet acted—One as to Cyprus tribute. On this subject Goschen has written at length. I sent his paper to Freddy Cavendish—The other with regard to the officials on the Albanian League. I doubt the use of our acting on this. The Turks are acting either with good or with bad faith. In the former case it is better to let them work out their own plan. If the latter, they are sure to evade our demand, and it is not quite clear how we could enforce it.

I wish Chamberlain had said less about Foreign Affairs.

372. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville [P.R.O. 30/29/123]

10, Downing Street. Nov 6. 80.

You will certainly make a better answer than any one else to the effusion of Jingoism which you have sent me and probably in order to minimise the matter it may be best that you should do it from yourself alone. Were it mine I should be disposed to say that the letter had my respectful attention, that I felt sure H.M. would be the first to acknowledge the duty of Ministers to advise in conformity with the well understood principles of policy which they had declared during the whole Eastern Question and on which they had been called to power that I did not despair of so applying these principles as to meet H.M.'s desire for the maintenance of peace in the East while well assured that there were no other principles which could maintain it or could give a chance of salvation to the Ottoman Empire which the Sultan is now busily engaged in destroying.

I should think as you appear to do that little will have to be said on Foreign Politics next Tuesday but I think it should be said that a very important principle with regard to the execution of Treaties is now at issue in the East & that Lord Beaconsfield was right in saying that if the Treaty of Berlin was to fail of execution it should not be owing to the fault of England. Dervish is evidently either to hand over Dulcigno or else to

1 See from Goschen, No. 496, 22 Oct., arguing afresh against the proposal to appropriate the surplus Cyprus revenue to pay the debt due to the British Treasury in respect of the guaranteed loan of 1855, F.O. 78/3609; see nos. 293, 366.
2 See no. 368.
3 For speech at Birmingham, 26 Oct., regretting Britain's preventing the Balkan peoples from freeing themselves or others from helping them, see The Times, 27 Oct., p. 10d; see from Elliot, No. 698 confidential, 29 Oct., for Austrian protest, the Pesther Lloyd having reported Chamberlain as calling for the freeing of the east from the abominable yoke of the Turk, F.O. 7/995.
4 Sc. Hawarden; Gladstone did not arrive in London until Mon. 8 Nov.; see also copy in Add. MS. 44544, fos. 90–91.
5 See Granville to the Queen, 8 Nov., written without having seen Gladstone, enlarging on the 'perfect consistency' between the liberal and conservative policies in carrying out the treaty of Berlin, P.R.O. 30/29/37.
6 9 Nov., at the lord mayor's banquet.
7 The new Turkish commissioner sent to Dulcigno arrived there 2 Nov.
complete the execution [of] a fraud & falsehood exceeding all former 
examples. But which is it?

[P.S.] Can you venture on any friendly word for Servia, e.g. a regret 
at any misunderstanding which will tend to harden the Sultan.¹

Reflection rather has confirmed me in my later view of the Austrian 
reply.² O. R[ussell] will tell you that Bismarck was surprised when he 
found Austria had gone so far in our sense.

373. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

[Add. MS. 44172, fo. 284]


I will call at no 10 at five Oclock on Monday, & will go over to Fred 
Cavendish’s in the evening.

Crowe is often well informed, but sometimes gets hold of cock & bull 
stories.³

374. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville


1. This time, I cannot believe Mr. Crowe.

2. I hope to be ready for you at five.

3. I inclose two letters from Forster—for your perusal if you have 
time.⁴ Also my reply.⁵ Whatever we do we must not transact this dangerous 
business hand over head.

375. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville


I have considered with all the attention in my power the choice of our 
friend Adam for a Peerage. There can be no doubt that his personal 
qualities w[oul]d adorn the rank he desires, & if this were all the matter w[oul]d be easy. His sound & earnest Liberalism w[oul]d be of as much 
use to you as, for some years at any rate, absence from the H. of Lords

¹ Granville in replying to the toast to the Lords made a witty speech without alluding 
to foreign affairs; Gladstone, in replying to the toast to Her Majesty’s ministers, dis-
cussed the execution of the Berlin treaty as here proposed, but did not refer to Servia, 
see The Times, 10 Nov., p. 6a–f.

² See no. 363.

³ See J. A. Crowe to Russell, 29 Oct., reporting the arrival of a Turkish mission to 
recruit German officers for the Turkish army, forwarded in Russell to Granville, 15 
Nov., P.R.O. 30/20/177; printed Knaplund, Letters from Berlin, 169; cf. p. 308, n. 3.

⁴ Of 5 and 6 Nov., on coercion and land reform in Ireland, Add. MS. 44157, fos. 
191, 206.

⁵ To Forster, 7 Nov., arguing against the principle ‘a quiet land, a strong land bill’, 
and against suspending the Habeas Corpus Act, Add. MS. 44157, fo. 211.
w[oul]d permit. He may feel that the descent from a Duke to a Commoner at Madras w[oul]d strike a few minds, but they must be of a very mean order. In the matter of precedent, I am not sure that the case is strong: & there is another & serious question wh[ich], if we were in a condition otherwise to go forward, w[oul]d have to be further examined. That is the deficiency of income. Perhaps he may be able & disposed to give you on this subject some more particular information. There is however a barrier to any further consideration of the case at the present moment. We have not yet presented to H.M. any recommendation for Peerages except upon grounds which were very specific: & I think you agree with me that we had better maintain our reserve on that subject for some time longer. The only case1 that I have now before me as possible is one having relation to bygone events & possibly presenting the character of an engagement. You will kindly, I dare say, make known to Adam the state of the case which I have placed thus freely & at some length before you.2

376. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone  
[Add. MS. 44172, fo. 285]  

...3 The Dr objects to my going out, but I should not like to miss the Cabinet. Would it be very inconvenient to have it here?4 I wish you joy of your speech, & reception.5 I think I was right to give up saying what I should have said, if it had not been so late.

377. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville  
[P.R.O. 30/29/123]  
10, Downing Street. Nov 11. 80.

I hope you are better. Pray read the Standard of today on yesterday’s Cabinet and Ireland.6 I am disposed at once to offer Halifax the Ld Lieutenancy of the East Riding.7 The rival in property, far ahead of him, is Londesborough.

1 i.e. that of Odo Russell.
2 See p. 213, n. 1, and p. 215, n. 1; Granville sent on Gladstone’s letter to Adam so that copy only remains in the Granville papers; Adam was not made a peer, but his son was made a baronet in 1882 after Adam’s death, p. 361, n. 6. 3 Details of a chill.
4 The first cabinet of the series (above, no. 366) met at Granville’s house and discussed Montenegro, Ireland, and the Basuto War, Add. MS. 44642, fo. 73.
5 For Gladstone’s reception with ‘deafening and prolonged cheering’ and his speech at the lord mayor’s banquet, 9 Nov., see The Times, 10 Nov., p. 6c-e.
6 See the Standard, 11 Nov., p. 49, reporting the cabinet’s discussion of the three courses open to it on Irish coercion and betraying inside knowledge; see note of the cabinet of 15 Nov. for discussion of the leak, Add. MS. 44642, fo. 78; see no. 405.
7 Vacant by Lord Wenlock’s death; Halifax refused and Lord Herries was appointed, 16 Dec.; see Gladstone to Herries, 27 Nov., Add. MS. 44544, fo. 99.
We ought soon to consider the Adam Vacancy.¹
You were 'victimised' on Tuesday by the late hour, and you freely
accepted the situation. I would gladly have heard your statement on
foreign policy, instead of your literal adoption of mine.
Unless you are coming out today I will call between five & six.

378. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone


I am much better essentially, but I am not allowed to go out—a little
gout—Claret two days at Fullertons, a glass of the Ld Mayor's hock. I
know how methodically your time is mapped out, so I do not ask you to
come earlier, but I should have been very glad to have seen you before
Menabrea's [sic] visit at 3,² and before I write to Goschen by today's mail.³
Halifax excellent[,] Londesborough not a very good Ld Lieutenant, but
he has been a faithful Peer to us this year.

379. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

10, Downing Street. Nov. 13. 80.

Pray read this curious letter.⁴
I am afraid it will not do in my reply⁵ to suggest by way of comfort that
she may always regard a Ferry Ministry as in a transition-state.

380. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

India Office. Nov 17/80.

I have seen Spencer and Hartington.
The latter takes no extreme view, but under all the circumstances thinks
it impossible to resist Forster's appeal.⁶
I agree with him. Spencer is still stronger than we are.

¹ Adam was replaced as chief commissioner, Board of Works by Lefevre, p. 222, n. 5.
² When he saw Menabrea, Granville denied that the European concert had broken
up, and urged its use in the Greek frontier question, see to Paget, No. 614, 11 Nov.,
F.O. 45/401.
³ He wrote privately, 11 Nov., 'events may occur which may make it desirable that
you should come away before you intended and with some splash', but there would be
no change of policy and he had told Menabrea this, P.R.O. 30/29/210.
⁴ The Queen to Gladstone, not traced.
⁵ Not traced.
⁶ For extra powers for the Irish government, made in the cabinets of 12 and 15 Nov.,
Add. MS. 44642, fos. 75–78; see also Cowper to Gladstone, 13 Nov., urging the suspension
of the Habeas Corpus Act, Add. MS. 44466, fo. 320; Gladstone to Forster, 16,
17 Nov., arguing against fresh powers, Add. MS. 44544, fos. 93, 94, and T. Wemyss
Reid, Life of W. E. Forster (1888) ii. 267–8.
381. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

18, Carlton House Terrace. Nov 18/80.

It annoys me much, whenever there is a difference of opinion on any matter with you.

Is it certain that Forster will not give way.

But it is difficult for him after his minute, not to stick to his guns, and if he does so, I do not see how we can let him resign.

It showed my usual want of repartee, not to have an answer to the query you put about your consistency,¹ if you acted without that demonstration which you said at the Lord Mayor’s was wanting.

Is it not a sufficient reply, that the whole Irish Govt now represent to you the necessity while they had said nothing of the sort up to the 9th.

382. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

10, Downing Street. Nov. 18. 80.

Do not let us be disheartened—the string is extremely difficult—it is no wonder if in pulling at a knot we seem to tighten it. The hurry, diversity & excess of business prevent full information. I mean as to other than present facts.

I go a great way with you, though not all the way, as to the authority of the Irish Govt.

But it is my special duty, and responsibility, to forecast the debate in the H. of C., as it is Forster’s to provide for the state of Ireland.

This I own dismays me; not least on account of F.’s disinclination to send the case to a Committee.

I beg you, again, to notice a little Mem² circulated by me this morning.

It is very difficult to find, after what we have said & done, a justification for legislating during the trials, unless it were in the face of a great outburst of crime, which neither has occurred, nor is likely at an early (I doubt it at a later) date: the case we have to deal with being a paralysis of certain most important civil rights, & we having chosen our first mode of dealing with it. Can this be easily denied?

I go out at 1.30 sharp, to be in by or before three.

383. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

18, Carlton House Terrace. [18 November 1880].

All these questions appear to me to be subsidiary to the principal one.

Is the state of things so bad as to require immediate coercion?

¹ Gladstone in the Guildhall speech, 9 Nov., had said that the time had not come for extra powers to be given to the Irish government, but had warned the Irish that he would not shrink from claiming them if necessary.

² i.e. against Irish coercion, Add. MS. 44642, fo. 91.
If not, we certainly ought to postpone it. But if [it] be so, minor difficulties must be got over.

The discussion of yesterday\(^1\) threw much light on the difficulties of both courses. It is not impossible that it may have induced the Irish Secretary to see that there are countervailing advantages in postponing the consideration of coercion for a time.

---

384. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

10, Downing Street. Nov. 18. 80.

Please to look at Welby's four questions—\(^2\)

My disposition *prima facie* would be to answer them in the affirmative—referring however to the Cabinet, as I think you would wish, the question whether we are to go on quietly paying to the Turk the Cyprus Tribute and also paying the Guaranteed Dividends.

Perhaps the French Govt would have to be consulted before action.

---

385. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

10, Downing Street. Nov. 19. 80.

Many thanks. I recommend Nos 2 and 4—without prejudice to the question of your writing if you think fit.\(^3\)

H.M. has rather odd ideas as to the way of conducting business.

Let me know whether I am in writing today to indicate to her my knowledge of her telegram to you.\(^4\)

---

1 i.e. in the cabinet, see Add. MS. 44642, fo. 81; see also note by Gladstone for Granville written during the meeting, drawing his attention to the peers, 'who have not the battle to fight in the Commons', being all with Forster, and Granville's reply, that it might be 'the secondary difficulty of the debate which prevents some of the House of Commons reflecting upon what is really the right thing for the country', ibid., fo. 90.

2 Asking (1) what the F.O. thought about the use of the Cyprus revenue additional to the amount assigned to pay the Turkish tribute; (2) what the Treasury replied to Goschen's account, p. 212, n. 4; (3) what Granville thought of a 'general re-arrangement of the guaranteed loan'; (4) what the 'Treasury thought would be financially best for the portes and the bondholders; the law officers reported, 11 Jan. 1881, that the surplus Cyprus revenue might legally be retained by Britain; see no. 638.

3 The docket on no. 385 shows that this relates to Gladstone's reply to the Queen's complaint, 18 Nov., of the meagreness of his report of the cabinet meeting of 17 Nov.; see also note by Gladstone, that Granville had minuted on his summary of arguments on Irish coercion, sent to the Queen, 19 Nov., 'excellent & quite fair—could you not add after the first sentence of the 5th paragraph, that the passing of the West Meath Act took four months', Add. MS. 44172, fo. 296.

4 From Balmoral, 18 Nov.: 'rumours are plentiful of cabinet dissensions and I ought to be fully informed'; and reply that discussions were too inconclusive to be reported at length, P.R.O. 30/29/37.
386. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

10, Downing Street. [25 November 1880].

Nothing worth having sent for me—\(^1\)

I told her next to nothing—and she really makes no objection to anything. I think you will find her serene on Saturday.

I will give you details later.

387. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

10, Downing Street. [25 November 1880].

I gave her the exact substance of this,\(^2\) though less well put.

She rather bowed assent to each proposition, but I think was chiefly anxious not to commit herself to any assent or dissent.

She made no sign of objection to anything we may decide.

388. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

Hawarden Castle. Nov. 29. 80.

Prince Nicholas would have acted more in accordance with rule had he telegraphed to you.\(^3\) However I thought it right to send on his message to the Queen by Tel. yesterday, and she I suppose was pleased as she telegraphed to me her thanks.

Nothing could be more kindly and agreeable than she was at my audience, which was rather long. About the Irish disturbances,\(^4\) she seemed quite fair and willing to listen to reason. She had also cooked up an objection to Trevelyan: but this melted 'like a mockery king of snow'. However I promised to say one word to him about the old *escapade*.\(^5\)

She did not mention O. Russell,\(^6\) and we were both in such good humour that it did not occur to me. There is however an obvious word to say, viz. that a Peerage, after 1878 Berlin, would have borne something of a party colour, and also a Peerage after the Conference in 1880: but that *now* it is

---

\(^1\) The Queen summoned Granville to Windsor after the cabinet on Tues. 24 Nov., see Ponsonby's tel. 24 Nov., P.R.O. 30/29/37.

\(^2\) Mem. by Granville for the Queen on Irish coercion, not traced.

\(^3\) i.e. as foreign secretary; Prince Nicholas to Gladstone, tel. thanking on the completion of the Dulcigno cession, not traced; see also Green to Granville, tel. No. 167, 27 Nov., F.O. 103/10.

\(^4\) The struggle in the cabinet on Irish coercion ended on 25 Nov., when Forster gave way, Add. MS. 44642, fo. 104; see also Chamberlain, *Political Memoir*, 5–13, and cf. below, p. 228, n. 3.

\(^5\) See to Trevelyan, 29 Nov., offering him office as secretary to the Admiralty *vice* Lefevre, made chief commissioner, Board of Works, alluding to his resignation in 1870 (over increased grants to church schools) as placing him, as he himself recognized, in a difficulty which would not recur, Add. MS. 44544, fo. 100.

\(^6\) For Russell's peerage, see nos. 127, 290, 370, 375, and 391.
perfectly free. I think I will write this to her, as a non-controversial explanation.

Irish Land weighs much upon me. It is going to be a great crux for us. I am a little afraid lest Forster get a twist: particularly because on reflection I think his not sharing my anxiety for something near an unanimous report from the Commission\(^1\) meant that he felt sure the majority would be for very large changes. I am working much upon the subject. Could you usefully, as you gave him such good support a fortnight ago, write with advantage a word for gentleness? What I should like is practical security rather than theoretical fixity for the tenant.

I shall read your speech with the first daylight i.e. tomorrow.

I do not know why Seymour cannot have the Danilo Order?\(^2\)

389. *Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone*  
[Add. MS. 44172, fo. 299]  

What happened at Windsor. I heard that Forster looked glum on his return.

A good meeting at Hanley.\(^3\) Perfect audience—3, or 4000 packed liberals. The Members most loyal to Gov. But George Leveson was the great success of the evening. He brought the house down—not so much from what he said, though it was very neat (By advice of his father he avoided politics) but by his tone voice & manner.

I suppose we had better go on with France Russia & Greece,\(^4\) in having places of call for the fleet, and let Austria & Germany take away their’s, if they wish to do so.\(^5\)

As Goschen and Austria coincide, we had better let the Montenegrin boundary question be dealt with as they propose.\(^6\)

I have desired a pamphlet\(^7\) to be sent you which Derby and Freddy [Leveson-Gower] recommend.

---

1. i.e. on Agricultural Depression in the United Kingdom (the Richmond Commission, appointed by the conservatives) which was preparing a preliminary report limited to Ireland; see p. 224, n. 6.
2. This sentence was written across the top of the front of the letter; see tel. No. 172, 27 Nov., reporting Prince Nicholas's desire to confer the cross of the Danillo order on Admiral Seymour, F.O. 103\(10\); see also no. 391.
3. i.e. of Stoke-on-Trent liberals, addressed by Granville; see *The Times*, 29 Nov., p. 8b; George Leveson-Gower brought a brief message from his father, who had been member for the constituency before he himself was 'a member of the world'.
4. Corrected by Gladstone to 'Italy'.
5. See nos. 347, 361; see also from Elliot, tel. No. 201, 28 Nov., that Austria considered the naval demonstration at an end, F.O. 7/96.
6. i.e. to be discussed by the ambassadors at Constantinople and not in the international Montenegrin frontier commission, appointed under the Berlin treaty; the NE. frontier still remained to be drawn.
Derby does not see the answers to the pages 26–28 in which it is argued that fixed rent & free sale must be mutually destructive.

390. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

Hawarden Castle. Nov. 30. 80

I have read your speech¹ (in the Standard) and think it excellent. I am so pleased, also, to hear of George’s success.

I quite agree about the Fleet—The Austrian proposal about the residue of Montenegrin boundary I have not seen—I am very sorry to read of aggressions on their territory.

The pamphlet you name has not reached me: I shall read it with interest. Fixity of tenure does not improve, thus far, upon nearer acquaintance.

391. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

18, Carlton House Terrace. Nov. 30/80.

I will send a copy of the enclosed to Forster.²

B. Seymour cannot by the regulations be allowed to receive the Montenegrin order. But we might give him the G.C.M.G., & minor grades of the St. Michael & George to Green & Sale.³

Goschen who arrives in the middle of next month, might be sounded if and when he would like a G.C.B.⁴

I am glad to hear of the Queen having been so gracious and sensible. She would be very reasonable on most points, if she lived in a more wholesome atmosphere.

I doubt raising an argument about Odo, unless she starts it.⁵

I am nervous as to your opinion about my speech, which I hope you will read in the Times’ report if you wade through it at all.

392. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

18, Carlton House Terrace. Nov. 30/80.

Stansfeld called on me yesterday—& spoke about his visit to Ireland (where he had seen Forster) and his work on the Commission.⁶

¹ At Hanley, see the Standard, 29 Nov., p. 3a–b, and leading article p. 4a.
² i.e. no. 392, see copy of note to Forster, 30 Nov., P.R.O. 30/29/117.
³ See nos. 388, 397, and 398; Seymour declined (see no. 414) and no offer was made to Sale or Green.
⁴ See nos. 290, 297, and for the offer declined by Goschen in 1881, nos. 495, 502, 503.
⁵ The Queen agreed to renew the offer of a peerage (see no. 127) to Russell, who accepted, 3 Dec., Add. MS. 44467, fo. 91.
⁶ For preliminary report of the Richmond Commission, consisting of a majority statement, favouring fresh land legislation in Ireland but against the 3 F’s, and a minority statement (by Stansfeld, Carlingford, and 4 others) favouring the 3 F’s, see Parl. papers (1881) xv. 5–9, 20–24; final report, ibid. (1882) xiv.
He says Richmond is reticent as to the time of their report, that he Stansfeld has urged the expediency of reporting before the meeting. He believes that Richmond would like to defer, but will not be able to do so. I asked him whether he could not manage in some way to have his pressure put upon record.

He said that Carlingford wished to move amendments on Richmond’s report, & that he (S) would prefer a counter report which would be signed he believes by a small minority, but not only by Carlingford & himself.

I thought his plan the best, even if it embodied much of the Chairman’s report. People will not study amendments.

He praised Carlingford highly.

He boasted that he utterly smashed by cross examination, Dufferin’s evidence in favor of Landlord’s past improvements.

He thinks a strong bill will be necessary, based on the principle that free contract has not existed, and does not exist in Ireland. With such a bill on the table Gov can carry what coercion they like, and will checkmate Parnell.

I think his notions are a great development of Bright’s plan, and something of the plan of Monck, Powerscourt etc. etc.

He says there is a great risk in having delayed to call Parliament together, but that it was right to run it.

He told me that he intended at once to explain the Irish land question, which he thought he could do in three separate speeches, in different big towns of Yorkshire.¹

I suggested that this would be hardly consistent with his position as one member of a Commission about to consider their report.

He answered that this had not occurred to him, but that he would give up the idea unless he heard from me that I had changed my mind.

The strain upon Forster is very great. His temptation to go far on the land question is immense. He is sure to do what his conscience tells him is right. I hope he will fully see the danger both here and in Ireland of going too far. It will be very easy indeed to break up the Cabinet on this question.

I entirely agree with what I know is your opinion that the great thing is to give practical security rather than theoretical fixity to the tenant.

393. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville [P.R.O. 30/29/123]


1. I have read the Land Pamphlet. It seems to me clever, hard, narrow, reckless. In one great point it conveys a most disagreeable impression. It is strongly anti-Irish: and it is at the same time strongly anti-English. However, its arguments deserve consideration.

¹ Stansfeld abandoned this plan; for his one speech at Sowerby Bridge, in which he avoided the Land Commission, since it had not yet reported, see The Times, 20 Dec., p. 10f.
I do not see that Fair Rent is strangled by Free Sale. If an arbitrator fixes a 'fair rent' at £100, and the tenant thereupon sells his interest in his occupation for £2000, I say that is not a fair rent, and the example given is not in point.

My great desire is however to avoid arbitration upon rents generally and prospectively though in the now agitated state of matters it may be requisite again to introduce, once for all, the interference of the Judge for rents which are 'exorbitant' or beyond what a solvent tenant would undertake to pay.

I certainly wish that on the vacancy of a farm the landlord should be free to take what rent he can get. But I would try to prevent, on Judge Longfield's basis, the whittling down by undue augmentations the interest of a tenant in possession.

I have been fagging from day to day at a scheme for working these ideas into shape.

Thanks for two letters of yesterday.

394. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

Hawarden Castle. Dec. 1. 80.

I have now got Goschen's suggestion, and I do not dislike it. The dynastic link would I suppose be what O'Connell proposed for Ireland under Repeal. I am a little afraid of offering it to the Turks. Is not the letter worth circulating?

2. On the other hand, you are a better judge, but I do not greatly affect Haymerle's doctrine that the rest of the Montenegrin frontier should not be dealt with till Albania cools down. Albania cooled under Dervish's fire, and Dervish fired under fear of our fire. If Dervish goes, & the fleet breaks up, I do not feel much confidence in the cooling down.

3. Haymerle is now I suppose thoroughly frightened, & we have nothing more to expect from him, until he gets frightened the other way.

395. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville


I have read with great pleasure your draft on Haymerle's communicated

---

1. See M. Longfield, 'Land Tenure in Ireland', describing his proposals for a system of so-called 'Parliamentary tenant-right', Forinightly Review, 1 Aug. 1880, xxviii. 137.

2. See to Granville, private, 23 Nov., suggesting the solution of the problem of inducing Turkey to make the Berlin cession to Greece by means of direct Greek negotiations with Albania for the union of part of Albania with Greece by a 'dynastic tie', P.R.O. 30/29/188.


4. i.e. to Elliot, No. 763A, recording conversation with Hengelmüller on the dispatch in which he insisted on moral pressure alone being used if the concert proceeded to deal
dispatch. Only I pray that, if accuracy of recital will permit, the word possibly in p. 17 may be left out: on the ground that it too much under-
states our case in regard to the scheme for taking Smyrna.

It does not seem clear what Austria will do in regard to the pledge
required by France & given at our instance:¹ unless it be to say that as
France retires she retires too.

What does seem plain is that for any real progress as to Greece (to say
nothing of Reforms, finance, or Armenia) we have but two contingencies
to look to
1. A change in the tone of the French Govt.
2. The pressure which Greece may bring to bear on Europe by going
to war.

Can we fill up the next three or four months with concerted diplomatic
action, reserving the liberty of each Power to alter its course if circ[um-
stance]s alter?

In the Memoirs of Herries you will find a most curious account relating
to the formation of the Goderich Government.²

396. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

Private.

You could not have time to read lengthened papers about the Irish Land
question just now: but that you may see briefly the sort of aspect it is
beginning to bear I send you a note I have just written to Forster.³

Please to send it back through Hartington.

397. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone


I have sent on your confidential memoranda to Hartington—telling
him I entirely agree, as I presume he will. It is indeed lucky that we meet
next week.⁴ On what day shall you be in London.

with the Greek frontier question and Granville expressed confidence in success, since
Turkey had yielded to the naval demonstration 'possibly' stimulated by knowledge of
the Smyrna plan, F.O. 7/987. Gladstone's correction was made.
¹ i.e. at the time of the Montenegro naval demonstration, that this measure should
if necessary be applied also to the Greek matter; see p. 201, n. 5.
² Edward Herries, Memoir of the public Life of the Right Hon. J. C. Herries (London,
1880), 2 vols.
³ See copy, 7 Dec., voicing alarm that some members of the Bessborough Land
Commission favoured compensation for Irish landowners, Add. MS. 44158, fo. 34; no. 396 is in Gladstone's hand in his papers being returned to him with the letter to
Forster.
⁴ The cabinet was summoned for Thurs. 16 Dec., but put forward to 13 Dec.
You did not answer about Michael & Georges for Dulcigno. But Godley confirms me in the belief that silence meant assent.

I have not seen the papers written by the Commissioners.

398. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville


1. The Cabinet is altered at Forsters desire to Monday. His opinion is, that Parliament ought to be further accelerated. I told him, in our telegraphic conversation, that, as a first impression, I did not see that the advantage could outweigh the inconvenience; but that, if he with his fuller knowledge had a decided opinion, I would readily summon [the] Cabinet for Monday. His answer leads me to do it.

I cannot but fear that the excitement and panic in Ireland are too much (in more directions than one) for some of our friends. But the early meeting of the Cabinet may do good in reference at least to the Land question—

The objections to the earlier meeting of Parl I suppose are

1. It will I fear rather confuse the preparation of Estimates etc which depend on the day of meeting
2. It will create some alarm
3. It will further, and entirely for sometime, prevent Parnell and his friends from being present in Parliament, or else at the Trials
4. It will be construed especially in Ireland as having been done by us for that purpose.

Forster is moved, I presume, by the widening influence of the Land League, and the increased number of offences, not so far as I know their increased gravity.

2. Your question about honours for Dulcigno must have escaped my eye; possibly a case of overleaf. I should not greatly suppose that there was any claim of officers to notice, except it be Seymour.
399. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone [Add. MS. 44172, fo. 318]

The box went first to Hartington. I found in it this minute of his which I have not forwarded to Bright.¹

400. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville [P.R.O. 30/29/123]
Hawarden Castle Dec 12. 80.

I return Stansfield's [sic] letter.¹ I think that if I had to speak to him I should simply indicate the broad difference between proceeding on the lines of the Land Act and striking at the root of property in land.

The question however must not be begged what constitutes property in land? I do not see any better definition than this: the proprietor is the man who either occupies, or chooses the occupier.

He that once for all parts with the power to choose the occupier ceases I think to be the proprietor.

Hence perhaps arose the absurdly long terms of lease in certain cases: at least I know not what else could suggest them. (Did I ever tell you that Meath is his own sub-tenant under a lease for 4000 years.)

I inclose a note from Richard Grosvenor² who was here yesterday. Perhaps you may be able to look in upon me on your way to the Cabinet with Hartington whom I have exhorted to see you.

401. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone [Add. MS. 44172, fo. 320]
10, Downing Street. [14 December 1880].

Stansfeld evidently has made up his mind to go further than we wish. He says the Duke [of Richmond] has promised a draft by the meeting, which His Grace hopes will be unanimously agreed to.

Stansfeld is dead against compensation & thinks the delay right.

402. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone [Add. MS. 44172, fo. 324]
10, Downing Street. [14 December 1880].

Ought you not to fill up Fife's place.³

On the whole I think Camperdown, with a civil phrase about knowing that Household is not his object.⁴

¹ Not traced.
² See to Gladstone, 11 Dec., showing that the necessary interval between the decision to summon parliament and its actual meeting, owing to formalities and Christmas, would bring it only one day earlier than that fixed and therefore recommending no change, Add. MS. 44315, fo. 30.
³ The captancy of the corps of gentlemen-at-arms, which he resigned, 14 Dec., Add. MS. 44467, fo. 134; Camperdown, 29 Dec., refused to succeed, P.R.O. 30/29/123; Huntly, 8, 9 Jan., accepted, Add. MS. 44468, fos. 14, 21; see no. 417.
⁴ Gladstone wrote here: 'I must of course first name him to the Queen.'
Had time permitted, of which neither of us had much, there were various things which I should like to have said yesterday after the Cabinet.¹

I will now only refer in a few words to two points connected with your Department

1. With reference to the Pope’s benignant but confidential expression of his views on outrage in Ireland, I really hope that some means will be taken of letting him know that we are aware how absolutely and entirely their value depends upon the removal of the seal of secrecy. As long as that is attached to them, I apprehend that they are worth exactly £0. 0. 0.

2. I should like to have asked you whether there is any truth in the current rumour that Bismarck is promising a cession of Crete _vice_ Thessaly and Epirus.³ If there be, I should be inclined to say (1.) That it ought to be in honour impossible to leave those two provinces as they now are under the direct Government of the Porte, after the promises that have been held out to them by the Powers. They ought to have at the least a true tributary autonomy, in terms keeping as close as may be to the Treaty of Berlin. If Albania too, so much the better. But further

(2.) If this is to happen, and Crete to be Greek, it seems to me not wholly unworthy of consideration whether Cyprus might not be properly handed over by the Porte and us, in sovereignty not in mere occupation. This would incidentally be a strong challenge to the late Government, but I do not know that it would be an unsafe one. Of course it should not be thought of unless desired by the people. At present they can hardly have dreamt of it.

I send you herewith a letter from Childers.⁴ Forster is the only man

¹ For cabinets of 14 and 16 Dec., concerned with the Irish Land bill, committee on Corrupt Practices bill, army organization, and naval estimates, see Add. MS. 44642, fos. 112-15.

² See from Paget, 27 Dec. [sc. Nov.], describing a communication from Cardinal Howard that day, P.R.O. 30/29/182; and to Paget, copy, 14 Dec., urging Paget to seek a public instruction to the Irish clergy, P.R.O. 30/29/208; and Errington to Granville, 16 and 20 Dec., reporting his having urged the inutility of private instructions, P.R.O. 30/29/149; and p. 231, n. 4.

³ See Russell to Granville, private, 17 Jan. 1881, reporting Bismarck’s formally proposing this, P.R.O. 30/29/177; Knaplund, _Letters from Berlin_, 188–91.

⁴ Of 17 Dec., asking whether Cowper was up to his work as lord lieutenant of Ireland, Add. MS. 44129, fo. 127; and reply, 18 Dec., proposing to send his letter to Forster,
who can really give evidence. I have not been without some misgiving but it would be most unjust to give weight to what may be wholly valueless. I observe, however, that Forster always speaks & writes in the first person singular: and he is not an egotist.

I have put a question¹ to him by this post, of which I send you a copy. There can be no doubt that if in April we had anticipated what we now have to encounter we should have sought for a man of more experience.

405. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville [P.R.O. 30/29/123]


I send you the inclosed Mem² on account of No 1. I fear this is the most probable account of the undeniable leakage; and it is more satisfactory than if the cause were voluntary.

I was much struck by some words used by F[orster] at one moment in the Cabinet, which, in their full meaning, seemed to be beyond his consciousness.

[P.S.] I may be wrong but at the first moment the French proposal for arbitration on the Greek Frontier pleases me.³

406. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone [Add. MS. 44172, fo. 325]


Thanks for your note. I have telegraphed to Paget⁴ to represent strongly what you suggest as to the inutility of secret advice, instead of open instructions to the clergy.

Lady Herbert came to me saying she had been referred to me by you. She came on the same story as Mr Errington had previously done. It is evident that the Pope wishes to use our present necessities as a lever to force us to renew unofficial communications with him. Lady Herbert is who alone could answer the question, Add. MS. 44544, fo. 113; and Childers's letter, 19 Dec., objecting to this, Add. MS. 44129, fo. 129.

¹ Whether, when it was necessary for him to come to London for the parliamentary session, he would be able to leave the Irish government in a state of efficiency 'adequate to this great crisis', Add. MS. 44158, fo. 74; copy, P.R.O. 30/29/123.

² i.e. by Godley, 18 Dec., on Forster's talking freely in the Athenaeum as an explanation of the leakage of the Land bill to the Standard; discussed in the cabinet, 16 Dec.; see also Godley to Granville, 20 Dec., P.R.O. 30/29/123; and Chamberlain, Political Memoir, 9–10, for Chamberlain's exoneration of both himself and Forster; see no. 607.

³ See from Lyons, tel. No. 133 and dispatch No. 1167 confidential, 18 Dec., proposing that the mediation of the six powers be converted into arbitration, F.O. 27/2438.

⁴ Not traced, but see from Paget, private, 20 Dec., reporting its receipt and his acting on it in an interview with Cardinal Howard, who allowed Paget to expect a public instruction; and tel. 4 Jan., announcing a public pontifical letter of that day to the Archbishop of Dublin, condemning the Irish agitation, P.R.O. 30/29/182.
so inaccurate that it is most undesirable to employ her in any communi-
cation.

I therefore told her that 'I had reason to believe that the Pope had
authentic information, upon which he could act if he had a mind, & that
he was also much more likely to be convinced by the representations of
English & Irish Catholic landowners, than by any representations of the
British Gov. I added that the conduct of the Priests exasperated British
& Protestant feeling so much, that it made any action on the part of the
liberal party, favorable to the Roman Catholic Religion, much more
difficult than it ought to be.'

I always thought it a mistake recalling Jervoise, which Derby did—but
to re-appoint a new man is a different matter.¹

The idea of at once negotiating to give up Cyprus to Greece does not
much smile to me,² and I should like to talk it over with you before taking
any action.

I propose writing to Lyons³ that with regard to arbitration, H. M's Gov
are very anxious to concert any reasonable mode of settling the Greek
question, and for that purpose should be desirous of favourably considering
any proposal of the French Gov. But that it would be difficult to form any
opinion of the proposed deviation from the previous decision without
further explanations as to the nature of the proposal.

That in the mean time I should be glad to know whether the French
had mentioned the proposal to other Govts. and if so whether it had been
rec[eive]d with favour.

It might be well to add a secret intimation to Lyons to find out whether
Gambetta was a party to it.

Please telegraph me an answer on the French proposal.⁴

407. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville [P.R.O. 30/29/123]
Hawarden Castle. Dec. 20. 80.

1. I inclose to you a letter from Hartington and copy of my reply.⁵
2. I inclose also a letter from Harcourt.⁶ I am ready for either plan.

¹ See no. 947.
² See no. 403, and W. N. Medlicott, Bismarck, Gladstone and the Concert of Europe
(1956) 222–3.
³ See tel. No. 666, 20 Dec., replying as proposed to the French suggestion to turn the
mediation into arbitration, F.O. 27/2425.
⁴ See to Granville, tel. 20 Dec., giving his approval, P.R.O. 30/29/123.
⁵ Of 19 Dec., on his wish to have supported Forster's appeal for extra powers to the
Irish government and to prosecute the land league and his failure on any Irish measure
fully to agree with the cabinet; and placatory reply, 20 Dec., promising precedence to
measures for restoring order, Add. MS. 44145, fos. 160, 165.
⁶ Of 19 Dec., proposing Courtney as home under-secretary vice Sir A. Peel who had
resigned on grounds of health, Add. MS. 44196, fo. 120; and reply, 20 Dec., that he
agreed, if Granville's alternative plan to appoint Fife was rejected, Add. MS. 44544,
fo. 116.
Probably R. Grosvenor should be heard if the new U[nder] Sec[retary] is not to be a Commoner.

3. I look upon the notion of renewing diplomatic relations with the Pope, now no longer a Temporal Prince, as visionary. I am glad you have written to Paget.

4. About Cyprus I must have written obscurely. It was an idea in the *paolo post futurum*: and proceeded on the assumption, as yet wholly uncertain, that it might become proper to frame some scheme good all round as alternative to the transfer of dominion agreed upon by the Berlin Conference.

408. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone  
[Add. MS. 44172, fo. 331]  
Confidential.  

I do not quite agree about Forster.¹ He is capable of very great self sacrifices, but I think him (though only superficially so) certainly egotistical.

I do not think he would consent to a recall of Cowper, & I am glad of it. It is a perilous time for getting up in a boat—Cowper has immense political connections, & his retirement would be attributed not to our doubt of his efficiency, but our anger at his having pressed for coercion. Besides I do not know what strong man you could get to be Lord Lieutenant, with Forster in the Cabinet below him. I should think the administration would be more strengthened by the substitution of the best of the lawyers for O Hagan, who ought to be Cowper's first adviser in cases of difficulty.

I guess that Forster will ask again for a Lord of the Treasury, as under secretary.

Godley has written to me about Fife.² I should be very glad indeed of the offer being made to him.³

I expect Goschen today.

409. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone  
[Add. MS. 44172, fo. 334]  
Private.  

I greatly regret that Hartington should have written to you the letter of the 19th.⁴

¹ See no. 404; see also Cowper to Gladstone, 23 Nov., offering to resign; and, 12 Dec., renewing his offer as he could not change his opinion that habeas corpus should be suspended and parliament summoned, Add. MS. 44467, fos. 33, 130.

² On 20 Dec., proposing him as home under-secretary since while captain of the corps of gentlemen-at-arms he had represented the Home Office in the Lords, P.R.O. 30/29/123; Granville to Gladstone, tel. 20 Dec., agreed, Add. MS. 44172, fo. 330.

³ Harcourt preferred Courtney (see Harcourt to Gladstone, 23 Dec., Add. MS. 44196, fo. 124), who was appointed, see no. 413.

⁴ See p. 232, n. 5.
But I am not surprised, and with his present views, it was fairer that he should do so.
I did not remember his opposition to the non continuance of the Peace Preservation Act—but I have no doubt that his recollection is right.
I was convinced by the arguments at the time, & I do not in the least regret the determination.
I cannot say as much of the bill of last year. I was a party to it, but wise after the event, it seems to me to have been a mistake.
As to the decision in Novr there is much to be said on both sides of a most difficult question—I was prepared to act with Hartington & Forster if the latter had persisted, and I am inclined to believe, that you would have done the same. But to break up the Gov at that time, would not have helped us or any other party in the State to deal with Ireland, and to go on with the old habit of coercion acts more or less efficient, without showing a determination to introduce remedial measures, on sound principles, is not a policy, which I should support.
The objection the other day, to changing our position for the sake of gaining a few days, seems to me to have been great, but there again I was prepared, if the Irish Gov had insisted, to have supported Forster. If however the decision was wrong, my responsibility for it is complete.
I am glad that Hartington will help you by suggestions for the land bill—It is the duty of us all, to give every assistance in our power, to you in this moment of supreme difficulty. But I reserve my liberty of differing from you on any essential point.
Your answer to Hartington appears to me excellent, & I hope will have the effect of showing him how usefully we may all act together.
P.S. After reading over my letter, I retract the expression of regret that Hartington should have written to you. It is better that he should have done so.
I see also that I have omitted to put as strongly as I ought to have done the duty of cordial cooperation in settling the difficulty in which the country is placed. I was much struck by an observation made at the late Cabinet, that if your Gov would not find a solution of the Irish question; it would be almost impossible for any other to do so.

410. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone


I send you what Odo, Munster, & Musurus say.¹

¹ See from Russell, No. 579, 20 Dec., reporting Germany's acceptance of the French proposal (p. 231, n. 3) provided the award was settled by a majority vote and not enforced by arms, F.O. 64/963; to Russell, No. 805, 30 Dec., recording Münster's language on 20 Dec., and different language on 22 Dec., and mins., F.O. 64/957; to St. John, No. 770, 21 Dec., recording conversation with Musurus Bey, the chargé d'affaires, F.O. 78/3077.
You will see that Odo & Munster differ as to Germany’s answer—which must be cleared up.

Encouraged by your postscript, & by the concurrence of Goschen, I have told Lyons that we should agree to the proposal of the French Gov, if Turkey and Greece agree to the arbitration, and engage to abide by the award.¹

I have told Menebrea [sic] who came here today, & who knew nothing of the French proposal, what I proposed to do.²

Goschen seems in good humour but despondent about the situation in the East.

He is strong for letting the Bondholders do what they like, but for keeping ourselves quite aloof if they consent to negotiate with the Turk without us.

Our object being the political one of improving the finances of the Ottoman Empire, which would indirectly be of advantage to its creditors.

This cannot be done without an independent enquiry and commission.

He doubts the Turks agreeing to this excepting under strong pressure, & under the greatest necessity.³

He is of opinion that we must go on with the Greek question, but does not make many useful suggestions.

He thinks that it is impossible for the moment to do anything about European or Turkish reforms.

He says there are 2 courses—To keep up a cool and distant attitude exercising pressure as much as we can or as all Europe seems to be running after the goodwill of Turkey, to join in the race for which he thinks notwithstanding appearances that we are favorably handicapped.

I asked him when he meant to go back. He said he had announced the end of Jany—But it must depend upon many circumstances.

He did not ask me a single question about the position of home politics and when I made some allusion to them, was perfectly reticent.

I wrote to Harcourt about Fife.⁴

⁴11. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

Hawarden Castle. Dec. 23. 80.

I send you two interesting letters for perusal:⁵ and also my reply to Bright.⁶

¹ See to Lyons, No. 669, 20 Dec., as here reported, F.O. 27/2425.
² See to Paget, No. 678, 21 Dec., describing Menabrea’s visit to Walmer and communication to him of the French proposal, F.O. 45/401.³ See nos. 303, 354.
⁴ On 20 Dec., unsuccessfully proposing as home under-secretary; see no. 408.
⁵ From Hartington, 21 Dec., showing satisfaction with Gladstone’s reply to his complaint of Irish policy (see no. 407), Add. MS. 44145, fo. 167; from Bright, 22 Dec., on Childers’s county plan for Ireland being too complicated, arguing against suspension of habeas corpus, and approving Gladstone’s proposed Land bill, Add. MS. 44113, fo. 140.
⁶ Of 23 Dec., answering his arguments for getting rid of limitations on land ownership.
A Foreign Minister cannot feel very grateful for being treated to a number of communications extraneous to his Department. And indeed I should much like a conversation with you on the Greek question, in which I fear Bismarck is working for mischief. But for the moment Ireland overshadows every thing. Within the Cabinet we have I think a spirit of concord which will keep all straight, but together with this three or four more or less divergent tendencies which it will require much care to harmonise—I count greatly on your aid.

I am just going with my son to the Duchess's funeral: an absence of three hours from my working room, by far the longest I have had in any day since I left London, I believe I might add since the Prorogation.

[P.S.] I send a letter from Blachford not quite such as I should have expected: one from Chamberlain is on its way to you.

I have returned from the funeral: quiet, well arranged, a great company of relations, two Princes; he looked ill.

Have only now read you about Greece: on the new report I withdraw what I say about Bismarck. I should like to know at what method Musurus glances. I can conceive one—Agree perfectly in what you have done.

412. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

Hawarden Castle. Xms. Day. 80.

I thank you much [for] your letter returning Hartington.

I think the Disturbance Bill was defensible and even right under the very peculiar circumstances. There are high authorities (especially Sir V. Blake) who hold that the state of things never ought to have existed & that the Poor Law should have been left to do its natural and proper work: this would certainly have been more costly to the landlords. And I who am now rather contending on their side must say that the rejection was a high-handed piece of landlordism.

I send you a communication from Bright to keep up the suite of your information.

in Ireland and suggesting that in view of Forster's concessions the cabinet might have to give extra powers to the Irish government, if outrages continued, Add. MS. 44113, fo. 144.

1 Gladstone indicated by a cross here the reference to this subject added at the end of the letter, after he had read enclosures in no. 410.

2 Of the Duchess of Westminster, died 19 Dec., buried at Eaton Hall, Cheshire, 22 Dec.

3 Of 20 Dec., on his misgivings about the capability of the liberal party as at present constituted to govern Ireland, Add. MS. 44107, fo. 361, not answered; see similar letter to Granville, 21 Dec., P.R.O. 30/29/148.

4 Of 21 Dec., enclosing a letter from Labouchere on Irish land and expressing his own view that a Land bill including the 3 F's would satisfy all but extremists, Add. MS. 44125, fo. 51; Labouchere to Chamberlain, 17 Dec., ibid., fo. 53.

5 See to Gladstone, 24 Dec., repeating that if a good Land bill were passed there would be no need for coercion in Ireland, Add. MS. 44113, fo. 146.
And I wish you a happy Christmas: human happiness being but a parti-coloured affair I mean to go up on Wednesday.
Please to consider and return ‘First Sketch’.

413. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville


What do you recommend about the inclosed note from Westminster? H.M.’s wish must dominate in the matter. If I feel her pulse shall it be through Ponsonby?
I have written to Courtney: hardly time yet for a reply. The Transvaal will probably upset his reply.

On Thursday I should propose first to deal with the principle on which our Land measure is to be based and then to take what the Irish Govt. will have to propose in the way of coercion.
I have warned Forster that his way may not be altogether smooth.

414. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone


I return with thanks these interesting papers—Your answer to Bright, as your former answer to Hartington appears to me to be excellent.

With regard to the amendment of the Bill of 1870, I am the reverse of Hartington, I am for less rather than more.

Bence Jones is evidently a hard unsympathizing landlord, but there are some difficult things to crack in his article in MacMillan, and in Richey’s book on the Irish land laws.
I am curious to hear whether Courtenay [sic] accepts.

1 i.e. of the Queen’s speech.
2 The Duke of Westminster, after his wife’s death, offered to resign the mastership of the horse, but was persuaded to remain, taking a year’s leave, see Gladstone to Westminster, 3 Jan. 1881, Add. MS. 44544, fo. 125.
3 Cf. Gladstone to Granville, tel. 27 Dec., suggesting he should ask Carlingford’s opinion, P.R.O. 30/20/123.
4 On 24 Dec., offering appointment as home under-secretary, Add. MS. 44544, fo. 120; printed G. P. Gooch, Lord Courtney (1920) 160.
5 See to Gladstone, 25 and 29 Dec., accepting, provided he need not vote in any division on the Transvaal, to the annexation of which he was opposed, Add. MS. 44467, fos. 211, 242; see also G. P. Gooch, op. cit. 160.
6 For the cabinet of 30 Dec., which discussed Forster’s Irish Land bill, see Add. MS. 44642, fo. 118.
7 Possibly refers to letter to Forster, 18 Dec., see p. 231, n. 1, or to a later tel. untraced; Forster had not yet arrived in London.
I am glad that the French should have made this move about arbitration. We shall have more influence as no 2, than as no 1—I presume that it will not be necessary to take any further step, till I meet you.

The strain upon you must be tremendous.

I have so often remarked that a Gov seemed in extremis during the recess, a few days of Parliament entirely restored it to convalescence.

If we could only hold our tongues for the next ten days!!

Beauchamp Seymour has civilly declined the G.C.M.G. I suppose he wanted the Bath.¹

415. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville


Many thanks for your letter.

The Christian religion requires a man smitten on one cheek to offer the other. This precept is fulfilled in me, without any merit or free choice: today I am smitten to the right on coercion, tomorrow to the left on Land.

I send you a note from Forster with copy of my reply.²

In times like these, one is obliged to think, even if forbidden, of rather stiff alternatives. My quotation in the note to F[orster] is not merely ornamental. But it is quite possible that a Land Plan on the lines of the Land Bill of 1870 may fall to the ground between the Grey stool and the stool of the three F.s. Now, I do not seek inspiration at the hands of Auberon Herbert (see P[all] M[all] G[azette] of yesterday)³ but I am by no means sure that it would not be the smaller evil to let Irishmen knock their heads against one another upon questionable theories, either in Grand Committees or some other way, rather than to introduce them into Imperial legislation properly so called.

We have passed the 'shortest day': let us hope that our light may grow more abundant.

I send an interesting letter from the Queen.⁴ I send a succinct answer (copy inclosed) today: and reserve the letter for further consideration.⁵

I have not time to write continuously to Hartington: but any thing I have said is open to him.

Yours is one of the names, not now very numerous, which I can see on an envelope without feeling uneasy.

¹ See nos. 391, 397, 398; and Seymour to Granville, 17 Dec., P.R.O. 30/29/146.
² From Forster, 26 Dec., further arguments on Irish coercion and Irish land; and reply, 28 Dec., Add. MS. 44158, fos. 88, 95.
³ See Auberon Herbert to the editor, on political justice in Ireland, arguing that the survival of the Irish depended on their becoming civilized and not on legislation to create peasant proprietorship or encourage emigration, Pall Mall Gazette, 27 Dec., p. 3.
⁴ 26 Dec., urging upon him the adoption of coercive measures for Ireland before the announcement of a new Land bill, Letters, iii. 166-8; cf. p. 228, n. 3.
⁵ See Gladstone to the Queen, summarized in a footnote, Letters, iii. 167.
I have got your telegraph, & have written to Carlingford. I do not however know whether he is in town. I like the paragraph very much.

With regard to Westminster, I should in your place send the note, or a copy of an extract, and ask the Queen what she wishes.

I gather that W. would rather like to keep his office, if he could be excused from the show duties, which I should think she would agree to.

I shall be in town tomorrow night.

I send you a Mem. of the faults we admit in the Land Bill. To them I suppose we may say that, proceeding upon the principle of the Act, we shall endeavour to apply effective remedies.

Pray recollect non-mention of Habeas Corpus and Arms.

Ponsonby comes up at 3.15 charged I presume to renew the fight of yesterday.

Musurus is extremely anxious to explain a plan which he considers could not fail to settle the whole matter about Turkey and Greece.

PS. Shall the answer to Huntly be Yes?

Thanks for your memo. After boring you so much for it, I am come to the opinion that I had better not use it.

I am afraid it will open up the whole question of the act of 1870, and of the possible amendments of its provisions, and it will in a slight degree weaken the position of refusing to state beforehand the provisions of the coercive & remedial measures.

1 See p. 237, n. 3.
2 See no. 413.
3 i.e. the provisions against exorbitant rents, against undue increase of rents, on compensation for disturbance, assignment of leases, and the land purchase clauses in the Irish Land Act, 1870, Gladstone’s unsigned and undated mem., Add. MS. 44765, fo. 71.
4 By the Queen, to prevent the announcement of the withdrawal from Candahar in her speech at the opening of parliament; see Letters, iii. 178–80; Guedalla, ii. 133–5; A. G. Gardiner, The Life of Sir William Harcourt (1923) i. 597–600.
5 He asked, 6 Jan., whether, if he accepted the captaincy of the corps of gentlemen-at-arms, he would be attached to any office to represent it in the Lords, Add. MS. 44468, fo. 9; was told, 8 Jan., that he should represent the Local Government Board, Add. MS. 44544, fo. 127; and, 9 Jan., accepted, Add. MS. 44468, fo. 21; cf. p. 233, n. 2.
6 i.e. in the Lords’ debate on the address.
These considerations have struck me so strongly, that it seems to me worth your while to consider whether they do not apply to you. I do not feel sure what your decision ought to be.

419. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

[PR.O. 30/29/124]

10, Downing Street. Jan 7, 81.

I would I think both prevent the resort of ships to the Piraeus for the moment and inquire Corbett’s reason for desiring them.¹ He ought to have had some strong ground for such a message as he sent.

I reserved your Mem. about Irish Land to act according to circ[um-]stances. The advices I received about the state of feeling in the House made me think it best to notice the points² but I do not know that it has done any good.

420. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville³

[F.O. 27/2488]

10, Downing Street. Jan 16, 81.

It occurs to me as not by any means impossible that B. St Hilaire might regard Mallet’s plan as capable of being worked into a useful auxiliary to his own.⁴

If I am not wrong in this, I would write as on your first page, only requesting Mons. M[allet] to make it clearly understood that the quasi-favourable opinion expressed was given at a time when the French were not in the field.

From my point of view it would not be necessary to prime Mallet with the idea that the French Govt would not now be favourable; but only to let him understand that we hold our hands while France is at work.⁵

¹ Granville asked Northbrook to telegraph to Admiral Seymour to disregard Corbett’s request and asked Corbett to justify his appeal; to Corbett, tel. No. 5, 5.40 p.m., 7 Jan., and min. F.O. 32/531; No. 7, 12 Jan., F.O. 32/527; Corbett in tel. No. 50, 29 Mar., unsuccessfully renewed his appeal after the Greek disappointment at the final settlement, F.O. 32/531.
² See Gladstone’s speech in the first night’s debate on the address, Hans. Purl. Deb. cclvii. 120–1; and p. 239, n. 2.
³ No. 420 answers Granville to Gladstone, undated, asking whether he should tell Mallet that Britain would not object to his proposing to France a money settlement of the Greek frontier question (see no. 316) provided this did not seem a British counter-proposition to the current French one, F.O. 27/2488.
⁴ To urge Greece and Turkey to apply for the arbitration of the powers; see to Lyons, Nos. 3 and 4 confidential, 1 Jan., F.O. 27/2483; cf. nos. 405, 406, 410; the plan was abandoned by 17 Jan.
⁵ See from Lyons, No. 37, 14 Jan., reporting Mallet’s wish to submit his plan to France intimating British approval, F.O. 27/2488; and reply as proposed by Gladstone, No. 156 confidential, 20 Jan., F.O. 27/2483.
421. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

[Add. MS. 44544, fo. 133] [Copy] Feb 3/81.

Please come here at 3. But if possible let me know your view. I think with H[artington] about debating amendments: but think it quite impossible to confine our plan to a particular manner.

422. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone


You will see by Lyons’ telegram that the answer Ch Lacour is to give me is vague, and says that the Friedland will not stay long, & deprecates a man of war being sent by us.

Shall I tell Lacour that we shall order 2 ships to cruize and call at Tunis for orders & that the presence of ships of both nations need not delay our coming to an arrangement at once as to the question itself. I wish you joy sincerely of last night. It was a great coup.

423. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville


I think you are quite right—and cannot well do less, or more, with reference to this foolish escapade of the French.

I send your note back as it may assist your memory.

Thanks for what you say of last night. It was indeed a deliverance: but it seems and feels like a dream.

424. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville


I am sorry if my absence at Brighton till near the meeting of the House has caused delay.

1 Granville to Gladstone, undated, proposing an answer to the Greek remonstrance against the arbitration proposal; and reply, undated, F.O. 32/527, not printed.
2 i.e. of Northcote to Gladstone’s urgency resolution; see Hartington to Gladstone, 3 Feb., Add. MS. 44145, fo. 193; resolution, carried that evening, enabled the Speaker, after a minister’s declaration that the business was urgent, to divide without further debate, amendment, or adjournment; cf. Hans. Parl. Deb. cclviii. 88–156.
3 To Granville, tel. No. 11, 5.30 p.m., 4 Feb., F.O. 27/2501.
4 See to Lyons, No. 112, 5 Feb., recording this intimation to Challemel Lacour, F.O. 27/2483. ‘The question’ was the claim of Levy, a British subject, to a right of pre-emption to the Enfida Estates in Tunis.
5 i.e. the successful use of the urgency resolution to prevent Irish obstruction on the Protection of Life and Property (Ireland) bill, see Hans. Parl. Deb., loc. cit. 156, introduced after an earlier intervention of the Speaker to close the debate by his own authority.
I find here one dispatch from America. And a proposal for settlement, which you think good—as I do.
There must be more in the case.

425. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone  [P.R.O. 30/29/124]
18, Carlton House Terrace. [21 February 1881].

Sir E. Thornton announced 2 despatches, disagreeable in tone.
Lowell only read me the one enclosed.
He came to me early on last Saturday. He said that he had a second despatch to read to me—that he had not done so on the first occasion because a discretion had been given to him—that he saw I was annoyed at the tone of the first despatch, & he thought it better to abstain. But he had just rec[eive]d a telegram taking away his discretion.
He was very conciliatory & sensible, & told me that he had no doubt Evarts' wish was to settle the matter before he went [out of] office next month.
I ended by telling him that I was not in the habit of receiving Diplomats of a morning at my own house—& that he had better telegraph to his Govt to say that I had made an appointment with him at the F.O. on Monday (today) after the levee.
I will go over to you, if you will let me know—or meet you at the Levee.

426. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville  [P.R.O. 30/29/124]
Private. 10, Downing Street. Feb. 22. 81.

Having written a good word the other day, I must now report in an opposite sense; except as to animus which was thoroughly good. There was a great lack of propelling power. We seemed to go back to the point at which we stood two months ago, the three F.s revived, Hartington’s plan revived, nothing made much head, we stopped about where we began.

1 See Evarts to Lowell, No. 110, 4 Feb., communicated 16 Feb., proposing as a settlement of the Fortune Bay incident (see no. 258) that the legal argument should be abandoned and Britain pay an indemnity to the American fishermen for the force used against them, F.O. 5/1824.
2 To Granville, tel. No. 4, 10 Feb., reporting Evarts's reading to him the two dispatches, the second of which hinted at 'a display of force' if the attacks of Newfoundland fishermen upon Americans continued, ibid.
3 See to Thornton, No. 33, 21 Feb., and tel. No. 6, 22 Feb., ibid.; £15,000 was agreed upon as the British indemnity, 26 Feb., and the incident closed, ibid.
4 See note by Gladstone of his satisfaction with the progress of the Irish Land bill in the cabinet, Add. MS. 44642, fo. 150.
26 February 1881

Argyll was mild upon his points: but the Chancellor, at this moment, sends in a long paper of minute difficulties without (so far as I see) any remedies. But I close my Jeremiad.

427. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

10, Downing Street. Feb. 24. 81.

They will tell you about my little accident. Inaction for a few days is imposed by Paget & Clark. I suppose Forster with whom I have talked fully should state the case about the Arms bill—as Hartington might not like to do it, but he perhaps could state the general course of business—after seeing R. Grosvenor.

As respects all this I am much grieved at the inconvenience I cause. You will all act for the best today in my absence. I think Forster might find it useful to talk with Thring on the Land bill.

428. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Confidential. 10, Downing Street. Feb 26/81.

The copy of my minute for the Queen will give you the pith of what passed at the Cabinet—Chamberlain was very angry, Bright less so in the Cabinet, but spoke to me strongly of our having gone against you in your absence.

I answered that I believed that you really wished the Cabinet to decide the question, & that postponement of decision was almost impossible.

[P.S.] Richard Grosvenor was strong about the feeling of the bulk of the liberal party.

He says there are only a few extreme men with Bright & Chamberlain.

429. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

10, Downing Street. Feb 26th. [1881].

Many thanks for your kind note. The question is difficult & does not encourage dogmatising. I have my fears of consequences. They depend upon the will & persistency of the Irish—a quantity absolutely unknown

1 Not traced.
2 Gladstone had fallen on the evening of 23 Feb. and injured his hand.
3 i.e. in the cabinet which Gladstone could not attend, 25 Feb.
4 Not traced.
5 Whether to proceed with the Peace Preservation (Ireland) bill (the arms bill), the Protection of Life and Property (Ireland) bill having passed the Commons on 25 Feb.; arms bill introduced, 1 Mar., and by using the urgency resolution, enacted, 21 Mar., Hans. Parl. Deb. cclix. 1963–2020, 1481.
6 In conversation after the cabinet.
7 Nos. 427 and 429 were written by Catherine Gladstone and signed by Gladstone.
but the Cabinet could not do otherwise than decide at once & so far as it was necessary for me to set them free, I had done it unequivocally. On Monday I mean to try a little ordinary business. The reports of me by Paget & Clark are excellent.

430. **Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone**

[Add. MS. 44173, fo. 6]

18, Carlton House Terrace. March 4/81.

I do not know personally anything of the relations between the Duke of Cambridge, & Sir Garnet Wolseley [sic]—& I have not read the article by the latter.

Childers is right about our being weak in the Lords on army matters. None of the Gov, excepting Northbrook, can give any assistance to Morley.

There is an immense number of officers on the Conservative side: & some of the few on our side oppose the Gov on military matters.

431. **Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville**

[Add. MS. 44173, fo. 4]

[Copy]

Downing St. 5 March/81.

Here is a 'no surrender'—'non possumus'—nail the colours to the mast, break the bridges & burn the boats, letter!

A distinct but unproved charge, unsustained charge of insubordination is the ground of refusal.

I cannot recede on the ground of an allegation passed through the Queen's pen, but not resting on her original knowledge.

On the other hand, if it is true, Sir G. W[olseley] ought not any longer to be Quarter Master Gen[eral].

There is therefore a grave case for consideration. Query whether my best course will be to propose to H.M. that the Minister for War shall forthwith communicate to the Commander in Chief the case wh[ich] has arisen, & proceed to examine it.

Please to send this on to Childers & I shall be glad to hear from or see either or both.

I am free except at one.

1 The ground of the Queen's opposition to Wolseley's being made a peer.
2 Wolseley, 'Long and Short Service', defending the short service introduced into the army in 1870, referring appreciatively to the Duke of Cambridge's mem. 1871, and supporting the proposals of the conservatives' Militia Committee, *Nineteenth Century*, Mar. 1881, ix. 558–72; the Duke favoured long service.
3 The Queen to Gladstone, 4 Mar., on the Wolseley peerage proposal, Guedalla, ii. 144.
4 i.e. his letter to the Queen, 5 Mar., proposing to put the Queen's charges against Wolseley before the Duke so that either the accusations or the recommendation of a peerage could be dropped, Guedalla, ii. 144–5.
5 Sent by Granville with the min.: 'I think Gladstone's proposal is the right one. I doubt the Duke being as stout as the Sovereign', Add. MS. 44173, fo. 5.
432. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

[Add. MS. 44173, fo. 8]
18, Carlton House Terrace. [9 March 1881].

Does Childers scheme require a bill. If so there could be no great objection to postponing the creation till it was likely to come before the Lords.

433. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

[Add. MS. 44173, fo. 11]
Private & Imme. 10, Downing Street. Mch 10. 81.

I think of writing to the Queen to propose Prince Leopold for a Peerage—it would probably please her and him & might at this moment have a good & mollifying effect. Please give me Aye or No.

434. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

[Add. MS. 44173, fo. 13]
18, Carlton House Terrace. [12 March 1881].

Query—
If the Tower rules do not press, might you not comply?
Also with regard to the new Peers, which would probably be just as well or better—and then only insist on Sir Garnet, on the ground of public business, offering to wait till the necessity arises in the Lords.

435. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

[P.R.O. 30/29/124]
Foreign Office. March 14/81. 5 P.M.

I hope I did not do wrong in giving notice of a message of condolence

1 Granville to Gladstone [9 Mar.] approving Gladstone to Ponsonby, 9 Mar. (pressing again for the Wolseley peerage, Guedalla, ii. 146) except his saying the Queen would not think her ministers likely to expose national interests to unnecessary hazard, Add. MS. 44173, fo. 10, not printed; Gladstone's copy retained the sentence; see nos. 479, 480, 493, 525.
2 For army reform; Childers argued that no bill was needed about the length of service, linked battalions, the reduction of generals and regimental officers or increase of field officers, but only for the transfer of officers to the militia and the calling out of the reserve in sections instead of en bloc, Add. MS. 44173, fo. 9.
3 Granville was averse, but ready to accept Ponsonby’s opinion; see pencilled discussion between Gladstone and Granville, Add. MS. 44173, fos. 11–12; in April the suggestion was formally made by the Queen, see no. 464.
4 i.e. with the Queen’s wish to postpone the appointment of a new constable to the Tower of London and the revision of Tower regulations to bring it as a fortress under the secretary of state and leave it under the crown only as a palace; see Childers to Gladstone, 10 Dec. 1880, Add. MS. 44129, fo. 118.
5 Gladstone to Ponsonby, 12 Mar., yielding to the Queen’s wish to delay making new peers, except Lord Ampthill, whose peerage was announced, 20 Feb., is noted but not copied in Add. MS. 44544, fo. 144.
to the Dss of Edinburgh—the business of Lords was nil—and my colleagues agreed you were sure not to object, & that you would have time to alter your notice.

436. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Foreign Office. March 16/81.

Do you think Dufferin’s telegram, which describes Nihilist threats, ought to make a difference as to the P of Wales going.

I have sent it to the Queen & Prince without saying anything.

437. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

10, Downing Street. March 17. 81.

I write a line that I may convey to you correctly what I said in the Cabinet.

My rule is, in reporting the proceedings of Cabinets to the Queen, to speak of their decisions in matters of Parliamentary procedure, and other things which are not usually submitted for the Queen’s approval: but to avoid that or any similar expression in regard to matters which are to be so submitted.

Such I have said is the rule: it is possible that in some occasional instances I have unwittingly deviated from it and if so I regret it. These papers though important are usually prepared in haste, and inadvertence may be one of the signs that the evening of my long day approaches.


2 Gladstone to Granville, copy, 15 Mar., inquiring whether Corbett had answered a question put to him by Goschen (2 Mar., P.R.O. 30/29/189) about the value the Greeks would attach to Crete as compensation for the unfulfilled Berlin award, Add. MS. 44544, fo. 144, not printed.

3 Dufferin to Granville, tel. private, 15 Mar., P.R.O. 30/29/185.

4 To St. Petersburg, to represent the Queen at the tsar’s funeral. Gladstone returned the letter, having written on it his reply: ‘I do not think threats relating to the new Emperor have an appreciable bearing on the case of the P. of W. & P[rince]ss but it is of course a matter of pure opinion. W.E.G. Mch. 16.81.’ For the prince’s visit, see Sir Sidney Lee, King Edward VII (1925) i. 503–7.

5 No. 437 docketed by Sanderson: ‘Seen by the Queen.’

6 Gladstone’s note of the cabinet, 17 Mar., does not record this, Add. MS. 44642, fo. 163; the Queen had complained that he had described as a cabinet decision what ought to have been described as a submission of advice; see Ponsonby to Granville, 18 Mar., for the Queen’s acceptance of this explanation, P.R.O. 30/29/38; see also undated note by Granville, wrongly placed in Add. MS. 44174, fo. 151, commenting.
438. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

We are ordered to Windsor.
But as I have telegraphed that Leveson has probably got the measles, it is likely that we may be stopped.
If not, what line [shall] I take about Peerage.¹

439. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

I have had the last twelve of my Cabinet reports examined with reference to the rule I described to you.
I do not see that in any respect they have offended.
The word 'decide' seems to be never used in reference to the class of subject which might go before Her Majesty.
In cases where we had felt an important Telegram ought to go without submission, I have specially & apologetically mentioned it.
In other cases my practice seems to have been to say 'The Cabinet agreed upon'. What else could I say? Certainly not 'the Cabinet agreed to advise'.
For such a form of recital would give to my personal report the effect of a representation from the Cabinet and would imply an assumption of power on my part to which I have no claim.
I doubt whether, as to these reports, I have anything to confess, but I am quite open to suggestions.

440. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

I suppose we had better yield²—or do you wish me to write to the Queen.
The question of expenses may be reserved.

¹ Gladstone returned the letter, having written on it his reply: 'I have written an "interlocutory" letter to Ponsonby [Guedalla, ii. 148-9]. His letter made out that Wolseley would be a "political officer". I have pointed out that this would be wholly untrue—and destructive of our object, which is to get independent support. (For this reason Adye would be quite out of the case.) Also that the relation of Wolseley to the F[ield] M[arshal] in the H of Lords might perfectly well be defined beforehand. This was the only daylight I could see. In order to avoid extremities, which have come into view. WEG. Mch 19. 81.'

² To the prince's wish, which Granville had at first opposed, to take with him the insignia of the Garter and to invest the new tsar with them after the funeral, Lee, op. cit. i. 504.
Londonderry cost 2700£, & there are precedents for paying Royal Garter Missions, and also for such a mission as he is now going on, one of condolence.

441. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville [P.R.O. 30/29/124]

H of C. Mch 21. 81.

Some flurry or mental perturbation has made the handwriting of your inclosure¹ less legible than usual.

I doubt the wisdom of the Prince's application, but I am perfectly satisfied to leave the matter in your hands. And I presume that the objection on the ground of time, which I started, has no foundation.

442. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville [P.R.O. 30/29/124]

Secret. 10, Downing Street. Mch 25. 81.

Many thanks about Herbert.²

Ponsonby's see-saw³ does not represent constitutional Govt and would only lead to making extra demands in order to have something to recede from.

However, such as it is, he omits the Derby Garter.

His precedent is absolutely of no value. It only shows that Lord Liverpool properly objected to the establishment of a rival military organ in the House of Commons.

In those days Parl did not, nor I think until the last 25 years, interfere in army questions so far as I know. Now, the H. of Lords is invoked, in that & other matters, against the nation.

443. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville [Copy] [Add. MS. 44544, fo. 146]

25 March 1881.

I have read Goschen's No 129.⁵ I should think that the line of the Peneus and Crete should be our No 1, so as to keep side by side with Germany.

¹ The Prince of Wales to Granville, 21 Mar., on his wish about the Garter (enclosed in no. 440) P.R.O. 30/29/47; see also subsequent correspondence.
² Granville to Gladstone, 21 Mar., congratulating him on Herbert Gladstone's maiden speech in the Commons, Add. MS. 44173, fo. 18, not printed.
³ Untraced; presumably Ponsonby's rejoinder to Gladstone's further letter on the Wolseley peerage, 21 Mar., Guedalla, ii. 148-50; see also Gladstone's mem., 24 Mar., on the Wolseley peerage, Add. MS. 44765, fo. 110.
⁴ Granville to Gladstone [25 Mar.] asking his criticism of proposed language to Münster on the Greek frontier question, Add. MS. 44173, fo. 21, not printed.
⁵ Tel. No. 129, 24 Mar., asking whether he should propose that the Greeks sacrifice the port of Prevesa in order to get (a) all Thessaly without Crete, or (b) part of Thessaly up to the river Peneus with Crete, F.O. 78/3292; see p. 246, n. 2.
All Thessaly, without Crete or Prevesa, our No 2. In writing & thinking thus I am much impressed by the fact that we do not know how far the eagerness of the Greeks for Prevesa is justified by reasons aired all in good faith, or how far it may be to get a base of operations against Epirus.

444. *Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville* [P.R.O. 30/29/124]

10, Downing Street. March 28. 81.

I think your memorandum for Telegram to Goschen1 excellent: most happily balanced—& it is a question of balancing. As to words, I have put my suggestions in pencil on the margin.

445. *Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville* [P.R.O. 30/29/124]

10, Downing Street. March 28. 81.

If there is any thing in the movement just reported as to Crete, might not this be a moment for suggesting that Greece might offer money which she would otherwise spend in war.2 This is delicate ground. I only commend the matter to your thoughts.

446. *Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone* [Add. MS. 44173, fo. 22]

18, Carlton House Terrace. March 29/81.

It would be an excellent thing if an amicable arrangement could be brought about between Turkey & Greece. But I send you a short note from Dilke on the subject.3

I am not sanguine as to the result & it would be disagreeable to be thought acting outside the other Powers.

There are 3 ways of moving if desirable

1° Through Lyons with Mal[l]et, as Dilke suggests.

2° Privately to the King.

3° Through Bismarck.

I should on the whole prefer the latter. He is at this moment acting agent for Europe, & should be treated with confidence—and it is rather in accordance with his views.4

1 To Goschen, tel. No. 210, 28 Mar., accepting the Turkish proposal to give Greece all Thessaly without Crete, if generally accepted and immediately executed, and justifying the departure from the Berlin award as only one interpretation of protocol 13 of the Congress of Berlin, with Gladstone’s pencil alterations, F.O. 78/3290.

2 Cf. nos. 316, 420; no action taken.

3 To Granville, undated, commenting on no. 445 and asserting that the Greeks could not afford such a sum of money as the Turks would accept, but advising a reference to Charles Mallet, Add. MS. 44173, fo. 24.

4 Add. MS. 44544, fo. 149, notes a reply, 29 Mar., to the last paragraph which has not been traced.
31 March 1881

447. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

10, Downing Street. Mch 31. 81.

A blow—¹
This is my proposed reply for the moment.²
It will not shut out any other.
It is, I think, a great mistake, from his own point of view.

448. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

18, Carlton House Terrace. [31 March 1881.

A great blow indeed.
I wanted to speak to you about it yesterday.
Today I am in bed but only with influenza.
I do not think I have a chance of success with Argyll—but I will try whenever you like.³

449. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

[Add. MS. 44173, fo. 25]

18, Carlton House Terrace. April 1/81.

I am so sorry I cannot speak to you today. I will do so tomorrow.
In any case I think I should rejoin by insisting on two or three days reflection on the heavy blow he is dealing on you, & your Gov before he announces his intention.

450. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

18, Carlton House Terrace. April 3/81.

Karolyi has given me the enclosed⁴—I propose sending the enclosed telegram to Berlin.⁶

² 31 Mar., asking him to wait until the bill was introduced into parliament, ibid., fo. 24.
³ Gladstone returned the letter, having written on it his reply: 'I think it possible the Chancellor, who has greatly sympathised with him, could do something? This w[oul]d have to be introduced tenderly to the C himself. For the present I shall tell no one. I am partially kept indoors by precautions ag[ain]st a cold.'
⁴ Granville to Gladstone, undated, congratulating Gladstone on his budget speech, Add. MS. 44173, fo. 26, not printed.
⁵ To Granville, 3 Apr., containing the draft of an identic note, defining the proposed Greco–Turk frontier, to be presented by the powers to Greece and Turkey, and justifying the departure from the Berlin award, F.O. 7/1027; cf. interchange of notes by Granville and Dilke, attached to no. 450.
⁶ To Ampthill, tel. No. 236, noon, 4 Apr., reporting that Britain would assent to the Austrian proposal as soon as Germany approved it, F.O. 64/985.
I do not like the phrase ‘unique but de leurs efforts’.
I am not sure that it would not be well to add after ‘territoire’ ‘advantageous to Greece from the character of the populations and the fertility of its soil.’

451. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville


Really the Austrians are rather cool in administering this dose ready mixed.
But quite apart from this
1. I think we cannot take unique but de leurs efforts
2. I heartily approve your proposed words
3. I agree to your Telegram.
[P.S.] I hope you are better.
The Ponsonby note² should I suppose go to Childers.

452. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Confidential. 18, Carlton House Terrace. April 4/81.

I have had a long talk with Argyll.³
On the main question, I made him uneasy, but I doubt having produced any real effect. I am not sure that you could not yet succeed tomorrow evening. At present however he is resolute.
As to the mode of announcement, I told him that he had no discretion, that he must when giving you such a blow, meet your wishes as to the form & time of announcement.
I am not clear that he does not meditate pamphlets & speeches during the Easter recess.
The Chancellor is to be here at four.
P.S. The Chancellor is all right—He thinks the Bill⁴ economically wrong, but politically defensible.
He will have a talk with Argyll, but he doubts it’s success. It appears that Argyll confided in him, and did not agree in the arguments which the Chancellor used to dissuade him.

¹ The note stated that the new frontier assured to Greece ‘un large accroissement de territoire par une solution pacifique, unique but de leurs efforts’.
² Not traced, possibly further on the Wolseley peerage.
³ Cf. Granville to Gladstone, undated, saying that discussion was hopeless with Argyll, who had ‘a passion’ for his resignation now, Add. MS. 44173, fo. 31.
⁴ The Irish Land bill.
5 APRIL 1881

453. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville


I return—and with gratitude—your admirable letter.¹
I wish there were ever so many such letters to send him.
Yes: he dines.

454. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Tuesday night [5 April 1881].

Woronzoff has a message for you from the Emperor. He wishes to know whether and when you could receive him.
Can you meet the P of Wales & Woronzoff here tomorrow (Wednesday) at dinner.²

455. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville


We dine with the Baths tomorrow & I am sorry to be unable to accept your kind invitation: doubly welcome, for it is a sign of your & Lady G. s convalescence.
Argyll] is I fear quite impracticable. He has hedged himself within a circle of notions, & is unapproachable. He is persuaded that he will be greatly abused, which I do not believe. He gives hints of support out of office; which he will find it difficult to work into realities. When the Govt was formed, I had great misgivings about him & by no means was eager to press him as I expected something of this kind but he was then in more sanguine humour. I deeply regret the mistake he is making, & alike on personal & public grounds.
If this stands unalterably, do you see any objection to a paragraph in Pall Mall of Friday.
'The D of A. has resigned the Privy Seal. It is believed that the cause has been a difference with his colleagues on some of the provisions of the Irish Land Bill.'³
I deeply regret your loss of such a coadjutor in debate.

¹ To Argyll, 5 Apr., urging him to have it out completely with Gladstone and the chancellor before he finally decided, part printed Fitzmaurice, ii. 296, Duke of Argyll... Autobiography, ii. 380.
² Gladstone saw Woronzoff on 7 Apr., the day he introduced the Irish Land bill, but kept no note of the 'message'.
³ Cf. from Argyll, 5 Apr., insisting on his resignation, despite the changes made in the Land bill by the cabinet, 4 Apr., and Gladstone's fresh appeal; 6 Apr., asking how the resignation should be announced; to Argyll, 6 Apr., replying as proposed in no. 455; Add. MS. 44105, fos. 41, 47, 49.
7 APRIL 1881

456. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

[P.R.O. 30/29/124]
Ap. 6. 81.

You mention French assurance of ‘no wish to annex’. Has the assurance gone as far as ‘no thought of annexing’—if so it would be well to say it? We might have disclaimed [a] wish to annex the Transvaal on the day before doing it.

The answer seems to me quite right.

I would mention the inquiry through Lyons.

At the Levée yesterday Lacour oddly & abruptly said to me ‘que pensez vous des affaires de Tunis’? I answered with truth that I had read nothing on the subject within the last week or ten days.

Again there has been foul play & the Standard has got some print of the Land Bill.

457. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

[P.R.O. 30/29/124]

The Goschen Telegram of today’s arrival somewhat disturbs me.

Are we to offer Greece, as the reward of her acceptance, only an unbounded number of sheets of paper to be used up in diplomatic remonstrance with Turkey, should she proceed, as to the fulfilment of her engagement, in the same manner as she did last autumn about Montenegro and get up in Larissa what she got up in Scutari.

Can we not say that while not attempting to bind others we cannot be bound to include in the words ‘pacific acquisition’ any other sense than that which yesterday you attached to them.6

1 No. 456 is written inside a double sheet on the outside of which is the end of a letter by Granville: ‘any change of policy has occurred. It is a ticklish disagreeable matter—and we ought to make up our minds, what attitude we ought to take.’ Gladstone to Granville, 6 Apr., enclosing his letter accepting Argyll’s resignation and proposing Carlingford as his successor, Add. MS. 44173, fo. 33, not printed.

2 In dispatch to Lyons, No. 328, 7 Apr., recording a conversation with Challemel Lacour on Tunis, F.O. 27/2484.

3 An Italian inquiry about French assurances to Britain on Tunis.

4 Cf. nos. 377 and 405; Granville’s note that Spencer and Hartington preferred a discussion in cabinet to a circulation box; Selborne to Granville, 6 and 7 Apr., on the importance of tracing the source of the leakage, Add. MS. 44173, fo. 35, P.R.O. 30/29/141; and Gladstone’s note of the cabinet, 8 Apr., Add. MS. 44642, fo. 174; see p. 315, n. 3.

5 Goschen’s tel. No. 163, 7 Apr., not traced; but cf. his tel. No. 160, 6 Apr., already fearing that the obligation of the powers (undertaken to induce Greece to accept the new settlement) to watch over its execution might be whittled away by the qualification ‘peaceful’, F.O. 78/3292; Granville wrote on no. 457, ‘send me the Telegram’.

6 See Granville to Goschen, tel. No. 247, 6 Apr., informing him that the phrase would not exclude such pressure upon Turkey, if she failed to execute the settlement, as would prevent the Greeks from fighting, F.O. 78/3290.
Can this question be considered (if it be needful to postpone) at the Cabinet tomorrow?1

458. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

[PR.O. 30/29/124]  
10, Downing Street. [8 April 1881].

Have you any objection to turning U.S. Mission into an Embassy, if both parties do it, and it costs no more money.3

459. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

[P.R.O. 30/29/124]  

I forgot to say yesterday one thing that was in my mind.

Beaconsfield’s death4 must be regarded as a more than possible, though I hope far from certain contingency.

In the event of its happening, I am minded to write at once to Rowton, to offer a public funeral.5 There is no occasion for going beyond rules but I am under the impression that rule rather demands it. He has not only been Prime Minister for seven years but an eminently conspicuous Prime Minister; and conspicuousness is I suppose the measure.

I will however call for a list of the precedents. Public funerals have been very few I think since Palmerston: but the offers probably more numerous. Meantime I should like to know how the matter strikes you.

I never saw the country look so blighted and unspringlike.

I hope Lady G. will be able to move tomorrow & I remain . . .

460. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

[Add. MS. 44173, fo. 36]  
[10 April 1881.]

The Emperor has expressed to the Queen a hope that she will cooperate in putting down Nihilism. She asks how she is to answer.6

1 See Gladstone’s note of the cabinet, 8 Apr., ‘Greek frontier question. Much left in the hands of Ld G and Mr. G. for the recess’, Add. MS. 44642, fo. 174; Granville to Goschen, tel. No. 256, 9 Apr., making it clear that the phrase covered ‘collective material pressure’ upon Turkey if necessary, F.O. 78/3290.

2 No. 458 was docketed by Hervey that he had received it, 9 Apr.

3 Gladstone wrote ‘it smells of more expence après coup’, and Granville replied, ‘the salary of Minister has been raised high’, to which Gladstone answered, ‘I defer to your strong wish’; but the status was not changed.

4 He had been in ill-health throughout the winter; on 15 Mar. he appeared for the last time in the Lords; from 23 Mar. he was continuously ill; died 19 Apr.

5 See to Lord Rowton, 19 Apr., as described, and reply declining, Add. MS. 44469, fo. 113; see p. 262, n. 1.

6 See Ponsonby to Granville, 9 Apr., enclosing a copy of Alexander III to the Queen, 20 Mar./1 Apr., asking for advice as to her reply to the proposal about nihilism, P.R.O. 30/29/38.
Lobanoff has asked me whether if the assassin was known to be in England we would give him up, and has announced an early invitation to join a conference against Nihilism.

I have sent these questions to the Chancellor.¹

461. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone²  [Add. MS. 44173, fo. 42]

18, Carlton House Terrace. April 11/81.

I agree about Beaconsfield, and if it is to be done, the more spontaneous it is, the better.

I should be glad if you were able to anticipate the proposal from the Queen and from the Public. Should you not write to the Queen, when it happens. I believe there is no hope.

462. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone  [Add. MS. 44173, fo. 39]

18, Carlton House Terrace. [11 April 1881].

I send you Ponsonby’s letter³ about the Queen’s answer to the Emperor.

Having receive[d] the Chancellor’s answer,⁴ which I also enclose, (Please return) and before receiving your telegram, as she wished to have an answer this morning, I advised her to say that her Gov and the Country shared her indignation and horror—& that the Gov would be ready to do all that was needful within the limits of the law & constitution.

I said that it would be very useful if H.M. were to add a hint that it was most desirable that the Emperor should not make proposals to this Country. But I doubt whether [this] could be well said in a Royal letter.⁵

I have telegraphed to Dufferin,⁶ & Woronzoff has telegraphed not from me, but from himself to that effect.

¹ Sentence scored through by Granville; see to Selborne, 10 Apr., asking how to answer the Queen and be prepared to answer Lobanov, P.R.O. 30/29/141; to Gladstone, tel. 10 Apr., proposing to instruct Amphill to dissuade Bismarck from proposing, on Russia’s behalf, a conference to concert common action against nihilism, since British traditions precluded acceptance; and reply, tel. 10.30 a.m., 11 Apr. concurred; and tel. 10.15 a.m., 11 Apr., recommending consultation of the chancellor and law officers about the reply to Lobanov, P.R.O. 30/29/124.
² No. 461 is printed, Fitzmaurice, ii. 196.
³ To Granville, 11 Apr., on the Queen’s satisfaction with Granville’s advice and the chancellor’s statement that the murderer of a sovereign was not, under the extradition laws, in a different position from the murderer of a subject, P.R.O. 30/29/38.
⁴ From Selborne, 10 Apr., recommending that the Queen reply to Alexander III that Britain would deal with nihilism according to the law and the constitution and Granville reply to Lobanov depreciating a conference and assuring him that a regicide would be subject to extradition, P.R.O. 30/29/141.
⁵ See Granville to the Queen, tel. 11.25 a.m., 11 Apr., advising as here described, P.R.O. 30/29/38.
⁶ Not traced; the invitation to the conference was nevertheless made and declined with a full explanation of British policy; cf. p. 264, n. 2, and p. 271, n. 3.
Woronzoff was delighted with your reception of him. Dufferin’s account of the Emperor is not brilliant.¹

P.S. The Chancellor is not aware that we have no treaty of extradition with Russia.

We have always been averse to having one—and up to a late period the Russians made difficulties. Lobanoff asked for one some weeks ago. I asked Harcourt, & he requested me to say that we were about introducing a new bill on the subject, and it would be better to wait.²

463. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone  
[Add. MS. 44173, fo. 44]  
Walmer Castle. April 12/81.

How can I sufficiently apologise to you for having taken a very important step without any previous consultation with you.

I have absolutely declined Lord Dela Warr’s offer³ to go on a mission to the Bey of Tunis to assure him of our support.

I doubt your ever forgiving me.

464. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville  
[P.R.O. 30/29/124]  

1. I am sorry to hear we have no extradition Treaty.

How could the ridiculous idea be entertained for a moment in this country that in the case of a Sovereign killing would be no murder.

It would be both dangerous and useless for us to go into a Conference of Governments about Nihilism, and would as the first result get a verdict for the Freiheit.⁴

2. The Queen now wishes a Peerage for Prince Leopold⁵ and communicates her desire as within. I apprehend however that it is my business to recommend? and I shall reply accordingly.

3. The Prince of Wales desires to be Trustee of the Museum: I think we cannot do better than elect him.

4. What do you think of offering the Speaker G.C.B. now that the obstruction row has gone by?

¹ See Dufferin to Granville, private, 7 Apr., ending with allusion to the tsar’s not being a man of ability, to his ‘shy and rough’ manner and his inexperience, P.R.O. 30/20/185.

² Fugitive Offenders Act, 27 Aug., 44 and 45 Victoria, cap. 69; cf. ‘about issuing,’ no. 120.

³ Not traced; De la Warr was something of an Arabian scholar.

⁴ The cabinet, 26 Mar., decided to prosecute the editor of Freiheit, a German anarchist paper published in London, for libel in an article rejoicing at the assassination of Alexander II, Add. MS. 44642, fo. 167; he was convicted, 25 May, and sentenced to 18 months’ imprisonment.

⁵ See no. 433; Prince Leopold created Baron Arklow, Earl of Clarence, and Duke of Albany, 24 May.
465. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

[Add. MS. 44173, fo. 46]

Walmer Castle. [13 April 1881].

I anticipated your Freiheit jury argument in talking to Munster.¹ He told me that he had given all the arguments against our joining the conference to Bismarck, when at Berlin. It looks as if B. wished to create a sore between us & the Russians.

I think you are right to admit P of Wales to the Museum, but is there a vacancy.

I see no objection to the G.C.B. for the Speaker²

Please keep one for Paget

The K.G. will be a difficulty again.³

We are not quite rid of the influenza yet.

466. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

[P.R.O. 30/29/124]


I telegraphed to you this morning on the Greek reply⁴ which I think extremely clever though it is stated to have been the result of embarrassed counsels.

I think you were quite right in sending at once to Bismarck and trying to keep him or put him in the foreground of this business.⁵ Yet I fear he may hold everything subordinate to his favourite purpose of troubling the East and setting the powers at loggerheads, and I hope you will consider what else can be done.

Can we learn from Turkey whether she is disposed this time to go

¹ See to Ampthill, No. 180 confidential, 13 Apr., recounting arguments used with Münster against Britain’s accepting the nihilist conference, F.O. 64/977.

² But see Hamilton to Granville, 14 Apr., suggesting the offer be stopped since it would be misrepresented (the Speaker being thought to have helped the liberal government against obstruction but not the conservative) and he did not want it while in office; and Granville to Gladstone, tel. 14 Apr., suggesting, on reflection, that Gladstone took a good House of Commons’ opinion before he offered it, P.R.O. 30/29/124; conferred in Sept.; cf. nos. 475, 495.

³ A K.G. was likely to fall vacant on Beaconsfield’s death; the difficulty of the Queen’s opposition to the award of K.G. to Derby would recur, see p. 165, n. 2.

⁴ See Greek foreign minister to the ministers of the mediating powers at Athens, 13 Apr., accepting the new Greco-Turk frontier, but disclaiming responsibility for disorder in territories not awarded, from Corbett, No. 117, 7 Apr., No. 124, 13 Apr., substance telegraphed, F.O. 32/529; see also Granville to Gladstone, tel. 14 Apr., asking approval for a message to Germany that he was ready to accept with the other powers; and reply, tel. 7.25 p.m., deferring approval until he had seen the Greek message; and tel. 9.45 a.m., 15 Apr., approving after seeing it, P.R.O. 30/29/124.

⁵ The evacuation and transfer of the ceded territory; see to Goschen, tel. No. 269, 16 Apr., forwarding Bismarck’s proposal that the mediating powers should next receive Turkey’s views on this matter, F.O. 78/3290 and tels. exchanged, 16 Apr., between Gladstone and Granville, P.R.O. 30/29/124.
through fairly with the arrangement (not playing again the game of Dulcigno). If she is we may I suppose promise to discourage any further territorial schemes of Greece. I do not well see how we can so utterly refuse her appeal as not to urge Turkey in her own interest to give Epiros something of the benefit which she has given, I do not say to Eastern Roumelia, but to Crete.¹

It will be a deep disgrace to Europe, and nothing less, if, after all that has happened, she is baulked in the execution of this scheme.² I cannot but think the Russians at any rate would feel this: & if we could get at any rate to be assured of a right state of feeling in them and the Italians, we might hope to do something even should Turkey again play false as she did before.

2. I continue to receive excellent reports about the Land Bill: if only this will last.

3. There is no hurry about G.C.B. for the Speaker. But if it is right, it is a higher claim than Paget’s, should they clash?

4. I am pleased at Beaconsfield’s rally³—may it continue.

You will like to read the inclosed: (better than a letter I sent you yesterday).⁴

467. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

[Add. MS. 44173, fo. 106]

Walmer Castle. [16 April 1881].

Harcourt has spent a week at the Durdans.

Found host & hostess frantic.⁵

He will give no advice about Scotland, & was with difficulty prevented by Harcourt from publishing, in Scotland that he had less than no connection with the Gov.

Rosebery says that he does not pretend he had any claim for the Privy Seal, but that it was monstrous that he should not have been consulted, and some explanation given why it was not offered to him !!!

I have written to Harcourt a letter⁶ to forward if he likes. Putting in the civilest manner I could the obvious answer.

¹ No action taken.
² The Greco-Turk convention, 24 May, settled the question; the delimitation of the frontier and evacuation were completed during the summer; but see no. 548.
³ See Lord Rowton to Gladstone, 15 Apr.; cf. earlier report, 12 Apr., and later one, 17 Apr., Add. MS. 44469, fos. 77, 63, 95.
⁴ Not traced; the enclosure in no. 466 was Argyll to Gladstone, 13 Apr.; see no. 471.
⁵ See Harcourt to Granville, private and confidential, 15 Apr., describing Rosebery’s disappointment at Carlingford’s being preferred to himself for the office of lord privy seal, writing as here reported, P.R.O. 30/29/130.
⁶ Copy, 16 Apr., explaining Carlingford’s appointment as due to Gladstone’s pre-occupation with the Irish Land bill, and dwelling on his unbearable position in the Lords if Rosebery deserted, &c., ibid.
I had always doubts of the refusal of the under secretaryship being pure chivalry.¹
I hope you will see Rosebery on your return to town.

468. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Walmer Castle. April 17/81.

I have to trouble you about a personal question. They are always the most difficult.

If you remember on several occasions, we agreed it would be best to send Dufferin to Constantinople
Paget to St Petersburgh
Layard to Rome.

I mentioned it twice to the Queen. I asked Lobanoff whom the late Emperor would prefer—Layard[,] Elliot, Thornton or Paget. Of the 4 he much preferred Paget.

Paget to whom I wrote a private letter,² objected that the change would ruin him, and be bad for Lady Paget’s health. (She was ill 17 years ago at Copenhagen.) I answered the arguments but have had 2 rejoinders, the last containing a refusal from Paget to go to St Petersburgh with a medical certificate to the effect that it would be dangerous for Paget, his wife & daughter. In the meanwhile, the Duke of Edinburgh says it will be a bad beginning for the new Reign—that Lady Paget (which I believe is true) has made herself extremely unpopular at Rome, & very offensive to the Emperor’s two younger brothers.

There is therefore every reason for not sending Paget to St Petersburgh.

The question is. Is he or Layard to be at Rome.

Eight years ago, a regulation was made that the terms of Embassies & Missions should be only for 5 years, unless the Sec[retary] of State prolonged them. Derby renewed them all, excepting one minister. Paget’s term expired last month.

He has been a strong and abusive Jingo.

He or more probably his wife have been canvassing violently in Royal & other circles for permanence at Rome.

Layard on the other hand though much cleverer, has made himself unpopular both at Madrid and at Constantinople. He is looked upon by the Diplomatists as an intruder in the profession—and they will complain that Paget has been made a victim to a new rule, which has hardly been applied before, in order to make a nest for the unpopular cuckoo, who has not been very careful in the language he has used about us.

What do you think.

Of the Professional men for St Petersburgh, Morier, Thornton, Lumley and Stuart (Blantyre’s brother) have the best claims.

¹ See p. 148, n. r.
² Not traced.
Morier much the cleverest—but with a temper, self-conceit, and huffiness beyond belief.

Thornton the more solid—Lumley the most man of the world, and European.¹

I suppose it would be right to consult Lobanoff again.

469. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville


I inclose to you a letter from Lord Queensberry and copy of my reply.²

In shaking off the trammels of superstition, I think he has also accidentally let fall from him those of modesty?

2. I also send a letter from Harcourt³ with particular reference to what he says of Rosebery. Surely though so positive he can hardly be correct?

If with his excellent powers and prospects, R. means to have nothing but the Cabinet, it is a mistake.

I think it has been decidedly a misfortune to Argyll never to have served except in Cabinet Office.

Rosebery too has always seemed to me an essentially modest man.

I shall do nothing hastily in the matter.

3. I am not very well informed about W. Cheshire⁴ where my son W[illiam] is going today and Herbert probably a day or two hence. I do not feel very confident.

4. Till the question is settled whether the older Boers can controul the younger, we must I fear consider the South African peace as provisional⁵—H.M. writes about it as you might expect.⁶

5. Beaconsfield I hope and think will live. But I suppose he cannot lead.

6. I hope to stay here now till early next Monday.

I hope the good weather has operated at Walmer as it did in Curzon St.⁷

6 P.M. Yours just rec[eive]d. I withdraw Harcourt’s letter. Your clear

¹ Thornton appointed to St. Petersburg vice Dufferin, 26 May 1881, and succeeded by Morier in 1885; Paget appointed to Vienna, Jan. 1884 vice Elliot who retired; Lumley replaced him at Rome and Layard remained en disponibilité; see nos. 476, 478–80, 998.
² i.e. to Gladstone, asking for a British peerage, not traced; reply, 18 Apr., declining on the ground of his change of political party, Add. MS. 44544, fo. 157.
⁴ By-election caused by Sir Philip Egerton’s death; the liberal candidate was defeated, see no. 488.
⁵ The preliminary agreement with the Boers was signed, 22 Mar.; the convention of Pretoria, 21 Aug.
⁶ See the Queen to Gladstone, 16 Apr., on the need for firmness to the Boers and the humiliating character of the peace, Guedalla, ii. 152.
⁷ Where it brought the improvement in Beaconsfield’s condition.
& full statement seems to raise various questions. In answer to the one you put directly, I think Thornton's the best claim so far as I am able to judge. Lobanoff must I suppose be consulted again.

470. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Walmer Castle. April 18/81.

Harcourt writes that Roseberry [sic] is too sore for a written communication, and has therefore not forwarded my letter. But thinks time & convention may have a good effect.

471. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Walmer. April 19. [1881].

I sent you back Argyll’s letter. It did not appear to me quite well conditioned.

And the account of the Cabinet is an immense exaggeration. Indeed I do not remember anything but a general agreement that it was impossible to make progress in your absence.

The Queen complains that my tone is too decided in writing to her. She has suggested directly Sir Garnet Wolsley [sic] for St Petersburgh & indirectly Lytton.

I shall decline being responsible for either appointment.

Lord Beaconsfield’s death will give you some difficulty about the garter.

472. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

Hawarden Castle. April 21. 81.

I hope there is no truth in an obscure notice which has caught my eye that you have not thrown off your indisposition yet.

There are various subjects which we shall have to run over in conversation when we meet in town. For the most part they will keep: including your 'too decided' way of writing! Among them is the Rosebery affair: in which, as he has no locus standi so I may have none for appearing to suppose that he thinks he has.

1 Harcourt to Granville, 17 Apr., from Sandringham agreeing with all Granville had said (see p. 258, n. 6) and writing as here reported, P.R.O. 30/29/130; see also Gardiner, op. cit. i. 413.

2 Argyll to Gladstone, 13 Apr., disputing Gladstone’s view that he had carried the cabinet with him on the Irish Land bill and describing the difference in the discussion when Gladstone was not there, Add. MS. 44105, fo. 62; see p. 258, n. 4.

3 Not traced; cf. nos. 437, 439.

4 See nos. 467, 469, 470.
You will I think like to read the inclosed from Sir N. Rothschild, which I send, though it certainly does me much more than justice, for other reasons. This last cropping out of B[eaconsfield]'s affection for his wife is touching.

I have suggested one or two small emendations on your draft to A[mpthill] about Conference on Nihilism. It is a very ticklish subject without doubt.

No response from Argyll to my last.

473. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Walmer Castle. April 21/81.

I am rather uneasy about Tunis.

Our Consul continues to bombard us about sending some naval protection. His last application is for a despatch boat, because he has no means of rapid communication with us excepting by telegraph which is in the hands of the French.

I enclose a letter and instructions from Menabrea, sensible enough.

I hope my answer is discreet.

I see that during the reigns of Louis Philippe and of Napoleon the third the French were constantly biting at Tunis and as often stopped by the decided language of successive Foreign Secretaries.

I do not like barking without biting. But if the result of our not barking at all, is that the French make the magnificent harbour described in Hewett's memo, and in Admiral Spratt's letter to Clarence Paget, impregnable by ships of war, and neutralizing Malta, we shall look rather foolish.

In answer to Lyons' intimation that we might have to send naval protection for our subjects in Tunis against Mahommedan fanaticism, St

---

1 From Sir Nathan Rothschild, 20 Apr., declining the offer of a public funeral for Beaconsfield, reporting his wish to be buried with his wife at Hughenden, and sending an extract from the will of 1878, Add. MS. 44469, fo. 123; see nos. 459, 461.
2 See to Ampthill, No. 187, 18 Apr., authorizing him to say that the assassination of a sovereign would be covered by British extradition treaties, being murder and not a political crime, F.O. 64/977; emendations aimed at verbal exactitude.
3 See to Argyll, 14 Apr., replying mildly to Argyll's report of cabinet opposition on the Irish Land bill (p. 261, n. 2), Add. MS. 44105, fo. 66; Argyll replied 20 Apr., ibid.
4 See nos. 422, 456.
6 i.e. reply to Menabrea's letter (20 Apr., enclosing instructions to the Italian consul in Tunis) 20 Apr., declining the Italian proposal of concerted action, offering to have a ship ready to sail, but insisting that the presence of Italian and British ships would only be provocative, F.O. 45/443.
7 Not traced.
Hilaire said that we should be quite justified and the French would do the same.

He also told Lyons that he had repudiated to the Turkish Ambassador the idea that Tunis formed part of the Ottoman Empire.¹

I am inclined to tell Lyons² that I am glad that the Foreign Minister recognized at once as a matter of course our duty to protect our fellow subjects, but that I did not quite understand the intimation that the French might do the same. As I was under the belief that there was a French man of war at Tunis now.

Also that it was right the French should be reminded that this Country had always maintained the doctrine now put forward by Turkey and by the Bey, that Tunis was under the suzerainty of the Porte.

The risk of war with France about Tunis is appalling. But they would have to think twice before they took steps which might bring upon them England[,] Italy, & the Arabs.

A hint need not commit us, while it might have a moderating effect upon the French.

474. **Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville³**


As to Tunis I hope my telegram⁴ has been intelligible to you, and to you only.

The ‘second Malta’ you will recollect was the character given to Cyprus, as it was to be, by Disraeli.

It appears to me that our position for resisting the French intrigues in Tunis—which are but too palpable—has been frightfully weakened: first by the acquisition of Cyprus in utter defiance of the Treaty of Paris, secondly, to a degree not yet quite cleared up, by Salisbury’s declaration:⁵ which, whatever it may have been, I suppose binds us.

The first point I think most grave, and in fact the position seems to me not tenable beyond the point of friendly remonstrance in case of need.

Nothing could I think possibly be better than your letter to Menabrea.

---

¹ See from Lyons, Nos. 313, 331, 6, 11 Apr., F.O. 27/2491.
² See to Lyons, No. 390, 23 Apr., using these words, initialed at the foot on the back by Gladstone, F.O. 27/2484; to Lyons, No. 3904, 23 Apr., recording his assertion to Challemel Lacour that Tunis was part of the Ottoman Empire, ibid.; to Lyons, private, 22 Apr., P.R.O. 30/29/202, printed, Temperley and Penson, *Foundations*, 414; and from Lyons, No. 380, 25 Apr., reporting his communication of Britain’s views to Barthélemy St. Hilaire, F.O. 27/2492.
⁴ Gladstone to Granville, tel. 11.35 a.m., 22 Apr.: ‘Your letter. Am averse to concerted simultaneous despatches. Your reply [to Italy] perfect, while arguing in the other quarter [with France]. Pray remember ou †second Malta [Cyprus]. Write by post’, P.R.O. 30/29/124.
⁵ See nos. 490, 491.
You will have understood that I do not retract my approval as to sending ships, and if the occasion arise I should send a sufficiency.

The possible harbour is a grave fact but I do not see that it neutralises Malta more than it is neutralised by Malta. The other side is in other hands; and there is another access by Messina, say 80 to 100 miles round. Ponsonby on H.M.s part requests a postponement of any recommendation for the Garter.¹

475. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Walmer Castle. April 23/81.

We have not been well during our stay here, but are getting better. I should be out of the house, if the weather was less cold, & Lady G. hopes to leave her room in a day or two.

The French have had their invitation to join a Nihilist Conference on the 19th.

Ours is not arrived but Lobanoff has prepared me for a visit after he gets a courier.

I have written to Lyons to say that we are quite firm, & ready to refuse the conference if the proposal comes to us, but that we had better not use the identic arguments.²

If you settle to give the G.C.B. to Brand, I would suggest your sounding him first. It is possible that he might prefer the offer not being made at present, disliking both to accept & to refuse it.³

The Suter case is a difficulty.⁴ I agree very much with the Treasury,⁵ that the Taxpayers ought not to be perpetually paying ransoms for people who choose to reside in notoriously unsafe countries.

I believe I am wrong, but I do not see the strong international claim against the Turk. Could we make the Italians pay for a murder of, or a ransom extorted from an Englishman travelling or residing at Palermo or would we pay for a French farmer in Galway, whose ears were cut off.

¹ Not traced; cf. p. 257, n. 3, and no. 471.
² See to Lyons, No. 391, 23 Apr., reporting Challemel Lacour’s communication of the Russian invitation, describing Britain’s intention to decline, but using different arguments from France to avoid Anglo-French concert proposed by France, F.O. 27/2484; cf. p. 255, n. 6.
³ See nos. 464-6 and 495.
⁴ See Consul-General Blunt to Granville, tel. 8 Apr., reporting the capture by brigands of Henry Suter, a British subject engaged in sinking a mine near Isvor, and the ransom demanded, £T.15,000; Goschen to Granville, tel. No. 292, 15 Apr., requesting authority to hold the Turkish government responsible for the ransom and an indemnity to Mrs. Suter if Suter were killed; and Granville’s questions on draft tel. No. 274, 19 Apr., giving this authority, F.O. 78/3613.
⁵ See Treasury to F.O., 19 and 22 Apr., protesting against giving authority to Blunt to pay the ransom; see also Lingen to Pauncefote, 22 Apr., explaining that the Treasury wrote on Gladstone’s instruction, ibid.
In the meanwhile, if Suter is killed, there will be great indignation here. I have sent the papers to the Chancellor, & telegraphed again to Blount to know for how long he can temporize.

I saw in an evening paper that you were going to move the adjournment of the House on Monday, out of respect for Ld Beaconsfield. I presume this is not the case. Such a motion would be more plausible in the Lords. But I should think the precedents were all against it.

I have a vague recollection of having refused to do so for one distinguished Peer, and having agreed to do so I think for Lord Campbell. But then he was Speaker of the House, and had died on the morning of the sitting.

I have asked Hervey & Godley to look out for precedents.

476. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

[Add. MS. 44173, fo. 75]

Walmer Castle. April 23/81.

I perfectly understood your telegram—and your 2nd Malta, although anything less like one I cannot conceive.

The ground would be entirely taken from under our feet, if the original design of the late Cabinet had been adopted, which was to seize Cyprus.

It makes a difference Turkey having agreed to transfer it.

Derby came out of one Cabinet, in which he had been wrangling, and said ‘Occupy, fortify, grab & brag’ is the whole policy of the Gov.

I own to jealousy of France getting an overwhelming preponderance in the Mediterranean.

I wrote you a note this morning about an adjournment of the House of Commons. Godley’s box arrived this afternoon. I telegraphed my assent to your proposal.

The English have not much sense of proportion in their public buildings. The deficiency extends to some other things.

I have seen Dufferin. Ready to go whenever I require, but rather kicks against Goschen’s plan of learning his lesson under Goschen at Constantinople. He says with some reason, that the position of a new Ambassador, while the old one remains, is awkward.

1 See Pauncefote to the chancellor, 23 Apr., ibid.
2 See tel. 4 p.m., 23 Apr.; Blunt to Granville, tel. 24 Apr., replying eight days, ibid.
3 When the Commons reassembled, Mon. 25 Apr., after Easter, Lord Richard Grosvenor moved the adjournment until Tues., Hans. Parl. Deb. ccix. 1182; cf. Granville’s observations in the Lords, who did not adjourn, 5 May, ibid. 1801–2; cf. list of precedents, P.R.O. 30/29/124.
5 Granville to Gladstone, tel. 23 Apr., agreeing to the adjournment of the Commons, reporting that he had declined the invitation to Beaconsfield’s funeral, and adding that he had sent a dispatch boat to Tunis, P.R.O. 30/29/124.
6 He had left St. Petersburg, 15 Apr., and arrived, 28 June, at Constantinople as ambassador vice Goschen, who left 26 May.
He would like to be thoroughly crammed by Goschen, either in London or else somewhere on the road.

Paget arrives here on Monday, assuming a leave, which I did not give. It will not be a pleasant subject to discuss.¹

I incline much for Layard. You did not give an opinion.

477. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville


Your semi-cipher Telegram received. All right, except the indispositions, which I hope will soon make themselves all right by disappearing. I will now make the proper arrangements.

I send you for perusal a most interesting letter from Godley with particulars which he has gathered.²

I shall not be in the House until six, and Ld R. Grosvenor will give the notice for me.³

I notify the intention to the Queen by Telegram and to Northcote by letter: also to Sir N. Rothschild: at the same time declining the funeral.

With regard to the Suter case what I have had in my mind is the case, parallel in principle I think, of the very heavy fine which we compelled the Greek Government to pay down in hard money to the widow, where the husband had been murdered by brigands.⁴

478. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

[Add. MS. 44173, fo. 83]

Walmer Castle. April 24/81.

I have had a painful hour with Augustus Paget. As he will call on you, it is as well that you may have the option of reading this long rigmarole.⁵

479. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville


The large number of matters on which I should like to speak with you begins to overflow—and yet I am so pressed as to be very little able to

¹ See no. 468.
² About Beaconsfield’s death, to Gladstone, 23 Apr., reporting a conversation with Sir N. Rothschild who described the last hours and instructions about the disposal of his papers, Add. MS. 44222, fo. 174; see also Granville to Gladstone, 25 Apr., returning and commenting and saying that he and Lady Granville were better, Add. MS. 44173, fo. 80, not printed.
³ See no. 475.
⁴ i.e. the Vyner case, 1870, see Parl. papers (1870) lxx. 221; and p. 269, n. 2.
⁵ See copy of mem. of conversation with Paget, 25 Apr., recounting Paget’s reasons for refusing St. Petersburg and Granville’s reasons (Paget’s unpopularity in Rome and his abuse of the liberal party) for wishing to remove him from Rome, which he had not told Paget, Add. MS. 44173, fo. 84.
write. I must note down however one or two things, as I fear, notwithstanding your improved accounts, that you will not be available here yet a while.

1. I begin to believe the Rosebery rumours\(^1\) are a \textit{canard} only. My family are in friendly communication with both, and they dine here next Tuesday.

2. An application has been made to me through West, to know whether, if Northcote were to ask for the £2000 pension which lapses by the death of Disraeli I should give it him.\(^2\) How does this strike you? To me it bristles with difficulty & objection, in point of precedent, and of reasonable public interpretation.

3. I am going to see Paget who has been urgent on the subject though it is almost the first time, if not quite, when I have consented to see any one on a question of this kind. I have read your Mem. and am truly sorry for what you had to go through. I will report to you if I have any thing to say. Meantime I am given to understand you would do well to communicate \textit{with} R. Grosvenor, and possibly with Dilke, as to the feeling of the party about Layard. Neither of them have spoken to me.

4. The Queen has through Ponsonby begged that I will not submit any recommendation about the vacant Garter at present. Very intelligible. I have at once agreed to postpone: on special grounds which you will understand.

5. The Wolseley case\(^3\) will have to be taken up again when you come to town.

6. I shall be anxious to speak to you about Tunis\(^4\)—and I have no fear of our disagreeing.

7. So also the question about Suter is one of some difficulty. I do not know what you will think of my supposed precedent?

8. Are you good for a Cabinet on Saturday.\(^5\)

9. The idea is now up again in my mind about making Herbert a Lord of the Treasury without salary: the two Secretaries much approve:\(^6\) but I do not yet quite see my way as to what his work is to be.

\(^1\) i.e. of his discontent, see nos. 467, 469, 470, 472.

\(^2\) See also W. S. Northcote to Gladstone, 27 Apr., asking whether his father would be considered, Add. MS. 44469, fo. 104.

\(^3\) See nos. 430–2, 434, 438, 442; the Queen maintaining her opposition, the peerage was deferred until 25 Nov. 1882, after the Egyptian campaign; but see nos. 493, 525.

\(^4\) See Granville to Gladstone, tel. 25 Apr., asking how to reply to a fresh Italian appeal for concerted action in view of the French fleet's going to Goletta; and reply, tel. 26 Apr., averse to combination, but leaving Granville discretion to act on his judgement as to sending a force, P.R.O. 30/20/124.

\(^5\) It met, Fri. 29 Apr., Add. MS. 44642, fo. 176; see no. 482.

\(^6\) Hamilton noted here: 'F. Cavendish is more against than for it'; Herbert Gladstone appointed in a fresh commission issued, 24 Aug. 1881; for a similar position held by Gladstone's eldest son, see \textit{Gladstone and Granville}, i, no. 5, note 2.
10. No real difficulty was raised by Gibson last night\(^1\) beyond what we know to have been in the subject rather than the Bill. Lymington made an admirable argument\(^2\) last night on tenant right: to some extent it is the speciality of his family.

11. Paget has been here. The conversation passed off in generalities: but I told him I felt sure you would converse with me on the matter, and I also ventured to say that there was no foregone conclusion as to the successor. He said nothing offensive.

**480. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone**

[Add. MS. 44173, fo. 92]

Walmer Castle. April 27/81.

1° I am glad to hear Roseberry [sic] dines with you. If you talk to him confidentially on public matters, it will probably blow over. But it is no canard. Spencer has seen it all in black & white.

2° I do not know how the pension question stands by your amending act.\(^3\)

2 [sic] I should think Northcote with his family was a poorer man than Beaconsfield. I have always heard that Pines [sc. Pynes] was a small estate.

If it depends still upon the declaration of the claimant, would it not be difficult, to question Northcote’s assertion.

3°. I am glad Paget saw you. I will talk to you about Layard when I come to town.\(^4\)

4°. I think you were quite right to postpone the question of the garter. Derby is undoubtedly the right person, but it would be a bitter pill for the Queen to have to give him Beaconsfield’s.

Palmerston had almost always a garter in suspense. It was probably procrastination, but he always asserted that there were advantages in it.

5°. The Wolsley [sic] question will not be settled without a struggle. Ponsonby told me she was quite aware she must yield to your [threat of]\(^5\) resignation, but she thought it impossible you could resign on such a question.

6. Tunis does not seem so alarming as the Italians and Menabrea in his late note appeared to think—at all events for the present.\(^6\) I suppose our best policy is to do nothing to irritate the French unnecessarily, and at the same time nothing to reassure them as to possible results.

---


\(^2\) Ibid. 1143-53.

\(^3\) See Gladstone’s Public Offices Pension Act (1869) dividing offices of state into first, second, and third class, and stipulating the amount of service required in each to justify a claim, *Parl. papers* (1868-9) i. 329; *C. J.* (1869) 411.

\(^4\) See nos. 468 and 476.

\(^5\) See no. 493.

\(^6\) See p. 267, n. 4.
7. I have asked Dilke to speak to you about Suter. You will see the Chancellor's opinion.¹

I always thought Ripon pushed us as far as it was possible to go about poor Vyner,² but his case and that of Synge³ were stronger than Suter's as against the Turk.

8°. If you have a Cabinet, I will go up to it, otherwise I should remain till Monday.

9°. I see no objection to making Herbert a Lord, & many advantages. The objection of asking a man to do work without pay, hardly applies between a father & a son.

10. Everybody agreed that Gibson was not very effective. I do not imagine that Elcho will utterly demolish you.

481. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville


1. I send you the two last letters from Argyll with mine in relation to them.⁴ Nothing good.

2. As you have seen writing on the subject, could you give me the real portée of R[osebery]'s complaint or grievance? They do not dine: but friendly correspondence goes on.⁵ My wife thinks she can feel the ground, without danger.

3. I am inquiring whether we can dispense with a Cabinet on Saturday—as it is a pity you should come up two days sooner for it.

482. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

H of C. Ap. 28. 81.

1. No Cabinet on Saturday. A short Cabinet tomorrow at 3 for the special purpose of considering whether Dillon should be arrested.⁶

¹ See mem. by Selborne, 25 Apr., with min. by Granville regretting the chancellor's agreement with himself that it was difficult under international law to make Turkey liable for the ransom and proposing that Dilke should see Gladstone, F.O. 78/3613.

² Lady Ripon's brother for whose murder an indemnity was exacted from the Greek government, Parl. papers (1870) lxx. 221 and (1871) lxxi. 493.

³ Col. and Mrs. Synge captured by Greek brigands at Tricovitza near Salonica, 22 Feb. 1880, see Hans. Parl. Deb. ccl. 1299.

⁴ 25 and 26 Apr., and reply, 28 Apr., continuing the controversy about the attitude of the cabinet to the Irish Land bill, Add. MS. 44105, fos. 76, 80, 86; see p. 261, n. 2, and no. 472.

⁵ No letters from Rosebery to Gladstone have been traced for 16 Mar.–14 May, but see to Rosebery, 29 Apr., 2 May consulting him on Scottish business then before parliament, Add. MS. 44544, fos. 164, 165.

⁶ The cabinet took the unusual course of voting, dividing (Granville and Spencer being absent) 6 and 6, and Gladstone giving his casting vote for arrest, Add. MS. 44642,
Perhaps Kimberley may also report on Potchefstroom:¹ but nothing to my knowledge stands for decision.

2. Nothing about Beaconsfield till Monday week—

We must be very careful about the words of our Addresses.²

I have sent you all A[rgyll]'s letters³ as I know you feel the importance of the subject in connection with the House of Lords.

483. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville


The more I look at the Suter case the less I like it, or see my way to our proposing a vote for it, or otherwise paying the money.⁴

It appears to me not legal but purely political.

The argument from the Greek case appears to me as far as I recollect it not merely parallel but a fortiori.

The hypothetical argument from other countries seems to have no force. There is a certain standard of order, which Governments are expected, and if civilised able to maintain—Casualties happening under such Governments seem not to enter into the case.

In Italy however there were brigands who carried people away to the mountains & demanded ransom. This is a case of organised disorder. But no one ever thought of holding that the Governments of those countries should pay the ransom. If there have been claims, or calls in connection with such cases, they have been repelled.

The fact that a man who is a British subject and who voluntarily went into a Turkish province is confined is not I suppose the reason why the British Exchequer should release him. I think the Italian brigands used to confine the people and hold them till they got the ransom, threatening to kill them if followed up by troops. With none of this did we interfere.

If it was worse than I suppose, my argument is on one side all the stronger. Why are we to interfere in Suter's case? Is there any admissible reason if it be not that Turkey chooses to tolerate, and as many think encourage,
hordes so ferocious that they are not content with the hostage, but that unless ransomed he is to be a victim.

If so then Turkey tolerates what no other country has ever tolerated namely brigandage which is also savagery. Greece did it not: yet we made her pay. Such a difference in the case of Turkey seems to constitute her liability. And I cannot understand why we are not to reserve part of the Cyprus indemnity: at any rate until the matter can be considered with some leisure for this is a case that it is hard to deal with, amidst other pressure, having a pistol presented to one’s head for fear of Suter’s death—and that fear I take to be the only admissible argument.

The Synge case\(^1\) has already begotten the Suter case.

If it becomes understood that when an Englishman is nabbed in Turkey the English Government will pay, provided sufficient threats are used, then who can put a bound either to the multiplication of the cases, or to the swelling of the ransoms. We ought not to embark on a course of proceeding of this kind, pretending to ourselves that it is an isolated case. I think it is a policy, it will certainly be a system, and on such a system it seems to me that Parliament ought to have something to say. \emph{We ought not to put it in a position, in which it will have no choice.}\n
I might add, in which the upshot will be that the brigands and the Pachas will have a very good understanding, and a handsome proportion of the ransoms will form a new resource for the Bankrupt Empire.

\[P.S.\] The ransom demanded for Suter has gone altogether beyond any reference to his entire means. This limit having been passed, and the Treasury substituted as the paying department, what other limit is there?

484. \textit{Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone} \[Add. MS. 44173, fo. 99]\n
Walmer Castle. April 29/81.

1000 thanks about the Cabinet.

Spencer and I feel that we have no right to give an opinion without all the facts being before us, and that there of course may be a case so strong as to make it necessary, but our feeling is all against putting Dillon in prison.\(^2\)

I do not know whether this will be in time to catch the train.

I am sorry to say Lobanoff has proposed the conference. I will send you an account later.\(^3\)

\(^1\) See p. 269, n. 3.

\(^2\) See p. 269, n. 6.

\(^3\) See to Wyndham, No. 1764, 29 Apr., reporting the Russian invitation to a conference on nihilism with assurances that it committed Britain to nothing, and Granville’s regrets that it had been given; and No. 188, 10 May, refusing the invitation, F.O. 65/1108.
I hope you will not think I was wrong in telegraphing to Blount [sc. Blunt] to pay as much as was absolutely necessary in order to save Suter's life.¹ If he was to be saved, it was clear from Blount's telegram, that this must be done without loss of time.

I understood from the Treasury letter, and from a telegram from Dilke, that you approved of the ransom being advanced if necessary, and that the restitution of the money should be demanded from the Turk.

I am not convinced as to the liability of the Turk in the Suter case, but am quite ready to strain our right as much as possible.

I agree with you as to the small claim of Suter, but his head would be a disagreeable incident.

In any case, I suppose a strong minute of the Treasury as to the future, circulated by the F.O. & presented to Parliament will be the right thing to have done.

I wish you joy of J. Manners' amendment.²

It was not I who saw the letter.³ It was Spencer. He says the tone was as angry & hostile as possible.

The grounds[ :] want of Consultation about Scotland, and especially about Privy Seal, which reticence he felt more than it's not being offered to him.

I very much doubt communications with the Countess. Women always are more unreasonable than their husbands about the claims of these and this seems to be especially the case with Hannah.

A little confidential talk with him, on the state of Affairs, would more likely soothe him, than anything else.

One instance of his not being in a reasonable mood, was a complaint that I had refused to spend this week at the Durdans for Epsom races, which showed there was a general wish to shunt him.

¹ See from Consul Blunt, tel. No. 4, 27 Apr., saying that it was not safe to temporize any longer; to Blunt, tel. 11.45 a.m., 28 Apr., authorizing him to pay Suter's ransom, reducing it as much as possible, F.O. 78/3613.

² See notice of motion to amend the Irish Land bill, 28 Apr., so as to remedy Irish ills by the development of Ireland's natural resources, rather than by measures which 'confuse the relationship between landlord and tenant', Hans. Parl. Deb. cclx. 1307; not moved.

³ See no. 480.
To judge from what you say I have been misunderstood about the Suter case, on which my whole view was set out in my letter of yesterday.1
The 'head' argument is indeed disagreeable, but it appears to me only to require to be renewed from time to time, and that there is one way only of meeting it so as to obviate its recurrence namely withholding the Tribute money and thus making it the interest of Turkey to act, who alone can.

Dilke tells me that the Law officers have given an opinion against this but it appears to me to be a matter wholly out of their jurisdiction.
I attach no value to Treasury minutes with protestations for the future, or to Foreign Office expostulations and unless the course is pursued which I urge, and which I meant to make a condition (but this of course is now too late) I can only foresee a course of future proceedings on the one hand ludicrous, on the other deplorable, and which I know not who can defend in the House of Commons.

488. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville2
The Durdans, Epsom. May 7. 81.
1. Nothing can stand better than the Tunis affair as you seem to have left it.
2. I willingly give up the epigrammatic bit about Beaconsfield which indeed I had not at all made up my mind to speak, and I think I can supply its place with a quotation about Marcellus3 which none of the people most liable to be misled will understand.
3. I really think all is smooth here: certainly nothing can be more kind. The country perfectly delicious.
4. I see it stated that Carnarvon will call attention on Tuesday to a letter of mine to Mr Tomkinson4 during the West Cheshire Election in

1 See no. 483. Blunt paid the ransom and Suter was released, 24 May, but the money could not be recovered from Turkey; see further min. by Gladstone, 17 June, proposing discussion in the cabinet; Treasury to F.O., 23 June, refusing to sanction similar advances in future; to Dufferin, No. 498, 18 July, on the warning issued by Blunt that travellers in Macedonia, captured by brigands, must not expect to be ransomed by the government, F.O. 78/3613.
2 Gladstone to Granville, 5 May, consulting him on the words of the inscription on the Beaconsfield monument in his 'anxiety to be true and not to sail too near the wind'; and, undated, arguing against the Queen's proposal to confer a title on Beaconsfield's brother, P.R.O. 30/29/124, not printed.
3 Virgil, Aen. vi. 855-6, enabling him to stress the size and avoid dwelling on the quality of Disraeli's achievement, in moving the address to the Queen for a monument in Westminster Abbey to Beaconsfield, 9 May, Hans. Parl. Deb. cclxi. 41.
4 The defeated liberal candidate; for his reading, at a meeting, of Gladstone's letter, approving his outspokenness on the Transvaal and using this phrase, 14 Apr., see The Times, 15 Apr. p. 7f.
which if I remember right I have said that the question in the Transvaal was in my view, for us, a question of avoiding blood-guiltiness. That appears to me little more than a truism where it is a question of shedding blood which a man believes to be clearly unnecessary. For those who do not thus believe it is a different matter: of or for these I have said nothing. Carnarvon has & has had a cacoethes of action or stir in him, which has been at the root I am sorry to say of all these mischiefs in South Africa. I do not wish to say this if I can help it but it is my conviction.

489. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

10, Downing Street. May 14. 81.

Last night I thought of Reay for your negotiations at Paris.

1. He is already there—on bimetallism
2. He is I understand a very good Frenchman
3. He has the turn & habit of statistical & social questions & I should think him likely to be very sound in principle.

Rosebery, to whom I wrote, agrees, as far as he knows.

I think him worth your inquiring about.

490. Lord Granville to Cabinet Colleagues

May 14 [1881].

1° I circulate Lord Salisbury’s note to me of to-day
2° The whole of the Salisbury Tunis papers
3° Those which I proposed to present to Parliament
4° The whole of Lord Lyons’ despatch of July 19/78

I should be glad if my colleagues would give their opinion, as to what is due to the public service—

What is due to Lord Salisbury

See Carnarvon’s observations in the Lords, Kimberley’s reply, and Argyll’s speech, 10 May, Hans. Parl. Deb. ccli. 136–52.

2 See Gladstone to Granville, 14 May, on Sir R. A. Cross’s application (Cross to Gladstone, 6 May, Add. MS. 44469, fo. 226) for the civil list pension rendered vacant by Beaconsfield’s death and precedents against giving one to a political opponent, Add. MS. 44173, fo. 108, not printed.

3 As commissioner with Dilke, Baxter, and Kennedy for the negotiation of a fresh commercial treaty; see nos. 213, 223, 292, 509, 511, 512.

4 See Gladstone to Rosebery, 14 May, consulting about appointing Reay to lead the British negotiators, Add. MS. 44544, fo. 168; and reply, 14 May, Add. MS. 44288, fo. 70.

5 Objecting to the publication of Lyons’s dispatch, 19 July 1878, reporting Waddington’s assertion that Salisbury had proposed the French annexation of Tunis—‘vous ne pouvez pas laisser Carthage aux mains des barbares’—since his contradiction could not also be published, being with a report of other words of Waddington, subsequently withdrawn, P.R.O. 30/29/143.
What is due to ourselves—

I should mention that although I recorded in general terms only what Leon Say said to me,\(^1\) he did repeat to me as an undoubted fact, that Lord Salisbury had said to M. Waddington 'Prenez Tunis, Carthage ne doit pas rester aux barbares'.

It should be remembered that I require some justification\(^2\) for having told Lord Lyons that there was apparently some discrepancy between the language held at Berlin, & that which was subsequently used in writing.

491. *Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville*  
[P.R.O. 30/29/143]  
Windsor Castle. May 15. 81.

Your box reaches me as I am waiting in the corridor at 2.45 for the Queen to go in to dinner. Even had I more time it would not be easy to suggest the precise course, especially as to your despatch.

One thing is plain, it seems difficult to suppress altogether. But is there such a great hurry—can we not wait say till Tuesday to consider it.

The only serious difficulty I see at the moment is about discrepancy—can that passage be unnoticeably omitted?\(^3\)

492. *Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville*  
[P.R.O. 30/29/124]  
Windsor Castle. May 15. 81.

I had a long audience today: H.M. very kindly & gracious.

She would like Böhm to execute the Beaconsfield Memorial.\(^4\) It appears to me that this is a matter in which we may reasonably gratify her. Unless I hear to the contrary I shall assume this to be your opinion.

The account in the Standards of the stoning soldiers and police in

---

\(^{1}\) See to Lyons, No. 698, 17 June 1880, F.O. 27/2421, reporting the conversation with Léon Say, in which Granville spoke of this discrepancy, printed 'Correspondence respecting the affairs of Tunis', *Parl. papers* (1881) xlix. 501, laid 19 May.

\(^{2}\) i.e. in order to answer De la Warr, who, after the treaty of Bardo, 12 May, establishing the French protectorate, had given notice of a motion on Tunis; for debate postponed until 27 May, and then the real issues avoided, see *Hans. Parl. Deb.* cclxi. 1440–50; cf. cabinet discussion, 13 May, Add. MS. 44642, fo. 179, with min. by Gladstone: 'I am of opinion that Lord Salisbury’s proceedings have entirely cut away the ground ... from under our feet. How can they be kept secret if debate arise', fo. 180.

\(^{3}\) No. 491 was circulated by Granville to the cabinet with no. 490 and its enclosures; for mins. by Carlingford, Childers, Northbrook, Harcourt, Hartington, Selborne, Dodson, Chamberlain, Kimberley, and Spencer against publication of the dispatch of July 1878, and by Bright and Forster for it, see P.R.O. 30/29/143.

\(^{4}\) Cf. exchange between Gladstone and Granville on the docket of a Board of Works letter, 26, 27 May, in which Granville suggested that Gladstone appoint Böhm as there were no precedents for the consultation of a committee, Add. MS. 44470, fo. 12.

\(^{5}\) For account of attack upon soldiers and police after a land meeting at New Pallas, Limerick, see the *Standard*, 13 May, p. 3c.
Ireland is a gross exaggeration. Still it is hardly a pleasant matter & brings back upon the mind the extreme difficulty of the work of the Executive in Ireland at this moment, & the need of a strong hand.

In a small matter, a horrid idea presents itself to me, that the H of C. probably ought to give up its Whitsuntide holidays for the Land Bill.¹

I found Clarendon here & talked to him a little about the Land Bill.

493. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone² [Add. MS. 44173, fo. 110] [20 May 1881.]

I am still of opinion that we are lamentably deficient in the House of Lords of military men who generally agree with the Gov on their military measures.

I am not quite as strong as to Wolsley [sic] being the person who can fill up the gap.

The only other question is whether this is the best opportunity for forcing the Queen's hand. It appears that she has said that she knows she must yield to a threat of resignation of Mr Gladstone, but that he cannot go to that extremity on this point.

It may happen, & it probably will happen that there may be more serious matters on which to put necessary pressure will be absolutely necessary, & threats of resignation ought not to be frequent.

In saying this, I do not want to retract anything, which I have previously said.

494. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone [Add. MS. 44173, fo. 115] [24 May 1881.]

Would it not be better for Hartington & for me to call on you to talk over this matter.³

It is difficult to write shortly on the matter.

495. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville [P.R.O. 30/29/124]

10, Downing Street. May 28. 81.

1. Should we not at once offer G.C.B. to Goschen.⁴

¹ The debate on the second reading of the Irish Land bill ended, 19 May, the committee stage, 27 May; the Commons adjourned for Whitsuntide 8–9 June, the report stage began, 22 July, the third reading, 29 July.

² No. 493 relates to a draft letter to the Queen renewing the recommendation of a peerage for Wolseley circulated by Gladstone to the cabinet, 19 May, Add. MS. 44765, fo. 116; see nos. 430–2, 434, 438, 479, 480, and 525.

³ I.e. the Wolseley peerage; the meeting took place at 4 that day, see Gladstone to Granville, 24 May, Add. MS. 44173, fo. 116, not printed.

⁴ See nos. 290, 297, 391, 502, and 503.
2. And may I not now sound the Speaker—not for action yet a while—

3. Please read Forster's interesting letter before Cabinet.

Your note just come. You win by 1/4 neck.

496. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

10, Downing Street. June 1, 81.

I return this draft on the Canal-project, to which I know of no objection. But I had understood the Cabinet to authorise a communication going somewhat farther, namely to the extent of your saying that in the event of any intrigues or undue political pressure against it you would endeavour to obtain for it fair play.

497. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

[Add. MS. 44173, fo. 118]

10, Downing Street. June 2, 81. 1½ Pm.

I have this short note from Forster. Shall I mention in Cabinet today the state of the Irish Executive.

498. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

[Add. MS. 44173, fo. 117, not printed.]

Foreign Office. [3 June 1881].

I found this box on coming out of the Cabinet. It would have been a good thing to have mentioned it.

1 See nos. 464–6, 475; conferred in Sept.
2 See to Gladstone, Dublin, 27 May, writing optimistically of the effects of the new instructions to the police, Add. MS. 44158, fo. 161; printed T. Wemyss Reid, Life of W. E. Forster (1888) ii. 320–1; for cabinet meeting, 28 May, on the Irish Land bill, see Add. MS. 44642, fo. 182.
3 Granville to Gladstone, 28 May, also suggesting G.C.B. for Goschen, Add. MS. 44173, fo. 117, not printed.
4 See to the British Suez Canal Directors, 30 May, instructing them for the approaching meeting of the company's council, that Britain approved the project for a sweet-water canal from Ismailia to Port Said, provided it was limited to that, F.O. 78/3358; cf. Gladstone's note of the cabinet's decision, 28 May, that Vivian was only to secure 'fair play' in Egypt for the project, Add. MS. 44642, fo. 182.
5 Of 1 June, confirming his views of 29 May; to Gladstone, 29 May, on his intention to use force, police and soldiers, in dispersing mobs, Add. MS. 44158, fos. 167, 172; Reid, op. cit. 321–2.
6 Granville returned the letter, writing on it his reply: 'I have some doubts, unless you have made up your mind as to the probable course.' McCarthy's announced motion for a vote of censure on the Irish executive was not discussed in the cabinet, 2 June, Add. MS. 44642, fo. 184.
7 i.e. the publication in the United Irishmen newspaper of New York of incitements to murder English public men and appeals for money to support the Fenian cause.
I am inclined to do as you first suggested. Introduce it as a topic, when Lowell (as he is afraid he may be instructed to do)\(^1\) makes a representation about the arrest of American citizens without a trial in Ireland.\(^2\)

499. **Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone**  
[PR.O. 30/29/124]  
18, Carlton House Terrace. [3 June 1881].

I hope you will not sanction publication.\(^3\)

I find Goschen had formed the strongest opinion against the Bulgarian Constitution, before he knew the intention of the Prince.

He says it is absolutely unworkable.\(^4\)

500. **Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville**  
[PR.O. 30/29/124]  
10, Downing Street. [5 June 1881].

1. If you think fit I should be glad that a copy of my short letter to M. Zancoff should go to Mr Lascelles.

2. I wish to report to you that in conversing with Dufferin I dropped a suggestion that, when he can, he should try to pick out some able and trustworthy Turkish functionary and to get him made Governor of Armenia with a sufficiency of power and reasonable independence. I also hinted, as a means of procuring this, at the small value we set upon our nominal, sole, and illegal title (referably to the Treaty of Paris) to interfere between the Sultan and his Asiatic subjects generally. These topics are not new between you & me, & probably you have mentioned them to Dufferin.

3. I have received the inclosed letter from Cowper\(^6\) (see 2):\(^7\) but I shall

---

\(^1\) See min. by Granville on conversation with Lowell, 3 June, F.O. 5/1778.

\(^2\) Gladstone returned the letter writing on it: 'We shall meet. Ought not U.S. Govt. to prosecute for the passage about P. of Wales? W.E.G. Jun 3.81.'

\(^3\) See Tsankov to Gladstone, 9 May, appealing for help against Prince Alexander's attempt to revise the Bulgarian constitution; reply, 26 May, that Britain would always be found on the side of liberty and legality, Add. MS. 44469, fo. 246, Add. MS. 44544, fo. 172; and to Gladstone, tel. 2 June, asking permission to publish the reply in the Bulgarian newspapers, Add. MS. 44470, fo. 48.

\(^4\) Gladstone returned the letter writing on it: 'I will be governed by you. But what does Goschen think of the proceedings of the Prince (which to me look very bad) W.E.G. Jun 3.81'; letter of 26 May not published, but see The Times, 18 June, p. 7e, for Tsankov's tel. 17 June, appealing to Gladstone to save Bulgarian liberty; for tel. and reply, see Add. MS. 44470, fo. 91.

\(^5\) Gladstone's letter book dates all copies of letters 4-12 June, from the Durdans, Epsom.

\(^6\) To Gladstone, 2 June, on (1) theological degrees for presbyterians and (2) the critical state of Ireland and the principle adopted of always having such a large force available, when disorder was expected, as to render it hopeless, and his intention to take a holiday while Forster was in Dublin, Add. MS. 44470, fo. 43.

\(^7\) Gladstone numbered (1) and (2) the two subjects of Cowper's letter.
write to him in the terms agreed. I write to Forster to ask when he would like to have a Cabinet.

4. I cannot say that reflection about Bulgaria takes away my misgivings. With E. Roumelia as an example at his side why does the Prince make these enormous demands. (Do not reply).

501. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

[Add. MS. 44173, fo. 120]

I will with pleasure send your Zancoff letter to Lascelles. I quite agree in what you said to Dufferin, so does Goschen.

Curious & not satisfactory, that Cowper should leave Dublin, when Forster is there. They ought to be working together.

I can run up at any time for a Cabinet.

502. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

[Add. MS. 44173, fo. 121]
[Holmbury]. June 10/81.

I send you Goschen’s answer.

I presume it is useless to make a rejoinder.

I do not remember any refusals under similar circumstances.

If he is going to lead a cave, it will be injurious to us, but I doubt it’s being useful to him.

No one can successfully act the part of a cherubim—one must sit either upon the great liberal, or the great conservative party [bench].

503. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

[P.R.O. 30/29/124]
10, Downing Street. Ju 12. 81.

Goschen is never superabundant in care as to the ‘form’, but I do not think his note means any mischief.

I was offered & declined G.C.B. after returning from the Ionian Islands but I hardly quote this as a precedent against you because 1. I had produced no immediate result 2. I was not in political alliance at home with the Government under which I acted.

1 See to Cowper, 4 June, thanking for his views, but postponing a decision about strengthening the Irish executive, Add. MS. 44544, fo. 176.
2 See to Forster, 4 June, saying that he had written to Cowper, and asking this question, Add. MS. 44544, fo. 176.
3 See to Lascelles, No. 39 confidential, 7 June, enclosing a copy of Gladstone to Tsankov, 26 May, F.O. 78/3307.
4 Not traced.
Here is a 'regrettable' announcement from Lady Huntly,¹ which probably you have expected. Please consider what to advise.

The letter addressed by Sir H. Ponsonby to you on the 14th,² under command of Her Majesty, suggests, & perhaps not for the first time, a somewhat serious question. It is announced that the Queen will not consent to a cession of Cyprus; but as the Government have not advised anything of the kind (nor indeed entertained the subject) it is difficult to understand this intimation otherwise than [as] a notice. Again, neither is a notice intelligible otherwise than as a virtual prohibition. But it is totally incompatible with the duty of Ministers under the British Constitution, as I need hardly say—indeed I do not see how it would be admissible under any form of government—to acquiesce in any limitation of their duty to advise on any subject from time to time as the honour & interests of the Crown may appear to require.

I do not urge that this is a matter which need now be discussed but clearly we have to take note of it as it may recur and as it may recall passages of our past history which help to illustrate its importance for the future.

On your Bulgarian draft,³ with which I agree, I wish to note two things.

1. Nothing has been said to show where & why the Constitution is

¹ See from Lady Huntly, 14 June, enclosing her husband's letter resigning the captaincy of the corps of gentlemen-at-arms, owing to his need to live cheaply abroad, Add. MS. 44470, fo. 82; see no. 507, and p. 281, n. 8. Granville wrote his reply on the letter and returned it: 'I am afraid it [is] a very bad case.' Gladstone rejoined: 'What as to successor?'

² On the Queen's suspicion (suggested by newspaper paragraphs and the summoning home of the governor) that some discussion of Cyprus might be going on and announcing 'that she cannot consent to give up this island'; and calming reply, 15 June, P.R.O. 30/29/39.

³ See to Lascelles, No. 40, 14 June, substance telegraphed, protesting against the ordinances (appointing military tribunals to investigate offences against public order, and giving special powers to the minister of the interior over the press) as contrary to the prince's undertaking that he would govern according to law and the people's wishes, F.O. 78/3307.
unworkable, or what are the failures in practical administration which have led to these extraordinary measures.  

2. After receipt of the two ordinances I said in H of C something to the effect that they would require further information to warrant them in our eyes.  

507. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone  
[PR O. 30/29/124]  
18, Carlton House Terrace. June 16/81.  

When you formed your Gov, St Albans refused his old post.  
But at the time you gave it to Huntly, Hamilton reported that St Albans would have been glad to have it—Since then he has flown at higher game, and has lately suggested himself to me as successor to Lorne.  
He has always behaved well to us although his clever little wife, since she has inherited an Irish property, has gone against us.  
I should like to sound him in your name.  
If he objects, or you do not agree that he should be sounded, I should advise your proposing Dalhousie to the Queen for promotion—in which case his place could be given 1° to Elgin 2° to Wenlock.  

508. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville  
[PR O. 30/29/124]  
10, Downing Street. June 19. 81.  

I am quite willing that you should try Carrington about Huntly’s office, if you think him the best: I should have leant to Dalhousie; but you are a better judge.  

1 Cf. to Lascelles, tel. 24 June, asking for a full report on the deficiencies of the Bulgarian constitution, ibid.; no report traced.  
3 The captaincy of the yeomen of the guard was St. Albans’s old post, but the captaincy of the corps of gentlemen-at-arms was now in question; it had been given to Fife, May 1880, and when Fife resigned to Huntly, see min. by Granville [31 Dec. 1880], suggesting Huntly, and saying Hamilton reported as here described, P.R.O. 30/29/123, not printed.  
4 i.e. as governor-general of Canada.  
5 St. Albans refused.  
6 Gladstone wrote: ‘Pray proceed as you propose’, and returned the letter.  
7 Gladstone to Granville, 17 June, enclosing amendments to Granville to Lyons, No. 594, 22 June, stating Britain’s attitude to the French annexation of Tunis, F.O. 27/2485, not printed.  
8 See Carrington to Gladstone, 23 June, accepting the captaincy of the corps of gentlemen-at-arms,Add. MS. 44470, fo. 110; see ibid., fos. 135, 137 for unavailing attempt by Huntly, 28 June, to recover his office.
509. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Foreign Office. June 20. 81.

Please consider what ought to be the result of the conversation of which I enclose a record.¹ I saw M. Amé the day after, but he did not recur to the subject.

510. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone²

18, Carlton House Terrace. June 21/81.

Harcourt has sent me a remarkably able brief for the despatch which the Cabinet decided to send rather to my regret as I am afraid it may end in something of a triumph to the Fenians.³

Tenterden was of opinion that it had better take the form of a record of conversation with Lowell as less provocative of discussion.

Lowell asked me whether we were going to make communications. He hoped not, he told me most confidentially that he was not sure of Blaine in the matter.

I told him that it was settled to do so, but I wished to know his opinion whether I should do it through him or to Thornton. He was strongly for my doing it through him.

I have a little condensed Harcourt's arguments, in order to adopt a conversational tone.

I shall be grateful for suggestions.⁴

511. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

10, Downing Street. June 22. 81.

⁴ See to Lyons, No. 170 commercial, 23 June, recording a new French proposal (originating with Dilke) for a simple most-favoured-nation treaty, in order to break the deadlock, caused by the refusal of the English cotton manufacturers to supply a classification of goods which would enable the old ad valorem tariff to be translated into specific duties, F.O. 27/2535; see nos. 511, 512.

² Gladstone to Granville, 21 June, on Lady M. Alford's wish for a statue to Stratford de Redcliffe in Westminster Abbey to complete the group of Cannings, P.R.O. 30/29/124, not printed.

³ See to Thornton, No. 127, 24 June, recording a conversation with Lowell, in which Granville called his attention to the United Irishmen and appealed to America to restrain its machinations, F.O. 5/1778; see p. 277, n. 7.

¹ See to Lyons, No. 170 commercial, 23 June, recording a new French proposal (originating with Dilke) for a simple most-favoured-nation treaty, in order to break the deadlock, caused by the refusal of the English cotton manufacturers to supply a classification of goods which would enable the old ad valorem tariff to be translated into specific duties, F.O. 27/2535; see nos. 511, 512.

⁴ Gladstone returned the letter writing on it: 'The dispatch seems to me to stand perfectly well. I think that in its middle part it rather more than fulfils the intention of the cabinet. W.E.G. June 21.81.' See draft, for alterations by Harcourt, Selborne, Kimberley, Hartington, Chamberlain, Northbrook, and Granville, and letters with it from Harcourt and Forster, but no alterations by Gladstone.
even if it were unavoidable, of which I cannot judge—given the French a great advantage in argument.

2. In principle the 'most-favoured-nation' affords the best basis for a Treaty but the 'evolution' of craft seems to have discovered the means of evading it.

Can any remedy or safe-guard be found?

Can the most favoured nation clause be so understood or enlarged that a concession made on certain goods of a given material shall give a right to claim the admission of all other goods of that material at rates not less favourable referably to value? I fear this might be a difficult problem to work out. But without something of the kind how could we make the most favoured nation Clause a reality?

I do not know if you remember how America compelled us to refund duties on N. Carolina rice because Palmerston had philanthropically admitted at a low rate rice from the W. coast of Africa.

Had fraud been as accomplished then as it is now we might have baulked the United States by confining our low duty to rice below a certain value: for the American rice bore a higher price.

Unless we can stop this leak in the m.f.n. Clause, I see no plan except the classification which it seems the Cotton men have declined.

But, as a practical course, might not this perhaps be tried: M. Amé having suggested it, to point out to him by well-selected instances how it might be evaded & nullified, & then ask him as a suite to his own suggestion, how he would prevent this evasion?

512. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone [Add. MS. 44173, fo. 123]

18, Carlton House Terrace. [23 June 1881].

I am glad to say that the cotton people have consented to propose a classification, and have thus taken away the only impediment to our having the barren advantage of having the best of the argument.

The best thing now is [to] have a treaty as good as the present. Dilke seems to despair of this result.

The Manufacturers clamour for a rupture. But then they want retaliatory duties.

I should have thought the alternative would have been a simple M.F.N. clause treaty—which would relieve us from many entangling difficulties.

1 Gladstone to Granville, 25 June, forwarding the Duke of Bedford's letter; and reply [25 June] that Bedford could vote as he liked on the Irish Land bill and the Duchess retain the mistress-ship of the robes, Add. MS. 44173, fos. 126, 130, not printed; see also Bedford to Gladstone, 24 June, resigning for his wife, her office, because he could not support the Land bill in the Lords, Add. MS. 44470, fo. 119; Granville to Bedford, 26 June, persuading him to postpone, P.R.O. 30/29/28 A, fo. 525; Bedford to Gladstone, 5 July, postponing, Add. MS. 44470, fo. 170; for withdrawal and later renewal, see nos. 521, 563, 565, 566, 569, 913, 920, 921.
Cobden's Treaty was a great coup. But it was administering mercury to a very diseased liver. It would be worth a good deal to get out of the habit of administering mercury as a portion of a normal diet.

Tenterden's objection certainly has foundation, but is it enough to make us give up the idea.

I feel sure if you cannot suggest a mode of obviating this difficulty Amé neither can nor will do it.

513. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

[PR.O. 30|29|124]

10, Downing Street. July 15. 81.

I am rather staggered at the appearance of Mr Lascelles in the Bulgarian ceremonial\(^1\) without any satisfaction given to us by the Prince in respect to our representations:\(^2\) but I will not venture on a positive opinion.

Reflection about Tripoli does not at all disincline me to the suggested step.

Could you circulate the draft\(^3\) as from you & me. It seems a pity to have a Cabinet for it alone. The Commons Ministers have been very hard worked.

We came to blows, so to speak, with the Irish last night, and I made (with advice) a most violent speech which followed up one of Bright's: & in which I watched carefully as I went along.\(^4\) It all worked well & we have got the Clause.

But what I chiefly wanted to say was this. If there is any one thoroughly good man in Turkey, why not urge him strongly upon the Porte for Armenia with proper powers, at the time when we are helping in the matter of Tripoli?\(^5\)

I see Dufferin spoke of Muhtar, but I do not know whether he is or is not such a man.

---

1. See Lascelles to Granville, tel. No. 23, 13 July, reporting his presence at the reception of the corps diplomatique by the prince, before the meeting of the Bulgarian parliament which accepted the constitutional changes, and at the parliament's meeting, F.O. 78/3309.

2. See p. 280, n. 3, and to Lascelles, No. 59, 30 July, administering a mild rebuke, F.O. 78/3307.

3. i.e. to Lyons, No. 676, 15 July, warning France against interference in Tripoli, F.O. 27/2486; draft circulated to the cabinet together with an interchange of notes, 13 July, in which Gladstone expressed his preference for the dispatch over a private hint or inaction; and mins. by Kimberley, Selborne, Dodson, and Northbrook, P.R.O. 30/29/143.


5. Cf. no. 500; and Dufferin to Granville, No. 520, 28 June, received 4 July, reporting language to the sultan in Gladstone's sense, F.O. 78/3281.
514. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

18, Carlton House Terrace. July 18/81.

In the office they think Lascelles is quite right. I am not clear about this. We had better wait till we get the full report. I have suggested to Dilke to give an answer to Labouchere which will not commit us, promising papers as soon as we have got & considered the full report—& saying that any further communications to Prince Alexander will be in favor of his exercising with moderation & liberality the powers which have been confided to him by the Assembly.¹

² Dilke wishes to state at the next Cabinet his views on Commercial treaties.

Have you any objection.

515. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville


I am glad to hear a good account of you. It seemed wicked to feed on you yesterday in your absence, though we were so kindly entertained.

Pray read the inclosed letter from H.M.²

She does not often err, but it is not in point of taste, quite perfect.

I need not say the answer as to a Vote of Parl is clear.

R. Churchill brings forward, if he can, Tunis, and Tripoli, tomorrow.³

The recent correspondence is most opportune.

Could it be presented at once?⁴ Pray consider with Dilke.

516. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

18, Carlton House Terrace. July 22/81.

I return you the Queen’s letter. I quite agree with you. The immediate presentation of the Tripoli papers would have an excellent effect here and be useful in the Debate tonight. Dilke suggested that the publication at present might injuriously affect the action of the Turks—which is not

¹ For Dilke’s denial that Lascelles had displayed ‘lively sympathy’ with Prince Alexander, and promise of papers in reply to Labouchere, see Hans. Parl. Deb. cclxiii. 1132–3; see Parl. papers (1881) xcviii. 247.

² The Queen to Gladstone, 20 July, on Dean Stanley’s death, proposing that parliament should vote money for a statue, Guedalla, ii. 164–5.

³ He was not able to do so until 25 July, when he asked whether ‘the whole subject’ of events in the Mediterranean might be discussed in parliament, and was induced to postpone his question, Hans. Parl. Deb. cclxiii. 1755.

⁴ ‘Correspondence respecting the affairs of Tripoli’, Parl. papers (1881) xcix. 485, laid in the Lords, 26 July, in the Commons, 27 July.
impossible. I have desired the papers to be made ready for presentation
and I have asked Dilke to communicate with you whether they should be
presented or not.

I suppose it would be difficult in the House of Commons to give the
facts, stating that the publication would be creditable to both Govern-
ments as regards the frank and friendly communications that had taken
place but that there are other reasons why their immediate publication is
not desirable. I shall be perfectly content with either course.

If you will be good enough to meet here tomorrow I hope to be able to
attend.¹ The attack has been very sharp—entirely owing to imprudence
in wine, fruit, and exposure to East wind draughts. I think it will soon be
over.

517. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

[PR.O. 30/29/124]
10, Downing Street. July 23. 81.

You will I hope have understood my transplanting the intended Cabinet
to this place as a surrender of any hope of your presence. The Transvaal
Debate is really our main subject and I think there is nothing to trouble
you.

I settled with Dilke yesterday, under the terms of your note, that the
Tripoli correspondence might be presented, and a hint at the same time
given in a friendly way to Turkey not to presume upon it.²

Midhat cropped up yesterday unexpectedly—I spoke in brief and general
terms.³

Great enthusiasm this morning at 1.30 on closing the Comm[itt]ee on
the Land Bill.

518. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

[PR.O. 30/29/29 A]
Private.
10, Downing Street. July 27. 81.

I am sorely vexed about Goschen.
He voted against us last night.⁴
He did not vote on the life & death business of the Transvaal motion.
He says the weak-kneed Liberals are the strong kneed Liberals, &

¹ The cabinet met, 23 July, in Downing Street, and Granville was absent, Add. MS. 44642, fo. 203; no. 516 written by Sanderson but initialed by Granville.
² See to Dufferin, No. 523, 26 July, communicating to Turkey the warning to France over Tripoli (p. 284, n. 5), but disclaiming any intention of supporting Turkey in
difficulties provoked by her own imprudence, F.O. 78/3271.
³ For Commons’ discussion of the death sentence (subsequently commuted) passed on Midhat Pasha for alleged complicity in the murder of the sultan, see Hans. Parl. Deb. cclxiii. 1618–25.
⁴ When the Commons considered the Irish Land bill as amended in committee, in
the division on one of the amendments, passed by the narrow majority of 36, Hans. Parl. Deb. cclxii. 1957.
represents Liberalism as a torrent which they bravely stand against. (I thought such work had been the business of the Tories).

This gives me an indigestion.

I hope you are better, & trust this note may not make you worse.

519. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

[Add. MS. 44173, fo. 138]
10, Downing Street. Aug 12. 81.

I assume that whatever the Lords do tonight, they will do quickly. Would it not be well if you in your House, & I in the Commons, invited our colleagues to an informal meeting when you conclude, in my (new) room behind the Chair, to see in a summary way how the case will stand for further, and I hope final, consideration? Although the space left for doubt to arise will I think be very narrow.

520. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

[P.R.O. 30/29/124]
10, Downing Street. Aug 17. 81.

1. Do you think the time has now come when I may submit the list of new Peers as agreed on?

2. Do you recommend my writing notes of regret to any one or more not chosen?

521. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

[P.R.O. 30/29/124]

1. Re the Duke of Bedford. If you can concoct or suggest nothing better than the inclosed, please send on to Hamilton as addressed.

1 Granville to Gladstone [8 Aug.] on rebuke from the Queen, 7 Aug., about ‘the disgraceful conduct’ of the Commons on the Irish Land bill, that they should not send up to the Lords a measure which they cannot conscientiously pass, P.R.O. 30/29/124, not printed.

2 For the Lords’ acquiescence in the Commons’ refusal of some of their amendments in the Irish Land bill and insistence on others, see Hans. Parl. Deb. cclxiv. 1707–9.

3 Granville wrote: ‘Yes, with pleasure. G.’ and returned the letter.

4 mins. by Granville and Gladstone, 16 Aug., on Macdonell to Granville, tel. No. 65, 16 Aug., on his refusal to discuss the matter of the bishop of Gibraltar with the papal secretary of state (P.R.O. 30/29/182), P.R.O. 30/29/124, not printed.

5 i.e. in meeting with Gladstone, Hartington, Cork, Grosvenor, and Wolverton, 7 July; see Godley to Granville, 5 July, P.R.O. 30/29/124; three peers, Tweeddale, Howth, Reay, were given baronies of the United Kingdom; Sir Harcourt Johnstone was raised to the baronage as Lord Derwent, Sir Henry James Tufton as Lord Hothfield, Sir Dudley Marjoribanks as Lord Tweedmouth; an explanation of the postponement of his peerage was sent to Wolseley, Add. MS. 44471, fo. 103.

6 See Bedford to Gladstone, 25 Aug., renewing his wife’s resignation of the mistress-ship of the robes, Add. MS. 44471, fo. 107; and reply, 28 Aug., interpreting his letter
2. I think that as I have once trotted out individually in a letter to Mrs Garfield, it is enough & I had better be in your hands when you send to lament her loss and her country’s. It also occurs to me that our colleagues would like to be included though at first I inclined to the dual message only.

3. I shall expect to hear from you whether you desire Morier or Malet.

522. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Walmer Castle. [30 August 1881].

Hartington, and the India Office, and the (permanent) Foreign Office are strongly in favour of our supporting the Egyptians.

I propose to hold the language of the enclosed minute to Menabrea. The further question whether we should send a ship, in accordance with the request of the Egyptians and with the wish of the India Office, is more doubtful. But I rather incline to do so.

523. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

[Add. MS. 44173, fo. 139]

[Deal Castle]. Aug 30. 81.

I see no objection to your proposed minute if it be consistent with what I have further to say.

I assume Sir J. Pauncefoot [sc. Pauncefoot] to be right in holding that the question of territorial right in this case is one for arbitration.

In that case ought we not decidedly to recommend to both parties to hold their hands with a view to a settlement of that kind?

If both are determined to be on the ground may they not be upon it as English & Americans were I think in San Juan, pending the arbitration? This much I recommend for consideration—As to sending a ship it seems to me a serious matter. It seems to imply that the matter is not one for arbitration but for force, to be used against Italy, and to be used by us single-handed. To all single-handed action by us on Egyptian or quasi-Egyptian territory there seem to be strong objections.

as the 'expression of a high minded scruple' and not as resignation, Add. MS. 44545, fo. 13; and further correspondence, 31 Aug., 5 Sept., Bedford insisting on the resignation, but agreeing to his wife's continuing to act until a successor was appointed, Add. MS. 44471, fos. 151, 173; see p. 283, n. 1.

1 See Gladstone to Mrs. Garfield, 21 July, telegraphed by Lowell, sympathizing with her after the attempt on President Garfield’s life, Add. MS. 44544, fo. 194; and no. 534.

2 Malet was decided on as consul-general at Cairo, but owing to the Egyptian crisis the offer was not finally approved by the Queen until 21 Sept.

3 30 Aug., reasserting the view that the territory to which Italy wished to extend Assab Bay, on the western coast of the Red Sea, belonged to Egypt under Turkey, F.O. 78/3365. Egypt appealed to Britain for support but Gladstone urged successfully that it be withheld, see 'Great Britain and the Planting of Italian Power in the Red Sea', E.H.R. (1944) lix. 223.
524. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Walmer Castle. [31 August 1881].

The plot thickens. Shall I send this answer.¹
Roheita almost adjoins Assab Bey. It is on the coast with an island near it.

525. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Walmer Castle. Sep 8/81.

No 1. I do not understand whether Wolsley [sic] is aware that the Governorship is not vacant till /82, & whether his proposal is that he should not be made a Peer till then.

Childers present proposal² seems to be to make Sir G. W. a Peer and Adjutant General at once.

When the question was first raised, I fully endorsed Childers statement that the professional Peers were nearly all opposed to the Gov, & I then thought that the advent of Sir G. W. would be a great advantage to the Gov.

Since then his peerage has become the secret of the Comedy, & I have doubts whether he will be as useful as I thought.

But the principal feeling of Hartington & me, on reflection, is that it is not a good case on which to have an upstanding fight with the Crown.

It is one on which plausible adverse arguments might easily be raised.

526. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Walmer Castle. Sep 8/81.

1000 thanks for your charming present, which I am delighted to have.
We are all in despair at your visit being over.
You will sleep well after Tyrone.³ It appears to me very important.

¹ i.e. to Cookson (Cairo), tel. No. 42, dispatch No. 158, 1 Sept., dissuading Egypt from sending troops to Raheita, F.O. 78/3365; see also Gladstone’s reply written on no. 524: ‘I have suggested one modification which I think you will not disapprove. Should there not be some comm[unicatio]n to Italian Govt in the sense of moderation. And might there not be some comm[unicatio]n also with France WEG Au 31.8.’
² See to Gladstone, 28 Aug., 4 Sept., sending Wolseley’s request for the governorship of Gibraltar, proposing to recommend him instead for the adjutant-generalship, vacant in Nov., and reasserting the wish to have him in the Lords, Add. MS. 44129, fos. 236, 241; see p. 267, n. 3, nos. 493, 494, and p. 287, n. 5.
³ In the by-election rendered necessary by E. F. Litton’s (liberal) appointment as one of the commissioners under the Irish Land Act, the liberal candidate, T. A. Dickson, won, 8 Sept., the home ruler standing as third candidate gained only 97 out of 7,159 votes cast; see also Gladstone to Granville, tel. 8 Sept., announcing the victory and adding: ‘I think this rather strengthens the argument for some beginning of release [of Irishmen imprisoned under the coercion acts] such as the priest’, P.R.O. 30/29/124; for Gladstone’s pressure for the release of Father Sheehy and the relaxation of coercion, see Hammond, 246-7.
I hope to be in London between eleven & twelve tomorrow, which I hope will be in time to catch you before you are off to Hawarden. It will be desirable for us to have a little talk about Egypt.

I hope my telegram of last night was intelligible and I am glad to see from a F.O. tel., received this morning, that the French seem to attach importance to our steady union & co-operation in Egypt. This seems to me the main matter, so far as the affairs of that country are concerned, & I hope they will not think a Turkish General open to the same objection as Turkish troops. I hope also it may not be long before we get a confidential report on the whole transaction.

I wrote to Mr Hammond, and I have a pleased reply from him.

I forgot to open to you a small matter which puzzles me a little. Dhuleep Singh, who had previously written to me in terms of praise and sympathy in reference to policy abroad, pressed for a short interview before I left town without naming his object, & I did not like to ask him. He came to town for the occasion and his purpose was to present me with a massive silver inkstand of rather elaborate design and of some value. I did not like accepting yet thought I could not refuse. Was I right? Can I do anything beyond perhaps, showing him some civility. Do you think he had any arrière pensée? as Peerage or the like. You may remember we thought of that 7 or 8 years ago, but desisted, I think, from believing him to be opposed to us in politics.

Where Arabi Pasha had revolted, 9 Sept., and the crisis not yet been turned by the appointment of Cherif Pasha, 13 Sept.; for outcome of the conversation see to Adams, No. 877, 10 Sept., on importance of Anglo-French concert over Egypt, F.O. 27/2486.  
1 i.e. to Granville, tel. 9.50 p.m., 11 Sept.: 'I answer. The point is one on which I should agree if our friend of whom I always speak [France] agrees, but not otherwise' answering Granville to Gladstone, tel. 11 Sept., 'Austrian Consul has telegraphed that the Turks have been applied to by the Khedive for their intervention. Rivers Wilson says that a Turkish General carrying an order to the Regiments to be disbanded, would be obeyed, but can we take his word?'; Add. MS. 44173, fo. 146.  
2 Adams to Granville, tel. 11 Sept., F.O. 27/2501.  
3 Adams to Granville, No. 801, 5 Sept., on the French opposition to the dispatch of Turkish troops to Egypt, F.O. 27/2496; cf. D.D.F. iv, no. 123.  
4 To W. O. Hammond, 7 Sept., on Gladstone's visit to his seat, St. Alban's Court, Kent, Add. MS. 44545, fo. 20; reply not traced.  
5 i.e. in Aug. 1873, see Gladstone and Granville, ii, nos. 887, 891, 892, 903, 907, 972, 974, 975.
4. One word more about Egypt. I agree with the Times, subject to correction, in thinking that if any extraneous force is required, it should be Turkish.

Long cipher telegram just come in: will add P.S. if in time.¹

P.S. It is about the Treaty, & unintelligible.

529. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville


I have telegraphed to you today² that I am in readiness to meet you in town on Egyptian matters should there be, in your judgment, occasion for it.

My opinions however as at present advised are in conformity with what I believe to be yours. I sum up thus

1. steady concert with France.
2. Turkish General to go if need be
3. Turkish troops, in preference to any others.
4. No British or French force, unless ships be needful for bonâ fide protection of subjects.
5. Apart from all this, I long for information on the merits of the quarrel; as on them I suppose may depend the ulterior question of reducing, or disbanding, the Army.

Before I go to Leeds,³ I shall wish for your counsel on the question how far I am to be outspoken on two questions.

1. Parnell.
2. Fair trade.

I am ready to go all lengths on both: but on the first I am rather advanced as to Home or local rule, not wishing to stipulate excepting for the supremacy of Parliament, and for not excluding Scotland in principle from any thing offered or done for Ireland.

¹ See Dilke to Granville, tel. 1.30 p.m., 12 Sept., proposing to prolong the existing Anglo-French commercial treaty from Nov. 1881 to Feb. 1882, provided that Britain agreed to the reassembly of the Anglo-French commission for the negotiation of a new treaty; declaration for this purpose, 21 Sept.; Gladstone to Hamilton, tel. 13 Sept., referring to this as undecipherable, but now understood as acceptable, F.O. 27/2539; see nos. 509, 511, 512.

² See note on the docket of no. 529 for text.

³ For Gladstone's visit to Leeds, which he had declined to represent in parliament in 1880 and Herbert Gladstone now represented, 7–8 Oct., and his speech on fair trade, Ireland, foreign and colonial policy, see Morley, iii. 59–61, and below, no. 553.
I have not yet received the letter to which your telegram refers. It will probably arrive this evening.

We agree that the offer of St Hilaire about the treaty must be accepted with the clear understanding that the Commissioners are to be very stiff as to terms. Hartington agrees with me about Assab Bay, but is afraid the Italians will not accept. At the F.O. they think that the Egyptians will kick. I therefore added a sentence to the message, saying that it was probable that the Egyptians would desire some condition against the transit of arms into Abyssinia.

I will telegraph to you tonight or early tomorrow, on the receipt of your letter. I shall of course be ready to run up. But I hope it will not be necessary for you to move.

There seems to be a lull in Egyptian affairs, and I do not think it impossible that it may last.

I agree in all your 5 points.

Malet seems to have gone rather far in his conversation with the Sultan.

We need not of course at present press the French on the subject of a Turkish Commissioner. I hope you will approve of my telegram to Dufferin.

I am against a Peerage for Dhuleep Singh unless which would surprise me, Hartington thinks there is an Indian object.

1 i.e. Gladstone to Granville, tel. 13 Sept.: 'Hold myself in readiness to meet you in town on main subject [Egypt] of my last letter should you see occasion for it. I write by post', P.R.O. 30/29/124.

2 To Adams, No. 262 commercial, 14 Sept., accepting, F.O. 27/2539.

3 See Macdonell to Granville, tel. No. 69, 9 Sept., reporting Italian appeal to Britain to suggest a modus vivendi with Egypt over Assab Bay; Granville to Hartington, tel. 10 Sept., proposing to assist at Cairo and Constantinople the negotiation of an Italo-Egyptian convention; to Macdonell, 13 Sept., replying in this sense, F.O. 78/3365; the convention failed, but an Anglo-Italian exchange of notes, Feb. 1882, established a working agreement; see p. 288, n. 3, and no. 523.

4 Malet visited Constantinople on his way back to Egypt from leave in England in order to confer with Dufferin and was received by the sultan on whom he urged intervention in Egypt, if it became necessary to repress rebellion there, to Granville, No. 246 confidential, 21 Sept., F.O. 78/3324.

5 Granville to Dufferin, tel. No. 430, 14 Sept., instructing him to avoid committing the government over Egypt, and to advise the porte to avoid hasty action but to use pacifying language, F.O. 78/1201.

6 See no. 528.
I do not trust his liberalism. I believe he is in short street and his
civilites & liberal professions may be a little stimulated by his necessities,
& his desire for a Peerage.
If I were you, I would give him my books. The reading of them would
be the making of him.
Hammond called here yesterday, but we were out.

532. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone
[Add. MS. 44173, fo. 154]
Walmer Castle. Sep 15/81.
I shall be quite delighted at your going any length¹ about Fair Trade.
On reflection I am not so sure about Home rule. Would it not be better
to reserve any announcement till you can explain the plan.
It will of course not conciliate Parnell & Co. On the other hand at all
our bye Elections it will be represented as truckling to them.
I am not sure whether you mean that Ireland & Scotland are to have
more local self Gov. But that England is not.
I hope this beautiful weather will clear the crops here.
The opinion here is that the bad weather has cost farmers about 2£ an
acre as compared with what fine weather would have done.

533. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville
[P.R.O. 30/29/124]
I congratulate you on the improved state of affairs in Egypt.
With respect to Parnellism, I should not propose to do more than end[?]²
a severe and strong denunciation² of it by severing him altogether from the
Irish people and the mass of the Irish members and by saying that Home
rule has for one of its senses Local Government, an excellent thing to
which I should affix no limits except the supremacy of the Imperial Parlia-
ment, and the right of all parts of the country to claim whatever might be
accorded to Ireland. This is only a repetition of what I have often said
before, and I have nothing to add or enlarge. But I have the fear that when
the occasion for action comes, which will not be in my time, many Liberals
may perhaps hang back, and may cause further trouble.³
Forster has been here⁴ and is just gone on to Ireland. He is much set
upon releasing suspects as the state of the several districts will bear it.
He also is broad in his ideas as to what will have to be granted to Ireland
in the way of local Government.

¹ At Leeds, see nos. 529 and 553.
² i.e. at Leeds.
³ This paragraph is printed in Morley, iii. 57–58.
⁴ Cf. Gladstone to Granville, tel. 16 Sept., 'Bilateral [Anglo-French commercial]
declaration [p. 291, n. 1] Forster and I agree that the third consideration is [in]admissible
but the rest not open to similar objection', P.R.O. 30/29/124.
Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville


The Queen opens anew the question of the Garter and suggests the Duke of St Albans: thinks Duke of Grafton would not take it: is silent about the proper man. I shall be glad of your advice. My own first impression is to wait a while, perhaps for a second vacancy.

2. I have suggested for Forster’s consideration whether he should circulate some information to the Cabinet on agrarian crime (which has continued large) and release of suspects—although there is not yet any thing to consult on, and very much depends on the first two or three weeks after the Court gets fairly to work.

3. I should think poor Mrs Garfield must receive this rush of innumerable telegraphs with mixed feelings: on the one hand gratitude for the feeling shown, on the other a sense of disturbance at a season which calls for outward tranquillity and inward recollection.

Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Walmer Castle. Sep 25/81.

I do not know West, but made many enquiries about him before proposing his appointment to Washington.

There was some difference of opinion.

Houghton was dead against him, but his authority was somewhat diminished, by his confiding to me that the most successful appointment I could make, would be of himself.

Lyons, who strongly recommended him for the post, had had him as Sec[retar]y of Embassy for 3 years.

Derby recommended him strongly, but reminded me that he was, his brother in law.

West lived with a French woman, had 4 children by her, & then married her—they are I believe legitimate in France.

She is dead, the boys are provided for, the girls have been well brought up at Paris. Lady Derby has chaperoned the eldest in London this year and it appears asked Lady Thornton to enquire whether the [?]other daughter would be received at Washington.

Gladstone to Granville, 22 Sept., informing him of a report that West’s ‘domestic circumstances’ may cause scandal in Washington, where he had just been appointed minister, Add. MS. 44545, fo. 26, not printed; see no. 535.

For the Queen’s wish to defer offering the K.G., vacant by Beaconsfield’s death, and her opposition to the liberal wish to offer it to Derby, see nos. 465, 471, 479, 480, and 536; Grafton invested, Feb. 1883; p. 469, n. 2.

See Gladstone to Forster, 24 Sept., Add. MS. 44159, fo. 22.

President Garfield died, 19 Sept.; cf. no. 521.

See above, n. 3, for letter which Granville answers.
Mrs. Blaine in a charming letter answered that she would be cordially received by herself and by Mrs Garfield, as West's daughter.

In consequence of this, I have given West permission to do as he thinks best, but rather suggesting that he should first ascertain for himself at Washington what he had better do.

Do you see any objection.

536. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone [Add. MS. 44173, fo. 160]
Walmer Castle. Sep 26/81.

I agree about the Garter.
St Albans is hardly the man for it—though there would be no real objection.
If I were you, I should wait for a 2d vacancy although it would not perhaps be necessary to state it.¹
The news from Ireland is certainly not satisfactory yet—
And bad news from South Africa.
Good from Afghanistan and apparently so from Egypt.²
Poor Mrs Garfield—I believe sympathy, if believed to be sincere, is almost always soothing, even in great grief.

537. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville [P.R.O. 30/29/124]

There may be the elements of a scrape in the West affair. But, assuming his general claim to be clearly good, of which of course I am no judge, I do not see that you could set it aside on the ground of immorality; or of impolicy growing out of it, after such condonation on this side [of] the water, and such promises on the other. Only the American people may behave as the Volksraad is said to have behaved.

The question of doubt in my mind would rather be whether it was right—at some former period—to tolerate the course of life whence comes the difficulty, if it was patent.

2. Though thankful for the more remote good in Egypt and in Afghanistan, I am very sore and uneasy about the South African news. It means at least and at once the detention of the force, if there is any thing beyond an appeal to us as matter of reason and justice for alterations; and may mean more. Such are my present impressions: but they are formed in the dark.

¹ See p. 294, n. 2.
² The appointment of Cherif Pasha, 13 Sept., had restored peace in Egypt; the friendly ameer in Afghanistan had defeated, 22 Sept., news received 26 Sept., the pretender, Ayoub Khan; Zululand was reported restless, and the Volksraad in the Transvaal was making difficulties in ratifying the convention of Pretoria; see The Times, 26 Sept., p. 114, for long report of Irish outrages.
3. You have probably seen Parnell's speech. Law says it is within the Act. Forster asks me what we ought to do if he does the like in the provinces. I reply he ought to have the same measure of justice as others: and I do not see the difference between Dublin & the provinces.

[P.S.] The demonstrations yesterday were really most remarkable.

538. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

[Add. MS. 44173, fo. 164]

18, Carlton House Terrace [sc. Walmer]. Oct 1. [1881].

If the enclosed does not clash with what you wrote, please send it over to the Resident Clerk.

Do not let us be baulked. Shall I propose ourselves to Brocket. I am afraid you would think the 2 journeys to Walmer long for so short a time.

539. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

[Add. MS. 44173, fo. 165]


I have desired the report of my conversation with the French Chargé d'Affaires on Egypt should be sent to you. I am almost sure that you will not disapprove.

Dufferin seems to have been less well informed than Tissot as to the Sultan's intention.

1 At the Land League convention in Dublin, advocating test cases by the Land League before full use was made of the Land Act and the court it established.


3 Dalhousie accepted the K.T., vacant by the death of Lord Airlie, cf. Add. MS. 44472, fo. 91; Fife had been made K.T. on Lord Seafield's death, 24 Mar.; see also Godley to Granville, 29 Sept., P.R.O. 30/29/124; it was first offered to Rosebery, 2 Oct., Add. MS. 44545, fo. 31.

4 Not traced.

5 See to Lyons, No. 952A most confidential, 1 Oct., recording a French communication that Turkey had not abandoned her intention of sending a Turkish general to Egypt (no. 528), the French opposition and counter-proposal to send identical instructions to French and British consuls in Cairo and a French and a British general, F.O. 27/2486.

6 But see to Gladstone, tel. 7 p.m., 1 Oct., 'Dufferin telegraphs that the Sultan has decided to send an officer to Egypt. I propose to reply that as the crisis is past and after assurances given that the incident is closed we hear this decision with great surprise and wish to know with what object and in what capacity he is sent', P.R.O. 30/29/124; and Gladstone's reply, agreeing, Add. MS. 44173, fo. 166.
It is very unlucky that he should settle to send a Turkish representative. I suppose that the orders which we should propose at their request to be sent to the 2 consuls should be to advise the Viceroy to receive the representative of the Suzerain with all respect, but not to permit him to interfere in any way with the internal administration of the country. 1

541. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone [Add. MS. 44173, fo. 167] Walmer Castle. Oct 2/81. I send you some letters which came together from Dilke. 2 I doubt it being necessary for you to read anything, excepting two extracts which Sanderson has copied in a more legible hand. Of the alternative instructions, which he suggests, I like the 2d best. 3 I do not think our case is strong against specific duties.

542. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville [P.R.O. 30/29/124] Hawarden Castle. Oct 2. 81. midnight. I agree, as you anticipate, with all you have said in your draft. 4 I also agree with Lyons: and with B. St Hilaire's dispatch to Lacour until he comes to the proposal to send two Generals. 5 We may however I think distinguish between sending them now to which you have shown the objection; and sending them to administer, apart from this crisis. I do not say this should be done, but it is not open to the same objections.

I should have felt we could take very strong ground against any interference whatever from the Sultan, had it not been for the precedent set by our predecessors who, wrongly as I suppose, called in his pretended power as Suzerain to depose the late Khedive.

Still I think we may join with France in opposing strongly, as you say, any interference of the Turkish Emissary with administration, while he should be received with personal respect.

1 See to Lyons, tel. No. 360, 4 Oct., instructing as here proposed, F.O. 27/2500; and dispatch No. 960, 4 Oct., reporting Anglo-French agreement on the dangers of Turkish intervention in Egypt, and reserved British reply to the French counter-proposal, F.O. 27/2487; see also no. 545.
2 Dilke to Granville, Paris, 28 Sept., 30 Sept., on the need for a fresh adjournment of the Anglo-French commission which had resumed its sittings after France had offered concessions in the specific duties equivalent to the old ad valorem duties (see nos. 509, 511, 512) and agreed to renew the existing treaty (see p. 201, n. 1, and p. 203, n. 4); and proposing alternative instructions to the commissioners, Add. MS. 44173, fos. 169—72, P.R.O. 30/29/121; cf. correspondence with royal commissioners, F.O. 27/2545.
3 Gladstone agreed, see min. on the back of no. 541.
4 See no. 540 and Gladstone to Granville, tel., P.R.O. 30/29/124.
5 i.e. the proposal to send a French and a British general.
I shall be also glad if you can arrange for some joint act with France which may have the effect of discouraging Bismarck's intrigues.¹

543. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

[Add. MS. 44545, fo. 31]

[COPY]


I send you herewith a long & saddening letter from Forster with my reply.² Please let them go on to Hartington for perusal.

Derby's articles,³ perfectly inoffensive as towards us, tend I fear to emboldening agitation & weakening the law.

544. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

[Add. MS. 44173, fo. 173]


Errington after consulting the Cardinal Secretary, has sent me the accompanying note and enclosure.⁴

There are some points in the Cardinal's letter, which are not quite accurate representations of my conversations with Errington, but I do not know that they require a rectification.

I did not express sympathy, deference, and interest for the Holy See. & I did not admit the impossibility of the Pope receiving communications from our Embassy at Rome, which he is actually doing.

I am not sure whether the draft of letter of officious credence to Errington is right.

Please look at it.

545. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

[Add. MS. 44173, fo. 175]


I have telegraphed to Malet to ask whether he can suggest any useful or harmless action that we can take with France.⁵

¹ See no. 545.


³ See Lord Derby, 'Ireland and the Land Act', arguing that it would be wrong to suppose the problem of Ireland solved, since the question of home rule remained, Nineteenth Century, Oct. 1881, x. 473.

⁴ None of Granville's correspondence with Errington (unofficial representative with the Pope) has been traced. It was private and might have been found in P.R.O. 30/29/149 (general C–E) or 182 (Italy), or the unbound 22 A, 26 A, 29 A.

⁵ See to Malet, tel. No. 58, 4 p.m., 4 Oct.; and reply, tel. No. 75, 5 Oct., recommending a joint Anglo-French communication that their representatives were instructed to assist in maintaining the independence of the khedive against any attempt of the Turkish envoys to control his administration, F.O. 78/3327; for British and French dissuasion of Turkey from sending a general, see Granville to Dufferin, Nos. 688, 691, 2, 4 Oct., F.O. 78/3272; see p. 296, n. 6.
The instructions to our Consuls, which I suppose the French will accept will have that effect.

I do not like the idea of the two Generals—& it would be unpopular here.

Although it has acted well in one sense up to this time & though I think it prudent to continue it, there is much to be said against England & France mixing so much in the affairs of Egypt, & I doubt whether we ought to extend this interference.

546. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone


I am very glad you mean to have a Cabinet.¹

I think it quite right, & [it] will strengthen Forster much in whatever decision is taken.

547. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville


I send you a long letter from the Chancellor,² with my reply. Under the circumstances of the time, the case is embarrassing enough.

548. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville


I do not think you are bound to take notice of Cardinal Jacobini’s expressions in a letter addressed to Mr Errington as if they were addressed to yourself: nevertheless I have suggested a few words in pencil on p. 2 of your draft, which perhaps you may not dislike.³

2. I observe that Drummond Hay in discussing the Morocco question says nothing on a very important point: have the French any case or is it simple ambition & aggression?⁴

3. I suppose Lyons will be informed of all this & could he not suggest

² To Gladstone, 2 Oct., on his doctor’s prescription of absolute rest until mid-Nov. which would make his attendance at Nov. cabinets impossible; and reply, 4 Oct., that his opinion might be wanted on measures to deal with Irish disorder, Add. MS. 44297, fos. 191, 195.
³ See p. 298, n. 4.
⁴ To Granville, No. 15 commercial, 9 Sept., received 17 Sept., reporting an agreement between the French consul at Mogador and a local chief opening the coast south of Agadir to French trade and suggesting the French were weakening the sultan’s authority in order to carry out their ambitions in north Africa; see F.O. 99/217.
the expediency of moderation about Morocco as a help to thorough understanding & cooperation in Egypt: do not reply but simply take this for what it is worth.¹

4. Our rules in Egypt I presume to be to act in concord with France, to aim at a minimum of interference, and work for the good of Egypt itself.

5. Do you think the hitch in Thessaly serious?² I shall be glad if this matter settles itself while I am at Leeds.


You saw Dilke’s letter to me.³

I return that which Chamberlain sent you.⁴

I add one from Baxter, and a minute of Mr Lee, Dilke’s private Secretary, as to Lord Lyons views.

I am inclined to agree with the Commissioners against Lord Lyons, but the latter is higher authority on the political aspects of the question.

Of the alternatives proposed by Dilke & Baxter, I like Baxter’s second the best.


This is very serious, but not unexpected.

He⁵ would be an immense loss in the Cabinet, in the Lords, & in the country.

I am afraid I am not very sanguine as to the perfect recovery in Novr. I thought there was a loss of power the whole session.

He evidently wants to continue in office. It would be difficult to hasten his resignation at present, even if it were desirable. Have you made any decision as to a possible successor.

¹ Cf. from Lyons, No. 944, 19 Oct., reporting the execution of instructions to warn France that Britain attached importance to Moroccan independence, but not connecting it with Egypt, F.O. 27/2497; cf. also negotiations leading to the entente of 1904, e.g., Cromer to Lansdowne, 17 July, G. P. Gooch and H. Temperley, British Documents on the Origins of the War (1927) ii, no. 359.
² See p. 258, n. 2; and Dufferin to Granville, Nos. 820, 832, 20, 25 Sept., reporting the completion of Turkish evacuation of the parts of Thessaly ceded to Greece, except for Volo, F.O. 78/3285.
³ i.e. on French commercial negotiations, see no. 541.
⁴ See Hamilton to Sanderson, 5 Oct., sending Chamberlain to Gladstone, 4 Oct., supporting Dilke’s opposition to the resumption of negotiations, except on condition of promise of concessions on cottons and woollens (text in Add. MS. 44125, fo. 98), P.R.O. 30/29/124.
⁵ i.e. Lord Selborne, see nos. 547 and 564.
Coleridge—no accession of strength—I think the contrary.
James better, but no great shakes.
Jessel stronger than all of them in legal matters, but a dreadful bore in public speaking, & I believe not handy in political matters—besides being a Jew.
I suppose some people would suggest Harcourt.

551. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

[Add. MS. 44173, fo. 182]

I have only read the account of your really triumphant entry.¹ I am dying to see your speech.
Thanks for improvements on draft to Errington.²
As to Morocco, I presume that Drummond Hay would admit that the French can easily find a case—but that this would not prevent the practical inconveniences of the act—the breaking up of the Empire (over which we have now the principal European influence) [,] the action of Spain.
I asked Lyons, when here, whether he could not introduce the matter confidentially to the attention of the Fr. Gov. He thought it better not to do so at once, but promised to bear it in mind. I will send him D. Hay’s letter.
I like your formula about Egypt.
I do not think the hitch in Thessaly very serious, although there may be great temptation to the Porte, the position being very important.

552. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

[Add. MS. 44173, fo. 184]

You approved of the idea of a Viscountcy for Lyons. The Queen is sure to approve.
Lyons may be surprised if the compliment is paid, that it should not be an Earldom, as was given to my father & to Cowley, when Ambassadors at Paris. But the first was already a Viscount, & the 2d was the negotiator of a great European Treaty, whose colleague Clarendon was I believe offered a Marquisate.
Will you write to him or shall I sound him in your name.³

¹ i.e. into Leeds.
² See no. 548.
³ See Gladstone to Lyons, 22 Oct., congratulating on the viscountcy, after Granville’s sounding and the Queen’s sanction, Add. MS. 44545, fo. 40; and Lyons to Gladstone, 25 Oct., on his pleasure in accepting, Add. MS. 44472, fo. 169; created 24 Nov.
553. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone  

One line to wish you joy. We read with delight your two speeches.\(^1\) They will do immense good.

I hardly know what to say as to your allusion to me.\(^2\) But it has touched me deeply.

I send you a note of Dilke's about a successor to Baxter.\(^3\) We can talk it over next week as also whether there should be any conditions sent to Lyons.\(^4\)

554. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville  
[Copy]  

I think, associated as you are with Lyons, it will be much better that you sh[oul]d write to him: but pray say a word for me in the offer, because though he has never had a chance of sharing in any very conspicuous European transaction, I have through so many years have [sic] been so deeply sensible of his singular fairness, his great perspicacity, & the perfect balance of his mind. In consequence of Dufferin's Telegrams about Bismarck's plotting,\(^5\) I have directed a Tel. in cypher to be sent to D from myself, the terms of wh[ich] you will not I think disapprove. Everything at Leeds was most satisfactory (except a touch of lumbago not yet off me): including eminently the enthusiasm of 25,000 men in the Cloth Hall yesterday for my son Herbert, whom they always call by that name & whom I think they really love. I hope you will not disapprove my speeches, except their length, but I had really a good deal to say. Thanks for your timely information. I close here as we are to meet so soon.

---

\(^1\) At Leeds, 7 Oct.; the second at the Old Cloth Hall administered the warning to Parnell that 'the resources of civilisation against its enemies are not yet exhausted', see The Times, 8 Oct., p. 6a; and no. 529.

\(^2\) For Gladstone's allusion, at Leeds, to his own retirement and the confidence with which he would leave the charge he had borne in Granville's hands, to Granville's great abilities, his devotion to the country and his capacity to serve it, and somewhat less warm allusion to Hartington, see The Times, 8 Oct., p. 6b.

\(^3\) Not traced, but see Dilke to Granville, Toulon, 9 Oct., repeating proposal to appoint J. K. Cross and A. Illingworth vice Baxter to the royal commission for the commercial negotiations with France; and 13 Oct., arguing against Gladstone's suggestion of Sir T. Brassey; and 17 Oct., adhering to his preference for two men, Cross and Illingworth, P.R.O. 30/29/121; see also no. 558.

\(^4\) For Dilke's, Chamberlain's, and Baxter's wish to attach conditions to the resumption of commercial negotiations with France; Lyons's wish, on political grounds, for their unconditional renewal; the cabinet decision, 12 Oct., to resume without conditions; see Granville to Dilke, tels. 10, 12 Oct., and letter, 17 Oct., and Dilke to Granville 13, 24 Oct., ibid.; see also p. 297, n. 2.

\(^5\) See Dufferin to Granville, tel. No. 392 confidential, 8 Oct., reporting that Germany, and perhaps Russia, were seeking to excite the sultan's apprehensions of British designs against Egypt, F.O. 78/3293.
555. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville


I thank you cordially for your note of the 7th but I am after all in one very real sense an intruder & an interloper, and I will venture to say it was quite as great a pleasure to me to have an opportunity of doing justice at Leeds in an emphatic way, as it could be to you that I should have made use of the occasion.

I was told that I dropped my voice unconsciously in naming Hartington, and that some of the audience did not catch the word. On this account, I took an opportunity at the luncheon on Saturday of referring without any detail to the two names together.

It is really a wonderful community at Leeds.

The point raised in the Lyons letter of the 7th as to an unconditional meeting of the Commission is a nice one which I should be quite willing to leave in your hands, but which you will probably take advantage of the Cabinet to mention.¹

Although the subjects of Ireland and the Transvaal are very grave, yet I think & hope they will not call for prolonged discussion, the right course being in each case pretty clear.

The Q. was well satisfied as to what I told her of my intentions at Leeds. She wrote to caution me:² as, she civilly said, she used to caution the late Government.

556. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone


As Lyons’ policy has been adopted by us, we had better carry it out according to his views.³

557. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville


My public appearances have had, my office considered, a tendency to excess: and I have been considering whether I might not excuse myself from the Guildhall on Lord Mayors Day,⁴ making my appearance in

² See the Queen to Gladstone, 2 Oct., and reply, 2 Oct., and second letter, 4 Oct., Guedalla, ii. 169–70.
³ i.e. on the commercial negotiations with France, p. 302, n. 4; Gladstone wrote: ‘I quite agree. His comments are ably put. O. 16’, and returned the letter; Granville noted: ‘We shall defer sending instructions till Lyons and Dilke have discussed the situation.’
⁴ Gladstone attended after all and spoke on Ireland and on parliamentary procedure, see The Times, 10 Nov., p. 6c, and below, no. 560.
London a day or two after. I should be so very glad too to leave the management of the occasion in your hands and Hartington’s. Pray think of this.

We go to Knowsley next week for three nights: there I shall probably receive a small deputation from Liverpool.

In Lascelles’s letter on the affair of Bulgaria,¹ I do not seem to detect any overflowing sympathy with freedom.

I am glad there is a hope that the Liberal forces may be found after all too strong for the Prince.

I am laid up with cold on the chest but hope it may not be long-lived.

558. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

[Add. MS. 44173, fo. 188]


I am so sorry that you have caught a chill.

I trust that the liveliness of my sympathy is not owing to my having done the same. It has attacked some of the parts, which were weakened by the last attack of gout—heel & knee.

I propose to send no instructions to Dilke or to Lyons till they have met & talked the matter over about the Treaty negotiations.

I have asked Dilke whether it is necessary to appoint any new commissioner.²

A note has crossed mine, in which he rather suggests the same thing.

559. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

[P.R.O. 30/29/124]


My cold was I think simply the result of excessive exertion of the throat in the Cloth Hall at Leeds: the greatest physical effort I ever made—Strong measures have brought me through really with great rapidity. But I am extremely sorry to hear you are suffering, especially if the new enemy should contrive to ally himself with any dregs of the old one. Your temper is proof against any thing: but I find age & official business, plus indisposition, an awkward & embarrassing trio.

I quite agree in your mode of proceeding about the Commercial Treaty with France.

Thomson’s last Telegram relieves me: our suggestion about Ayoub’s

¹ See to Granville, No. 146, 4 Oct., received 17 Oct., describing the new council of state and the diminution through its appointment of the full powers conferred upon the prince, F.O. 78/3310.

² See to Dilke, tel. 17 Oct., P.R.O. 30/29/121, and p. 302, n. 3, and below, no. 560.
residence was reasonable, and a refusal would have been suspicious as well as unpleasant.\(^1\)

With your permission, I should like to tell Godley to show Morley the article in the Neue Freie Presse of Oct 2 lately sent by Fraser from Vienna.\(^2\) He might find on it remarks friendly to Austria, \& encourage her to found her rivalry with Russia in the Balkan Peninsula, so far as it need exist, upon honest endeavours to win the good will of the populations by respecting their interests and rights.

I should like to write fully about Ireland but I am still in the arrear \& confusion due to my laying up.

O'Hagan retires—and I have agreed, not without difficulty, that Sullivan \textit{not} Law shall be Chancellor.\(^3\) It is a question of the greater capacity against \textit{far} the greater service.

The Proclamation\(^4\) was issued without my assent, but I approve of it. Indeed our experience seems to me to be supporting a good deal my original view in favour of working against the Land League instead of getting the present Act: of course I mean working by a strong \textit{Act}.

No new point of doubt has arisen in the Transvaal and the Boers are now rather dirtily haggling about L S D—We simply hold our ground.\(^5\) Get well \& soon.

560. \textit{Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone} [Add. MS. 44173, fo. 191]


If the question of health is involved, I have not a word to say.

But if this is not so, I am very strong against your plan. It would be a great disappointment to the public, and would be very awkward for Harty Tarty \& me.\(^6\)

After the magnificent speeches you have lately made, and especially

---

\(^1\) See from Thomson, tel. No. 64, 20 Oct., replying to Granville's tel. No. 26, 17 Oct., that he had obtained assurances from the shah that the refugee pretender to the Afghan throne would not be allowed to live near the Afghan frontier, F.O. 60/439.

\(^2\) See Fraser to Granville, No. 409, 3 Oct., sending the extract from the \textit{Neue Freie Presse}, repelling a suggestion in \textit{The Times} that Austria might, with British approval, make further encroachments in the Balkan peninsula, F.O. 7/1017; and Sanderson to Godley, 25 Oct., sending him the extract for Morley and asking him to speak in the sense of no. 559, Add. MS. 44472, fo. 173.


\(^4\) i.e. against the Land League.

\(^5\) The financial clauses of the convention of Pretoria, 3 Aug. (x, xi), provided that the Transvaal should take over the debts for which the South African Republic was liable up to the annexation and the expenditure, £265,000, incurred by Britain on its behalf since the annexation.

\(^6\) See no. 557.
after the striking effect produced the other day in the city1 a very short simple speech from you would be enough.

There seem to be objections of one sort or another to all who have been mentioned to succeed Baxter.

Dilke you will have seen agrees with me that unless we find an unobjectionable man, we may as well not fill up the place.2

I have not got a great deal of gout but what I have completely cripples me.

I am carried from my bed to my sofa.

561. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

[Add. MS. 44173, fo. 194]


I have asked Godley to speak to Morley as you suggest.

I am better today and therefore do not write to you a letter, which I flatter myself you would (erroneously) regret to receive.

There is a phrase in your letter which I am inclined to glaze, & frame in gold.

O'Hagan telegraphed to my alarm, that he would come here today to ask my advice.

I was much relieved. He is in perfect ecstasy with your letter.3 He only wished to know whether there was any objection to his going for a time to Rome. I told him what had been settled about Errington and that I thought the presence of so distinguished an Irish Catholic as himself, could only be of great use to Errington.

I suppose Sullivan is a stronger man than Law.

562. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

[Add. MS. 44173, fo. 200]

Walmer Castle. [30 October 1881].

Two criticisms have been made to me on your statement4 as to agricultural losses, which I could not answer.

1 For Gladstone's speech, 13 Oct., on the falling of legislation into arrears owing to Irish obstruction, on his hope for a bill on London local government, deploiring the state of Ireland, announcing Parnell's arrest, and advocating so much local government for Ireland as did not impair the imperial parliament's supremacy, see The Times, 14 Oct., p. 8a.

2 See no. 558, and Gladstone's min. for reply (untraced): 'Ask Lyons about new commissioner. Give in about Guildhall. Sorry you suffer.'

3 Gladstone to O'Hagan, 20 Oct., volunteering an assurance that he did not ever suspect that his resignation might be due to any difference of opinion over policy, Add. MS. 44472, fo. 135.

4 See Gladstone's speech to the Liverpool Liberal Association at Knowsley, where he was Derby's guest, 27 Oct., on the aims of Irish policy to maintain liberty, law, and order and the true interests of the Irish people, The Times, 28 Oct., p. 8a.
31 October 1881

1° that you had overstated the amount of loss, inasmuch as you took the whole amount of importation of food, whereas you ought only to have taken the excess over the minimum amount which is always imported.

the 2°. Criticism is the other way. It is argued that far from a saving being affected by the bad weather, it has cost more than 25/100 more labour, besides the loss of a month's work of horses & men in preparing the land for next year's crops.

Do not answer this, but I will repeat the question when we meet, which I now hope to be able to do, as the gout is moving away.

I liked your Liverpool speech exceedingly.

563. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone


Ponsonby has written to me privately by the Queen's desire, telling me to suggest a successor whom she could propose to you as a successor to the Duchess of Bedford.

As she wants a Duchess, & gives reasons against all, the task is not easy.

I have written a letter to the Duke of Bedford, which you could not have written, but I doubt its being of more avail than the previous communications.

I will discuss names, when we meet.

My gout is certainly better.

564. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville


I will reserve my answers: but I write to say that so far as I can see there will be no occasion nor work at present for a prolonged series of Cabinets, for I do not think that things are yet in such a state as to enable the Govt. practically to forecast a great deal of its Sessional work.

The Chancellor is much better.

I name 2 Pm for the Cabinet on the 10th as I think many may come up on that day.

1 i.e. to the deputation from Liverpool at Knowsley.
2 Granville to Gladstone, 30 Oct., approving his refusal to A. Arnold to be a guest of honour at a banquet organized by the Greek Committee to celebrate the completion of the territorial cession from Turkey, Add. MS. 44173, fo. 198, not printed.
3 Not traced; see p. 287, n. 6, and nos. 566, 569, 918, 921.
4 See Selborne to Gladstone, 29 Oct., on his improved health and his intention to come to London on 9 Nov., and to attend whatever cabinets it was thought desirable he should, Add. MS. 44297, fo. 210; and above, nos. 547, 550.
565. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Walmer Castle. Nov 1 81.

Ponsonby has sent again to say that he thinks the Queen inclines to the Duchess of Roxburghe.¹

I presume this would do if she proposes it.

[P.S.] I have just got your note.

I know of nothing for Cabinets, unless you wish to name a committee for considering Parliamentary practice. Hartington I believe would like to have a central Asian Treaty discussed.

I am delighted to hear of the Chancellor.

566. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

Hawarden Castle. Nov. 2. 81.

Many thanks for taking the Duchesses off my back.

Lady Derby assured me that in answer to a question put plump the Duke of Bedford declared he had no intention of breaking his connection with the Liberal party. He says this thing is done on grounds not political.

The most important question now standing for discussion next week² is whether the Cabinet ought to give to Parliamentary Procedure a precedence next year over legislative measures. And Parl. procedure divides itself into two great and separable branches

1. Restraint of individual members
2. Devolution of portions of duty.

In ‘oversea’ affairs we seem to have a kind of lull such as preceded the Franco-German War.

I hope you are getting on, and I wish much to speak [to] you in London on personal matters and prospects.

567. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Walmer Castle. [3 November 1881].

I do not know on what grounds we can object³—are there any.

¹ Gladstone wrote here: ‘Quite satisfied. I do not know whether D[uchess]s of Leinster should be borne in mind. N.3.’ and returned the letter; Ponsonby’s letter not traced; the Duchess of Bedford remained (see no. 569), and a new appointment was unnecessary.

² For cabinet, 10 Nov., which decided on the basis of a mem. by Sir E. May that parliamentary procedure should be the main business for 1882, referred Irish and Scottish local government to a cabinet committee, and discussed the Transvaal, Ireland, and Central Asia, see Add. MS. 44642, fo. 220.

³ i.e. to German compliance with the Sultan’s request for German instructors for his army; Gladstone returned the letter, writing on it: ‘I am for assenting, & making the useful addition you suggest. W.E.G. N. 3’; tels., 5 and 6 Nov., accordingly sent to Ampthill and Dufferin; cf. p. 217, n. 3.
Shall we agree, or shall we thank for communication, & say we have no observations to make.

or shall we say, that we trust if they grant the request, that they will press on the Turkish Gov the importance of making the army less costly as well as more efficient.

568. **Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville**

[F.O. 78/3272]  
[Hawarden Castle]. 6: Nov/81.

You will I hope notice the dispatch of Dufferin No 905\(^1\) in which the Sultan

1. reproaches us for not fulfilling the Berlin stipulations favourable to Turkey

2. boasts of his own ready fulfilment of the counter stipulations

3. threatens not to behave so well in future.

Would it not be right to point out that it is the business of the Porte to make proposals on (i)—to invite them to specify what reasonable project has ever been refused or discouraged by us—and to deprecate in the strongest manner these references to past conduct which in regard to many points could only lead to controversial correspondence of a painful character.\(^2\)

If you come to town by Tuesday—and I hope your health will offer no impediment—I shall be glad to come to you if I may on Wednesday.

569. **Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone**

[Add. MS. 44173, fo. 204]  

The Duke of Bedford withdraws his resignation of the Duchess' office.\(^3\)

He says it is not creditable to himself to do so.

He stipulates that she may be permitted to resign, if the principles of the Irish Act are applied to England.

I have thanked him in your name & mine—told him that after he had made the offer, the responsibility rested primarily with you, & secondarily with me in consequence of the part, which I have taken—and I have asked

---

\(^1\) i.e. to Granville, No. 905, 13 Oct., F.O. 78/3286.

\(^2\) See Granville to Dufferin, No. 765, 25 Nov., arguing that the Turkish complaints were groundless and ending with Gladstone's proposed words, F.O. 78/3272; No. 568 is with this draft and is followed by a mem. from Tenterden, 8 Nov., doubting the wisdom of noticing the sultan's ill-humour, but supplying the arguments used in the draft; see also no. 307.

\(^3\) See Bedford to Granville, 5 Nov., and reply, copy, 6 Nov., both as here described P.R.O. 30/29/148; see also p. 287, n. 6, and no. 563.
leave to join the Duchess, when the contingency occurs to which he alludes.
I have telegraphed to the Queen.¹

570. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Walmer Castle. Nov 14/81.

I am glad the Montgomery note prospered.²
I answered a somewhat similar note from the Duke,³ by saying that if the occasion occurred, I should deeply regret it, but that I should not [regret] my indiscreet interposition.
But I should think the course you propose for yourself is the best.

571. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

Hawarden. Nov. 15. 1881. (sent N. 21).

By way of sequel to our recent conversation, I wish to put some ideas before you.⁴

1. Would you think it a very great object to bring Derby, supposing him to be willing, into the Government? There occurs to me as possible one way of doing it, which might associate it with a change in the War Office agreeable to Her Majesty. (Remember what F. Cavendish told me as to Hartington & the burden of the India Office.)
   a. W.E.G. lays down the Ch. of Ex[chequer]ship.
   b. Childers to be C. of E.
   c. H[artington] to be Minister of War.
   d. Derby to be Sec. for India.
   H’s willingness would have to be ascertained first, and D’s second. The change would do less than justice to F. Cavendish, but he would I am

¹ Not traced; but see Ponsonby to Granville, 8 Nov., saying that if the Duke meant to imply that he was doing what he thought was wrong at the Queen’s bidding, she would rather he did not sacrifice himself; and, 9 Nov., that the business was likely to turn out all right, P.R.O. 30/29/39.
² See Gladstone to A. Montgomery, 12 Nov., explaining that West would succeed Sir C. Herries as chairman of the Inland Revenue Board, in the expectation that Montgomery himself, who had been a member since the Board’s institution, would not want the office, Add. MS. 44545, fo. 52.
³ See Gladstone to Bedford, 7 Nov., expressing pleasure at his note to Granville and reassuring against any proposal of an Irish Land Act for England, Add. MS. 44545, fo. 49; and Bedford to Gladstone, 11 Nov., on his readiness to support the government, Add. MS. 44473, fo. 39.
⁴ Cf. Granville to the Queen, copy, 5 Nov., seeking to remove the Queen’s suspicions that intended changes in the cabinet, including Gladstone’s resignation, were being concealed from her, P.R.O. 30/29/31, Letters, iii. 246–7.
sure make no difficulty and there would in all likelihood be early opportunities of giving him his due.

2. If any thing of this kind were done before the Session begins, I think it would imply my remaining in the post of First Lord until next Autumn. This is not what I could wish; but, if health and strength be continued, there are arguments for it: among them this that the change of leadership in H. of C. and headship of the Govt., with consequent changes, may be most safely & conveniently conducted during the Recess.

I have two other observations to make.

3. Forster, anticipating in Ireland I think for the winter improvement but not quietude, seems also to anticipate the necessity for a stronger and more independent initiative on the spot than present arrangements would supply, i.e. a new Lord Lieutenant. Pray revolve this in your mind.

4. My last word bears upon the general argument. We ought to recollect that the Duke of Devonshire’s life becomes less ‘valuable’ in the sense of Insurance Offices every year. Any risks attending change of leadership can in my opinion be safely faced, all cooperating for that purpose, while Hartington is on the ground. But in case of Hartington’s removal then indeed I am utterly non-plussed as to the succession. Were the leadership once in his hands, things would settle and adjust themselves afresh around him. (I look upon Dilke as a probable future leader; but only after an apprenticeship in the Cabinet.) Now I think that, upon principles of providence, this argument tells materially against indefinite delay on my part. We are at this moment capitally provided in both Houses but great uncertainty as to its continuance.

572. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

Hawarden Castle. Nov. 21. 81.

I send herewith for your perusal copy of a letter from Forster and of my reply.¹

Also a telegram received in cipher from the Queen today and my reply.²

Also a letter for ruminations.³ It is tentative and provocative, and does not as you will see express any fixed conclusion of my own.

Rosebery has been with us in privacy for a few days. In this light, or twilight, he shows even better than in the glare.

I hope you have no more gouty troubles.

¹ i.e. 20 Nov., suggesting his resignation of the chief secretaryship for Ireland when law and order had been restored; reply, 21 Nov., alluding to the possibility of his own retirement. Add. MS. 44159, fos. 102, 106; cf. T. Wemyss Reid, The Life of William E. Forster (1888) ii. 367-9.

² Not traced; on the Duke of Albany’s marriage.

³ i.e. no. 571.
I have written to Sir K. Mackenzie to make the offer.¹
Many thanks for Leveson's note.² I promise not to examine him in the Primer for several years.

573. **Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone**

Walmer Castle. Nov 21/81.

I go to town tomorrow Ch. Lacour will formally ask me to suspend for six months the agreement that the French flag will be hauled down in the plains of Ruateia [sic] on the 31st of Decr if by that time we come to no agreement about the Newfoundland Fisheries.³

I send you a note from Kimberley on the subject.⁴

In the meantime I propose to tell Ch. Lacour that in consequence of the change of Gov in France,⁵ we will consent to a further prolongation of one month.

Pray let me know what you think of this by telegram, and whether you are able to give an opinion on Kimberley's proposal.

574. **Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville**

Hawarden Castle. Nov. 22. 1881.

I return Kimberley's letter. You have had my answer by telegraph.⁶

I trouble you with the inclosed chiefly on account of Selborne's suggestion about Bramwell. The other letters are about a Baronetcy for Phillimore; to which I incline. Forster wishes a Baronetcy for Sullivan. It is rare to make legal Baronets: but it seems a reasonable thing, in proper cases.

It is quite possible the Queen may send for me.

¹ To Mackenzie, 21 Nov., offering the lord lieutenancy of Rosshire, Add. MS. 44545, fo. 58; appointed 3 Dec.
² From Granville's nine-year-old son, thanking for the present of a Latin primer, Add. MS. 44173, fo. 207.
³ See Gambetta to Challemel Lacour, 21 Nov., instructing him to make the proposal on the ground of the suspension of negotiations about the French rights in the Newfoundland fisheries and the Tahiti group of islands, of which Raheitea was one, *D.D.F.* iv, no. 193; see below, p. 313, n. 1.
⁴ Of 20 Nov., on the groundlessness of French complaints that, by authorizing grants of land and giving the inhabitants representation in the assembly, Britain was infringing the treaty of Utrecht and the rights of France on the Newfoundland coast, and on his wish to get rid of the treaty by buying the French out, P.R.O. 30/29/135.
⁵ Gambetta replaced Ferry as prime minister and Barthélemy St. Hilaire as foreign minister on 14 Nov.
⁶ Gladstone's tel. 22 Nov., replied that he did not know the merits of the question, but Granville's intention seemed reasonable and continued: 'Your inclosure. Should like to hear both sides. Why should not other party buy the land they want. Summon me to town if you find occasion', P.R.O. 30/29/124.
⁷ Selborne to Gladstone, 20 Nov., suggesting a peerage for Sir George Bramwell on his retirement, Add. MS. 44297, fo. 214; Bramwell was given a barony, 3 Feb. 1882, see no. 578; and Sullivan and Phillimore, baronetcies, 28 Dec. 1881.
575. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

[I.O. 30/29/124]


I took [upon] myself to give a delay of 6 months, which was to be final, for the pulling down of the French flag.

All the best heads in the F.O. & the Col: Office were in favour of the longer period.

I did not comply with Kimberley’s wish that I should sound Ch. Lacour as to the willingness of the French Gov to be bought out by the Colony—a little time is required to consider this question. There can be no occasion for you to come up at present.

You will receive a copy of the letter which I gave to Ch. Lacour, & the account of my conversation with him.¹

I have rece[ive]d your secret box and beg you to allow me a little time to reflect on it.

I go to Wolverton’s for a day or two on Saturday. I am better thanks than I was.

576. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

[Hawarden Castle. Nov. 24. 81.]

I am sorry to perceive that your improved bulletin is only comparative. The Queen will I think have me for an audience about the 30th. You may then, I see, still be in the offing.

If there is no objection to her seeing Crowe’s letter, which Dilke suggests your burning, I cannot but suggest that it should be sent to her for obvious reasons.²

Matters in Ireland worsen. I strongly urge upon Forster (who seems to keep his head quite cool) keeping his colleagues informed.

577. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone³

[Add. MS. 44173, fo. 214]


I am sure you will not misunderstand me, nor think I am unmindful of what is due to you, if I decline discussing any arrangement based upon your retirement at a fixed period.

¹ See Challemel Lacour to Granville, 21 Nov., and reply, 23 Nov., acceding to the request, but expressing a wish to resume the negotiations as a whole; Granville to Lyons, No. 1137A, 23 Nov., recording the French proposal and his reply, F.O. 27/2549; see also Granville to Kimberley, 23, 30 Nov., P.R.O. 30/29/135.

² See J. A. Crowe to Dilke, 18 Nov., forwarded by Dilke to Granville, 20 Nov., on party divisions in the German reichstag and Bismarck’s relations with the emperor, P.R.O. 30/29/121.

³ See no. 571. The starred passage of no. 577 is partially printed from the copy now in P.R.O. 30/29/124, Fitzmaurice, ii. 302.
I will tell you what I think abstractedly \([sic]\) of your scheme of an immediate rearrangement of offices.

*As to Derby, he would be a great acquisition. His position his personal character & he is at the same time popular with the liberals, and supposed to be a conservative element by the nervous.

I should like to see him at the India Office. He would sanction no military follies, and be anxious to effect financial reform there.

The Queen would object strongly, and there are many who would also object. Even so anti Jingo a personage as my brother, told me a little time ago at Walmer, that he wished to see Derby in the Gov, but not at the F.O. or in the I.O.*

But what is more important is that I doubt Derby accepting.

Lady Derby told a person on whose accuracy I have perfect reliance, that she hoped much that no offer would be made to her husband, that he would decline, and that in her opinion, the refusal would do harm to him, and to us.

As to Hartington I do not know. I have no doubt he finds the work of the India Office heavy—but it is his way good humouredly to rumble & grumble about his political duties, and it is not clear that he would prefer arbitrating between the D. of Cambridge & Sir Garnett \([sic]\).

If there, he would probably be able to do more than Childers in controlling the Duke—& he would at the same time be more popular with the army.

The substitution of Childers for you at the Exchequer would certainly not be liked, and there is the question of the awakening the susceptibilities of others, by any change which is not urgently necessary.

As to the Lord Lieutenancy, Forster ought to speak more decidedly than he does one way or the other. It is perfectly clear that he would like when the time comes, a strong Ld Lt taking the lead as Kimberley and Clarendon used to do.

Cowper’s speech\(^1\) the other day does not make the question more easy of solution.

I am afraid you will think this letter unsatisfactory doing that odious thing of suggesting difficulties, instead of the way out of them.

578. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone  

[Add. MS. 44173, fo. 220]  


I quite agree about Phillimore, & Sullivan.\(^2\)

If Bramwell’s politics are as sound as Selborne seems to think, I see an advantage in making him a Peer.

\(^1\) At Belfast, 23 Nov., in which he asserted his agreement with the Irish policy of the government, although he was not a member of the cabinet, and denied that he had retired from responsibility or had any intention of retiring, The Times, 24 Nov., p. 6a–b.

\(^2\) See no. 574.
579. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville [P.R.O. 30/29/29 A]


I need not comment on the protest at the beginning: but generally your 'Private' letter is exactly the judicial review that I expected from you; and, if the reasons are on the whole in the direction opposite to that of my wishes, that is not your fault. I dismiss the subject from my mind.

A rumour came to me that Lady D. had said Derby would take no office but the first—I know not whether it has any foundation.

I agree about Cowper, whose speech however I have not yet seen in full. Forster is a man of many fine, some very fine qualities. But I do not think he wants a very strong Lord Lieutenant, if he can help it.

I propose to be in town on Thursday, about the middle hours of the day. By leaving home earlier for Windsor, I could come on Wednesday if you chance to wish it. I hope to hear more of your movements by tomorrow's post.

580. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville [P.R.O. 30/29/29 A]

Hawarden Castle. Dec. 4. 81.

1. Mr Freeman's dispatch No 14 leads me to suggest for your consideration whether the Bosnian address to me should be sent to him for inspection—with a caution not to commit any one which would not be fair play.¹

2. Unhappily, going to tea (five o'clock) with Lady Derby to ask about her eyes I had a rencontre there with Mr West's daughter and did not think it right to decline an introduction (which could have been done).² It is a fishy business, & mischief may come of it, but I do not see that you have been wrong, and in this little matter it would have been pure Phariseeism for me to refuse.

3. I hope your Windsor visit went off well. The footing of mine is perfectly defined: extreme civility, but 'keep your distance'.

4. I send for perusal a letter on a matter in which you have always felt much & just interest.³

¹ See to Granville, No. 14 political, 22 Nov., reporting that the address from 'the Leaders of the Bosnian Insurrection' against Austria, lately published in the Neue Freie Presse, was spurious; to Freeman, No. 2 political confidential, 7 Dec., sending the address, which Gladstone received, 28 Oct. (Add. MS. 44471, fo. 85) but had not acknowledged, asking for comment and cautioning as proposed, F.O. 7/1023.

² See nos. 535, 537.

³ See the editor of the Standard to the Queen's printers, 2 Dec., clearing them of responsibility for the Irish Land bill leak (no. 456) and note by Hamilton for Gladstone, Add. MS. 44765, fos. 163, 164.
581. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Confidential.


The Queen who telegraphed to me to come on Friday instead of next Tuesday—and who telegraphed again that I was to be there at 6, received me at 7, and had absolutely nothing to say.

She seemed much pleased with your visit.

She said that Harcourt had made himself very agreeable at Balmoral,¹ but that it was in bad taste immediately afterwards to make his speech,² & pay a visit to Sir Wilfred [sc. Wilfrid] Lawson.

She thought the Gov did not sufficiently appreciate the bad condition of Ireland.

She said she was proud of having objected to Sendall’s appointment.³ She was glad the War Office difficulty was over & believed the D. of Cambridge was all right. . . .⁴

582. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Casa la Iglesia comes here tomorrow.⁵

He will speak to me about Morocco. By Morier’s account, the Spanish Minister has no doubt of the French doing that which will cause anarchy in that country.⁶

If such a contingency arises, he sees no remedy for a very serious state of things, which Spain could not brook, but the presence of the English—

¹ He stayed there, 20–23 Oct., Letters, iii. 246.
² For Harcourt’s speech at Glasgow, 25 Oct., in which he likened the leadership of Salisbury and Northcote, in Chatham’s simile, to the ‘dull and placid stream’ and ‘raging turbid torrent’ that met at Lyons, see The Times, 26 Oct., p. 10a–d; A. G. Gardiner, The Life of Sir William Harcourt (1923) i. 417.
³ i.e. as governor of Natal; for expectation that the colonists would give up their opposition, see Courtney to Gladstone, 28 Nov., Add. MS. 44473, fo. 104.
⁴ For the Queen’s opposition to Wolseley’s appointment as adjutant-general, on the ground that Childers was seeking to impose upon the Duke of Cambridge a man with whom he could not work, and agreement, 15 Nov., to postpone the appointment while an understanding was reached with Wolseley to refrain from publishing his views about army reform, see Guedalla, ii. 171–4, and above, nos. 430–2, 493, 525.
⁵ See to Morier, No. 142 confidential, 7 Dec., reporting the conversation at Walmer and his reply to the Spanish minister’s reference to Morocco, in a conversation at the Foreign Office, minimizing the danger, but expressing readiness to exchange information with Spain, F.O. 72/1594.
⁶ See from Morier, No. 214 confidential, 26 Nov., reporting that the Spanish proposed joint Anglo–Spanish action, by sending warships to Tangiers and temporarily occupying ‘part of Morocco’, and he replied minimizing the danger of French intervention; see also mem. by Tenterden drawing attention to No. 214 in preparation for Casa la Iglesia’s visit to Walmer, F.O. 72/1596; for Granville’s approval of Morier’s language, see to Morier, No. 143, 10 Dec., F.O. 72/1594; see also p. 299, n. 4.
Spanish flags in the waters of Tangiers, & even for a time a joint land occupation, to show that the questions which might arise must not be settled by France alone.

I propose not committing myself, but say that I shall take quiet means of ascertaining whether Gambetta will renew the assurances already given by St Hilaire.¹

That I valued a good understanding between Spain & England on the subject of Morocco, but that any premature combinations would only hasten a decision on the part of the French who must be perfectly aware, of the complications they might create by any attempt on Morocco.

A telegram,² and even a letter would be perfectly in time.

583. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone  [Add. MS. 44173, fo. 230]

Walmer Castle. [5 December 1881].

I send you a letter from Errington, which has crossed one from me in which I snubbed him for having given the Cardinal hopes of the renewal of semi diplomatic relations. Errington's recital of what had passed between us would be correct if instead of the sentence at the end which I have bracketed he had written—(but to renew them is quite a different thing—)

When Errington comes away, I suppose we shall be quite ready to communicate with the Pope's Secretary, either through Paget, or through Lyons.³

584. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville⁴ [P.R.O. 30/29/124]

Hawarden Castle. Dec. 6. 81.

1. I return Errington's letter. He seems to be going rather ahead. He treats the case as if the Pope were going to do at our instance something out of the way, & something of very great importance. I confess I do not attach such vast importance to this step, & it does not seem at all out of the way that he in the metropolitan see of Ireland should have a title which his predecessor had. We I apprehend want nothing but that the Clergy like other people should support the law. But the Pope ought for his own credit to want this just as much as we do, & not to set it up as something gratuitous on his part, or requiring an equivalent on ours.

There is in Rome a certain Archb[isho]p in partibus named Passevalle, of

¹ See to Lyons, No. 1199, 10 Dec. (F.O. 27/2487), asking for the assurance and from Lyons, tel. No. 97, 14 Dec., reporting Gambetta's categoric statement that France 'is quite resolved not to touch Morocco', F.O. 27/2498.

² See Gladstone to Granville, tel. ii.44 a.m., 6 Dec., entirely agreeing with the proposed answer, P.R.O. 30/29/124.

³ See p. 298, n. 4.

⁴ No. 584 is printed, Fitzmaurice, ii. 286, without the last paragraph.
high character & position. He was Pope’s Chaplain & preached the opening Sermon for the Vatican Council. But he would not stand its extravagances & is in consequence laid aside. His language recently reported to me is of some anxiety lest we should re-establish diplomatic relations with the Pope: and he treats the anxiety on that side as purely aimed at getting some countenance from us for anti-Italian pretensions.

2. As to Italy and Egypt I cannot conceive what just offence you can have given. It is a *res peracta* since the controul has been established and Italy not made a part of it.

585. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville


This letter of the Metropolitan of Belgrade¹ does not seem to justify him, but directly impugns the conduct of the Govt on the score of legality. It would be worth while I think, to get copies of

1. The Constitution
2. The law which the Metropol[olita]n has broken.²

586. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville


1. I answer your Memorandum about Assab by Telegram. ‘I agree in your Memm on Menabrea of Dec. 10¹ but think compulsion is not asked query needful to name it.’³⁴

2. *We* have not I think heard any thing from Vienna of the Austrian conscription in Bosnia and Herzegovina. I hope there may be no such thing. But if there is, it seems to me impolitic, cruel, and of most doubtful title.⁵

(We seem however to hear very little from Vienna.)

I am afraid that Austria is egged on by Bismarck and if she provokes a conflict with Russia in the Balkan Peninsula she will probably come to grief. She will never as against Russia commend herself to an Orthodox or even a Slav population: and Russia has much more to offer Turkey than she has.

¹ Not traced.
² Granville wrote here: ‘ask for the information required by Mr Gladstone’ and a mem. was sent to him, 16 Dec.
³ For Menabrea’s representations that Britain should do more to persuade Egypt and Turkey to accept the proposed convention recognizing Italian rights at Assab Bay (p. 292, n. 3) and Granville’s reply that he was ready to advise acceptance again, see mins. on Paget to Granville, tel. No. 86, 11 Dec.; and Paget to Granville, No. 447, 12 Dec., F.O. 78/3366. ⁴ Gladstone to Granville, tel. 13 Dec., P.R.O. 30/29/124.
⁵ See from Freeman, Nos. 13, 15 political, 17, 26 Nov., sending copy of decree, 4 Nov., establishing conscription in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and describing the opposition and the Muslim emigration it had caused, F.O. 7/1023.
3. I send you a note from Ponsonby, with my curt reply. I shrink, after all the failures I have made, from urging the Queen to the personal discharge of public duty: though perhaps it is unmanly. I should be glad to have your opinion.

4. Hartington seems to think we the Govt should give distinct countenance to the Lord Mayor’s movement for the Property Defence Association. I consulted Forster and we are both of opinion that it is not for us to take any part in promoting it. The ‘Ladies Aid’ is a different affair.

5. MacColl has seen Ld Greville who says he has examined the proceedings of the Comm[ission] in Ireland, and he believes they are proceeding justly, though certain declarations are to be blamed. See also the notice in P.M. Gazette (of 12th), of Sir R. Palmer’s agent.

Argyll at white heat: the heat of his face not his hair.

P.S. On consideration I think you had better see Hartington’s last letter. A Cabinet, if there is business, might perfectly well be held on Monday or Tuesday. As to a Cabinet without it, I do not much like the sort of thing. What do you say?

587. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Walmer Castle. Dec 14/81.

I can see no objection to your answer to the Queen. It would be useless to press Her Majesty, and she cannot expect compliments on the decision.

I have asked for the Austrian convention with Turkey about Herze-govina & Bosnia.

With regard to the Lord Mayor’s fund, Hartington spoke to me about it yesterday in London — & told me what had passed between you. I said that Derby had written to know what the Gov wished about it, & that I had answered that I did not know not having communicated with any

---

1 Not traced.
2 See Hartington to Gladstone, 12 Dec., regretting that support was withheld from the lord mayor’s fund to assist the association of Irish landlords (the Property Defence Association) whereas the Irish government protected the association’s agents if necessary, Add. MS. 44145, fo. 292.
3 No letter traced, possibly done by word of mouth while Forster was in England, after 9 Dec.
4 Not traced.
5 See Argyll to Gladstone, 3, 6 Dec., denouncing the working of the land commission, Add. MS. 44105, fos. 118, 122.
6 See paragraph 4.
7 Gladstone to Granville, 14 Dec., on ecclesiastical preferment for Dr. Badger, P.R.O. 30/29/124, not printed.
8 i.e. in connexion with Austria-Hungary’s title to enforce military conscription which the convention did not mention; see convention with Turkey, 21 Apr. 1879, E. Hertslet, Map of Europe by Treaty (1891) iv. 2855.
member of the Cabinet about it, but that my impression was that they would not object to others although they would not think it right to put themselves forward in the matter.¹ This seems to be the pith of your & Forster's opinion, although Forster writes both ways.

Hartington's principal argument is that if we abstain, a tory & Cave character will be given to the thing.

He had not settled whether he should act upon your permission or not to subscribe himself. I am not very strong against subscribing, but deprecate some of us only doing so.

As to the Cabinet, I agreed with Hartington that there might be a certain amount of criticism as to our appearing to take things easy—but that I objected to Cabinets, when there was nothing to do—and that one Cabinet would not much disarm criticism, & if we separated without doing anything, it would be considered as an additional proof of our weakness and of our being disagreed.

I suppose however a Cabinet would be given by you, if he or others persisted in wishing for it.

I am sorry about Argyll.

588. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone [Add. MS. 44173, fo. 249]

Walmer Castle. Dec 15/81.

Rivers Wilson has receive[d] a telegram from Egypt. The Colonels are moving to substitute the War Minister for Cheriff Pacha. The notables are expected to support the latter, & there will be disorder.²

This [is] very serious.

And we shall be in a scrape, if we are not prepared with any policy.

I am not prepared to propose anything³—

The suggestion made is to get troops from India, or the French are sure to anticipate us.

We certainly ought not to be the first to break with the French. They will propose joint occupation, which is very awkward.

I am not sure that it would not be better hateful as it is, to insist upon Turkish occupation, under strict conditions.

¹ Granville's correspondence with Derby, not traced.

² For struggle between the army colonels and the Egyptian ministry, expected to be decided when the chamber of notables met, 23 Dec., see Lord Cromer, Modern Egypt (1908) i. 206–13; and min. by Granville, 16 Dec., instructing the F.O. to ask Malet whether Wilson's report was true; and tel. to Malet, No. 95, 16 Dec.; and reply, tel. No. 114, 17 Dec., pronouncing a movement to overthrow Cherif Pasha unlikely; all F.O. 78/1327.

³ Cf. from Lyons, No. 1122 confidential, 15 Dec., for Gambetta's proposal of an assertion of Anglo-French support to the khedive, which forestalled Granville and was the origin of the joint note (below nos. 595–7) F.O. 27/2499; and to Lyons, No. 1228, 19 Dec., F.O. 27/2487.
Can you suggest anything.
Ought we to have a Cabinet. The notables meet on the 23rd.¹

589. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone  
[Add. MS. 44173, fo. 252]  
Walmer Castle. Dec 16/81.

Dilke has written me a scolding letter, and announced that he has sent you a copy of it.²
His facts are all wrong—His minute properly advising that the papers should be sent to you you, [sic] which of course in any case would have been done, ends with 'I myself am not opposed to it'
There is a minute in his handwriting, 'Mr Gladstone decides it is to go on.'
Spencer was the only Cabinet Minister to whom the circulation box was not sent. He was away from town.
The matter was formally brought before the Cabinet, but at an earlier date than I mentioned to you at a guess the other day.
I will send you my answer to Dilke, as soon as I have ascertained a few more details.

590. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone  
[Add. MS. 44173, fo. 256]  
Walmer Castle. Dec 20/81.

I send you a copy of my answer to Dilke.³
It is impossible that you should remember all the little particulars of a case like this.

591. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville  
[P.R.O. 30/29/124]  
Hawarden Castle. Dec 23. 81.

1. I send for your perusal a letter which, in concert with Forster or rather on his suggestion, I wrote to Cardinal Newman,⁴ transmitting with

¹ See Gladstone to Granville, tel. 16 Dec., 'I suppose wait for some confirmation. The case arising I prefer now as heretofore Turkish to joint [occupation]. As to Cabinet, will follow your opinion whatever it may be', draft on the back of no. 588 and P.R.O. 30/29/124.
² From Toulon, 14 Dec., on difficulty of defending the North Borneo Charter, 1 Nov., in parliament since (a) its substance was unprecedented and (b) it had been insufficiently discussed by the cabinet, P.R.O. 30/29/121. Dilke said that when submitted to the cabinet, it came back with four mins. against and two for, and that on his insistence that it should be resubmitted, at least to Gladstone, it came back with his approval and then went forward.
³ See to Dilke, 20 Dec., quoting on (a) Dilke's min. which accompanied the first submission to the cabinet, and stating on (b) that after Dilke's insistence on resubmission it had been formally brought to a cabinet meeting, ibid.
⁴ See copy, 18 Dec., sending him copies of sermons of Roman Catholic priests in Ireland and asking him 'to consider whether he would write anything to Rome upon them', Add. MS. 44473, fo. 184.
it the seditious preachings of priests, which Forster had sent to me from Ireland. These the Cardinal has not yet returned—which looks as if he had been writing something upon them.

2. The Blaine letter on the Clayton Bulwer Treaty has a grave aspect if, as I presume is the case, it has been adopted by the new Presidential Government. Is it too much to call this letter (if worked out into practice) an audacious repudiation, differing from the repudiation by Russia in 1870 as to this important particular that the aim in her case was rational though the means were unwarrantable. But here the claims of the U.S. are in themselves, apparently, extravagant, and they would not have a shadow of excuse but for the proceedings of the late Govt as to the Suez Canal. I see that you are proceeding in a very considerate manner as to preparing a reply. For my own part I inclined to hope that we shall endeavour to act as the representatives not of a merely British interest but of all Europe in this important matter.

3. The Lord Mayor has so bungled the affair of the Property Defence Subscription & caused so much misapprehension as to the attitude of the Govt that at last I thought it best the Telegrams which speak for themselves should be produced. He had authority to publish them, but did not.

4. Which will be the best of two plans (or have you no choice)
a. to meet in London about Jan 5 or 6, push forward over Procedure schemes & any other business, & come back again to the country till a final meeting say about 25th—or
b. To meet for good about 15th or soon after.

Meantime I wish you all a happy Christmas & remain...

592. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone


I send you the rough draft of an answer to Blaine, with the observations of 4 of the Cabinet to whom I submitted it, before sending it to you.

1 See Blaine to Lowell, No. 270, 19 Nov., No. 281, 29 Nov., communicated 13 and 23 Dec., claiming and justifying modifications in the Clayton–Bulwer treaty so as to give U.S.A. exclusive control over any canal built through the Panama isthmus, F.O. 55/282; President Arthur dismissed Blaine and the policy was dropped by his successor.

2 For Gladstone's tels. to the lord mayor, 6, 8, 13 Dec., that the reasons which prevented official support for his fund for the defence of property in Ireland would also prevent advising on the best way of using the fund; confirming after consultation with Forster and giving authority to publish; see The Times, 23 Dec., p. 8b; see also nos. 586, 587.

3 The first plan was adopted and the cabinet met, 6, 7, 9, 25, 27, 30 Jan., 1, 3, 7 Feb., and the new rules of procedure were a principal subject at all the meetings, Add. MS. 44643, fos. 2–40.

4 See to West, No. 3, 7 Jan. 1882, finally sent 14 Jan., rebutting the American arguments for modifying the Clayton–Bulwer treaty and proposing the extension of the treaty to other powers, F.O. 55/290; and alterations.
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I hope you will suggest more amendments than they have done—
It is curious that Bright is the only one, who points out that it may be thought too tame—
I rather agree with Kimberley’s 2d criticism not with his first.
The Chancellor’s amendments seem good.

593. **Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone**
[Add. MS. 44173, fo. 26o]

1000 good wishes to you & yours—
It appears to me impossible that Newman should not take action upon your letter—But I am not sure that he will not try to answer portions of it.
Blaine’s conduct is very disgraceful. He does everything to keep up a cordial state of relations with us, till the moment of being doubtful whether he will remain in office, and he then fires off this dangerous rocket without any care as to where it may fall.
It is very like what Salisbury did about the Fortune Bay question—
In one aspect, it is not so bad as the Russians, at all events as regards form.
The latter declared they were no longer bound by an existing treaty—the Americans ask us to remodel it, & give a good many bad reasons for doing so.
I have sent a draft on the principle of speaking for the whole civilized world. Our attempts to get all Europe to join us in replying to the first despatch, were not successful.
You were right after the Lord Mayor’s declaration to publish the telegrams.
I have no very strong opinion about the day of the Cabinet meeting. But am inclined in favor of having two on the 5th & 6th.

594. **Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville**
[Copy]
[Hawarden Castle]. Christmas Day./81.

I return the Clayton Bulwer draft. What the situation requires is a skirmishing dispatch, and I think you have drawn it with great skill.
I have had the utmost difficulty in making out the very light pencil marks of the Chancellor. The second however I quite understand and it seems to me to supply the only thing wanting in the original draft, viz. that it did not seem to relever sufficiently the position in the controversy of the State primarily affected.
As to the first I read it as introducing into the draft references to a state of war which seem to me (if such there be) premature and entangling.
Viewing the position of this Empire in the world, I cannot but think it
a great law of prudence to make no new or needless admissions as to what might happen about these waterways in time of war.

(My recollection of the Suez conversation to which Bright refers is that we had a tacit instinctive sense of its being on the whole best to leave this matter quite open.)

I agree with you in approving Kimberley's No. 2.

I have myself suggested a reference to the Monroe doctrine in support of an important portion of your argument, but if you make it the terms will of course be such as not to constitute any new pledge of adhesion on our part to that doctrine.

My slight remarks are all in furtherance: & I am much pleased at the way in which you work through the first stage of an affair little creditable to those who bring it on.

A happy Xmas to you.

I shall be glad of an early answer, perhaps by wire, on my inquiry about Cabinets.

595. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

Hawarden Castle. Dec. 28. 81.

1. I send for your perusal Newman's reply. It is undeniable, but is no more than a generality, that absolute power in men is in certain ways limited by the conditions of flesh and blood.

2. I hope there is nothing in the rumour reported now by Dufferin of an arrangement between Russia and Austria as to the Balkans. As to partition it can hardly be true. But neither the one nor the other is trustworthy as a nurse of that which alone I presume we desire namely the free peaceful growth and development of local liberties. Would you be prepared under the circumstances to put it upon record that we could not view with approval any arrangement between foreign Powers which either directly or indirectly tended to invade or undermine these liberties.

3. Again to judge from Malet's Telegram of the 27th would it not appear that some additional assurance to the Khedive is wanted in support of the local as against unwarranted encroachment from the Central Power.

---

1 See to Gladstone, 23 Dec., saying that the matter of the seditious sermons belonged to the bishops and not to the Pope, whose power Gladstone overrated, it being absolute in theological matters but otherwise prevailing only in the long run, Add. MS. 44473, fo. 208; cf. Morley, iii. 63.

2 See to Granville, private, 26 Dec., substance telegraphed, reporting an 'incredible story' of Assim Pasha of an Austro-Russian agreement to partition the Balkan peninsula, P.R.O. 30/29/190; a reflection of the dreikaiserbund, 18 June 1881.

3 See to Granville, tel. No. 123, 27 Dec., that he saw no objection to Gambetta's proposal (p. 320, n. 3) but that the khedive was most likely to require support against the porte, not against his own subjects, F.O. 78/3327.
4. Cowper sends me a good tempered, high-minded, & considerate letter of virtual resignation, with some small reserve as to the exact time. It will go to you from Forster.¹


No. 1. I have not yet rec[eive]d Newman’s letter.

No. 2. Lobanoff says that the arrangement between Russia & Austria about the Balkan provinces is an absolute canard—I propose writing to Dufferin to inform him of this assertion (which I am inclined to believe, and to add the declaration that you suggest[]).³

No. 3. Gambetta’s proposal if properly worded, will probably meet your proposal as to an assurance to the Khedive.⁴

No. 4. A good letter, not quite consistent with his recent declaration. I shall be curious to know how you propose to deal with it.

Shall you be in town on Thursday or on Friday.


I send you some important papers about Egypt.⁵ I incline to agree to Gambetta’s draft—to approve the language held by Malet—to inform Gambetta of what Malet says and our concurrence in it—and to thank Colvin for his memorandum, without expressing an opinion on all his views.

¹ See to Gladstone, 27 Dec., writing as here reported, dwelling on the falseness of the lord lieutenant’s position when the secretary was in the cabinet, and insisting that his resignation was unrelated to Forster’s conduct or the government’s policy, Add. MS. 44473, fo. 231; resignation accepted.

² Granville to Gladstone, 29 Dec., sending birthday greetings, Add. MS. 44173, fo. 264, not printed.

³ Granville’s private letters to Dufferin, 15, 28 Dec., 5 Jan., P.R.O. 30/29/211, do not mention this; not traced either in official correspondence.

⁴ For further definition of the French proposal, see Lyons to Granville, Nos. 1161, 1162, 1172, 24 and 29 Dec., F.O. 27/2499; and Malet to Granville, tel. No. 123, 27 Dec., F.O. 78/3327.

⁵ i.e. from Lyons, No. 1180, 31 Dec., enclosing Gambetta’s draft of the joint Anglo-French note assuring the khedive of support, F.O. 27/2499; from Malet, No. 389 confidential, 26 Dec., reporting his discouraging the constitutional demands of the chamber of notables; mcm. by Colvin, enclosed in Malet’s dispatch, on the national character of the Egyptian movement and the duty of Britain and France to protect the control against it, F.O. 78/3326.
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598. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

Hawarden Castle. Jan. 3. 82.

I am vexed at having mislaid Cardinal Newman’s letter: but I have really (I think) described its general purport. The material point was that he has, I think, written to Rome.

I have been reading ‘the New Ceylon’—i.e. North Borneo. Probably you have seen it. I observe that it improperly & perhaps rather ostentatiously calls it British North Borneo, and a ‘colony’. The account of the country is attractive; but the customs of the natives will apparently supply material for cavil or reproach. The ‘procedure’ upon this matter you have amply established: but I have in vain striven to recall to my mind any of the arguments upon it. From the book I gather that the Cabinet acted in or about Decr. 1880 a most anxious time & this may account for the faintness of my impressions. Probably you have the topics more freshly in your mind, or have the means of readily recalling them, & it would be well I think if you could do this on Friday.²

Forster, & Selborne, will I think probably be there. Hartington seems to wish to be absent.

Many many thanks for your kind wishes. The qualifications, with which at a certain age one receives congratulations, does [sic] not diminish gratitude to the giver.

599. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville³

Hawarden Castle. Jan. 4. 82.

1. I agree with you that we should accept Gambetta’s draft;⁴ which appears to be rather skilfully drawn against danger on the side of Turkey.

2. Nor do I demur to your other proposals: yet I think words might be added conveying to Malet an assurance of our reliance on him not to commit this country to a total or permanent exclusion of the Chamber from handling the Budget.⁵

I suppose we are entitled to hold the present position so far as it is

---

¹ See Joseph Hatton, The New Ceylon. Being a Sketch of British North Borneo or Sabah . . . (1881).
² i.e. at the cabinet; but cf. Gladstone’s note of the cabinet of Fri. 6 Jan., not mentioning Borneo, Add. MS. 44643, fo. 2.
³ Granville to Gladstone, 4 Jan., congratulating on the birth of a daughter to Agnes Wickham, Gladstone’s eldest daughter, Add. MS. 44174, fo. 2, not printed.
⁴ Accepted after discussion in the cabinet, Chamberlain ‘demurring’, but submitting (J. L. Garvin, Life of Joseph Chamberlain (1935) i. 445) if it did not commit Britain to any particular subsequent course, Granville to Malet, tel. No. 2, 6 Jan., F.O. 78/3446; presented 8 Jan.
⁵ See to Malet, tel. No. 8, 11 Jan., replying to his No. 389, see p. 325, n. 5, using Gladstone’s words, and adding ‘caution will be required in dealing with the subject in view of the bondholders’ interests’, F.O. 78/3446.
necessary to guarantee the pecuniary interests on behalf of which we have in this somewhat exceptional case been acting in Turkey.

But I should regard with the utmost apprehension a conflict between the 'Controul' and any sentiment truly national, with a persuasion that one way or other we should come to grief in it.

I am not by any means pained, but I am much surprised at this rapid development of a national sentiment and party in Egypt. The very ideas of such a sentiment and the Egyptian people seemed quite incompatible. How it has come up I do not know: most of all is the case strange if the standing army be the nest that has reared it. There however it seems to be, & to claim the respect due to it as a fact, and due also to the capabilities that may be latent in it for the future. 'Egypt for the Egyptians' is the sentiment to which I should wish to give scope: and could it prevail it would I think be the best, the only good solution of the 'Egyptian question'.

3. A fresh note has come from Newman. Evidently he has tried to get something done at Rome, and (I think) has failed. I send you the material part.

4. Also a letter from Lady Anne Blunt on Egypt.

I am due in D. St tomorrow at 6.45. Pm. by the Irish Mail.

600. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

Hawarden Castle. Jan 12. 82.

On Malet's Telegram of 10th, received here this morning, I do not know how you can form a judgment without much further explanation. The demand of the Chamber to deal with the non-assigned revenues is not on the surface of it unreasonable. It is considered however by Cherif & the Controller totally out of the question.

It may be so; but why? If in this country there were given me the Spirit Tobacco & Beer Duties, I should not mind undertaking to provide for the National Debt, leaving all other Revenue & Charge to the House of Commons!

The assigned Revenues may be insufficient; but why not in that case ask for the required addition.

1 i.e. of 2 Jan., on the theme of papal power working in the long run, but being able to do little in an emergency; saying that the seditious sermons had reached the Pope, Add. MS. 44474, fo. 6.

2 Not traced.

3 Gladstone to Granville, 5 Jan., suggesting that dispatches sending newspaper articles from abroad be better docketed, Add. MS. 44545, fo. 84, not printed.

4 Tel. No. 10, 10 Jan., reported that the new organic law passed by the chamber of notables would give it the right to vote the part of the budget concerned with revenues not assigned for the service of the foreign debt, and Cherif Pasha's and Colvin's disapproval, F.O. 78/3448.
601. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

With reference to Lyons telegs Nos one and two of yesterday should I not telegraph to him that there seems to be no doubt that the note has not produced the favourable effect that we were led to expect, that it would seem unreasonable not to state what we meant and that we are extremely anxious that there should be no apparent difference between the action of the two Govts: that the character of the dual communication has been misunderstood partly in consequence of the comments of the European Press. That HM's Govt. in no way depart from the policy laid down in my desp[atch]t to Malet No. 216 of Nov.4.3 that we dislike intervention either by ourselves or by others as much as ever. That we look upon the experiment of the Chamber with favourable eyes. That we wish to maintain the connection of the Porte with Egypt as far as is compatible with the liberties which have been accorded to Egypt—that the object of the note was to strengthen the Govt of Egypt and maintain the existing course of things.

If any comments are sent, they should be in answer to a specific enquiry of Cherif.4

602. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

The news from Egypt, & from Paris is disagreeable—Dilke telegraphed to me from the F.O. after discussion with the permanent officials to know whether after Lyons despatches shewed that Gambetta was so firm against any explanation to the Egyptian [Government] I still wished the draft telegram to go forward proposing a short explanation.

I answered by authorizing delay till I had seen the despatches5—they are not much more than the extenders of the telegrams we had already received, but the situation is further complicated by the last telegram from Malet as to the imminent rupture at Cairo.6

1 No. 601 written by Hervey for a tel. that was not sent but given later to Gladstone.
2 11 Jan., reporting Gambetta's opposition to Granville's proposal (to Lyons, tel. No. 5, 10 Jan., F.O. 27/2573) of an explanation supplementary to the joint Anglo-French note, in view of the disturbing effect it had unexpectedly produced in Egypt, F.O. 27/2574.
3 i.e. of 4 Nov. 1881, stating British aims in Egypt, see F.O. 78/3320; printed Parl. Papers (1882) lxxxii. 1, and laid when the session began, 7 Feb., being published meanwhile in The Times, 25 Nov., p. 6a.
4 No. 601 reproduces the words of the explanation already proposed to Gambetta.
5 i.e. from Lyons, No. 28, 11 Jan., on Gambetta's opposition to any explanation of the joint note; No. 30, 12 Jan., on his opposition to the demands of the chamber of notables; both received, 14 Jan., F.O. 27/2559.
6 i.e. tel. No. 16, 14 Jan., reporting that Cherif Pasha must reject the notables' demands to control the budget, initiate laws, and enforce ministerial responsibility and that a
I propose to run up to London this afternoon. I will see the most competent people, and it will save time in communicating with you—

Dilke has had printed in the F.O. an elaborate minute of his own against the Borneo Charter. He seems not to have taken in that it is an unusual proceeding, for a Member of a Gov, whether under secretary or not to write a minute saying that he does not himself object to a subject under consideration & then when it has finally been settled, & the Gov rightly or wrongly committed to it, to find out arguments against it—I shall speak to him tomorrow about it—

I send you another letter of the Queen, & enclosures.2

603. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone3

London. Jan 15/82.

Before leaving Walmer, I got a memo drawn up by Tenterden & Rivers Wilson, as to the proposal of the Notables with regard to the budget.4

It shows conclusively that it is contrary to Treaty engagements. I sent it off at once, and hope you will receive it before this note—I propose therefore telegraphing to Lyons if you telegraph your assent [:] H.M.'s Gov agree with M. Gambetta that the proposal of the Notables at all events in its present shape cannot be agreed to, although there may be points worthy of consideration hereafter—Sir E Malet has therefore been instructed to join the French Representatives in supporting Cheriff in his opposition—

Also to telegraph to Lyons that he is to tell M. Gambetta, that while we give full weight to his objections as to further explanations, we think it important to give our R.R. [i.e. representatives] discretion in this matter.6

conflict between the ministry and the notables, supported by the army, was imminent, F.O. 78/3448.

1 See p. 321, n. 2. For Dilke's min., 13 Jan., stating that (a) it would weaken us in answering Dutch and Spanish protests, (b) it strained the prerogative, (c) it was based on a false assumption of Borneo's strategic importance; with min. by Granville, 16 Jan., P.R.O. 30/29/363.

2 i.e. of 13 Jan., returning mem. by Cairns, 16 Apr. 1868, on the sovereign's absences from her dominions, P.R.O. 30/29/40; further letter, [?] 14 Jan., not traced; Granville and Gladstone demurred at the Queen's intention to go to Mentone in March, see the Queen to Granville, 4 Jan., ibid.; see also nos. 604, 618.

3 Granville to Gladstone, 15 Jan., proposing Lords Belper and Wenlock to move and second the address, Add. MS. 44174, fo. 13, not printed; moved by Lord Fingall, see nos. 604, 610.

4 Not traced, though two joint memoranda, 16–18 Jan., on other Egyptian subjects are in P.R.O. 30/20/193.


6 See to Lyons, tel. No. 15, 16 Jan., insisting, as proposed, on the supplementary explanation to the joint note, F.O. 27/2573; and to Malet, tel. No. 12, 16 Jan., giving him discretion in making the explanation, F.O. 78/3446.
604. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

[Address: P.R.O. 30/29/125]

Hawarden Castle. Jan 16. 82.

1. I have expressed my mind piece-meal, in telegrams, about Egypt, during the night, & this morning. I suppose we ought to make our way to a part concession, with adequate reserves: but we are riding double, & we have a queer fish upon the pillion.

2. Dilke has done wrong: but I shall be glad to see the argument as he may set it out.

3. Your arrangements for moving and seconding seem good but people will say that having two Barons is preparatory to walking out of the Peerage altogether. I have done nothing yet.

4. I should be glad if you would desire that a list of H.M.s absences abroad should be forthwith drawn up in the F.O.—that we may notice how far they grow in frequency and length. Jenner though an admirable doctor is a mere Court tool.

Though the Queen has not named the subject (I believe) to me, I suppose it ought to be mentioned in Cabinet.

5. All telegrams sent to me, unless something is immediately dependent on them, go back to D. St when read.

605. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

[Address: Add. MS. 44545, fo. 89]

[Copy]

Jan. 16. 82.

With ref: to Spanish Wines I think we may perfectly well say, going on the lines of two of Dilke’s telegrams, that we reserve our judgment and choice, as between Foreign Treaties & independent reciprocal action (so to speak) but that the particular figures mentioned by Mr. West need not be regarded as final under all circumstances.

606. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

[Address: P.R.O. 30/29/125]

Hawarden Castle. Jan 17. 82.

1. I see Malet No 18 says he gave the President of the Notables no encouragement as to a compromise, & perhaps the matter was not ripe

1 Agreeing to the proposals in no. 603, texts in P.R.O. 30/29/125.

2 See no. 602.

3 For list see P.R.O. 30/29/125; for Gladstone’s earlier views on Jenner see Gladstone and Granville, i, no. 23.

4 See Morier to Dilke, tel. 10 Jan., reporting a Spanish proposal to reopen commercial negotiations by suspending West’s mem. of 2 Apr. 1881 and the Spanish reply, 18 May, and informal discussion between foreign minister and himself, F.O. 72/1634.

5 See to Granville, tel. No. 18, 15 Jan., reporting a conversation with the president of the chamber of notables about its constitutional demands, F.O. 78/3448.
for it. But if they admit in good faith the international engagements, as a preliminary, might not a compromise then be considered? Might not Rivers Wilson be asked to show us on the figures how far they admit of one?

Think of Bismarck & the Turk fighting the battle of representative & popular principles against us!

2. Should you be very averse to extending the Anglo-French concert in Egypt to an European concert?

3. I could not help suggesting the other day in a note to Tenterden that Thomson is wholly exorbitant in his use of the Telegram for a crowd of intricate details, which cannot be appreciated except in suite, & this without any urgency & tending to nothing but confusion.

4. If Ayoub Khan shows a tendency to draw to us, I hope we shall not turn to him the cold shoulder. He had a fair right to take his chance against us.

5. Dilke's Telegram of 16th to Morier does not make so distinct a retreat as I should have made, but it keeps in contingency the reopening of negotiations about wine etc. & this is the main matter.

6. I am sorry you had the trouble of writing about the little Alarum on Monday.

607. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

18, Carlton House Terrace. Jan 18/82.

I have asked R. Wilson to report on what points the Notables might be consulted without inconvenience.

No 2. Les beaux esprits se rencontrent. I wrote a long letter to Lyons yesterday, of which I send you a copy, although I did not mean to trouble you with it, till I had his answer, & thus let you have counsel on both sides.


2 See Granville to Amphill, No. 13 confidential, 16 Jan., recording Count Herbert Bismarck's description to Granville of his father's language to the Turkish special mission to Berlin, F.O. 64/1003.

3 See from Thomson, tel. No. 8, 16 Jan., reporting an inquiry by Ayoub Khan 'whether it would be possible for him to attach himself to the British Government', F.O. 60/466. He was detained at Teheran with the help of the shah until 10 Nov. but no attempt was made to conciliate him; see also p. 305, n. 1.

4 i.e. accepting the Spanish proposals on the reopening of the commercial negotiations (p. 330, n. 4), F.O. 72/1634.

5 i.e. of the day before, see Granville to Gladstone, 16 Jan., apologizing for the messenger with no. 603 and enclosures, having 'routed' Gladstone up during the night instead of going on from Chester to Hawarden in the morning, Add. MS. 44174, fo. 19; and to Tenterden, 16 Jan., P.R.O. 30/29/125.

6 Private, 17 Jan., asking his views as to Britain's acting in Egypt as the mandatory of Europe as proposed in paragraph 2 of no. 606, P.R.O. 30/29/203; printed, Newton, Lord Lyons, ii. 270–1.
3. Thompson [sic] has been telegraphed to as to being concise.
4. I will speak to Hartington about Ayoub Khan.
   The Standard is at its old tricks again. I am sorry that the Members of
   our committee were not ready to meet at once.
   I will send you the Borneo papers.

608. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Foreign Office. [18 January 1882]

Rivers Wilson's mem on what might and what ought not to be given to
the Notables seems sensible.

With regard to his political proposal, it is ingenious, and might be useful
in certain contingencies, but our proposing it now to Gambetta might
excite his suspicions, and if he agreed in the idea, it would be impossible at
this time to prevent it's appearing like an intrigue against Cheriff.

Rivers Wilson is devoted to Nubar. Malet thoroughly distrusts him.

[P.S.] I am not sure that it might not be useful to let R. Wilson go over
to Paris, to talk with Gambetta about the Notables. He is in the habit of
conversing with him about Egypt, and says that he is wonderfully well
informed on everything connected with it.

609. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

Hawarden Castle. Jan 19. 82.

1. I differ from nothing in your letter to Lyons on Egypt.
2. I quite agree with the French that we cannot compound the question
   with the Notables on the mere basis of time: on the other hand until I see
   Rivers Wilson's figures I hesitate to adopt the absolute proposition that
   no controul over any part of the Revenue can be given them.
3. The notion of bringing in the other Powers is agreeable to me & may
   avert serious danger: it is also good in view of that Panama business from
   the other side of the world, which looms large, and may become so awk-
   ward. But I quite agree in your view that this concert would not be
   applicable to the executive part of the business, requiring as it does sharp
   consideration from day to day: while there might be great advantage in

1 See leading article, recounting decisions on parliamentary procedure, county govern-
ment, and Irish land taken by recent cabinet meetings and stating that the details of the
measures were to be worked out by cabinet committees, the Standard, 17 Jan., p. 4 f.;
for other leakages to the Standard, see nos. 377, 405, 456, and p. 315, n. 3; for cabinet
committee appointed, 5 Jan., to investigate the disposal of the keys to cabinet circulation
boxes, see Add. MS. 44643, fos. 2, 6.
2 i.e. Dilke's, his own and Pauncefote's printed mins., P.R.O. 30/29/363; see nos. 589,
602, 604, and 611.
3 See nos. 599, 600, 603, 606.
4 See nos. 591-4.
having Europe pledged as to the general basis, were it only to prevent the Turk from intriguing.

4. When you & Rivers Wilson quite understand one another, I should think his seeing Gambetta would be good.

5. The composite Government\(^1\) looks to me like an effacement by Absorption of Cherif Pacha. Is this right?

610. **Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone**

[Add. MS. 44174, fo. 26]

Foreign Office. Jan 20/82.

Like you I should prefer a greater swell than a baron but it is doubtful whether we shall get a mover even of that rank. Wenlock agrees to second—Belper refuses to move—

Roxburghe has been sounded without success, St Germans has refused.

I have written to Lord Fingall. If he declines I can think of nobody but Mount Temple or Acton.\(^2\) What do you think of the latter—

The rest of our minority are in office, or have already moved or seconded, or are certain not to be willing & able.

St Germans & Belper’s refusals were not hostile.

611. **Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville**

[P.R.O. 30/29/125]

H[awarde]n Castle. Jan 20. 82.

I have received the Borneo Charter papers\(^3\) and have given all the time I could to the examination of them. Unfortunately I cannot as yet in the smallest degree revive any recollection of proceedings in the Cabinet or in the Government at the time when the decisive resolution was taken. So that I am in the condition of one shutting the stable door after the steed has been stolen.

It must however have been in the Cabinet of Nov.25.1880 that the matter was dealt with. At least that is the only Cabinet which I find recorded in my private Journal between Nov 22 and Dec 3, and it is within these limits of time that according to the Pauncefote Memm\(^4\) the question was settled. I will seek for further traces in London.

\(^1\) Made by the addition of members of the national and military party to Cherif Pasha’s ministry.

\(^2\) See p. 320, n. 3, and no. 615.

\(^3\) See no. 607.

\(^4\) Pauncefote’s mem., 17 Jan., met the arguments in Dilke’s min. (p. 320, n. 1), P.R.O. 30/29/363; see also covering letter in P.R.O. 30/29/194; Borneo Company’s charter, published in the *London Gazette*, 18 Nov. 1881; for Dutch, Spanish, and English protests, see F.O. 12/58; cf. Gladstone’s note of the cabinet, 25 Nov., which does not record any discussion on the Borneo Charter, Add. MS. 44642, fo. 104.
Many of the points in the case are I think pretty fully disposed of in the papers. There are two, upon which I should be glad to satisfy my mind.  

1. As to our military responsibilities for North Borneo under the new arrangement. Are they greater than, or different from, those under which we lie with respect to Sarawak? where certainly the enterprise of Sir J. Brooke has had the countenance and approval of the Government. I do not see why they should be greater, & I hope they are not. Of course we must bear them harmless1 in any extraneous matter arising out of our controul over their Foreign Affairs.  

2. As to the powers of controul over the administration of the Company of its affairs. The Pauncefote Memorandum seems to view these powers with unmixed satisfaction, and to state them in large though general terms at pp 46, 7. This subject excites in my mind a little jealousy and apprehension. I quite understand the justice of reserving the controul over foreign relations; and likewise a power, at least a negative power, in matters affecting the natives. But I do not know why we should take any thing more, and I fear that a general power of direction, or any thing like it, would draw us into a very general and indeed unlimited responsibility. Probably a more particular knowledge on this subject would suffice to satisfy my mind. The phraseology of the Charter however in Clause 10 looks, to my unpractised eye, rather too large and loose.

612. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

[Add. MS. 44174, fo. 28]  
Foreign Office. Jan 21/82.  

I can send you I think, a satisfactory answer to your important letter on Borneo.  

I send you a rough draft of a despatch secret & confidential, to Lyons2 on the lines of my private letter to him, for you to consider.  

It is not easy to answer all the objections in Lyons3 very able letter,1 but then are the objections so strong as those against all the other alternatives.  

Malet spontaneously telegraphs in our sense.4  

I do not see any harm in at all events consulting Gambetta. I doubt his having recourse to the desperate step, of anticipating us by a French occupation—& it is very desirable that he should know we object to a joint intervention—and have a slight leaning to Turkish aid.

---

2 Not traced and probably not used; for private letter, see p. 331, n. 6.  
3 See to Granville, private, 19 Jan., arguing against Britain and France acting as the mandatories of Europe or giving any greater part to the powers in Egyptian affairs, P.R.O. 30/29/171; printed, Newton, Lord Lyons, ii. 271-4.  
4 See tel. No. 23, 20 Jan., proposing that the European powers, while continuing to oppose the notables’ control of the budget, should guarantee a constitution to Egypt compatible with her international obligations, F.O. 78/3448.
613. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

[Add. MS. 44174, fo. 30]

Foreign Office. Jan 21/82.

Hartington is just arrived at the F.O. much exercised at Malet's telegram.

But he says he can suggest nothing better than what we think of proposing to the French Gov.¹

614. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

[Hawarden Castle. Jan 22. 82.]

Lyons has stated² the case against general concert in Egypt very well. My bias is in favour of it, but bias should not govern: and I fully admit that we cannot have it 1. without positive and sufficient cause, 2. without a limited and well defined purpose in view, 3. without a confident hope, or at the least a better hope than any other mode offers, of attaining it.

I am a little disappointed at not finding in Gambetta any sign that he counts popular principles for anything in the matter. But then we must remember that through the struggle on the Eastern Question his paper went strongly against us.

615. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

[Hawarden Castle. Jan 22. 82.]

Acton would be admirable:³ but, as of your own belongings, would be taken to intimate poverty. Yet justice to so superior a man ought to be taken into account.

What do you say to the inclosed about Co. Armagh.⁴

I have written to Majoribanks to move Firth to second.⁵

I hope you were not shocked at my long telegram this morning.⁶

616. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

[Add. MS. 44174, fo. 32]

Foreign Office. Jan 23/82.

To you who have the trunk of any elephant it may seem odd, but to me who unfortunately am differently constituted it does not seem so, that in the midst of all the anxiety about Ireland in Nov 1880, you should not

¹ i.e. the abortive plan for European intervention; see p. 337, n. 3.
² See p. 334, n. 3.
³ i.e. to move the address, see no. 610.
⁴ Not traced.
⁵ i.e. 20 Jan., asking them to move and second the address in the Commons, Add. MS. 44545, fo. 92.
⁶ Amending the drafts to Lyons sent in no. 612, P.R.O. 30/29/125.
have paid much attention to the Borneo question, or now remember details about it.

There can be no doubt as to the circulation of the box with the papers—the label is still in the box, with every name scratched out excepting that of Spencer, who was in Ireland. The F.O. is certain that it was sent to no 10—and one of your secretaries copied Dilke’s minute which was in it. The recollection of Kimberley & of myself is clear as to the Cabinet.

I hope you will think the minute by Sir Julian [Pauncefote] satisfactory as regards the questions which I am glad you put to me. We are agreed as to minimizing the action of the Gov, & Sir Julian shows that neither the promoters nor the F.O. have said anything opposed to the view, and that the Charter does not legally do more.1

617. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone [Add. MS. 44174, fo. 34]

You will have rec[eive]d Malet’s telegram.2
I should have been inclined to ask the F[rench] G[overnment] to agree to telling him & his French colleague, that there are certain things which we thought might be offered to the Notables as a compromise. But as you do not see your way to exclude from them as much as Wilson would like, and for which he seems to give good reasons, I will write nothing till you come.3

I hear you will be here soon after four,4 which will be ample time for writing & telegraphing.

I shall ask your permission to bring Wilson with me.

618. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville [P.R.O. 30/29/125]
10, Downing Street. Jan. 26/82.

Pray examine the dates & particulars of the inclosed rather remarkable

1 For Pauncefote’s second min. on the North Borneo charter answering the questions in no. 611, that the protection the company was promised and expected was no more than that involved in the recognition of the presence of British subjects or than if the company was incorporated under the Joint Stock Company Acts, the charter entailing no extra obligation, and that the government could only exercise a negative control over the activities of the company, see Add. MS. 44474, fo. 73.
2 Tel. No. 25, 22 Jan., asking authority to propose a plan arrived at by himself, the French consul-general, and the two controllers-general for the settlement of the dispute about the notables’ control of the budget, F.O. 78/3448.
3 See to Lyons, No. 95, 25 Jan., written after consultation with Gladstone, proposing to follow Wilson’s mem. on the financial powers of the notables, F.O. 27/2552; to Gladstone, undated, sending the draft for Gladstone to look at the ‘red ink amendments’ and note by Gladstone questioning the word ‘restriction’ in the last of these, P.R.O. 30/29/125.
4 Cf. Granville to Gladstone, tel. 22 Jan., that there was no need for Gladstone to come to London before Tues. 24 Jan., P.R.O. 30/29/125.
statement which I asked for.' Will the matter not have to be mentioned in the Cabinet?

619. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone  
Osborne. Jan 29/82.

I have not yet heard from R. Grosvenor. But Errington spontaneously & without any expression of opinion from me telegraphs

'I have now given up intention of returning from [sc. for] opening of Parlt, as I find it advisable & desired that I should remain here for the present. I shall write for a pair, and hope to send you important papers by next messenger.

Will you kindly inform Mr Forster.'[

620. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville  
10, Downing Street. Jan 31. 82.

I cannot but be struck by the total absence from Gambetta's Memorandum on the Notables of any indication of the spirit of a true Liberal.

That however is not the question before us: and probably we have now to deal with his successors.

As I understand the matter we might adjourn, if we cannot get rid of, the differences between us.

1. As to Controul and internationally sanctioned laws we withhold it bodily from the Notables.

2. We also withhold the taxing power.

3. We differ with Gambetta as to interior functions which (I apprehend)

1 On the Queen's absences abroad; see p. 329, n. 2 and no. 604; discussed in the cabinet of 27 Jan., leading to a division of opinion on the appointment of lords justices to act in her absence, in the cabinets of 7, 12, 18 Feb., Add. MS. 44643, fos. 19, 40, 45, 46.

2 On an inaccurate report in the Morning Post that Errington had been summoned by Grosvenor to attend the Commons, but told by the F.O. to stay at Rome; see Seymour to Sanderson, 3 Feb., P.R.O. 30/29/125.

3 Granville to Gladstone, undated, sending draft to Lyons, No. 110A confidential, 30 Jan. (F.O. 27/2552) on British policy in Egypt and Gambetta's proposal, with amendments to meet cabinet objections and Lyons's objection to European intervention, P.R.O. 30/29/143; Granville to Gladstone, undated, that Gambetta wished for an early reply and the peers of the cabinet approved the amendments, Add. MS. 44643, fo. 25; Gladstone to Granville, 28 Jan., approving the draft with some verbal alterations, P.R.O. 30/29/143; none of these printed; see no. 622.

4 Of objections to the assignment of functions to the Egyptian notables, proposed in No. 95 to Lyons (see p. 336, n. 3) enclosed in Lyons's No. 82, 29 Jan., F.O. 27/2559.

5 Freycinet replaced Gambetta as president of the council and minister for foreign affairs, 31 Jan.
it is not for us to give or to withhold but as to which if the Egyptian authorities are disposed to give them we think it is not for us to object.

This seems not a bad ground to stand upon.¹

621. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

[Add. MS. 44174, fo. 36]

Foreign Office. [January 1882].

The opinion² of one³ who left the Commons 36 years ago is worth nothing, but it seems that the statement of the Speaker that no 2 would wreck the whole scheme is very important—& the fact that no 1 would enable you at any time to strengthen your rules, if they were found inefficient is a strong argument in favor of omitting the resolution which is thought dangerous.

I can form no opinion how far the word ‘obstruction’ in no 1 would gild the pill. If it does not make an important difference in this respect, I should suppose it were better omitted.

622. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

[Add. MS. 44174, fo. 38]

10, Downing Street. [1 February 1882].

All the Cabinet have given written opinions on our draft,⁴ with the exception of Bright & Chamberlain, who (I think intentionally) abstain. No one but Spencer & Kimberley support us.

The suggestions however are not all in the same line.

It will be almost necessary to discuss—perhaps privately after the Cabinet, & then again after dinner.

623. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

[Add. MS. 44545, fo. 98]

[Copy]

2: Feb/82.

1. Jews’ meeting yesterday.⁵ Early. My position is rather peculiar. I am inclined, if you will let me, to subscribe to the Fund, with the understanding that it is purely elemosynary.

¹ See to Lyons, No. 121, 2 Feb., embodying Gladstone’s suggestions, F.O. 27/2552.
² i.e. on Gladstone’s proposed resolutions on procedure in the Commons; see nos. 808, 839, 852, 858, 866.
³ Granville himself, who was M.P. 1837–46.
⁴ i.e. to Lyons, No. 110A confidential, 30 Jan. (p. 337, n. 3), F.O. 27/2552; printed Parl. papers (1882) Ixxii; for written opinions see P.R.O. 30/29/143; for discussion in cabinet see next letter.
⁵ i.e. of protest against the recent treatment of Jews in Russia; see Godley to Granville, 19 Jan., sending a draft letter from Gladstone to its promoters sympathizing with the agitation; and min. by Granville against sending the letter, Add. MS. 44174, fo. 22.
2. I send you Sketch Paragraphs in original for consideration. In dealing with the Speech tomorrow, I hope we shall be more thrifty of time than yesterday, when we seemed to be at times, during the seven hours \( (5+2) \) rather long winded & needlessly effusive?

624. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone [P.R.O. 30/29/125]
18, Carlton House Terrace. [2 February 1882].

I do not quite remember the words of your suggested telegram to Malet.

'I am in communication with Fr. Gov. on the subject of your telegram no 32.[']

query

'Do nothing to precipitate matters, but abstain from any encouragement that we shall agree to abandonment of Sultan's firmans, and international engagements'.

625. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone [Add. MS. 44174, fo. 40]
18, Carlton House Terrace. [3 February 1882].

I have talked with Dilke as to the mentioning the prolongation of the Italian commercial treaty. We agree that it is not necessary.

I do not remember your exact words as to Egypt. But I am not sure that in the balance, too much weight is not given under present circumstances to the Notables.

Have you read Blowitz's extraordinary report of Gambetta's conversation about Egypt with Freycinet.

626. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone [Add. MS. 44174, fo. 42]
18, Carlton House Terrace. [3 February 1882].

Dilke says that he finds a very strong public opinion in favour of the Corrupt practices bill. He also says that the more bills that are wanted &

---

1 For two cabinet meetings, 1 Feb., one 2–7 p.m. and the second after the cabinet dinner; and for cabinet, 3 Feb., on the Queen's speech, see Add. MS. 44643, fos. 26–35.
2 Tel. No. 32, 1 Feb., from Malet reported Cherif Pasha's favouring the dispatch to Egypt of a Turkish commissioner and a Turkish army to prevent a military dictatorship F.O. 78/3446.
3 See to Malet, tel. No. 22, 2 Feb., as here proposed, F.O. 78/3446.
4 Dispatch from Paris reporting two conversations between Gambetta and Freycinet, when Gambetta reminded Freycinet that Britain had assented to Anglo-French military intervention in Egypt and the procedure of it been settled, The Times, 3 Feb., p. 5 a–b.
5 Included in the programme for the session as described in the Queen's speech, but crowded out by the long debates on the resolutions on procedure.
that are in the speech the better for our case as regards the form of the House.

Bright is not very keen in favour of the corrupt practices Bill.

627. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

18, Carlton House Terrace. F. 6. 82.

My addition would be to the effect that we do not see that a case for intervention has arrived since the intention is declared to maintain the international engagements. But should it arise our wish would be that it should represent the united action & authority of Europe, & we think the Sultan ought then to be a party.

628. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

18, Carlton House Terrace. Feb 8/82.

If Somerset brings in your name in questioning me about the Jews, shall I decline to answer saying it is irrelevant, or shall I say [']that when the attack is made upon you in your presence, that I have no doubt that you will be able to show how completely different are the cases.

that Turkey had been defended by us, guaranteed by us, and had given solemn promises to us—that both in the Neapolitan and in the Bulgarian cases, it was the Gov & not individuals who committed the outrages—that in the Bulgarian case there was official information upon which to go, and that above all in these cases you acted as a private individual and not in any official capacity—

629. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

10, Downing Street. Feb. 13. 82.

Re Rome & Errington, I would not widen the field gratuitously and

---

1 No. 627 gives at Granville's request, 6 Feb., Gladstone's addition to tel. to Lyons, No. 144, 6 Feb. (F.O. 27/2573), proposing an Anglo-French approach to the powers for discussion of the Egyptian question, P.R.O. 30/29/125; for the approach, as outlined in the tel. and approved by the cabinet, see circular dispatch to British ambassadors, 8 Feb., F.O. 27/2552; Granville's emendations to no. 627 to fit it into the dispatch: 'we' altered to 'Her Majesty's Government'; 'at present' added after 'arrived'; 'our wish' altered to 'their wish'; 'we' to 'they'; 'to any proceedings or discussions' added at the end.

2 Granville to Gladstone [8 Feb.] congratulating him on his speech in the debate on the address, Add. MS. 44175, fo. 43, not printed.

3 i.e. about the British attitude to Russia's recent persecutions of Jews, see no. 623.

4 Gladstone returned the letter, having written on it his reply: 'Either way will suit me: choose as may be most convenient. In the Neapolitan case my first appeal was to that Govt. W.E.G. F.8'; for Somerset's question, making no allusion to Gladstone, and Granville's colourless reply, 9 Feb., see Hans. Parl. Deb. cclxvi. 225-7. Granville wrote 'both these cases', Gladstone altered to 'the Bulgarian case'.

---
what Harcourt thinks we might avow would not be quite an accurate description of my interior mind.

Your closing paragraph seems to me to supply the terms of a safe and unexceptionable answer.¹

630. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone [Add. MS. 44174, fo. 44]

18, Carlton House Terrace. [13 February 1882].

An excellent letter,² but I am not quite sure about Canada being given as an illustration. It is as nearly independent as possible. And I should have been glad of an allusion such as you made in one of your speeches to England, & Scotland.

631. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone [Add. MS. 44174, fo. 45]

Confidential. 18, Carlton House Terrace. Feb 13/82.

In answer to my complaint of the tone of his card—Dilke has made the most complete & pleasant apology.³

632. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone [Add. MS. 44174, fo. 54]

Foreign Office. [14 February 1882].

Will something of this sort do.⁴

Instructions & papers to & from Jervoise and his predecessors, have been frequently asked for & refused. But remember that on two occasions, blue books have been presented.⁵

¹ For Dilke's reply to Drummond Wolff's question about Errington's position in Rome, that he was neither paid nor instructed by the government, which nevertheless welcomed information from him, not obtainable through the ambassador, see Hans. Parl. Deb. cclxvi. 376–8; Granville's draft P.R.O. 30/29/125.
² To the Queen, 13 Feb., replying to her complaint of the mildness of his speech against the motion for the repeal of the Act of Union with Ireland, by asserting that government must not be imposed upon those who do not wish for it, and referring to Canada's self-government, Guedalla, ii. 176–8; reference to Scotland added.
³ 13 Feb., apologizing for his language about North Borneo, P.R.O. 30/29/29 A; see nos. 589, 602, 604, 616.
⁴ Proposing that Gladstone should say 'no' to Drummond Wolff's question, whether the supposed 'officious letter of credence' to Errington could be laid before parliament, P.R.O. 30/29/125 and Add. MS. 44174, fo. 56; see also Hans. Parl. Deb. cclxvi, 14 Feb., 640–1, and no. 544.
⁵ 'Correspondence relative to the affairs of Rome', Parl. papers (1863) lxvx. 335, contained correspondence with Odo Russell, then representing Britain with the Pope, and 'Correspondence respecting the affairs of Rome', ibid. (1871) lxvii. 223, correspondence with Jervoise, his successor.
633. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

10, Downing Street. Feb. 17. 82.

The migrations\(^1\) you describe are bad for us—worse for the House of Lords.

As I understand the matter, we reserve our judgment on any Committee in either House hereafter but in no way engage ourselves about it. As to a Commission I should take still more elbow room. I cannot think of any thing like it: I am afraid it would be a great sign of weakness.

634. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone\(^2\)

18, Carlton House Terrace. [19 February 1882].

I was at first inclined to prefer 'investigation' to 'enquiry' but there is force in Forster's objection.

Are there not some advantages in the more vague form of the resolution, than in the longer and more defined words which Harcourt,\(^3\) & Forster\(^4\) respectively suggest.

I doubt whether the latter would afford more information to our friends, and they would give more points for the opposition to dispute and to mis-represent.

A resolution and a speech are two different things—

It might however be worth while to consult the Cabinet.

I should not think it advisable to amend the Land act, still less to do so exclusively in favour of one class—

635. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

F. 19. 82.

I have written one or two verbal changes on the margin:\(^5\) but I own I should like a greater change—

\(^1\) i.e. from the liberal to the conservative side in the Lords; Granville's letter on the support for Lord Donoughmore's motion for a select committee to inquire into the working of the Irish Land Act of 1881 not traced.

\(^2\) Granville to Gladstone [19 Feb.] describing Carlingford's excellent speech on Lord Donoughmore's motion, Add. MS. 44174, fo. 46, not printed.

\(^3\) To Gladstone, secret, 18 Feb., sending an amended form of the resolution to be proposed in the Commons, depreciating a parliamentary investigation into the working of the Irish Land Act, Add. MS. 44197, fo. 21.

\(^4\) To Gladstone, 19 Feb., preferring Harcourt's version, provided 'investigation' was changed to 'enquiry' in order not to seem to exclude parliamentary discussion, Add. MS. 44160, fo. 23; for the passing of the resolution in this form after four nights' debate, see Hans. Parl. Deb. cclxvi. 1106–7, 1729–98; cclxvii. 556.

\(^5\) Of Granville to Lyons, No. 194, 22 Feb., outlining an Anglo-French understanding on the functions of the chamber of notables, as the basis for discussion with the powers (p. 340, n. 1), F.O. 27/2552; Granville's note sending the draft, 'we only propose that to which Gambetta was ready to accede', and second note accepting Gladstone's changes and dropping the original conclusion listing the functions, P.R.O. 30/29/125.
Instead of taking the responsibility of recommending the Khedive to frame a new law, I would not go beyond referring to it as a possibility, with which at the proper time, if it arises, we should of course be prepared to deal.

In this way we should get rid of the narrowed list of attributions from which I shall be very sorry if the army be excluded.

636. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

10, Downing Street. Feb. 20. 1882.

All things considered I think we must abide by the terms of the motion. I must give what I can of the afternoon, after dispatching other business, to getting the facts of the case on Procedure into some order.

The foreign rumours, & accounts of the Skobleff speech, are disagreeable.

I do not remember to have seen authentic proof that Austria means to have the conscription in Bosnia & Herzegovina. It would I should think be clearly beyond the rights of occupation & administration to raise forces available for the general service of the Empire.

I told Cork in confidence of our intentions for this evening.

637. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

We have discussed the form with care—& we are strongly of opinion that that which Dilke will show you is the best—

The others would expose us to much criticism on the part of purists and of fair traders—

What do you think.

Hartington says he is quite ignorant on the subject, but that his impression is with us.

1 i.e. for the resolution deprecating inquiry into the working of the Irish Land Act, of which Gladstone gave notice that evening, to be taken on 27 Feb., instead of the resolutions on procedure; see no. 634.

2 See from Lyons, No. 150, 17 Feb., for the speech to Servian students in Paris calling upon them to struggle, as Slavs, against Germanism, F.O. 27/2560.

3 Already introduced by decree, 4 Nov. 1881; see p. 318, n. 4.

4 i.e. to give notice of the motion for the resolution about the Irish Land Act, aimed at the prospective motion in the Lords, where Cork acted as Speaker.

5 For reopening the negotiations with Spain (nos. 605, 606) for modifications of the Spanish tariff and of the scale of British wine duties in relation to alcoholic content, without offending free traders by a tariff treaty; Anglo-Spanish declaration of intentions which resulted, signed 21 Dec. 1884, remained unfulfilled.
638. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

Turkey. Finance. Sect. 57 10, Downing Street. F. 23. 82.

I see the Turk's default has been noticed by you in a letter to Dufferin. But I think his conscience will be assisted if officially or privately Dufferin be instructed to remind him of the inevitable publicity of the affair, and of the effects of that publicity on his finance in the future.1

639. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville


I misled you yesterday to a certain extent by an imperfect recital of the line I had taken last year2 about the 'police' of the House—the Speaker had just used the word to me, and I had not sufficiently rubbed up my recollections.

I believe the position assumed was this—I said, the Speaker is the Executive of the House, and every member of the House must support its Executive. This is quite a different matter from legislating, so to speak, in the matter.

The position yesterday3 was a very peculiar one—The responsibilities of action have throughout fallen exclusively upon me, the law officers having spoken as lawyers. The matter thus became personal, and I could not do otherwise than I did. It was the personal character of the affair, and not my holding a different opinion from others, that made me so obstinate.

I still however hold to my opinion and am heartily glad, in the interest of the Government, that our position has not been altered.

I am sorry to say that the Speaker, when appealed to by Northcote, gave yesterday an inaccurate and misleading account of what occurred during the scandalous scene4—which of course I could not question.

1 See to Dufferin, No. 80, 17 Feb., recording that, Turkey having failed again that month to meet the interest due on the guaranteed loan of 1855, he had demanded repayment of the sum advanced by the British Treasury now amounting to £224,565; No. 88, 24 Feb., writing as here proposed by Gladstone, F.O. 78/3377.

2 On 26 Apr. and 10 May 1881, when Bradlaugh claimed his seat Gladstone, though leader of the House, refused to guide it in maintaining the Speaker's authority, since he had voted with the minority and it was for the majority to answer the Speaker's appeal, but on 3 Aug., when the interpretation of the resolution of expulsion of 10 May was debated, Gladstone supported the Speaker, since it was strictly a question of the conduct of the executive; cf. Gladstone's statement, 22 Feb. 1882, 'whenever the executive authority of the House has been disobeyed, then I apprehend on principle it is quite clear that... the Executive authority must necessarily be carried through and supported', Hans. Parl. Deb. cclx. 1241, cclxi. 18, cclxiv. 700, cclxvi. 1320.

3 He opposed the motion to expel Bradlaugh, see Hans. Parl. Deb. cclxvi. 1315-48; for 'quasi-cabinet' attended by the law officers and Grosvenor which decided against the government's interference, see Add. MS. 44643, fo. 54; see p. 141, n. 4.

4 On 21 Feb., when Bradlaugh advanced to the table of the House and read the oath with a Testament in his hand; cf. Gladstone to the Queen, 21, 22 Feb., Letters, iii. 263-5.
I suppose Bradlaugh's operation at the table may have occupied about a minute. — At the beginning of it, I saw the Speaker rise, and I make no doubt he said 'Order, Order'; when he sat down again, leaving Bradlaugh in possession. Northcote also rose (which he could not have done if the Speaker had continued on his legs) and sat down again. The truth is that, naturally enough, neither of them knew what to do: and the stratagem, or trick, was undoubtedly successful.

640. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

He fully approves of any thing that does not touch on the action & position of the Judges.

641. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

There is another reservation in regard to the Lords Committee which I think we might make.

It should I think be understood that even now we do not object to be tried as a Government upon specific charges against any of our appointments of Sub Comm[ission][er]s or others.

I cannot help thinking this might give them a bridge by keeping their Committee alive with an amended reference.

[P.S.] You would find me at 3.30.

642. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

Though your debate came to nothing in the way of sensible result, I hope you will try to keep alive the peace-making operation. 4

It would be most convenient if any thing could be done before the

1 Gladstone's argument against the expulsion of Bradlaugh depended on his being able to show that the Speaker had not in fact been defied, but by sitting down had acquiesced in Bradlaugh's action.

2 No. 640 replies to Granville's question 'what does Forster say as to the suggestion [about the scope of the Lords' committee on the working of the Irish Land Act] which smiled to us'; cf. Forster to Gladstone, 26 Feb., protesting against a minister being put on his trial before a Lords' committee, Add. MS. 44160, fo. 28.

3 For Lords' debate, 24 Feb., and appointment of the committee to inquire into the working of the Irish Land Act, see Hans. Parl. Deb. cclxvi. 1501-22.

4 By restricting the committee's terms of reference; for four reports of the select committee of fourteen peers, see Parl. Papers (1882) xi; (1883) xiii; for its importance, see Hammond, 237-8.
Cabinet meets. For there are I think very strong practical reasons for our summoning a meeting of the party, if the row is to go forward: and would tend to complicate the situation as regards the Lords—

It so happened that last night Gibson, who on this subject carries the brains of the party, gave me an opportunity, and I used it to speak to him after your debate.

The upshot was this. I said, what is the exact thing we are going to fight about? I defined it to be 'present inquiry into the judicial administration of the Act of 1881'. For, I said, only shut that out from the inquiry (which means amending the order of reference), and, I feel persuaded, everything else could be settled. I acted on the words I had sent to you in the House of Lords.

If postponement has broken down, and if they are not satisfied with trying the Govt on the nature of the appointments under the Act, cannot the thing be made to march on the basis I now suggest?

Gibson did not argue strongly against what I said, and promised to think the matter over but said he was a very small person.

It is I think important that before we go into the fight it should be known that we fight because the Tories insist on what I have described—I still hope they will not.

643. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

[Add. MS. 44174, fo. 53]
Windsor Castle. Feb. 26. 82.

The Messenger was told at Lord Salisbury's that there was no answer to my note.²

The Queen gave no opinion as to our communications with Ld Salisbury.

She was civil to Herbert Bismarck.

The Princess Helen seems intelligent. In looks, she is a cross between Lady Dudley and Miss Hamilton the heiress.

644. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

[Add. MS. 44174, fo. 58]
18, Carlton House Terrace. [2 March 1882].

I presume you are neither able or willing.³

I should not object to a ten days lark abroad, & the F.O. Secretary is the

---

¹ A meeting of the parliamentary party took place on Mon. 27 Feb., at 3, Add. MS. 44643, fo. 61.
² 25 Feb., telling him that the cabinet had agreed that it would accept the proposed committee, if its scope was restricted, but would not accept one sitting judicially on the administration of the Act by the commissioners, copy, P.R.O. 30/29/153.
³ See Ponsonby to Granville, 1 Mar., returned in no. 645, asking for a minister to go with the Queen to Mentone at the end of Mar. or beginning of Apr., P.R.O. 30/29/29 A; Spencer accompanied the Queen.
proper minister I believe. There is not likely to be anything of importance
in the Lords, at the beginning of next month. But the question is whether
I ought to be, and whether you would sanction my being, away from
the F.O.

645. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

10, Downing Street, Mch 2. 82.

1. I think I am out of the case for Mentone.
2. I am doubtful whether Ponsonby means as many days as ten.
3. Must you decide now, & might not you be in a better position to do
   it a fortnight hence?

646. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

18, Carlton House Terrace. [3 March 1882].

Did you get any answer to your telegram to Ponsonby.

I wrote at five from the House of Lords, telling the Queen the reasons
I had given Lord Salisbury for not moving an address1—adding that he
quite agreed, but had requested me to state that this was the cause of his
not having said anything in the House.

I have just rec[eive]d the enclosed.2

647. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

10, Downing Street. March 3. 82.

I send you some written communications, by Telegraph and otherwise,
respecting the question of an Address. I have told Ponsonby we will con-
sider the matter carefully at the Cabinet tomorrow.

The inclosed came to me perhaps by mistake.

648. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

10, Downing Street. Mch 8. 82.

I submit that it is absurd, & a most costly absurdity, to send long
rhetorical dispatches by Telegraph.3

1 Of congratulation to the Queen on her escape when her life was attempted, cf. mem. of precedents, P.R.O. 30/29/125; the cabinet decided, 4 Mar., against Gladstone and Granville, Add. MS. 44443, fo. 66, Guedalla, ii. 180–1; for the address, 6 Mar., see Hans. Parl. Deb. cclxxvii, 163–6, 172, 223–7; see also Gladstone to Granville, 8 Mar., Add. MS. 44174, fo. 59, not printed.
2 From Ponsonby, 3 Mar., reporting the Queen's wish that parliament should par-
ticipate in the feeling shown in the country at large, P.R.O. 30/29/40; cf. from the
Queen, 5 Mar., P.R.O., 30/29/31.
3 See Cookson, for Colvin, to Granville, tel. No. 59 confidential, 7 Mar., on the
demands of the notables, F.O. 78/3448.
Sir A. Colvin might have conveyed the whole in these words
‘If responsible government be established, no limitations on the
Chamber are of any value.’

Voilà tout.
I wish these people would follow the example of Lord Lyons in his
Telegrams, or of Ld Ampthill.

649. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

[Add. MS. 44174, fo. 61]

18, Carlton House Terrace. [8 March 1882].

I quite agree about the length of the Telegram & will tell him so.
His paper is an indictment against the policy we have adopted. He
requires an immediate employment of force, which it is our object to
avoid.
But there is something in his criticism at the top of page 3 as to want of
preciseness, and I have set Tenterden & Rivers Wilson to work on this,
before writing to Lyons as you agreed—
Rothschild has been rather officious at Paris, but has brought back some
interesting information which I will repeat to you.
I am afraid Blunt has been a good deal humbugged by Arabi Bey.

650. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

[P.R.O. 30/29/125]

10, Downing Street. Mch 14. 82.

Please to look at this letter of Harcourt.
There is much to be said for his view
But I do not know any question of politics which on the whole is so ill
appreciated, as the delicacy of the structure of the Cabinet, and the very
great importance of any project which tends to alter the relative positions
of the Offices, or to increase the number of the great Ministries as they
may be called.

1 See to Lyons, No. 262, 10 Mar., approving alterations, proposed by Freycinet, in
Anglo-French proposals to the powers on Egypt (nos. 627, 635) and suggesting further
amendments, F.O. 27/2553; cf. to Lyons, tel. No. 75, 7 Mar., consulting about Colvin’s
suggestion of more rigid definition, ibid.
2 He communicated some information on the purchase of the Suez Canal shares in
1875, see Add. MS. 44644, fo. 93; see vol. ii, p. 69, n. 4.
3 See to Gladstone, Cairo, 16 Feb., on the national character of the Egyptian move-
ment, with advice from Granville on the back about a guarded reply, Add. MS. 44110,
fo. 4; and Hamilton to Sanderson, 7 Mar., asking Granville to see Blunt as Gladstone had
refused and Granville’s agreement, P.R.O. 30/29/125
4 To Gladstone, 14 Mar., proposing a ministry for commerce and agriculture, to
relieve the Home Office, Add. MS. 44197, fo. 36; cf. cabinet discussion, Mar. 1883, on
setting up a committee of the privy council or giving the work to the chancellor of the
duchy of Lancaster, Add. MS. 44644, fo. 17.
For nearly the first half of my life, and excepting a strong Poor Law Period, the Home Office was much inferior in weight and importance to the other Secretaryships of State. I am not sure whether the adoption of a denuding scheme would not again greatly depress it.

Pray think over this matter.

651. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Foreign Office. [14 March 1882].

The business of the Home office has always appeared to me to be very elastic.

In the time of George Grey & Waddington it seemed to absorb everything but Foreign Affairs & Finance.

Some of the subjects which Harcourt mentions certainly belong rather to a Ministry of Commerce, than to the Home office, & their removal although it would diminish that odious thing patronage, would not greatly diminish the prestige of the office.

652. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

18, Carlton House Terrace. [14 March 1882].

Thompson's [sic] telegram.¹

This does not seem to me a strong case.

The India Office are in a great hurry, & pressing us about this affair. It would take 6 weeks or two months to get an answer by post. But in the meanwhile a jobation is gone to him telling him to condense.

653. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

10, Downing Street. Mch 16. 82.

A propos of the fortresses in Bulgaria,² might it not be well, should the subject revive, to suggest calling for some reports from the various Consuls, or some cursory examination in order to learn whether they are now really available as fortresses or not?

¹ No. 23, 13 Mar., on Perso-British co-operation on the Russo-Persian frontier question, F.O. 60/447; Gladstone's min. 14 Mar., on copy in P.R.O. 30/29/125; 'This gentleman really wants a rap over the knuckles. It is a case (as far as I see) of simple substitution of the telegraph for the post. If others did the same the F.O. charge for telegraph would be millions not thousands'; marked by Granville: 'Done'.

² Cf. no. 568 on Turkish complaints of the failure to dismantle the Bulgarian fortresses according to the Berlin treaty; no action taken.
Lord J. Russell.
They do not know at the F.O. much of the state of Domestic slavery in Borneo.
It might have been possible to insert a prohibition of slavery in the Charter, but that was quite impracticable. In our treaties with Turkey & Egypt we were obliged to leave domestic slavery alone.
The Law officers have advised us that the Queen has by the grant of the Charter, obtained no dominion over Borneo.
Lord J. Russell in a letter to Captain McLean the administrator in 1841 at Sierra Leone, laid down that with regard to countries not within the British dominions, if the laws or usages of those countries tolerate slavery, we have no right to set aside those laws or usages, except by persuasion, negotiation & other peaceful means—
The Company has a flag, but has no right to the British flag—the charter provides that they shall only have a distinctive flag.¹

The Borneo business I think went off well. We had with us a large majority of our own men. Northcote beat himself in shabbiness.
I am uneasy at the rumours about the annexation of Bosnia & Herzegovina by Austria, lest where there is smoke there should be fire. I suggest that both Elliot and Lyons should be instructed to look out & learn anything they can. It would not only be an outrage but probably also the beginning of a great conflict.²

D. Wolff told Rosebery at dinner that they would beat us.
I am extremely obliged to you for your excellent speech.³
I will write to Elliot & Lyons. But I doubt the annexation.

¹ See Gladstone's speech, using no. 654, against Gorst's motion, 17 Mar., for the revocation of the North Borneo Company's charter, since it gave an implied sanction to slavery, Hans. Parl. Deb. cclxvii. 1148–1230; written across no. 654 are Gladstone's pencilled notes of Gorst's points to be answered: 'A new sovereign company on the model of that of the E.I.C. Filibustering by proxy. 1. Responsibility. 2. Information. 3. Cui bono'; see also p. 321, n. 2.
² No official or private instructions traced.
³ In the North Borneo debate.
657. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

10, Downing Street. Mch 23. 82.

1. Miss Irby (whose name ought not to go beyond yourself) writes to Herbert.¹

'The Nihilist Revolution in Russia is fixed for next month. It is impossible for me to give you my source of information; but it is so certain that you would be more than warranted in giving warning through the proper channels. It is very probably already suspected.'

She doubts Skobeleff's loyalty, & seems to say that Mad. Novikoff does not believe her. She ends 'it is a certainty'. Writes from Sarajevo.

2. R. Grosvenor has telegraphed for Errington to come for the division on closing-power.²

My own opinion is that our position as to his business in Rome would become critical, were his sojourn to be much further protracted.

3. When next we meet, I have something to say about the 'Irish Government'.

658. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

18, Carlton House Terrace. [23 March 1882]

I made a short allusion to Salisbury's Letters.³

In answering he said it was not the proper time to discuss them.

He afterwards came[,] said he had not written the last letter that it was his young private Secretary, & that he (S) was horrified when he read them, but he could [not] show up the boy. I urged him for the sake of his character, which was of more importance than the discretion of a youth, to give an immediate explanation.

He said he could not, but begged me to tell you. Let us hope etc etc.

659. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

10, Downing Street. Mch 29. 82.

I own to liking Dufferin's language⁴ better than the draft telegram.⁵

¹ i.e. to Herbert Gladstone, not traced; a friend of Madame Novikov, who corresponded with Gladstone on Russian and east European affairs; see no. 40, and p. 205, n. 4, p. 206, n. 3.
² Cf. no. 619; Errington voted in the division, 30 Mar., on Gladstone's first resolution on procedure, Hans. Parl. Deb. cclxviii. 422.
³ i.e. in the Lords, regretting the publication in The Times, 20 Mar., p. 6b, 21 Mar., p. 20c, 23 Mar., p. 6a, of letters to local conservative associations, condemning Gladstone's dictatorial government and support of Bradlaugh, Hans. Parl. Deb. cclxvii. 1643; see also Granville to the Queen, 24 Mar., Letters, iii. 268–9.
⁴ Dufferin's tel. No. 59, 29 Mar., reported the sultan's question about Britain's attitude in a Russo-Austrian war, and his answer that her friendship depended on Turkey's doing 'what was necessary to revitalise her administration', F.O. 78/3397.
⁵ Draft tel. to Dufferin, No. 88, 30 Mar., instructing him to remind Turkey that she
I should have liked to glance quietly at the Sultans very unfriendly conduct but this might be difficult: I would however distinctly refer to this that our attitude must be affected by the manner in which he discharges his engagements under the Treaty of Berlin, and assent to this by his avoidance of sectional engagements on his own part. Would not the last words of the telegram as they now stand bind us, in the event of the war supposed, even though the Sultan were endeavouring to work out some ambitious purpose of his own by intriguing or combining with one of the two Powers?

660. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville  
[Add. MS. 44174, fo. 75]
10, Downing Street. Mch 29. 82.

I send you a copy of a note I have written to Forster. The fat is in the fire: and most needlessly. I have also caused a word to be conveyed to the P[all] M[all] G[azette] in the sense that the impression as to Forster’s meaning is quite erroneous. I was idling, as you know, at Leighton’s studio: but I do not know that I could have done any thing. Northcote seems to have spoken wisely: & is censured by the idiotic Times accordingly.

661. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville  
[P.R.O. 30/29/125]
10, Downing Street. Mch 31. 82.

Some of the Powers seem to hesitate a good deal about special missions to Moscow for the coronation. Is it quite sure that the Emperor of Russia will desire it; or may he not wish the matter to go by with as little fuss (so to speak) as possible. I only suggest this as possible.

662. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone  
[Add. MS. 44174, fo. 78]
Holmbury. April 2/82.

I send you the sketch of a letter to the Queen, which I forwarded to will best secure her integrity and independence by relying on the general support of Europe, rather than any particular alliance, was replaced by one simply approving Dufferin’s answer, F.O. 78/3395.

1 29 Mar., asking him to correct the impression he had given (in his speech, 28 Mar., defending the government’s refusal to release Parnell, Dillon, and O’Kelly, Hans. Parl. Deb. ccxlvi. 199–203) that the government intended to renew the Coercion Act, Add. MS. 44545, fo. 113; and reply, 29 Mar., explaining he meant simply to declare that the government would not be beaten in Ireland, Add. MS. 44160, fo. 49; Northcote’s pacifying speech, Hans. Parl. Deb., loc. cit. 210; no. 660 not sent, see fo. 77.
2 Of Alexander III, postponed until 27 May 1883, when the Duke of Edinburgh, the tsar’s son-in-law, represented the Queen.
3 See undated draft, answering with assurances of Dilke’s loyalty, the Queen’s complaint that he had abstained from the division on the grant to Prince Leopold on his marriage, voted by the Commons, 28 Mar., P.R.O. 30/29/40.
Dilke as he did not turn up yesterday morning—also his letters of 1880, and 2 letters from him, with my answers. I do not remember what he said to you in 1880. But his letters of that date, will give the means of asserting his loyalty to the Queen.

663. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville [P.R.O. 30/29/122]

The Durdans, Epsom. Ap 3. 82.

1. Your sketch of letter to Ponsonby squares perfectly well with what I have said to the Queen in the matter of Dilke’s & Fawcett’s vote.

2. I think Dilke’s note of May 4 1880 shows that he adverted to the subject in conversation with me. I have no recollection of anything beyond an avowed retreat from the position formerly taken up. I feel a moral certainty that if he declared he could not vote for these grants my answer to him would have been ‘that must stand for settlement when the time comes’.

3. I have not to my knowledge had a word on the subject ‘lately’ from Chamberlain or any other member of the Government.

4. For the present I think the matter stands passably; but it is not possible (in my present opinion) to give to Dilke or to any member of the Government prospectively a free pass for these divisions. They ought as servants of the Queen to vote. But giving this notice, I would again let the matter stand till the time comes with an ‘alors comme alors’.

5. That there are others besides Dilke, possibly four in all, makes the matter more awkward but can hardly alter the rule.

664. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville [P.R.O. 30/29/122]

10, Downing Street. Ap 3. 82.

I think your letters to the Queen & Dilke have been written without waiting for my reply to your first reference.

Alternative B in Dilke’s letter would not (as far as I can say) be accurate. The letter to the Queen is I think excellent but I fear the inclosure in it from Dilke may set her on further correspondence. Mine of this morning to you contains I think all I have to say. I hold back your letter to Dilke.

1 No. 663 is bound in the Granville papers with Granville’s letters to Dilke.

2 See Gladstone to the Queen, 29 Mar., 1 Apr.; and reply, 2 Apr.; and Gladstone to Ponsonby, 6 Apr., Guedalla, ii. 183–5.

3 See from Dilke, 1 Apr., saying that he had told Gladstone, when he took office, that he, Chamberlain, Fawcett, and Trevelyan could not vote for parliamentary grants to members of the royal family; 2nd letter, reminding Granville of his two letters of explanation of 1880; to Dilke, 1 Apr., saying that Dilke’s responsibility ended when Gladstone, knowing his position, still gave him office; and 2nd letter, 2 Apr., that the letters of 1880 would show his loyalty; and from Dilke, 2 Apr., suggesting: (a) that Granville
[P.S.] If you come up tomorrow I should like to see you about Ireland. I intend to go down by the 5 Pm. from Euston.

665. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

Hawarden Castle. Ap 5. 82.

1. On the three points of the Egyptian case
   a. Substitution of a new Khedive. I entirely agree with you. It has not been shown either that Halim will do, or that Tewfik will not.
   b. As to the experts. If you cannot send them, I would urge on your present agents the absolute necessity of taking out of the mouth of the Egyptians all just or plausible cause of complaint on the ground that foreigners are unnecessarily quartered on the Egyptian people.
   c. I think there is more in Freycinet’s view on letting in the Sultan’s wedge, than on the other points. The Sultan is intensely false & fraudulent & tries to work everything against us. I have not the whole facts before me so as to give a formulated opinion; but, as to communicating to him the Dispatch, I am not otherwise inclined, & shall be quite content with what you may do.

2. On reflection, I incline to think that in the Dilke matter, yesterday, I ungenerously thrust on you the performance of my duty: and that I ought to lay out the subject of the future before him, in a short friendly conversation—he is a man that does not waste words—the case as it stands for the future, and ask him to make it known to Fawcett and any one else whom it may concern.

Weather colder here than any we had had in London.

666. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

Secret.

Hawarden Castle. April 6 1882.

As an illustrative fact, and to show that other fires burn besides those of tell the Queen Dilke refused further explanations and dismiss him, or (b) that Granville send his proposed letter to the Queen, as if he had not consulted Dilke, together with the letters of 1880, and add that Dilke’s abstention was justified to avoid a vote diametrically opposed to his previous position; all P.R.O. 30/29/122.

1 Lyons’s No. 284 very confidential, 3 Apr., reported Freycinet’s proposal of this as a means to end the struggle for power in Egypt, F.O. 27/2562.

2 See to Lyons, No. 313A very confidential, 22 Mar., proposing that Britain and France send experts to Cairo to assist in framing the financial part of the constitutional settlement, F.O. 27/2553; and from Lyons, No. 282, 3 Apr., reporting Freycinet’s objections, F.O. 27/2562.

3 See from Lyons, No. 283, 3 Apr., reporting Freycinet’s objections to communicating to Turkey the proposals for a constitutional settlement in Egypt, F.O. 27/2562.

4 Cf. Granville to Gladstone [? 4 Apr.] saying that he had come to an agreement with Dilke about his vote on the royal grants, Add. MS. 44643, fo. 122.
the Parliamentary oppositions, I send you Sir H. Ponsonby's letter of March 31 and my reply to H.M. for perusal.

P.S. Are we duly and regularly supplied with information other than telegraphic from Egypt as to what is going on? I seem to depend chiefly on the newspapers. Some papers from Cookson today.

667. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Walmer Castle. April 7/82.

I will send you some drafts, which I hope will carry out our ideas as to Egypt.

I wrote to Dilke before I got your letter, telling him that you did not admit his contention, that you said the question of grants was not likely to arise again soon, & would when they did have to be considered—Alors comme alors.

I added that you approved of my writing a letter to the Queen off my own bat—

As there is no means of communicating with Dilke excepting by the post, and a letter from you to him would be sure to be read by the French Gov, I have taken the liberty of telling them in Downing St, not to forward it, till they hear again from you.

Spencer is just arrived. I will write to you tomorrow.

668. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Walmer Castle. April 8/82.

Spencer arrived here yesterday evening. He showed me your letter, & I told him of your wish that I should talk out the Irish question with him.

He was as you may suppose perfectly straightforward and public spirited.

1 According to the docket of no. 666, about the Queen's opposition to baronetcies proposed by Gladstone; neither letter traced; cf. Granville to Gladstone, 6 Apr., 'the rejoinder [to the Queen] will be difficult', Add. MS. 44174, fo. 81; see no. 678.

2 i.e. to Lyons, No. 392, answering Freycinet's objections to the financial experts; No. 393 confidential, answering his objections to communication to Turkey; No. 394 very confidential, opposing the proposal to change the khedive; all, 11 Apr., F.O. 27/2553; see no. 665.

3 4 Apr., saying that his suggestion (a) (see p. 353, n. 3) was impossible and that his suggestion (b) could not be used since Gladstone denied that the assurances of 1880 were satisfactory and continuing as here described, P.R.O. 30/29/122.

4 Of 3 Apr., offering the viceroyalty of Ireland and suggesting discussion with Granville, Add. MS. 44545, fo. 114; Spencer accepted, 8 Apr., but referred Gladstone to no. 668; Gladstone replied, 9 Apr., that he would continue a member of the cabinet and lord president of the Council, Carlingford performing the duties, Add. MS. 44308, fos. 202, 204.
He dislikes the idea of resuming his old post, but he will do anything you are clearly of opinion may be necessary, or useful.

He likes his present office, and is much interested in several questions now pending there. He thinks it is a great disadvantage to him to lose the attendance at Cabinets, at this moment of importance, & when you are presiding over them.

He does not see his way to any great or immediate improvement in Irish affairs, though much may be done with care and patience.

One of his great difficulties is Forster. He likes him, & thinks it impossible to say that any one would have done better under the circumstances. But he is a strong man, a Cabinet Minister, and fond of work & not afraid of responsibility. The position at first was a difficult one for a Lord Lieutenant to hold his due place. It will be extremely so, after Forster has monopolized for two years the labour and the responsibility.

He thinks it difficult to settle for 2 months, what is to be done about coercion, or its substitutes—but he would not like to undertake the charge, without a knowledge of the general lines on which our policy is to rest.

He believes there are objections to the Lord Lieutenant being a Member of the Cabinet.

His post is in one sense of a different character—and the position as Cabinet Minister would be chiefly of an honorary character. But he thinks that criticism would not be strong at the present moment on such an arrangement, and it might strengthen him in the difficulty of his relations with the Chief Secretary.

If you press him to go, he would lay great stress on the suggestion he first made about Law & Sullivan.

I could not tell him when you proposed to take a decision, but I expressed an opinion that it would be soon. He is anxious about Cowper's position in any change.

669. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville


I send for your perusal a letter from Forster, and copy of my reply.²

The best ideal I can now frame for the Session is


b. To refer to Grand or Standing Committees some important Bills that are not matters of party.

¹ Not traced; possibly a proposal of additional powers for the two, who were attorney-general and lord chancellor for Ireland respectively.

² From Forster, 7 Apr., discussing the renewal of Irish coercion and sending a plan for an arrears bill, Add. MS. 44160, fo. 77; printed, T. Wemyss Reid, The Life of W. E. Forster (1888) ii. 415–19; and reply, 8 Apr., postponing Irish legislation till June, and urging him to think favourably of Irish local government, Add. MS. 44160, fo. 89.
c. To throw over for the year Local Govt England & London Govt.
d. To take serious Irish Legislation for the pièce de resistance in June & July.

670. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Private. Walmer Castle. April 10/82.

I showed my letter of Saturday\textsuperscript{1} to Spencer, & he entirely approved. I have this minute rec[eive]d the enclosed\textsuperscript{2} which shows more disinclination, and which with it's enclosure you ought to see.

Forster's letter to you, & Cowper's letter to Spencer, look as if there was little communication between them. As if shutting up the women had been the only question discussed by them.

671. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Walmer Castle. April 10/82.

Thanks for note & enclosure.

Your programme for the session seems right.

It is clearly impossible to go on with the local Gov & London bills—and as far as I know, we are hardly ripe with the first.

I like the idea of referring the non party bills to grand or standing committees of the Commons, but I must put in a strong request that some of these bills may be introduced in the Lords.

The piece de resistance for June & July will more than fill those months. Forster's paper\textsuperscript{3} is the ablest I have seen from him—I like your answer. I am not prepared to give an opinion upon the scheme for arrears—Is it absolutely necessary to have one.

As to the renewal of the present coercion act—there appear to me to be only three courses. Either to let it drop, to renew it for a year, or for the time you suggest after the passing of the new measure.

I do not see how it would be possible to announce, whatever the intention of the Gov might be, that you did not mean to use the powers given.

[P.S.] If anything is settled about the Ld Lieutenancy, I hope you will consult Spencer as to the mode of informing Cowper.

One great difficulty during April & May, will be as to the language to be held about intentions as to Ireland.

---

\textsuperscript{1} i.e. no. 668.
\textsuperscript{2} i.e. from Spencer, 9 Apr., on his aversion to the Irish viceroyalty, especially since the change might imply a change of policy and there was no alternative one, P.R.O. 30/29/29 A; enclosing a letter from Cowper about his resignation and failure to assert himself against Forster.
\textsuperscript{3} See p. 356, n. 2.
Hawarden Castle. Ap. 11. 82.

1. I wrote yesterday to Forster pointing out that a clear dividing line of special duties seemed to lie at the root of any arrangement as to Spencer.

2. I have read Cowper's letter to him with melancholy. The epithet which describes it is 'helpless'. Had he been a poor man, with his talents, he would probably have been very different.

3. As our large English Bills are virtually gone overboard for the year, and Irish legislation threatens again to occupy time, & we should still think try to have some Bills for England & Scotland, working them as much as possible through Standing Committees, I think it is most reasonable that they or some of them & the more the better should come first through the House of Lords—Bankruptcy, Patents, Criminal Procedure, might be worth examining in this view.2

4. We shall have to deal with the Finance of Irish Land, and there is so much desire, mixed with sanguine hope, about working transfer largely, that we must have a scheme capable of large application. This will I think involve the creation of local bodies in Ireland who can deal with us in an Irish sense. Forster I regret to say is rather averse to raising this question in the present year: but I think mistakenly: & I am by no means sure that I see how to get on without it.

5. Land-finance may supply sufficient pabulum for April and May: it is most desirable not to mix this with the other legislation for Ireland.

6. Rely on my doing nothing about the Vice Royalty without due consultation.

7. Your account of the conversation with Spencer was all that could be desired.

Walmer Castle. April 12/82.

I wrote to Hartington telling him that I believed Spencer would consult him about the Lord Lieutenancy. He answers that he is glad that there is to be a change in the Lord Lieutenancy but he don't feel sure of the expediency of Spencer going to Ireland. He wrote the other day to Forster to tell him that he did not agree with the Pall Mall & other papers which are urging that he should be made a Scape goat, but that he ought to insist on an efficient Lord Lieutenant—that if there was any difficulty about a successor, there was something in another suggestion of the Pall

1 10 Apr., on the need to agree about a division of labour, if Spencer became Irish viceroy, Add. MS. 44160, fo. 91; printed, T. Wemyss Reid, op. cit., ii. 421-2; and reply, Add. MS. 44160, fo. 97.

2 None of the legislation promised in the Queen’s speech was passed in 1882.

3 Granville first wrote 'I' and left 'don't' when he substituted 'he'.
Mall viz that it should be put into commission and that Lord Justices
should be appointed. Hartington is not sure that this would not be the
best plan—Sullivan—the Commander in chief, and the best Privy Coun-
cillor who could be found, (perhaps Monck) would form a very efficient
Gov, while the externals of the Vice Regal Court seem rather out of place
at the present moment.

He much doubts whether Forster, after being the absolute head of the
Gov for so long, could get on with Spencer, or any Lord Lieutenant with
a will of his own—

There is something in this suggestion—I do not know enough of Steele,
if he is still Commander in chief, but I heard he had vigorously defended
Forster.

674. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville  [P.R.O. 30/29/125]

1. In the conversation between Colvin and Bredif,¹ the Frenchman
seems to me, presumptively, nearer the mark.

2. I have read Dufferin’s letter of Ap 4² with uneasiness & am surprised
that he should not have mentioned Armenia to the Sultan. That consum-
mate rogue is pretending alarms which he does not feel, in order to prevent
us from pressing reforms which cause his corrupt and narrow mind real
alarm. These reforms we had virtually for the present narrowed to the
point of Armenia. We may not have the power of making him do what he
ought but we have the power of making him feel uneasy and insecure
while he does not do it, and ought this power to be, as Dufferin’s letter
implies, virtually renounced?

We shall I have no doubt be challenged on this subject, in our House if
not in yours, and I should hardly know what to say with that letter as the
dernier mot in the case.

675. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville  [P.R.O. 30/29/29 A]
H[awarden]. Ap. 13. 82.

1. On Irish Government I have already telegraphed to you.³ The choice

¹ See mem. by Colvin, 3 Apr., of conversation with new French controller-general
about the management by the chamber of notables of the revenues not assigned to the
service of the debt, enclosed in Malet to Granville, private, 4 Apr., both P.R.O.
30/29/160; see also p. 327, n. 4.
² To Granville, private, P.R.O. 30/29/190, and dispatch No. 250, 2 Apr., stating that
he had not mentioned Armenia at an audience with the sultan, F.O. 78/3383; to Dufferin,
No. 195 confidential, 20 Apr., approving his language without noticing the silence about
Armenia, F.O. 78/3377; see nos. 500, 513.
³ Tel. 13 Apr., replied to no. 673: ‘Do not see advantage but the reverse in substituting
three for one over the water [sc. Ireland], but admit difficulties on every side’, Add. MS.
44174, fo. 100.
seems to lie between Spencer and Carlingford. The second is or ought to
be easier, the first probably somewhat better, i.e. more certainly good. A
Council of three would I think produce a very unfavourable effect upon
the public mind.

2. Our Irish difficulties seem to mount up like Alp on Alp. Today I
have a letter from Forster in a sadly altered strain. He says 'I fear it will
be impossible to prevent (qy avoid?) very strong and immediate legisla-
tion'. He has very bad reports from his six magistrates, on whom he relies.
He gives me no detailed information. He proposes to come over on
Thursday 2oth. I think we must under the circ[umstance]s have a Budget
Cabinet before he comes, on Thursday at two—we can then have one for
him on Friday[,] Saturday or both. If you approve of this please to Tele-
graph. He certainly will not miss a pleasure by being absent from the
Budget Cabinet. Incessant pressure for expenditure from every quarter,
an unprogressive revenue, money necessary from some new tax or taxes,
that is the beggarly account we have to face.

3. The third branch of the Irish problem relates to the Purchase
Clauses. The turning point in this important subject in my opinion will be
found in the right arrangement rather than in the amount of the pecuniary
responsibility. The Irish tenant cannot, in my deliberate opinion, be safely
accepted as a debtor on a large scale to the Imperial Treasury. The political
objections are insurmountable, even if the financial objections be over-
looked. To make the responsibility of the purchasing tenant real, we must
have bodies of real weight in Ireland with which to deal, and throw upon
them the working of the clauses. The Irish are too strong to be governed
by agency which has to them a purely English character and which has its
seats in Downing Street and in Dublin Castle. I am much inclined
to believe that the safest course in these arduous circumstances is a bold one,
namely calling into existence, as the best form of local government for
Ireland, five provincial bodies according to the idea of Lord Russell, which
might at once be charged with the management of this question, and which
might in a future year take over all the functions of County Government.

Please let Hartington see this letter.

676. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

I do not quite take your view about Dufferin’s silence. He has great tact

1 See to Gladstone, 12 Apr., Add. MS. 44160, fo. 98.
2 Gladstone does not note a cabinet between Fri. 31 Mar. and Sat. 22 Apr., when Irish
business was taken.
3 See Gladstone’s outline of a bill for the establishment of provincial councils in
Ireland, to operate a scheme of land purchase, towards which Gladstone had been im-
pelled by the Lords’ committee of inquiry into the working of the Land Act, printed,
Hammond, 259-62.
in these matters. I rather adhere to what I said to Herbert Bismarck in Jany of which I enclose an extract.¹ I have told Dufferin that I will have it out with H. Bismarck² next week, about the statements made by his father, to the Chargé d’Affaires at Constantinople.

I may then speak to Musurus, and possibly it may be right to give fresh instructions to Dufferin.³

677. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone  
[Add. MS. 44174, fo. 103]  
Walmer Castle. April 15/82.

I have sent your pregnant letter⁴ to Hartington.

Forster is a strong man, but he is not very stable. He may come over with modified views on the 20th. I propose being in town early on that morning.

I have telegraphed that I have no objection to your dates for cabinets.

I quite agree as to the policy of substituting Irish for English agency in anything that is done about Bright’s clauses, but we shall have to hear what Forster says against local Gov.

The public will accept even a painful budget from you.

678. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville  
[P.R.O. 30/29/125]  

¹ I hope I am wrong about Dufferin’s conference with the Sultan. I quite agree with you as to his general character: he is like a man who has at last found his assiette. In any case, I am perfectly satisfied with the tone & matter of the extract which you send me as reminder from your conversation with Herbert Bismarck.

² I am certainly puzzled as to what it is that Forster means by his alarming language.⁵ Undoubtedly he is not quite as far from variability, as he is able and upright. Meantime some overtures come from Irish members which look as though the No Rent party felt itself beaten on that ground, and were disposed to make terms.

³ The fight is not yet over about the Baronets.⁶ I have sent H.M. the

¹ See to Amthill, No. 13 confidential, 16 Jan., recording his reply to Bismarck’s advice against pressing Turkey to reform, that pressure should be exerted by the European concert gradually and appropriately and would strengthen rather than weaken Turkey, F.O. 64/1003.

² See to Amthill, No. 158 confidential, 21 Apr., recording a conversation with Herbert Bismarck in which he reaffirmed Britain’s resolution to gain reforms for Armenia and asked for the moral support of Germany, and Bismarck made a cautious reply, F.O. 64/1003.

³ Not done. ¹ i.e. no. 675.

⁵ See p. 360, n. 1.

Gazette of Ap. 1880 with the list of ten—the fifth of that number that she had passed!

679. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville  
[P.R.O. 30/29/29 A]  
Private.  
10, Downing Street. Ap 20. 82.

I forgot to say today that if my dropping the Chancellorship of the Exchequer¹ could be made to serve any useful purpose in connection with the change in the Govt of Ireland, this would in itself be a welcome change to me.

680. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone  
[P.R.O. 30/29/125]  
18, Carlton House Terrace. April 21/82.

I send you a memorandum by Sanderson² on what has passed as to Errington & Gibraltar.³

I spoke to Dilke on the subject, which he believes is closed, & he thinks it would be undesirable to volunteer any explanation. If the occasion arises, it will be time enough for you to read the memorandum.

You would then be able to state that you had done so, and that you found that there were some allusions to Gibraltar in Errington’s letters, which although sent to you at the time, you had not had the leisure to read. It appears from them, that Mr Errington although he had some conversation on the subject with the Cardinal Secretary, had no negotiation to conduct, and informed Sir A. Paget of anything that was said on the subject.

681. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone  
[Add. MS. 44174, fo. 105]  
10, Downing Street. [22 April 1882].

I have to go to Windsor on Monday with Tissot and Braila.

What have you told the Queen about Ireland in your letter today⁴—To guide me.

¹ See nos. 571, 577, 685.
² Dated 20 Apr., follows no. 680, in P.R.O. 30/29/125.
³ Gladstone returned no. 680, having written on it his reply: ‘Thanks. I imagine Errington] added nothing practical to what is in the Parl. papers? W.E.G. Ap.22’; see ‘Correspondence as to Appointment of the Right Rev. Dr. Canilla as Vicar Apostolic at Gibraltar’, Parl. papers (1882) xlv. 303; for accusations that the government had condoned illegal arrests (arising out of incidents accompanying Canilla’s installation) at the Vatican’s instigation through Errington’s agency, see Hans. Parl. Deb. cclxviii. 642–3.
⁴ i.e. of 22 Apr., reporting the cabinet’s discussion, not traced; but see note by Gladstone: ‘I shall report provisionally & in very general terms’, written on no. 681 after ‘To guide me’; Gladstone returning no. 681, Granville wrote the final paragraph and sent it back.
What she will ask is whether we are aware of the dangerous state of Ireland, and whether we have decided upon any immediate measures to meet the evil. How many people we are going to hang and shoot etc. etc. etc.

682. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

18, Carlton House Terrace. [22 April 1882]

I shall see Tissot to-morrow.¹ The discussion of yesterday left me with few eggs in my basket.²

How would the following proposal do—

We once acting upon the advice of some of the Egyptian Experts, who were sanguine as to its success, proposed to France that we should authorize Turkey to send a general to restore discipline in the Egyptian army—The French declined—(When we both threw cold water on the Turkish Mission of Commissioners, it was because things seemed quiet, and because the Turk had acted off his own bat.)

Gambetta proposed to us that we should send a French and an English General. This was declined by us—

Is it impossible to combine these plans, and send a Turkish General armed with full powers by the Sultan, but with an agreement, that he should only use those full powers, with the consent of his Co-commis-sioners.

Perhaps you will discuss the idea with Spencer & let me have an answer.

If the French agree it would have a great moral effect to be able to contradict B[is]m[ar]ck, and to say that the 2 powers are quite agreed.

If they refuse, it will at all events take away the little core there may be in their complaint, that they propose and we only reject.

683. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville


I understand you to mean three Generals and such a plan I should think might be licked into shape if sensible & conciliatory men were chosen. But the adoption of any plan of the kind seems to suppose that there are pro-dicable reasons for apprehending a necessity of some kind for doing something precautionary.

Perhaps the monstrous promotions (as they seemed) give ground enough?

¹ See to Lyons, No. 443A, 24 Apr., recording his proposal to Tissot, the new French ambassador, of the mission of three generals to Egypt, F.O. 27/2553.
² Cf. to Lyons, No. 441A, 21 Apr., recording Tissot's invitation to Britain, if she would not accept the French proposal of a change of khedive (no. 665), to make her own suggestion for solving the Egyptian difficulty, F.O. 27/2553.
Forster has deterred me from the proposed answer to Biggar¹ by telling me it would lead to hostile debate. We have then concurred on one which does not snub on the one side, or commit on the other.

Pray bear in mind, relatively to our important discussion of tomorrow²
1. that a Cabinet Office (C[hancellorship] of [the] E[xchequer]) of the first class is disposable.³
2. that it would be acceptable to one or more Cabinet officers of the same class.
3. that in this view it might afford facilities of manipulation in given contingencies.

I send herewith for your perusal a note I have just had from Forster,⁴ relating to two papers which you by this time I hope may have seen: a letter from Parnell to O'Shea, and a mem. of O'Shea's and report to Forster of his conversation with Parnell.⁵

I also send you copy of my reply to Forster.

For question, 28 Apr., whether, pending their introduction of an arrears bill, the government would withhold support from Irish landlords executing eviction decrees; and reply, that the government as the upholder of the law had no title to do so, see Hans. Parl. Deb. cclxviii. 1677.

² In the cabinet, on change of offices; Gladstone's note only recorded discussion of legislation and decision to concentrate on procedure and Irish legislation as proposed in no. 669 above, Add. MS. 44643, fos. 79–85; see also mem. on legislative intentions for Ireland, Add. MS. 44766, fo. 61.

³ See no. 679.

⁴ 29 Apr., refusing to agree to the release of Parnell, Dillon, and O'Kelly, unless O'Shea brought back Parnell's promise of a public disclaimer of future abetting of intimidation, Add. MS. 44160, fo. 152; printed T. Wemyss Reid, The Life of W. E. Forster (1888) ii. 434–5.

⁵ Parnell's side of the Kilmainham 'treaty'; Parnell to O'Shea printed, Hammond, 276; Forster's account of the conversation with O'Shea, T. Wemyss Reid, op. cit. 436–8; for explanation of Forster's dissatisfaction with Parnell's assurances, Parnell's unavailing effort to substitute McCarthy for O'Shea, and Chamberlain's part in the negotiations, see Hammond, 271–9; cf. mem. by Gladstone, 5 May, of conversation with O'Shea who confirmed his report of Parnell's assurances, Add. MS. 44766, fo. 71.
2 May 1882

The promise seems to me if anything wider than we wanted—and the sole condition is the settlement of the arrears. The only question perhaps for tomorrow is the release of the three: about which, as at present advised, I see no remaining room for doubt. But I shall be most anxious to learn the impression made or to be made upon your mind.

Of course I take the conversation in the Cabinet before Chamberlain’s ‘mission’ as the starting point of my remarks.

I am due at Waterloo 10.55 a.m. tomorrow.

687. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

Secret & Immediate.

10, Downing Street. May 2. 82.

Forster spoke to me late last night in terms rather ambiguous but so far important that they did not involve adherence to his objections to immediate release.

I have this morning sent him an amended & shortened copy of my draft, not without hope that it may meet his view.

But should he persist, it had occurred to me that perhaps you could go down to Windsor with the communication to the Queen.

This was before I heard of Salisbury’s question.

688. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

House of Lords. May 2 [1882].

The Chancellor & Kimberley think I said nothing that clashed with what was settled to be said.

I told you I should not allude to the negotiations etc—I am not sure that my instinctive feeling does not apply to you.

Do you not think it would be better to wait for an attack, before defending yourself from the imputation.

You will know but—

1 In the cabinet, 1 May adjourned to 2 May, noon, when it decided to release the three; cf. Gladstone to Forster, 30 Apr., that he need not decide his position until after the cabinet, Add. MS. 44160, fo. 154.

2 i.e. of the statement of the government’s intentions for Ireland (constituting the government’s side of the Kilmainham ‘treaty’) in the hope of meeting his objections, Add. MS. 44545, fo. 128; Forster resigned the same day and was replaced by Lord F. Cavendish.

3 i.e. whether Spencer had replaced Cowper as Irish viceroy and what steps were being taken to pacify the country, Hans. Parl. Deb. ccxlviii. 1919.

4 For Granville’s reply to Salisbury, avoiding the negotiations with Parnell, see ibid. 1919–24.

5 Granville ended here without signing, leaving a clear half sheet.
Errington’s letter\(^1\) just circulated reminds me to remind you of what I have said as to his permanent or prolonged retention but I presume you have telegraphed or will telegraph to him the altered state of affairs in Ireland and perhaps the nature of the crisis might authorise the strictly temporary revival of his co-called agency until the crisis is over.

The Speaker is gone, or was going, out of town. I have sent to May to see what he thinks as to proceeding with any business tomorrow—\(^3\)

I cannot think it impossible that the dreadful event\(^4\) of last night should have some influence on the course of the Opposition with reference to Beach’s motion, or to our offer.\(^5\) Were this to be so it might be right to allow any pacific proceeding to take effect.

We are going to put off the dinner & my wife’s party on Wednesday.

I think in view of probable inaction tomorrow it will be well to let Richard Grosvenor, who has been sharply ill, stay away over the day.

Godley and Hamilton have the notion that the plot was to kill Burke, with whom dear Freddy’s being in company was accidental.

I shall go to the Chapel Royal & then come here.

I hear well of Lucy\(^6\) this morning. She is so good that she will pass unharmed through any fire of affliction.

You have felt this most deeply & I can only hope you got your sleep.

---

\(^1\) See p. 298, n. 4.

\(^2\) Gladstone to Granville, 5 May, sending a letter to Hartington, 5 May, proposing that, as no one could supply the relief to Gladstone that Cavendish had done, a chancellor of the exchequer should be appointed (Add. MS. 44146, fo. 32), P.R.O. 30/29/125, not printed.

\(^3\) Both Houses were adjourned on Mon. 8 May until the following day.

\(^4\) The murder in Phoenix Park, 6.30 p.m., 6 May, of Cavendish, appointed Irish Secretary, 2 May, and the Irish under-secretary, T. H. Burke.

\(^5\) For Beach’s notice, 5 May, of his intention, 8 May, to bring on the debate of the whole Irish policy of the government, and the government’s offer of time on 9 May for an adjourned debate, see Hans. Parl. Deb. cclxix. 235-6.

\(^6\) Lady F. Cavendish.
me to tell [you] how deeply he felt for you, not only on public grounds, but also on account of your intimate personal relations.

(I hear from Hamilton that a note has just arrived).

Should you not write to the Queen¹—

Harcourt telegraphed to Henry Ponsonby and I wrote a short note telling the facts, & saying I do so, as you were terribly overcome.

692. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

[P.R.O. 30/29/125]

10, Downing Street. May 8. 1882.

We cannot have an Irish policy without an Irish Secretary? And I am disposed to think that one of our very first necessities is to designate and prepare a successor to our dear murdered friend.

I inclose a letter from Northbrook² pointing to Trevelyan.

But

1. The grudge against him would not be less,³ and his conduct on the Leopold grant was the same.

2. His Parliamentary service though good is I think second to Dilke’s.

I therefore send you a Memorandum I have written on the conversation with Dilke on Friday last,⁴ to be ready for transmission at a proper time to the Queen.

693. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville⁵

[P.R.O. 30/29/125]

10, Downing Street. May 9. 82.

Here is another excellent letter from Spencer,⁶ copied. The pressure acts upon his handwriting & no wonder—

Pray consider about the American Govt.⁷ My impression still is that we should write and ask whether we may expect a reply, without any implied reproach, or allusion to events.

Trevelyan approved.

¹ Done 7 May, Guedalla, ii. 189–91.

² Of 4 May, proposing Trevelyan to succeed Cavendish as financial secretary to the Treasury, Add. MS. 44266, fo. 125; Trevelyan was now appointed Cavendish’s successor as chief secretary for Ireland without a seat in the cabinet.

³ i.e. than against Dilke with the Queen; see p. 353, n. 3.

⁴ 5 May, which satisfied Gladstone that Dilke would announce, at a time when no parliamentary grant to a member of the royal family was pending, that he would not abstain in future from voting for one; sent to the Queen, 8 May, Guedalla, ii. 192–4.

⁵ Gladstone to Granville, 8 May, announcing a kind note from the Queen and Trevelyan’s acceptance, Add. MS. 44545, fo. 132, not printed.

⁶ To Gladstone, 7, 8 May, on the Phoenix Park murders and the steps necessary to vindicate the law and strengthen the government in Ireland, Add. MS. 44308, fos. 217, 218.

⁷ i.e. whether to approach about the Irish press in the United States; cf. p. 277, n. 7, and p. 282, n. 3.
694. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

[P.R.O. 30/29/125]

10, Downing Street. May 9, 1882.

This is the programme as it presents itself to me—

Dilke’s refusal seems to make E. Fitzmaurice difficult: and I consider Brand would be the man to fill the blank.

Courtney—Treasury (with notice of change)
Campbell Bannerman—Admiralty
Ashley—Colonial Office
Brand—War Office
Holms? Board of Trade in which case the Lords of the Treasury would move up one step without a new appt. & Herbert G[ladstone] wd become a paid lord.

695. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

[Add. MS. 44174, fo. 114]

18, Carlton House Terrace. May 9/82.

Herbert deserves promotion. He is certain to get it. If there were any other liberal Minister, he would promote him at once. You would be justified in doing so. Yet if I were you, or he, I should not consent at the present moment.

696. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

[P.R.O. 30/29/125]

10, Downing Street, May 10, 1882.

1. Many thanks. Herbert can remain as he is.

2. Hartington (within) has written to me the inclosed. My daughter Mary goes down this forenoon to stay with Lucy [Cavendish]. She will telegraph to me. But I am almost determined to go even without telling them, for I feel that I cannot stay away. That would be tomorrow.

697. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

Sunday evening 9.25 Pm. May 14/82.

Inasmuch as & because the French absolutely (though I think

1 i.e. of the office of chief secretary for Ireland, accepted by Trevelyan, see S. Gwynn and G. M. Tuckwell, The Life of Sir Charles W. Dilke (1917) i. 441-3.

2 The list printed from Add. MS. 44174, fo. 112; for the changes made: (a) Courtney financial secretary to the Treasury vice Cavendish, Trevelyan chief secretary Ireland vice Cavendish; (b) Ashley colonial under-secretary vice Courtney, Campbell Bannerman secretary to the Admiralty vice Trevelyan; (c) John Holms secretary to the Board of Trade vice Ashley, Sir A. D. Hayter financial secretary W.O. vice Campbell Bannerman; (d) a new commission for the Treasury (June) including R. Duff and Herbert Gladstone vice Holms and Hayter; (e) Brand surveyor-general of the Ordnance vice Sir J. Miller Adye; see Add. MS. 44545, fo. 134 et seq.

3 9 May, begging that Gladstone would not go to Cavendish’s funeral, it having been impossible to answer Mrs. Gladstone’s tel. to postpone, Add. MS. 44146, fo. 33.
mistakenly) decline our terms as to Turkey & the other powers, I would conform to the first necessity, which is to concur with them under the circumstance[s] & now that they have conformed to us on the main point.

But please consider whether as the intention of going to Alexandria is avowed it would be well to let Malet know the terms, in order that if he sees risk to British residents at Cairo he may advise their withdrawal.

I expect to be at home at 10.30 & can come to see you if needful.

698. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone [Add. MS. 44174, fo. 115]

10, Downing Street. May 14 [1882].

I have answered Tissot in your words.

I made him copy a telegram from Malet, who says that it is of all importance that the Turks should join with us, or the notables would coalesce again with Arabi.

He seemed struck with it, and I therefore said. 'I think I shall be individually indiscreet.' He said 'Entre nous, oui.'

Rivers Wilson[,] Colonel Stokes and the FO are all against cautions to the residents in Cairo. Their tendency is to panic, & they think we only do harm.

Malet knows our intentions.

699. Interchange of notes between Lord Granville and Mr. Gladstone [P.R.O. 30/29/125]

[15 May 1882.]

May Northbrook send these instructions which I should communicate to the French Gov. G.

1 Her last proposal having failed, see no. 682, Britain agreed to France's proposal to send ships to Alexandria on condition that other powers should be represented; see from Lyons, No. 407, 12 May, F.O. 27/2563, to Lyons, No. 528, 13 May, F.O. 27/2554, and Granville to Gladstone, undated, that Tissot refused the representation of other powers, P.R.O. 30/29/125.

2 i.e. that if armed intervention became necessary recourse should be had to Turkish troops.

3 i.e. as in no. 697.

4 No. 128, 14 May, on the possibility of the chamber of notables and the army combining to resist any intervention in which Turkey did not share, F.O. 78/3448.

5 See to Malet, tel. No. 105, 13 May, reporting abandonment of the mission of the three generals, acceptance of the French proposal of ships for Alexandria, and agreement with Turkey to abstain from intervention at present, F.O. 78/3446.

6 Exchange between Granville and Gladstone, 14 May, proposing and approving, with modifications, tel. No. 106 to Malet, 14 May, instructing him to warn Arabi that disorder in Egypt would find Britain, France, Europe, and Turkey arrayed against the rebels, F.O. 78/3446, not printed.

7 i.e. to Admiral Seymour, in command of the squadron off Alexandria.

Very well drawn but they read as if the orders were for Alexandria straight. I presume they are meant for him to open when he gets orders to go there[.]

But is it not necessary, that orders should go to the Bay, [and] for them to proceed at once. I consider we have agreed to this—& after Malet’s telegram recommending it there seems to be no objection. G.

Yes: I had not seen M’s Telegram. WEG.

700. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

[Add. MS. 44174, fo. 117]
Foreign Office. May 15/82.

I spoke to Derby again this evening. I thought his manner much drier. I mentioned to him all that you had suggested. He said nothing, but hoped to see me on Wednesday.

701. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

[Add. MS. 44174, fo. 107]
Foreign Office. [15? May 1882].

I am afraid I am not hopeful—Derby’s inclination not to do a thing, strengthens with time and reflection.

702. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

[Add. MS. 44174, fo. 120]
Foreign Office. [16 May 1882].

On reflection, I am not sure that a visit to the Countess might not be of use if you can find time.

703. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

[P.R.O. 30/20/29 A]

10, Downing Street. May 16. 82.

With reference to your note of last night, it only occurs to me to say that the time taken by Derby is rather long, and that I wish we were secure of his giving you an opportunity of explaining on any particular point of difficulty, presuming his hesitation or reluctance to arise upon particulars.

I have just got your note of this morning & should have no difficulty in going at five this afternoon.

Forster made a sad series of blunders yesterday, and was extricated by the Speaker from a real scrape.

1 No. 127, 14 May, urging on political grounds the presence of ships which he had previously deprecated, lest it provoke attacks on Europeans, F.O. 78/3448.
2 Cf. nos. 571, 577, 579; for later and successful negotiations to persuade Derby to accept cabinet office, see nos. 895–900.
3 In the debate on the release of Parnell and the ‘Kilmarnock treaty’, 15 May, see Hans. Parl. Deb. cclxix. 788–90, 790–1, and Hammond, 289.
I have had a conversation with Lady Derby at the sacred hour of tea. It was long and friendly, but scarcely hopeful. It left pretty clearly traced on my mind these two impressions: first, he has no political difficulty whatever and has absolutely renounced in his own mind all idea, even in remote possibility, of rejoining his own party: secondly that, if I were out of the way he would be yours tomorrow. There was nothing said to shut the door but I do not think it very widely open.

It now occurs to me that Derby ought, in justice to himself, before he decides, to know fully the whole of our proceedings with regard to the release of the suspects?

Derby did not come to the Lords.
As soon as I got your note, as to the convicts—I wrote to him, but he was not at home. He did not drop a hint to me yesterday, of Lady D's strange personal suggestion.

[P.S.] On the contrary, he said it would be a great blow to conservatism if your Gov was turned out.

I met Derby at dinner. I forced him very reluctant into a corner. I told him that I was obliged to go to Windsor this morning to introduce a Foreign Minister.

He said he was very sorry, that he believed to his great regret that he should have to announce his refusal, together with the promise of all the support in his power.

I said I heard this not only with regret but with surprise—that I had left him with the conviction that he had no political or personal objection—He was much embarrassed, & said 'that is perfectly true'—he then
blurted out 'It is a private & family reason' ['']I will call on you early tomorrow.'

My explanation is that he has perhaps consulted Bedford. I know of no other relation to whom he was likely to apply—and that the Duke said if he (Derby) accepted, he should send in his wife’s resignation.

If this turns out to be the case, shall I press him much or not.

I called on E. Baring but could not find him at home.

708. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

10, Downing Street. May 17. 82.

The circumstances are indeed surprising but I have no hesitation in saying yes, press him, in the contingency you name.

I am glad he is to call on you.¹

709. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Foreign Office. May 18/82.

I have seen Hartington.

I have told him that as far as he is concerned, it is a good thing for him to see the working of as many offices as possible—that at the Exchequer, he will not only see an additional office, but will be placed in relation with all the departments.

We are agreed not to press for the status quo—though we should prefer it.

Hartington consents to give up India to Goschen.

But he thinks that the other arrangement would be better—Goschen to the War office, & Childers to the Exchequer, if there is no objection to Childers in that office. He thinks this ought to be ascertained.

We both think it doubtful whether Goschen will accept.²

710. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Foreign Office. May 18/82.

I agree with Hartington that he is right as to the certainty of the criticisms upon the square men in the round holes.

But this would only be a 2 days wonder, with regard to two able men.

¹ Cf. Gladstone to Lady Derby, 17 May, regretting Derby’s refusal to accept cabinet office; reply, 18 May, Add. MS. 44475, fos. 156, 160; and Mrs. Gladstone’s account of a conversation with Lady Derby, 18 May, and Gladstone’s, 24 May, Add. MS. 44766, fos. 75–77.

² See Gladstone to Goschen, 1 June, offering appointment as secretary for war; and reply, 2 June, refusing, since he opposed a further lowering of the franchise, Add. MS. 44161, fos. 282, 284; cf. nos. 679, 685, and p. 366, n. 2, and Gladstone’s note that he told the cabinet, 31 May, that he ought to be replaced as chancellor of the exchequer, Add. MS. 44643, fos. 119, 120.
711. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

[Add. MS. 44174, fo. 142]

Foreign Office. [? 25 May 1882].

Your proposed answer to Wolff smiled to me—and I have not relaxed my smile.
The only objections that occur to me—are that it might look as if you had been provoked into firing a blunderbuss at such an insect, & that the offer was so difficult for Northcote to accept, that it was only a way to avoid inconvenient questions.²

712. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

[P.R.O. 30/29/125]

Foreign Office. [26 May 1882].

Please look carefully at this.³ It is difficult.
There is the Scylla of English & French public opinion on one side, and the Charybdis of the Sultan’s jealousy of his dignity.⁴

713. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

[Add. MS. 44174, fo. 129]

Holmbury. May 27/82.

They have of course sent you these telegrams.⁵
Lyons’ letter is discouraging, & the outlook is not satisfactory, unless things right themselves at Cairo.
I propose coming over to luncheon tomorrow, unless news comes making me postpone it till Monday.

¹ Granville to Gladstone, 23 May, ‘your decision appears to me to be quite right [not to communicate further with Mrs. O’Shea] & your letter [to her] excellent. She is said to be his mistress’, Add. MS. 44174, fo. 127; cf. no. 861 A, and p. 444, nn. 2, 3, and Hammond, 306-12. Gladstone to Granville, draft tel. 24 May, commenting on Malet’s tel. No. 151, 23 May (reporting the defiance of the notables by the army and the ministry in the belief that Turkey would not be allowed to intervene) and proposing that the sultan be asked to announce his intention to intervene, P.R.O. 30/29/125, not printed.
² On 26 May Gladstone, with Northcote’s acquiescence, moved adjournment for Whitsuntide before question time in order to avoid questions on Egypt, but Drummond Wolff obtained the Speaker’s ruling that it would be more usual to move it after questions and Gladstone submitted, Hans. Parl. Deb. cclxix. 1698-9.
³ i.e. to Malet, draft tel. No. 140, 22 May, instructing him if possible to promote a settlement without Turkish intervention, owing to French nervousness lest their assent to the use of Turkish troops should become public, F.O. 78/3446.
⁴ Gladstone returned the letter having written on it: ‘Northcote has backed our deprecation [of parliamentary discussion on Egypt on the adjournment for Whitsuntide, Hans. Parl. Deb. cclxix. 1720-1] very well, and it was well received by the House in general’; but see above, n. 2.
⁵ From Malet, tels. Nos. 160-4, 27 May, reporting the resignation of Arabi’s ministry, the firmness of the khedive, the army colonels’ demand for the reinstatement of Arabi and Malet’s recommendation that the sultan be persuaded to summon him to Constantinople, F.O. 78/3448.
714. *Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville* [P.R.O. 30/29/125]
The Durdans. May 27. 82.

In anticipation of seeing you tomorrow, I write one line to say what, not suspecting the French, I did not mention yesterday, viz. that the French Ministers may do well to remember that there is a public opinion in England as well as in France, and that it is very jealous of France on account of the transactions in Tunis, and very jealous of any subserviency on our parts towards France, of which we are already more or less suspected. This was sufficiently evident in the House of Commons yesterday, although the House behaved extremely well.

The position is critical but the course of affairs in Cairo seems thus far satisfactory.

715. *Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone* [Add. MS. 44174, fo. 130]
Foreign Office. May 28/82.

Tissot would not hear of the 1000 soldiers. He said that there could be no truth in it.

He thinks though he does not commit himself, that Freycinet will concur in our instructions.

Pender has been here & has done a good thing. He has ordered his telegraph man to have a wire ready to be connected with a gun boat, in case the soldiers should man the telegraph offices.

He showed me an epitome of the news which will appear in the papers tomorrow. People will be a good deal alarmed. I am glad Parliament does not meet for three days.

Harty Tarty is at Kimbolton & the Porter believes he is not coming back for a few days.

Please thank Rosebery very much for his Hansom Cab. I had a pleasant drive—one hour & a quarter to Clapham—half an hour to the F.O.

The horse worthy of his name, high couraged, with plenty of strength & stamina, and a little fast.

The opposition of the notables is a great fact. Not only from the moral force it gives us, but from the proof it affords, that they who are better judges than the Europeans do not believe that the soldiers are thoroughly in earnest.

3 See also Granville to Gladstone, tel. 27 May, reporting the denial, P.R.O. 30/29/125; and to Lyons, No. 615, 28 May, recording the conversation with Tissot, F.O. 27/2554.
4 See to Dufferin, tel. No. 176, 28 May, instructing him to urge the sultan to summon Arabi and the other army leaders to Constantinople, F.O. 78/3377.
716. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

I think that Malet in his No 168 was quite right in conditionally withdrawing all opposition to the Khedive's asking for a Turkish Commissioner, & surely the French Colleague ought to have gone at least as far.

The French resistance to Turkish action has probably been the cause of all the mischief by causing the Sultan, with his usual falseness, to egg on the Khedive's Ministry underhand.

I do not see what more you can do: if Freycinet lags behind he will find himself in self-wrought isolation.

717. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

I am not sure that I rightly understand your telegram. Does it mean that we are 1° to go on pressing the Sultan to support Khedive[,] reprove Ministers, and summon the ringleaders sending a Commissioner for that purpose, or 2° that we should say, that we were glad to meet the views of the French yesterday, when there seemed to be a favorable change in the circumstances. But that now that Arabi is in power & in full revolt against the Khedive, we must revert to our proposal to invite the Sultan to send troops.

718. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

I answered Malet's telegram in a way, which you who have been more tender hearted about Tewfik than myself, are not likely to disapprove. The French will not force us to advise him to remain—and if they wish us to advise him positively to come to Alexandria, it will commit them all the more to support him—

I propose to answer Freycinet's new departure as to English & French occupation very sternly, but will not do so till I hear from you.
3° If the French answer is against inviting the Turk to send a man of war, how would it do to answer, that we have deferred to their opinion—and will only intimate that we have no objection to a Turkish man of war joining—

4 The Italian Gov agree to our proposal of yesterday, if the other Powers do so—¹

5 Is it clear that for appearance sake, we ought not to have a cabinet.²

6 Kimberley the only cockney colleague approves of what we have done.

719. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

Immediate. [P.R.O. 30/29/125]

[The Durdans]. May 29. 82.

Viewing the state of trains today & the value of time, I have answered your note by Telegram,³ to convey that it is moral force—(whether by sending a Commiss[ione]r or summoning Arabi & Co or both) which I recommend our calling on the Sultan to use. I gather that order is in less danger, or for the moment perhaps more, now that Arabi is again in power, & that our first object should be to have the Sultan committed visibly in Egypt against the unruly.—If you doubt about this, then it is another thing.

Urging this demand need not prevent prosecuting the other question as to troops, if after Dufferin's last Telegram,⁴ that be advisable.

720. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

[Add. MS. 44174, fo. 144]

Foreign Office. [30? May 1882].

Shall I confidentially consult Bismarck as to the French proposal for a conference⁶—to which the Turks by anticipation have objected.

§ 2 of no. 718, received at Epsom by messenger, P.R.O. 30/29/125.

¹ See from Paget, No. 167, 29 May, reporting that the Italian ambassador had been directed to advise the sultan to support the khedive against Arabi on the condition described, F.O. 45/454.

² Summoned for 31 May; see nos. 721, 722.

³ See p. 375, n. 3.

⁴ No. 109, received 12.30 a.m., 29 May, reporting that the khedive had formally asked for a Turkish commissioner; tel. No. 122, reporting the Turkish ministry's failure to agree on a reply to the khedive, not received until 11 p.m., 29 May, F.O. 78/3397.

⁵ See also Granville to Gladstone, tel. 4 p.m., 29 May, 'Admiral wants more ships in consequence of earthwork erected opposite [H.M.S.] Invincible. I have telegraphed to Lyons and written to Tissot that we propose to agree, and at the same time inform the Powers, and ask the Turk to send a man of war. Since my letter of today to you', P.R.O. 30/29/125.

⁶ See from Lyons, tel. No. 73, 30 May, reporting the French proposal for a European conference at Constantinople, F.O. 27/2574; to Lyons, tel. No. 244, 30 May, tel. 1 June, accepting after a cabinet decision, F.O. 27/2573; exchange of tels. between Gladstone and Granville, 30 May, arranging the cabinet meeting in view of the French proposal, P.R.O. 30/29/125; Gladstone's note of the cabinet, 31 May, recording Hartington's dissent, Add. MS. 44643, fo. 117.
I see no objection to it, excepting on the score of delay.

There would be a great advantage in knowing Bismarck's opinion, though if it be as it was in February in favour of a congress, it would hamper the Cabinet, if they wished to refuse it.

If you telegraph 'yes,' I shall understand that you wish me to consult Prince B.

Childers is gone to France—not leaving his address directing that nothing is to be sent to him, as his health requires to be absolutely free from work.

721. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

[The Durdans]. May 30. 82.

I think that if the Cabinet is to meet for the purpose of considering the French proposal it is best that they should meet perfectly free, and as you say a previous reference to Bismarck would tend to fetter their discretion.

I own I do not much like it on other grounds as it seems to recognise for him an exceptional position. One after another the Continental Powers may have had to make this acknowledgment, by implication at any rate: but I am rather jealous of his having it from England and fear it would a little tend to lower our position. In haste to let the messenger catch the train.

[P.S.] Derby finally declines.

722. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Foreign Office. May 30/82.

By the telegraphic message just delivered Freycinet says that if encouraged by me, he will summon his Council.

So there will be no loss of time, by our having a cabinet. It will certainly look better, and may prevent ill humour on the part of colleagues, but I am in despair at bringing them up a day too soon. [P.S.] When I gave my answer to Tissot, he said 'Il était temps'.

I hope I ought not to have answered like Arnel to his sister in the play 'Il n'était plus temps'.

---

1 See to AmPTHILL, No. 187 confidential, recording his conversation with Münster in which he described the negotiations with France without consulting, F.O. 64/1003.

2 See Lady Derby to Gladstone, 29 May, conveying Lord Derby's final refusal of cabinet office, Add. MS. 44475, fo. 205.

3 i.e. for the cabinet on 31 May; parliament was due to reassemble, 1 June.
723. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville  
10, Downing Street. [2 June 1882]  
I am not sure whether I went over far yesterday in saying Arabi had thrown off the mask—with reference specially to the Telegram reported *viva voce* by Dilke which it afterwards appeared was not quite so strong as we had supposed.  
He *has* indeed thrown it off but you are the best judge whether this need be said and I could qualify it a little *reading* the Telegram at the same time IF you think this expedient.

724. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville  
10, Downing Street. June 9. 82.  
Please to consider with care what should be said in the Cabinet tomorrow on the subject of the inclosed letters. I take upon me to let you know the case as it stands between P[arnell] and E[gan]: but I ask of you to be so kind as not to let it go farther.  
The question is what can & should be said in the Cabinet tomorrow. My opinion is that if Parnell goes, no restraining influence will remain: the *scale* of outrage will again be enlarged: & no repressive Bill can avail to put it down.  
The wretched murders of yesterday* have produced a temper in the House of Commons which would lead them to vote almost any thing we ask however strong: but this is in truth a danger as well as a temptation.

725. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville  
10, Downing Street. June 17. 82.  
Musurus came up to me, & I said after you that the Sultan had taken upon himself a very heavy responsibility.*

---

1 See Gladstone’s reply to Cross’s question, 1 June, on the state of Egyptian affairs and the position of the khedive, and Dilke’s more evasive reply, 2 June, to a further question, *Hans. Parl. Deb.* cclix. 1781, 1937.  
2 From Malet, tel. No. 179, 1 June, reporting the imminent deposition of the khedive by the army colonels; and tel. No. 180, 1 June, reporting that this was probably only a threat, F.O. 78/3448.  
3 For cabinet, 10 June, in which the Irish Crimes bill was discussed, as well as Egypt, and a sharp argument developed between Chamberlain and Harcourt about Parnell, Chamberlain wishing to strengthen his influence by concessions, see Add. MS. 44643, fos. 121-3.  
4 Walter Bourke of Rahassan, Co. Galway, land agent, and Corporal Wallace of the Dragoon Guards, acting as his escort, were shot dead near Gort on 8 June.  
5 Granville to Gladstone, 12 June, on the Zanzibar postal contract, P.R.O. 30/29/146, not printed.  
6 *I.e.* in deciding to send Turkish commissioners to Egypt and in refusing participation in the European conference at Constantinople; cf. to Dufferin, No. 330, 20 June,
He said yes; & in conformity with it the Sultan would certainly send troops: but what he could not stand was the Conference.

I said that it seemed to me quite necessary that the Powers through the Ambassadors at Constantinople should meet and arrive at an understanding (s’entendre).

He said yes certainly but not with protocols & the forms of a Conference.

I said I felt sure that none of them would be disposed to obstruct the action of the Sultan if it were satisfactory (or a word to that effect[]) but that the form of their proceedings would I presumed have to be decided by themselves.

He seemed to express satisfaction, after having tried to get more which of course I could not give.

726. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville  
[P.R.O. 30/29/125]  
10, Downing Street. June 17. 82.

I have no objection whatever to make to this draft which aims at preserving the Khedive’s Civil List from the interference of the Notables. But if you are writing on the subject of the attributions to be assigned to that body, do not the questions I mentioned to you 1. of exclusive taxation and 2. of sinecures for foreigners seem to call for simultaneous or early notice? I do not mean that they ought to be handed over to the Notables but that they should be suggested to the Powers, or to the proper parties for review.¹ It would seem possible in the present state of things, when the Four Powers have got their fingers respectively in the pie, & when they find that France & England have been feathering the nests of their people in Egypt, that the Four Powers may be ready enough to start criticism of this kind, & if there be any just ground for it, we might stand all the better for having anticipated them.

727. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville  
[P.R.O. 30/29/125]  
Ju 21. [1882].

Might not the attitude of your agent² at the moment be
a. direct commun[icatio]n with the de facto men.
b. subject to an announcement to Khedive that we consider permanent arrangements reserved for cons[ideratio]n & sanction at Constantinople.³

reporting several conversations of Musurus with different members of the cabinet, F.O. 78/3378.

¹ See min. by Granville here: ‘It was by inadvertence that I did not suggest this. Please draft accordingly’.

² Relates to Malet’s tel. No. 244, 20 June, asking for instructions for the event of the khedive’s reappointing Arabi his minister, F.O. 78/3448; written on the back of a copy.

³ Cf. to Malet, tel. No. 268, 20 June, instructing him to deal only with the president of the council where matters of public safety were concerned, F.O. 78/3432.
728. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

Early.

10, Downing Street. June 21. 82.

1. The more I reflect the more I feel unprepared to take any measure with regard to the Suez Canal single handed, or in union with France, apart from any reference to the authority of Europe.

2. I do not include in the class of measures such a step of protection as we have already taken in sending one vessel I believe to Port Said, nor the further sending of an iron-clad which you spoke of yesterday; holding over for the moment any question as to an army force on board.

3. But without reference to my wider proposition it occurs to me that, while the Suez Canal question is not before the Conference for discussion, yet as a part of the Egyptian territory it cannot be wholly excluded from notice. Whether the Conference accept Arabi or not, whether the Sultan send troops or not, certain matters surely must be included & provided for (according to our definition) in any arrangement which the Conference can accept. First of all among them must be security for the peace of the territory, and in the territory the Suez Canal is included. Part therefore of the field under their view embraces it quoad peace and order, & cannot so far as I see be withdrawn from it.

This if sound is important. 1

4. Should not Dufferin make known to his Colleagues (not as inviting any action from them) our intention to have reparation, & may it not be politic to put this question in the van, by formulating if we can what it may be right to ask in respect of the persons in the Queen’s service who were killed or injured.

5. Ought not the reparation to include all charges of transport for those who have been driven from their homes by the inability of Arabi & Co to keep order. 2

I am sorry to trouble you with so long a note.

729. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

18, Carlton House Terrace. [21 June 1882].

The Cabinet has not been summoned yet.

Northbrook has set the staff in work, and believes he will be able at all events to begin with a purely naval force, but must wait their report.

Derby announced to the Russians at the outset of the war 3 that the Canal could not be interfered with, & sent vessels to the ends.

1 See Gladstone’s note of inconclusive discussion in the cabinet, 20 June, of means to protect the Suez Canal; of further discussion, 21 June; and mem. of agreement that the safety of the Canal should be included in any arrangement made by the Constantinople conference; Add. MS. 44643, fos. 126, 129, 131.

2 See instructions to Dufferin, no. 730.

3 For action during the Russo-Turkish War, 1877–8, see no. 69.
I do not think it would be safe to introduce the subject of the Canal in any way at the conference.

I like very much your notion of an intimation[,] without asking any action from them, to the Powers of our intention to demand reparation.

But I doubt whether there is any precedent for the demand as to charges of Transport. I will enquire.¹


1. Propose in Conference that Sultan should send troops.
2. Support proposal with reasons.
3. Intimate that if Conference decline, or if Sultan decline, we shall invite Conference to concert effectual means for the re-establishment of legality and security in Egypt.
4. So far as we can at present judge, the form of this invitation will be to ask the Powers to provide for or sanction a military intervention other than Turkish under their authority.

731. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville [P.R.O. 30/29/125] 10, Downing Street. June 24. 82.

As we are on good terms with the Khedive & in communication with him personally might we not properly ask him what assurances he can give us as to the security & freedom of the Suez Canal?

And if the story as to the cannon proves to be serious, then ask also what is the meaning of sending cannon to the bank?

It appears that in [18]77 the Egyptian Govt & the Canal Co. took measures to provide against danger.³


I presume that we may refuse Egypt, without a Cabinet.⁴ Hartington was to be at Windsor this afternoon.

¹ The W.O. did pay for transport.
² No. 730, marked 'Decision of Cabinet'; described by Gladstone 'as agreed to as the groundwork for dealing with the question of intervention in Egypt', Add. MS. 44643, fo. 129; see to Dufferin, tel. No. 290, 8 p.m., 21 June, using no. 730, F.O. 78/3395.
³ See mem. by Gladstone, adding that Britain sent an ironclad under Admiral Hornby, Add. MS. 44643, fo. 131.
⁴ Relates to Dufferin's tel. No. 168 secret and confidential, 24 June, reporting the sultan's offer to transfer to Britain the exclusive control and administration of Egypt, reserving only those rights of suzerainty he then possessed, F.O. 78/3397.
733. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

There can be no doubt or cause for delay.
D[?ilke] spoke admirably well.—
I have only one suggestion to make on your reply at A. p. 3.
It is probably true as it stands: but rather too strong to announce? For 'we w[oul]d not tolerate' I would suggest 'our policy is wholly opposed to'
You repeat this at the end.
On the whole for [']possible modifications of internal detail['] I would also as less suspicious have something to this effect 'without excluding safe improvement of internal administration.[']

734. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

Yes. I think the authority of the Conference is moral not legal & will not bear straining by a rigid rule.
Again we have reparation to demand & cannot be bound by such a rule to abstain indefinitely.
And doubtless the Conference will ipso facto check & put back any idea of separate action.

735. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

Should not the Conference be moved, unless on the spot Dufferin sees strong reason to the contrary, to take notice of the Sultan’s astonishing course in conferring a high decoration on Arabi Pasha?
(For consideration not reply)
P.S. I have now read Dufferin’s No 174, but it does not lead me to withdraw [my] suggestion.

1 For Dilke’s skill in answering a series of questions on Egypt, 23 June, see Hans. Parl. Deb. cclxxi. 153–8; but allusion seems too distant to be certain; there was no cabinet or meeting of parliament on Sat. 24 June.
2 i.e. to Dufferin, tel. No. 302 secret and confidential, 25 June, declining the offer of Egypt, and stating (on p. 3 marked with a letter A by Gladstone) that Britain would not tolerate the preponderating influence of any single power in Egypt and desired the status quo with ‘possible modifications’, F.O. 78/3395; Gladstone’s amendments were adopted.
3 See from Dufferin, tel. No. 173, 26 June, forwarding an Italian proposal for an understanding barring isolated action while the conference was sitting, F.O. 78/3397; mem. by Tenterden against the proposal and min. by Granville, ‘I think Tenterden is right’, P.R.O. 30/20/125; and to Dufferin, No. 349, 27 June, rejecting the proposal, F.O. 78/3378; for self-renouncing protocol, signed 25 June, see E. Hertslet, The Map of Europe by Treaty (1891) iv. 3088.
4 Tel. No. 174, 26 June, reporting Turkish assertion that the time would come when Dufferin would ‘entirely applaud the act’, F.O. 78/3397; see also to Dufferin, No. 352, 28 June, recording remonstrance to Musurus Pasha, F.O. 78/3378.
Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

10, Downing Street. Jul 1. 82.

Nothing, I think, could be more confused and confusing than the conversation in the quasi-Cabinet on the news as it came in piecemeal. It is hardly possible (I think) for the human brain, at least it is impossible for mine, to maintain the due order and sequence of ideas in such a case.

I make the following assumptions—

1. We are agreed as to our separate question with Egypt in regard to *reparation*—this will develop itself with time.

2. We are agreed I suppose that we can take no definitive course in regard to the 'Egyptian Question' until the Conference, to which we have referred it, has either dealt, or refused to deal, with it.

3. We are agreed also, without doubt, in thinking that we ought not to give any countenance to the French idea of negotiating with Arabi apart from the Khedive.

4. I suppose we are also agreed in adhering to the instructions sent to Dufferin on the day before the Conference was to meet and laying down a plan of action there.

5. The French are cognisant of these instructions—is it not an answer to the overture (going beyond what was agreed to this afternoon) from the French to say that, having made our proposal to the Conference, we are not permitted, in our view, to recede from it in any way until the Conference shall have disposed of it.

In perspective there is a question that may be formidable—

If neither Sultan, nor Conference, nor France, will act—and if the Khedive, really or ostensibly, settles his affairs with Arabi—and if we have no difficulty in dealing separately with the question of reparation—are we then, on our own sole account, to undertake a military intervention to put Arabi down?

But this question has not yet, as it seems to me, arrived.

---

1 Interchange of notes between Granville and Gladstone, agreeing to refuse Dufferin's request (tel. No. 191, 30 June, for an appeal to Austria and Germany to let the conference take a step forward) despite Northbrook and Hartington, P.R.O. 30/29/143, not printed.

2 See from Cartwright, tels. Nos. 289, 290, 291, 1 July, reporting rising panic in Cairo and Alexandria as the struggle between Arabi and the Turkish commissioner came to a head, F.O. 78/3449; from Dufferin, tel. No. 192, 30 June, received 1 July, on the uselessness of the Constantinople conference, F.O. 78/3398; from Lyons, tel. 30 June, reporting Freycinet's wish to come to terms with Arabi outside the conference, F.O. 27/2565.

3 See no. 730.
737. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone  
18, Carlton House Terrace. July 2/82.

How would it do to answer Freycinet\(^1\) by expressing surprise at his suggestion to reverse the policy which had been agreed upon and which was the basis of the conference, which had been summoned at his suggestion—and to ask him whether he has communicated the possibility of such a change of policy to any of the other powers.

738. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville  
10, Downing Street. July 2. 82.

1. Dufferin’s No. 193,\(^2\) received by me this day, is a decided relief & seems to renew the hope of cooperation.

2. I have not the least objection to your sketch of possible answer to Lyons respecting the strange conversation of Freycinet.

3. I hope my note of yesterday evening did not trouble you—it was written to express my feeling that there was in the actual position no substantial room for difference. My sole anxiety had been not to formulate anew any thing naming Arabi without necessity.

4. The points which had occurred to me by way of answer to Lyons were

   a. to commend his having given a forward place to our demand for reparation.\(^3\)
   
   b. to dwell on our obligation to the Khedive.
   
   c. to refer to our instructions for the Conference from which we are not able, even were we willing, to recede.

5. I have not yet seen the communications from the Khedive through his agent.\(^4\)

6. I am due in Downing Street tomorrow before 11.30.

739. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville  

I have directed a summons to the Cabinet for three tomorrow, which I understand you to desire.

---

\(^1\) See to Lyons, No. 784 secret, 3 July, replying as proposed to Freycinet’s suggestion of separate terms with Arabi; and to Lyons, No. 807, 6 July, recording conversation in which Tissot explained away the proposal, F.O. 27/2555.

\(^2\) i.e. tel. No. 193, 1 July, reporting French assurance, in reply to his complaint, that support for Turkish intervention in Egypt would be expressed in the next meeting of the conference, F.O. 78/3398.

\(^3\) i.e. for damage done during the Alexandria riots, 11 June.

\(^4\) See to Cartwright, No. 210, 4 July, recording communication from Sinadin0 about the Alexandria riots, 11 June, Arabi’s loss of political authority and the consequences of his proceedings, F.O. 78/3432.
I have thought it right to give pretty broad and clear notice that I can be no party to the adoption of the measure which I understand will be suggested to us.

740. **Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone**

[Add. MS. 44174, fo. 153]

18, Carlton House Terrace. July 5/82.

The Cabinet appeared to me to be a necessity.

As soon as the India, War & Admiralty offices tell me that a thing is urgent, it is not a reason to assent, but it is one for the most careful consideration of what they have to say. It is obvious that [where] there are pros & cons of great weight the calm discussion of them by 13 men who are presumed to be intelligent above the average, ought to be of great use.

I suspect Hartington is very much in earnest about this proposal.

741. **Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville**

[P.R.O. 30/29/29 A]

10, Downing Street. July 5. 82.

I am afraid that for once I cannot agree. I do not admit that the Ministers of War and Navy have as such any special title to peculiar position or weight on the policy of adopting military measures.

I thought the case quite different with reference to the Foreign Minister; and for this reason I moved Hartington and Childers to make a reference to you before urging the demand for a Cabinet.

Hartington's position is different, and he has a locus standi as Minister of India, but I do not compare his responsibility to yours, and still less to my own.

I know his earnestness and his tenacity, but they do not in the slightest degree diminish my obligation to act upon my own deliberate judgment.

I send you a note of some of the reasons that weigh upon my mind.

Enclosure

1. If the de facto Government of Egypt are disposed to attempt blocking the Canal, the threat of military invasion is what will drive them to do it with the advantage of anticipation.

---

1 i.e. for further action in Egypt; Admiral Seymour was instructed, 3 July, to destroy the Alexandria batteries unless work stopped on the fortifications; for meeting of the cabinet on 5 July see S. Gwynn and G. M. Tuckwell, *The Life of Sir Charles W. Dilke* (1917) i. 446.

2 Cf. min. by Granville, undated, that Hartington, Northbrook, Childers, and himself met daily during the Egyptian crisis, at one o'clock at 10 Downing Street whence they 'could call on Gladstone or even summon a cabinet', P.R.O. 30/29/143.

3 To occupy the Suez Canal; not traced; Gladstone records no discussion of it in the cabinet, nor any meeting of the cabinet on 5 July; Canal occupied, 20 Aug.

2. The strong and palpable motives of policy which ought to prevent the Egyptian Ministers from making the whole world their enemies by tampering with the Canal render it improbable that they meditate or desire such a course, unless under the most desperate extremities. The testimony of Lesseps is on this head clear and weighty.

3. England has no separate rights which justify the adoption of military measures in respect to this international water passage by her own sole authority without reference to Europe.

4. I look upon such an assertion of these separate rights with regard to the Suez Canal as an act full of menace to the future peace of the world, and as likely to supply dangerous arguments which may be turned against us in such cases as those of the Panama Isthmus, and again of the Dardanelles and Bosphoros.

5. I do not consider that our engagements to the Conference at Constantinople permit us to use military force, or adopt measures morally equivalent to it, for the occupation of the Suez Canal when no violence has been offered or even threatened to it.

6. If ever there was a time when unless with a real necessity Parliament ought not to [be] called upon by us to discuss peace & war & make provision for military measures, it is the present moment when for the next three or four weeks Parliament should direct an undivided attention to matters immediately connected with the establishment of peace and order in Ireland.¹

742. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

February 82.

18, Carlton House Terrace. July 6/82.

Would it not be well to have a short Cabinet this morning. After this withdrawal of the French,² the Admiral may require fresh orders, though I hope none which would prevent his acting alone.

The answer to the French will require some consideration.

& it is a question whether we should not inform the Italians of the defection of the French, for the chance of their proposing to give opposite orders to their men of war.

743. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

[Add. MS. 4474, fo. 156]

Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

10, Downing Street. Jul 7. 82.³

Of course I will summon the Cabinet if you desire it but I should have

¹ The Prevention of Crimes (Ireland) bill went into committee 26 May, but was not finally passed by the Commons until 7 July; the Arrears of Rent (Ireland) bill was introduced 5 July, passed the Commons 21 July.

² See from Lyons, tel. No. 121, 5 July, reporting that the French admiral would not join Admiral Seymour in silencing the Alexandria batteries, F.O. 272574.

³ No. 743 was copied in the letter book under 6 July, Add. MS. 44545, fo. 161.
thought it ought not to meet at any rate before you receive the account of yesterday's Conference—as it might have to meet again, & hurried & frequent Cabinets create much stir.

I do not understand what fresh order Beauchamp Seymour could have as his original orders had no reference to the French.  

And what can we say to the French who have acted (from their point of view) in their right? Should we make the matter better by answering them?

To inform the Italians would be quite right but would not I suppose require a Cabinet or a moment's delay. It would not, I conceive be wise to ask them any thing: but it seems a fine opportunity for them.

744. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

[P.R.O. 30/29/126]

Immed[iate].

10, Downing Street. Jul 7. 82.

I should like to see you on your proposed instruction to Lord Lyons. It appears to me to do what I do not take to be your intention; to give a notice to the Conference that upon 'an appearance of danger' the Concert 'all or any' of the Powers would be free to take sole action in the matter of 'protecting' i.e. occupying the Canal.

This I thought you disclaimed the other day & I have bound myself, as I conceive, to the opposite principle.

Is the removal of the French to Port Said positive or contingent?

Is there any great necessity for a step at present?

I am inclined to agree with the French view as in Lyons No 122; & if we act would draw towards them in that sense, & consider in what way, the case arising, we should jointly proceed in the Conference to lay the ground for necessary measures.

745. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

[Add. MS. 44174, fo. 158]

18, Carlton House Terrace. July 9/82.

I think we must write something to put our position square with the

1 Gladstone records no cabinet before 8 July, and then no discussion of Egypt; the conference agreed, 2 July, to invite Turkey to send troops to Egypt and, 6 July, on text of invitation to Turkey and to embody conditions for Turkish intervention in a military convention between Turkey and the powers, see from Dufferin, tels. Nos. 197, 208, 3, 6 July, F.O. 78/3398.

2 No fresh orders were sent.

3 Cf. from Lyons, tcl. No. 122, 6 July, reporting Freycinet's insistence that France was right to refuse to co-operate in armed measures at Alexandria or for the defence of the Suez Canal, while the conference was sitting, F.O. 27/2574.

4 See to Lyons, tcl. 9 July, directing him to tell Freycinet that Dufferin was instructed to remind the ports of its obligation to protect the Suez Canal and to invite the powers in conference to take measures to secure its safety, F.O. 27/2573.
French with regard to our request to concert confidentially with them for the safety of the Suez Canal.¹

746. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

[P.R.O. 30/29/126]
Dollis Hill. Jul 9. 82.

I do not feel the necessity but I am willing to defer to your desire and judgment.

I am willing also to agree to the draft² you have sent me, though I liked much better the one on which you and I agreed in my room: I did not see all the notes upon it but I presume you know from their tenour that this is a more acceptable form.

I only propose one modification which seems to me to make the draft quite consistent.

The Admiral’s telegram³ is bad but I am at a loss to understand the meaning of the word surrendered. What title can he have to demand the surrender of any forts and this without instructions? I suppose it may be a conjectural word.

747. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

[Add. MS. 44174, fo. 160]
18, Carlton House Terrace. July 9/82.

When they brought me the telegram, I pointed out to him [Sir Cooper Key] that the demand for surrender was beyond the Admiral’s instructions.

He gave me some reasons why it was desirable, but said the change of a figure would make it ‘disarmament’.

I begged him to ask for an explanation. He said he had already done so.

I have heard nothing more, but I have written to him to telegraph that disarmament would be within, surrender without his instructions.

The 2d edition of the Sunday paper announces that the Admiral is about to demand the ‘surrender’ of the fortresses. If Seymour has announced this at Alexandria, it will complicate matters.

Ought we not to have a Cabinet when you come to town—in the case of an imbroglio.

¹ Note by Gladstone here: ‘I agreed in deference to him that we sh[oul]d write & agreed to the draft with a slight change.’

² For this draft, which was used with Gladstone’s amendment, see F.O. 27/2573; for draft circulated by Granville to the cabinet, with Bright’s min. of absolute dissent and Chamberlain’s min. urging a sharper instruction, see P.R.O. 30/29/143.

³ For Admiral Seymour’s notice to the foreign consuls that he would bombard after 24 hours, unless the forts of Alexandria were surrendered, see Lord Cromer, Modern Egypt (1908) i. 295.
[P.S.] Since writing the above Key has returned and urged strong objection to my message. He says that Araby [sic] would answer that it would take him weeks to disarm the fortresses.

I cannot find any Ministers in town—& every minute is precious. I have taken upon myself to authorize the telegram to run thus

‘change “surrender” into “temporary surrender” for the purpose of disarmament’

Key says the men of our fleet would disarm them in a short time.

I hope I have not done wrong.

748. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

Dollis Hill. [Sunday] July 9. 82. 9½ Pm.

The matter is one of much complication about ‘surrender’ because of the territorial question involved—so at least it strikes me.

But on the other hand I had already before your messenger came said this to myself

‘If he is authorised to blow them to pieces, may he not think it as well to give the Egyptians the option of placing them in his hands’.

This softened me.

Upon the whole & writing in haste I incline to think you have given the best directions that could be given in the case; and I hope you have solved the difficulty.

I send this back after only a few minutes delay.

As Ministers are out of town & will come back in the forenoon, there will I think be plenty of time to summon them on my return tomorrow at 11.15 (or earlier if you wish).

749. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

Immediate.

Jul 10. 82.

I have written the few lines¹ on the other side as a possible last paragraph to the draft you are anxious to send. They do not state my full view, but so much only as I suppose all to hold. From any who may differ on what lies beyond, I think they ask nothing. Whether they are of use or not, do not take the trouble of writing.

¹ On the British desire that measures for the protection of the Suez Canal be taken ‘at the instance or with the sanction of the Great Powers assembled in conference’ and after preliminary communication between Britain and France; follows in P.R.O. 30/29/126 and added to Granville to Lyons, tel. 10 July, F.O. 27/2573.
750. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

House of Lords. [10 July 1882].

I might have been more struck with Harcourt's letter, if it had not been so like Lord Salisbury's speech of this afternoon.

751. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

House of Lords. [11 July 1882].

Will you see Rivers Wilson, about the enclosed paper. Northbrook is extremely anxious on the subject. We both much prefer the second alternative.

752. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

10, Downing Street. July 11 1882. 10 Pm.

I am not quite sure in what light you view the proposal of the Eastern Telegraph Company inclosed in your note of this evening: but to me it appears one of the most extraordinary that ever reached me, all circumstances considered, especially its presentation to me, as I emerged from the debate in the House of Commons, by Sir Rivers Wilson an old Treasury man. There is not a word upon paper as to the cost as to the time as to the distance as to the need as to the advantages as to the title as to the political danger or advantage and under these circumstances a Sir Somebody Something, who accompanied Sir Rivers Wilson, appeared in order, as far as I understand, for me to have an opportunity to construct his case for him out of his brains by questioning.

1 See to Gladstone, secret, 9 July, on the failure of all measures of conciliation in Ireland, adding "it was no use trying to soothe these tigers by stroking their backs", Add. MS. 44197, fo. 80.


3 See Pender's proposal, in Northbrook's hand, for the Eastern Telegraph Company to lay a cable from Alexandria to Port Said and from Port Said to Suez either on the government's guarantee against loss, or on the government's behalf and at its expense, Add. MS. 44174, fo. 168; see also Granville to Cartwright, tel. No. 384, 29 July, recording the acceptance of the proposal in the first form, F.O. 78/3446.
I really submit that a proposal to throw upon the Government the cost, the responsibility, of making nearly 300 miles of Telegraphic cable, ought, were it only on account of the great cost to be involved (of which not the faintest idea is given) to be distinctly set forth, in all its proposed conditions and particulars.

It is not for me to construct a case by cross examination, even were I more equal to this than I am with six to nine hours a day of the Arrears Bill in the House to occupy my leisure time. It is for them to present it, and for us to examine & dissect it.

At present the case seems to me, on a most crude and hasty view, to bristle with points of objection. Could there (for example) be a more likely mode of raising the most formidable political difficulties, than assuming, at this moment, the right, which appertains to territorial supremacy, of laying down a cable from Port Said to Suez, along the whole length of the Suez Canal, by authority or in the name of the British Government.

On the spur of the moment I said it seemed to me that the natural course might be for the Company to proceed on its own responsibility, and for us to do what we could, as far as the reason of the case would go, to bear them harmless.¹

This may not be worth much, but at any rate it seems to me more rational than the paper forwarded by the Company.

[P.S.] I found Bright and Childers in the House and showed them the paper of the Company. They appeared to share my objections. But they have not seen this letter.

To make the thing more perfect, Port Said to Suez was put in as an interlineation.

753. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone  
[Add. MS. 44174, fo. 170]  
18, Carlton House Terrace. July 12/82.

I am very sorry to have been so unbusinesslike, and to have given you so much trouble.

Northbrook spoke to me in the Lords as to the great importance of getting a wire of a subsidiary character. He said he believed it was a matter which concerned several departments—I asked him to write to me, and I would attend to the matter.

Later Pender arrived & called me out. He said that the Egyptian land wire was cut, that the roundabout wire had a short time ago been delayed for nearly a fortnight.

He said he was ready to lay the line, but as it was beyond his concession, and might invalidate it, he wished for a guarantee from the Gov. I thought this was very objectionable—that if it were a necessity it would be better

¹ For this idiom see no. 611 and cf. no. 910.
for the Gov. to do it themselves. He then offered to lay it for the Gov. He supposed the cost would be about 60,000£, and it might be combined hereafter with a larger arrangement he was making with Hartington.

Northbrook agreed with me that this alternative was the best.

I should have gone at once to consult you but we were in committee on Rosebery’s bill,¹ & having divisions.

I then asked Rivers Wilson to try to find you—as an old Treasury man, and one of our representatives on the Suez Canal, he could explain matters better than I could in a letter. I said that I did not think you would consent off hand, but with his knowledge he could give you information, and be able to learn what you wished to know.

I am afraid I have been the cause of your being angry with him. But I am alone to blame.

754. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville²

10, Downing Street. July 12. 82.

Here is the apprehended letter from dear old John [Bright],³ which turns a white day into a black one.

It would not be fair in me to beg an interview. His kindness would make him reluctant to decline: but he would come laden with an apprehension that I by impetuosity and tenacity should endeavour to overbear him.

But pray consider whether you could do it.⁴

He would not have the same fear of your dealings with him. I do not think you could get a reversal, but perhaps he would give you another short delay, and at the end of this the sky might be further settled.

755. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

Jul 12. 82.

The words in pencil⁵ undoubtedly cut rather deeply into the basis I find it indispensable to hold about the Canal. Otherwise I agree.

¹ i.e. Entail (Scotland) bill, in committee in the Lords, 11 July, see Hans. Parl. Deb. cclxxii. 5–24.
² No. 754 printed, Morley, iii. 84.
³ See Bright to Gladstone, 12 July, resigning office as chancellor of the duchy of Lancaster, after the bombardment of the forts at Alexandria, Add. MS. 44113, fo. 175; printed, G. M. Trevelyan, The Life of John Bright (1925) 433.
⁴ See Granville to Bright, 13 July, suggesting a conversation, P.R.O. 30/29/148; and Bright to Gladstone, 13 July, saying it could be of no use, Add. MS. 44113, fo. 177.
⁵ No. 755 is written on the other side of a min. by Granville: ‘Hartington does not object. He would have liked the insertion of some words, which I have put in pencil but to which you probably would not agree’; the words were ‘if time permits’ to be added to the provision for authorization by the powers in the despatch to Lyons based on the tel. discussed in no. 749.
Please note a cross marked on p. 3—Should you not specify a little? I presume the vessels meant are French, or chiefly French. I thought you meant to refer to the dispatch of the French fleet to Port Said.

756. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

10, Downing Street. July 12. 82.

I am very sorry if the rather militant tone of my letter has given you the trouble of writing so much at length. But what I hope is that this company if they are serious in the matter will set it out in the regular way for surely there is much to say upon it.

We have had two hours of Egyptian debate, got up by Sir W. Lawson who made a vehement attack & called me up. I do not think any harm has been done. The peace party generally did not behave ill & Northcote wet-blanketed the affair, as well as he could, showing consideration as he has usually done in the Egyptian matter.

I have written anew to Bright who has been away from the House putting the point that the action of yesterday according to present & rather growing appearances may work for peace. God grant it.

757. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

10, Downing Street. Jul 13. 82.

I had much talk with Musurus: of its value you are the judge, but its tenour was as satisfactory as possible: he ended with saying you & I could settle it at once if he had the power.

He expressed some confidence that the Sultan would send troops provided he was not to do it as the mandataire of Europe: & that he would do it for the purposes known & desired by the Powers, the status quo, all legal rights, the firmans, & so forth.

I said the idea of his being mandataire had not to my knowledge been named or entertained; what was material was that there should be concurrence of aims.

1 i.e. no. 752.
3 13 July, accepting his resignation, but arguing that the bombardment of Alexandria would prove a contribution to peace, Add. MS. 44545, fo. 165; Bright's place was not filled, Kimberley acting as chancellor of the duchy as well as colonial secretary; see no. 780.
4 Exchange 13 July, Granville suggesting that Gladstone on leaving the cabinet room make a move for a fresh appeal to Bright, and Gladstone refusing to take the initiative, P.R.O. 30/29/126, not printed.
5 Not officially recorded.
I expressed my view of the action to this effect: that it had made a clear way for the Sultan’s troops into Alexandria: that he had a great opportunity: that it was a supreme moment for the Ottoman Empire, which moment it was still possible to use for good, but that time was precious, and this opportunity would probably be the last.

He seemed to enter into all this heartily enough & said he would write accordingly by telegraph today.

I found Menabrea pleased & sympathetic & told him briefly what I had said especially about its being a critical moment (or a fatale) and probably the last—that phrase he proposed to telegraph. He, as also the Spanish & the Greek, was all in the sense of congratulation, & of believing that the action had done much to bring us nearer to a solution & to peace.

The fire\(^1\) is a sad misfortune.

Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

[H. of C. July 13. 82. 9.45 Pm.]

The French communication\(^2\) seems to me in the main satisfactory.

But as being private and personal, & not binding his colleagues, it seems to call for a private & personal reply.

As regards the settlement of the interior question of Egypt, I know you feel scruples and difficulties as to an Anglo-French operation, as to which I concur, or sympathize.

The first thing is to have the Sultan’s answer on this part of the question?

As to the Suez Canal the question is simpler as one of their custody and I can conceive that an Anglo-French operation is practicable and might be accepted in principle under the authority of the Conference given in answer to the Anglo-French initiative.

I am ready to concur in any reply\(^3\) which you may send upon this basis, or to hold further communication, as you choose.

Meantime I say nothing to any one.

On the whole I feel pleased.

---

\(^1\) i.e. at Alexandria, fired by retreating Egyptian garrison, on the afternoon of 12 July.

\(^2\) See from Lyons, tel. No. 131, 13 July, reporting Freycinet’s communication that he expected the conference to depute Britain and France to restore the status quo in Egypt; that he might have difficulty with the chamber of deputies over emergency action unless the conference deputed them now to protect the Suez Canal; tel. No. 132, 13 July, asking that the communication be considered private and personal, F.O. 27/2574.

\(^3\) See to Lyons, tel. No. 464, 14 July, replying against immediate deputing of Britain and France, missing from F.O. 27/2573, but referred to in Lyons’s No. 133, below, no. 763.
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759. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone [P.R.O. 30/29/126]

Foreign Office. [14 July 1882].

Munster says that Herbert Bismarck has written to Stumm that the Chancellor is again ill.¹
This may be a real or an assumed illness.
Austria has ordered Calice to join in presentation of the note.²

760. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville [P.R.O. 30/29/126]

Jul 14. 82.

Bismarck ill is like the Sultan well.
I do not yet know of any cause for a Cabinet tomorrow.
I hope to go to Windsor in afternoon.
I have spoken my last word, & fired off my last letter at, J. B[right].³
He really has nothing to say, but then he is wise, & says nothing.

761. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville [P.R.O. 30/29/126]

10, Downing Street. Jul 14. 11 a m. 82.

Should not telegrams be sent in few words at once to your Ministers at St P[etersburg], Berlin, & Vienna, to press decision about making the application⁴ to the Sultan as planned by the Conference? Time is so precious: & still the wretched Sultan lingers.

762. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone [P.R.O. 30/29/126]

18, Carlton House Terrace. July 14/82.

I rather doubt about a scold to the 3 Powers.⁵
Two of them are of course waiting for Bismarck—& I have a strong idea that he is waiting in order to [give] the Sultan a chance of anticipating the demand.
Would it do to send the enclosed to Ampthill.⁶

¹ See to Ampthill, No. 301, 14 July, recording conversation with Münster, F.O. 64/1004.
² See to Fraser, No. 211, 14 July, recording conversation with Karolyi about the invitation to the sultan to send troops to Egypt on conditions to be laid down in a military convention, F.O. 7/1031.
³ 14 July, developing the argument that the bombardment of Alexandria though a warlike act was a measure tending ultimately to peace, Add. MS. 44545, fos. 166–7; printed, Morley, iii. 84–85.
⁴ i.e. to send troops to Egypt; see p. 387, n. 1.⁵ None sent.
⁶ Here Gladstone wrote, 'Yes'; see tel. 14 July, inquiring the cause of delay in presenting the identic notes inviting the sultan to send troops to Egypt, F.O. 64/1004; draft written on no. 762; see also from Dufferin, tel. No. 237, 15 July, reporting the presentation of the notes, F.O. 78/3398.
763. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

Lyons No. 133. 10, Downing Street. Jul 14. 82. 6.45 Pm.

I think you will probably still wish to work with the French but to avoid the danger of seeming to ask the Conference for a monopoly or privilege. I would suggest that if you do this, we should only have to take care, while not reducing the statement of the utility of making some provision, to make our proposal an offer and not a request.

There w[oul]d probably be no competition.

[P.S.] I mentioned this to Hartington, who did not kick.

764. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Admiralty. July 15/82.

I entirely agree as Northbrook has told you in assenting to the Admiral’s request for soldiers. But they should go as a police force, and not as a military expedition.  

The Admiral is responsible for the safety and order of the town, and he ought to have the general direction as to the troops.

Northbrook says that the War office object to this arrangement. It appears to me that politically it will be a great mistake if there be two separate commands.

But it appears that the matter cannot be arranged without an exerize of your authority.

Would it be possible directly, or through Ponsonby to get the Queen’s assent to our view at once.  

765. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

Windsor. Jul 15. 82.

As far as my judgment goes you have it full and entire.

But I am not quite sure in what terms to make an appeal to the Queen. If the opposition is only of professional [men] I apprehend we have power to put it down.

If Childers opposes, I think a resort to the Queen is somewhat hazardous.

I think it best at any rate for the present to send you the inclosed note to Childers which I have diluted as little as possible.

1 i.e. tel. No. 133, 14 July, reporting that Freycinet still thought the conference should depute Britain and France to protect the Suez Canal, F.O. 27/2574; see no. 758.

2 See Granville to Cartwright, tel. No. 343, 15 July, recording assent to Seymour’s request for two battalions from Cyprus to go to Alexandria to act as a police force, F.O. 78/3446.

3 i.e. that reinforcements landed at Alexandria should be under Admiral Seymour’s orders; note to Childers in no. 765 not traced.
766. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone
[Add. MS. 44174, fo. 178]
18, Carlton House Terrace. [16 July 1882].

Dufferin’s telegram took 12 hours.¹
I only got it too late to send any answer—even if I had been sure of the Cabinet’s wish.

767. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone
[Add. MS. 44174, fo. 179]
Confidential. 18, Carlton House Terrace. July 16/82.

Northbrook is afraid that if the French agree to our proposal as to the canal² that they may send a soldier as well as a sailor to concert measures, & we may imagine what such a warrior might concert with Sir Garnet Wolsely [sic].

He proposes therefore to send Captain Rice to Paris this evening.

It now appears that Arabi Bey is with his troops. It seems impossible that he should attack Alexandria, but he might however unlikely make a diversion against the Canal.³

In these circumstances might not Rice propose that the French & English Admirals at Port Said should be instructed to concert together in case of sudden danger with authority to act.

768. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville
[P.R.O. 30/29/126]
The Deanery, Windsor. Jul 16. 82.

1. Quite right I think to send Captain R[ice] to Paris this evening.
2. Not much believing in Arabi’s attacking Alexandria, neither do I believe in his attacking the Canal—unless possibly it were something against English vessels only in the Canal, which he might suppose to touch England alone. I agree that the two Admirals at Port Said might be instructed to act in the event of sudden & immediately impending danger.⁴
3. I entirely agree with your reply⁵ to Dufferin’s personal [telegram].

¹ i.e. tel. No. 238, sent 8.30 p.m., 15 July, received 8.30 a.m., 16 July, announcing his summons to an audience with the sultan for 16 July, and asking for instructions, F.O. 78/3398; to Dufferin, tel. No. 389, 16 July, replied that his request was too late, F.O. 78/3395.
² See no. 758.
³ See from Cartwright, tel. No. 329, 16 July, reporting Arabi’s dismissal from the ministry and the danger of attack on Alexandria from the army under him, F.O. 78/3449.
⁵ Enclosed in Granville to Gladstone, 16 July, instructing Dufferin to reply to the sultan that Britain did not object to dual action with France for the protection of the Canal but did for the occupation of Egypt and to avoid proposing sole British action, P.R.O. 30/29/126, not printed.
Have you ever considered whether the action of three would be admissible? I conclude conditions would be put on us, as on the Turk.

769. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Confidential. Foreign Office. July 17/82.

Spencer has sent me a long and of course not very legible letter, giving an account of his sayings and doings about the amendment in the Arrears Bill. Shall I send you the letter, or may I tell him that he is wrong in fearing that you are annoyed with his conduct.

770. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

10, Downing Street. July 18. 82.

In your excellent draft setting forth the history of the Egyptian question, I think a part of the words near the close on p. 13 might with advantage be reconsidered—you there place our objects in two categories

1. 'Their desire is that' . . . and then (line 2)
2. 'They consider it necessary to' etc. (line 5)

The objects are all good & right but there seems to be no ground for this distinction & I would suggest bringing the whole under the same phrase, or the same kind of phrase, as those already placed under No 1 which are among the gravest.

771. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

10, Downing Street. Jul 18. 82.

1. In the basis of Hartington’s proposed instruction to Dufferin I see nothing to object to—you are the best judge as to the time, & order of proceeding, how it will fit in—I am doubtful about adopting Colvin as an authority for action. Cartwright forwards his telegram without adopting it.

2. As respects the Indian troops I do not agree—I incline to think the chance of wanting them small—at any rate it is uncertain: & the Parlia-

1 Missing from the letters from Spencer, P.R.O. 30/29/142 and P.R.O. 30/29/29 A.
2 To Dufferin, No. 389A, 11 July, circulated to the cabinet with Granville’s min. that it had been drawn up either for immediate publication, for publication in due course, or preferably to be held as a brief for the members of the government, F.O. 78/3378, P.R.O. 30/29/143; Gladstone’s suggestion was adopted; 20 July, published, Parl. papers (1882) lxxxii. 439.
3 See from Cartwright, tel. No. 334, 18 July, reporting Colvin’s wish for the announcement of further steps in Alexandria, where disorder was likely to recur, P.R.O. 30/29/161.
mentary complication one most desirable under the circumstances to avoid, except in case of a clear necessity.

3. Northcote tonight said we ought to volunteer a statement of our policy.¹ This looked rather like weakness or perplexity.

772. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

10, Downing Street. July 20. 82.
I have invited Northbrook & Childers to an early conversation today about the finances which must I conceive be involved in any large proceedings. I will let you know. I should much deprecate any statement this week & the proper form might be a financial notice in H[ouse] of C[ommons] with simultaneous speech in the H of L.

773. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

18, Carlton House Terrace. [20 July 1882].
I agree.
I see the Times has been inspired but not by me—Chamberlain & Dilke press much for publication of historical despatch.² After Northcote’s complaints it might be as well to do so.
We have Cranbrook’s successful precedent.³ I trust ours is not equally mendacious
The P of Wales says that he hears that the Peers mean to cut up the arrears Bill extensively.

774. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

10, Downing Street. July 20. 82.
Cross is in a state of anxiety to know our instructions to Dufferin for the Conference & thinks there will be much difficulty on Monday⁴ unless you give them. The case is rather peculiar, and I think we should give all the information which we are able to supply without breach of obligation to others or danger to public interests.

¹ For Northcote’s speech in the debate about Egypt, raised by Drummond Wolff on a motion for the adjournment, see Hans. Parl. Deb. ccxxii. 906.
² i.e. Granville to Dufferin, No. 389A; see p. 398, n. 2.
³ See Cranbrook to Lytton, 18 Nov. 1878, giving an historical account of British Afghan policy on the eve of Lytton’s ultimatum which precipitated the Afghan war, Parl. papers (1878–9) lvi. 634; see above, p. 183, n. 4.
⁴ For Granville’s allusion to Dufferin’s instructions, since No. 389A had been laid on 20 July, as something of which the House was aware without particularizing, see the Lords’ debate, Mon. 24 July, Hans. Parl. Deb. ccxxii. 1484–1523.
The Arrears Bill can hardly go to the Lords, I fear, till tomorrow evening is far advanced; unless, which I do not wholly despair of, we are allowed to take a division before dinner. I think I may a little promote this by proposing the third reading in a speech under ten minutes.¹

775. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

[P.R.O. 30/29/126]

Immed[iate].


1. You seemed desirous yesterday² to let the capital question of restoring legality in Egypt stand over for a little, & this I think the circumstances call for.

2. But query whether we ought not to press very gravely on the Khedive the necessity of his immediately denouncing Arabi as a rebel or in some way promptly clearing the position now so obscure.³ It seems plain first that he has no longer any excuse for inaction in personal danger: secondly that his own position & claim upon us to maintain it depend essentially upon this for our title as against Arabi is implicated in the question.

3. I also suppose that, as we have now a Government in France, we are free to prosecute the question about the Canal, which has been indefinitely adjourned at Constantinople. I inclose the little sketch⁴ of yesterday made somewhat clearer.

On these two points I think we know the general mind of the Cabinet and that it might be sufficient to ascertain the mind of one or two.

If a Cabinet were required it might be at H of C. at 2½ or 3; as it was settled after all to meet at two & dispose of your Emigration clauses.⁵

Before Monday you ought I think to consider what answer we shall make to the old question ‘que diable faisait-il dans cette galère?’ ‘What was the exact title of our fleet to remain in Alexandrian waters after we had

¹ For Gladstone’s short speech on the third reading of the Arrears bill in the Commons, 21 July, and for introduction in the Lords, Sat. morning, 22 July, see Hans. Parl. Deb. cclxxii. 1307–10.
² i.e. in the cabinet, 20 July, almost entirely concerned with Egypt; see Add. MS. 44643, fo. 154.
³ See to Cartwright, tel. No. 358, 21 July, ‘your tel. No. 341 of today respecting Arabi’s proclamations. Press the Khedive strongly to issue a counter proclamation. Inform him that we are sending a large force to the Mediterranean’, F.O. 78/3446.
⁴ Of instruction to Lyons to propose to France an announcement to the Constantinople conference that they were ready jointly or with any other powers, who were willing, to take measures for the protection of the Suez Canal, P.R.O. 30/29/126; to Dufferin, No. 425; extending tel. No. 429, 24 July, instructing him accordingly, F.O. 78/3378.
⁵ For the government’s addition of clauses to the Arrears bill, allowing Irish Boards of Guardians to borrow money to assist emigration, when the bill was recommitted after the report stage and before the third reading later in the evening, see Hans. Parl. Deb. cclxxii. 1226–82.
drawn off our own people?' This is in some sense I think a hinge of the case.

I may be out between 12 & one or 1.30.

776. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

18, Carlton House Terrace. July 21/82.

I understand rightly, do I not, that we shall intimate on Monday¹ that the thing must be done, whether it is by combined action, as we expect and believe, or by measures which in the case of failure of other alternatives might throw the burden upon us.

It is probable that by Monday, we shall be able to speak authoritatively about joint action.

777. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

10, Downing Street. Jul 22. 82.

I do not think I can travel quite at the pace you propose. I am far from asking you to exclude sole action, and will say nothing myself in that direction (the direction of excluding) but viewing the probabilities of the case, as well as what we ought to desire, namely the exhaustion of every effort to procure collective or joint action, I think it would be hardly proper, even for those who can so distinctly contemplate acting alone in case of need, at this moment to intimate a contingent decision of which the conditions are still remote.

The nearest point to you to which I could reach would be to say that after the exhaustion as above, we should not be deterred by any apprehension as to the magnitude of the enterprise, or the amount of force required, if the way be clear in point of principle.

778. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

10, Downing Street. July 22. 82.

Propose to France as follows²

1. Unless the Turk has sent in an acceptance³ of a kind immediately available, instruct RR [i.e. representatives] to say they can no longer rely

¹ When the government's intention to ask for a vote of credit for the military occupation of Egypt and the protection of the Canal, and 'provision for change' was to be announced; see mem. by Gladstone on form of announcement, Add. MS. 44643, fo. 155.
² See to Lyons, tels. Nos. 497, 501, 21, 22 July, proposing that instructions be sent to Constantinople to propose to the conference to add Italy to the powers acting for the protection of the Canal, F.O. 27/2573.
³ The sultan had been given twelve hours to accept the invitation of the powers to send troops to Egypt; see to Dufferin, tel. No. 403, 19 July, F.O. 78/3395.
on Turkish Intervention, they consider immediate action necessary to prevent further loss of life & continuance of anarchy, & they offer, unless the Conference has any other plan, to devise with a Third Power if possible, military means for procuring a solution.

2. To ask Italy to be that third Power.
3. To consult immediately upon the division of the labour.
4. Germany & Austria being hopeless, should we nevertheless, in the interests of international law & order, endeavour to obtain the countenance of Russia??
5. Suez Canal may be included in the general scheme of allied action.
6. Query a personal Envoy??

779. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

[Add. MS. 44174, fo. 187]
18, Carlton House Terrace. [23 July 1882].

I wish you joy of the Canal news—Northbrook's telegrams are very satisfactory.

I see the Observer gives an account of Arabi's position, which looks unfavorable to a coup de main—But in this danger of water famine, the exodus of Alexandrians ought to be an advantage.

Hartington who is gone to Eastbourne, said he would not press for a Cabinet tomorrow; Childers would rather like one before Hamley, or Adye go to Paris to communicate with the French. But a conversation with a few might be sufficient.

780. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

[P.R.O. 30/29/126]
10, Downing Street. July 23. 82.

The telegrams appear to be generally good, but the Turk is at his old tricks and having spun all his intrigues outside until he came into the Conference he evidently means to make a fresh start with them from within.1 I hope the French will feel this & come to the mark at once.2

I hope you will not hesitate to take today, if opportunity offer, any step in the direction of inviting Italy.

Though not a man of blood, I am not astonished at Seymour's having shot some to stop pillage in Alexandria & am rather glad he has been able to avoid shooting more.

1 See from Dufferin, tel. No. 251, 22 July, reporting the sultan's agreement at last to take part in the conference, but his appointment of the incompetent Assim Pasha as his representative, F.O. 78/3398.
2 Cf. Lyons to Granville, tel. No. 151, 23 July, reporting the French acceptance of the proposal to add Italy to the powers to join in measures for the defence of the Suez Canal, F.O. 27/2574.
The Khedive’s action about Arabi seems important. About the Sultan’s I care less, after his conduct.
I take as the later of your utterances about a Cabinet tomorrow that in which you say it is not pressed.
Unless there be a definite matter of weight to enter upon, I should not like to have one before getting quit of my statement in the H of C. I do not know how you feel? & perhaps I have more [to] do in gathering together my thoughts from wandering over many things; but I have not confidence in my brain-force for it & am anxious to employ the day hours before the House in getting a clear consecutive view of the situation.
It may be a necessity—otherwise I should prefer either not to meet or only to meet at 6 or ½ past 6 after we are free in mind.
Kimberley is willing to take the Duchy ad interim: I have written to the Queen.

781. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone [Add. MS. 44174, fo. 189]
18, Carlton House Terrace. [23 July 1882].
This will oblige a decision—particularly as to Indian Troops—and application to Italy, which may force the French either to join us, or possibly to quarrel.
They wish us evidently to go in alone.

782. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville [P.R.O. 30/29/126]
10, Downing Street. July 23. 9½ Pm. 82.
This is confusion worse confounded—it is not the French reply, nor does it tell us when we are to have the French reply.4
Surely we must have told this to Lyons.
1. With tomorrow’s debate in view, I would at once ask Lyons to find out & let us know.
2. The answer being Yes as to the canal, and a probable No for the rest, I presume we accept the first & await the other.
3. But is it not time at once to communicate with the Italians and invite their co-operation: as to the Canal in mild concert with France; as to the

1 See Cartwright to Granville, tel. No. 348, reporting the khedive’s formal dismissal and disowning of Arabi in a public order, F.O. 78/3449; cf. p. 397, n. 3, and p. 400, n. 3.
2 See p. 393, n. 3.
3 i.e. the French refusal to co-operate further in Egypt following a decision of the chamber of deputies; for cabinet decision, 24 July, to send Indian troops to Egypt and inform France that Britain held herself free to receive co-operation from any power willing to give it, see Add. MS. 44643, fo. 160; Gladstone wrote on no. 781: ‘ans.—urge him to ascertain when French decision will come—and to ask Italy at once about her disposition.’
4 See to Lyons, No. 892, 25 July, recording conversation with d’Aunay giving the French reply, F.O. 27/2556.
other, in a decided proposal from ourselves: unless you think it better to await the positive reply of France: in any case should not Menabrea prepare his Govt for a request.

4. I presume the question of health for the troops has been well considered by the military authorities. It is a vital one. For the present I assume they are satisfied, & present action [is all that is] required. Doubtless you will let Childers know what has come from Paris on this head.

5. As to Indian troops I presume this hangs on the French decision—& again I should say the most urgent thing is to know at once when we are to have it.

6. I hope to be with you in C.H.T. before eleven tomorrow—when we can consider as to a Cabinet. Before that time, you will at any rate probably know when we may look for the French decision. Their course is to all appearance miserably feeble. I hope however, on the whole, you will at once ask something about Italy.

783. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

10, Downing Street. Jul 25. 82.

1. Colvin's language was generally excellent but I think we should in this matter get disentangled from the Conference—if you could manage it.
2. I have put 'while' instead of 'but'.
3. I quite agree with your substance but should like to add that opening the M[ahmoudieh] Canal would be taken as an earnest of good intention.

I think Moubarek is a notable, independent of Arabi?

784. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

10, Downing Street. Jul. 25. 82.

No answer was sent to Arabi. Please to use your discretion as to saying there was a covering letter from Mr Blunt to which I made a short reply. You can judge whether we are entitled to publish all: they are sent here-with.

1 See p. 403, n. 3.
2 See to Cartwright, tel. No. 374, 25 July, approving Colvin's statement to Ali Pasha Moubarek, who conveyed Arabi's wish to come to terms, adopting Gladstone's suggestions about avoiding reference to the conference and the Canal, F.O. 78/3432; for Colvin's report, see from Cartwright, tel. No. 357, 25 July, F.O. 78/3449.
3 Who appealed to Gladstone, 2 July, for his support; Blunt to Gladstone, 16 July, Add. MS. 44110, fos. 50, 52; for Carnarvon's question how Arabi's letter, published in The Times, 24 July, reached Gladstone and whether it was part of a correspondence and Granville's reply that it was the only letter and had not been answered, see Hans. Parl. Deb. cclxxii. 1669-70.
785. **Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone**  

[Add. MS. 44174, fo. 191]  

18, Carlton House Terrace. [25 July 1882].

You make no remark upon the Queen’s telegram.¹ I have said nothing to her about the Italians. I suppose you informed her of the decision of the Cabinet. Can I go on with the communication to Menabrea, without any further communication with her.

786. **Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville**  

[Add. MS. 44174, fo. 191]  

House of Commons. July 25. 82. 3½ Pm.

I sent at once for my letter of yesterday to the Queen² and here it is. Evidently the Telegram is a protest against it. The question is whether my words of yesterday may not be taken as sufficiently conveying to the Queen the opinion of the Cabinet that Italy ought to be invited.

I think they can: & I would suggest your sending a cipher Tel. to the Queen to say that the time is urgent, & you now pray for leave (citing me if you like) to act upon the conclusion which the Cabinet arrived at yesterday.

Query whether to subjoin that as we are already in qualified partnership with France some convenience may be anticipated from having another partner.

787. **Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville**  

[Add. MS. 44174, fo. 191]  

10, Downing Street. July 26. 82.

1. It has occurred to me that if in prosecution of last night’s discussion we have to enter upon particulars, the best promise might be that any one apparently implicated in crime should have a fair trial by native judges impartially chosen.³

2. After the recent telegram of Thornton from Russia about the conference, ought not you to send a conciliatory word which perhaps might draw Russia into the ‘moral concurrence’.⁴

3. Chamberlain said last night⁵ that if there had been no controll & no

---

¹ To Granville, tel. 25 July, that she thought ‘it very undesirable to ask the Italians to join’ Britain in measures for the defence of the Canal and better for Britain to act alone, P.R.O. 30/29/40.

² 24 July, reporting the decision of that day’s cabinet; see p. 403, n. 3.

³ For trial of Arabi and fellow rebels, see nos. 806, 813, 834-6 et seq.

⁴ See tel. No. 38, 24 July, reporting probable Russian support for a proposal that the conference depute Britain and France to restore order in Egypt; with Granville’s min. directing a conciliatory reply; and reply, tel. No. 251, 26 July, F.O. 65/1138.

⁵ On the motion to go into committee of supply for the vote of credit for Egypt, he distinguished the military revolt against which Britain was acting from the Egyptian hostility to the control, which had nothing to do with it, see Hans. Parl. Deb. cclxxii. 1802-5, 1806.
previous implication, we ought to have acted as we are now acting. I do not know why he said this. It earned for him a great compliment from Cross, naturally enough, & will probably be heard of again. In Chamberlain's interest, I reported it to the Queen!

788. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone [P.R.O. 30/29/126]

18, Carlton House Terrace. [26 July 1882].

I send some papers which have been presented.¹

A Secret & separate despatch which has not been published² & the Chancellor's and Hammond's³ observations on the question whether I might use it.⁴

789. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville [P.R.O. 30/29/126]

No. 2.

10, Downing Street. Jul 26. 82.

I sent your Mem. on to Childers with my concurrence. I fear however he will not be able to speak today.⁵

Reverting to the subject of the Secret Dispatch, I am disposed to think Selborne could not have written his letter to you on that matter, had our debate been within his knowledge.

The only point made, and so far justly made, with some effect against us is that by yielding to the French we have aggravated the Egyptian difficulty.

It is not possible to appreciate this point without knowing the nature of the connection which we found established between us and France.

Can this be really known except by the production of the Secret Dispatch?

If it is to be done, and to be of use, it must I imagine be immediate.

¹ Parl. papers (1878–9) lxxviii. 1.
² See Salisbury to Malet, secret and confidential, 19 Sept. 1879, Add. MS. 4446l, fo. 43; sent to support Granville's contention in No. 389A to Dufferin (see above, no. 770) that the obligation to co-operate with France in Egypt had been made by Salisbury, who in the Lords debate denied it, Hans. Parl. Deb. ccilxii. 1498.
³ From Selborne, 24 July, advising against publication and urging Granville to meet attacks by showing the merits of his own policy, P.R.O. 30/20/141; from Lord Hammond, 23 July, also against, since its bearing was financial, P.R.O. 30/20/150.
⁴ Gladstone returned the letter, having written on it his reply: 'I have read and am in a condition to speak when you revive the subject. W. E. G. Jul. 26. 82.'
⁵ Childers's speech, 27 July, on third night of the committee on the Egyptian vote of credit, described Salisbury's language: we claim to do what we like with Cyprus, and we leave you to do what you like with Tunis, but with respect to Egypt we agree jointly to use British and French influence, see Hans. Parl. Deb. ccilxii. 2004–17.
790. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Foreign Office. [26 July 1882].

I think you may state the substance of Salisbury's agreement.¹

If contradicted, we should have to produce the despatch. But I have asked Lyons to telegraph tomorrow morning whether he sees any objection.²

I enclose all that has passed.

791. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

Immedi[ate].

See over: & pray advise. My first impression is that it would be a very unwise measure for the Prince to go.³

792. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

10, Downing Street. July 28. 82.

Lyons Tel. 169.⁴ I do not see why you should be in a hurry to answer Freycinet's question. Of all the parts of Turkish intervention, none I should think could be more inconvenient than its application to the Canal. Dufferin's 269⁵ seems to show that we ought to make the Turk show his hand.

When do you expect to know the decision of the French ministry & Chamber?

793. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Foreign Office. [28 July 1882].

I have written to Lyons that I see no reason why I should answer Freycinet's mysterious account of Bismarck's mysterious views—that the

¹ For Gladstone's speech, 27 July, see ibid., 2092–3013.
² The dispatch was not laid until 1884; see Parl. papers (1884) lxxxviii. 385, and below, vol. ii, p. 178, n. 2.
³ To Egypt with the brigade of Guards, see Ponsonby to Gladstone, tel. 27 July, P.R.O. 30/29/126; Gucdalla, ii. 202; for the Queen's reference of the question to the cabinet and its advice against his going, see Add. MS. 44643, fo. 164.
⁴ 28 July, reporting Freycinet's question whether Britain approved Bismarck's advice to ask Turkey whether the Canal came within the scope of her intervention, and only to act if it did not, and then through the nearest of the powers and the conference, F.O. 27/2574.
⁵ Of 28 July, reporting the sultan's communication about his intentions in Egypt, F.O. 78/3398; see also to Dufferin, Nos. 444 and 445, 28 and 29 July, affirming Britain's responsibility for reconstruction in Egypt, F.O. 78/3395; and mins. thereon when circulated to the cabinet, P.R.O. 30/29/143.
matter will probably settle itself but that I send him the record of my conversation with Stumm, of which he can make as much or as little use as he likes.

I am glad to think there seems little chance of the Turk sending his troops—

I suppose we shall have the chamber’s decision tomorrow night.

794. **Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville**

[Add. MS. 44174, fo. 194]

Immediate.

10, Downing Street. Noon Jul 31. 82.

Is there any thing for us to say or do today, on the Freycinet smash, or shall I put off the Cabinet? till when?

795. **Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville**

[P.R.O. 30/29/126]

10, Downing Street. Aug. 2. 82.

(Lyons Aug. 1.) If the French crisis ends in a non-action Ministry, a withdrawal from the Conference, or something like it, will be a natural consequence for France? and in this way she may still be useful to us.

796. **Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville**

[Add. MS. 44545, fo. 174]

[Copy]

Aug 2/82.

With your assent, I propose to tell R. Grosvenor that he may consider Tuesday as fixed for the Arrears Bill.²

The Amendments are not printed so that we cannot consider them today. I summon for tomorrow at 2.³

797. **Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville**

[P.R.O. 30/29/126]

Aug 3. 82.

It seems to me that this can on no consideration be permitted before satisfactory arrangements have been made between Turkey & Great Britain? The bills should be refused?⁴

¹ Granville returned the letter having written on it his reply: ‘We know nothing about the French Cabinet [Freycinet having fallen and Ferry not yet having replaced him] but I should be sorry not to have a short Cabinet. G.’; for cabinet meeting on Egypt and Zululand, 31 July, see Add. MS. 44643, fo. 165.

² For the consideration of the Lords’ amendments to the Arrears of Rent (Ireland) bill, in the Commons, Tues. 8 Aug., see Hans. Parl. Deb. cclxxiii. 1151–97; after further negotiation, 10 and 11 Aug., the bill received the royal assent, 18 Aug.

³ For cabinet meeting on parliamentary business and Egypt, Thurs. 3 Aug., see Add. MS. 44643, fo. 166.

⁴ For see to Cartwright, cancelled draft tel. (under which no. 797 is written), 3 Aug., instructing him to tell Colvin that the porte had drawn bills upon the Egyptian treasury and that their non-payment should be covertly contrived, P.R.O. 30/29/126; to Cartwright, tcl. No. 395, 4 Aug., instructing as proposed, F.O. 78/3447.
798. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

10, Downing Street. Aug 10. 82.

1. On the text of the Proclamation¹ I would suggest instant reference to the Chancellor, & perhaps the Law Officers advising with him.

2. Particularly I would point to the phrase ‘foreign interference’ as requiring cons[ideration].

3. Still more, as it strikes me, the last paragraph is weak & lame. Ought it not strictly to order all persons to abstain from aiding & to the best of their power to oppose, Arabi & his confederates (who are nowhere mentioned) and perhaps as emphatically to obey the orders of the Khedive?

799. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

10, Downing Street. Aug 11. 82.

1. Yesterday in replying to Elcho and Wolff, after a word with Dilke, I adverted to it as a possibility, that the time might be close at hand when, making an advance on Seymour’s letter to the Khedive, we might issue some declaration to set forth the character[,] motives and limits of our action in Egypt.²

2. If you have not read the letter of De Blignières to Clemenceau, pray look at the closing passage of it. I read it with a considerable shock. It occurred to me that it might perhaps be right to cause some notice to be taken of it by the press.³

P.S. I have just read Adye’s Telegram⁴ and I most earnestly hope it may not be thought necessary to suspend the traffic of the Canal. Surely a preference (like that of our Telegrams) ought to be enough.

800. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Foreign Office. [12 August 1882].

Does not this confirm what you were surprised at my saying in the Cabinet.

¹ See from Dufferin, tel. No. 321, 9 Aug., giving text of the sultan’s proclamation, which accused Arabi of attacking the administration and so ‘giving rise to foreign interference’ and concluded lamely that Arabi was a rebel and the sultan would maintain the khedive’s privileges, F.O. 78/3398.

² See Hans. Parl. Deb. cclxxii. 1390, for Gladstone’s statement that Admiral Seymour’s assurances might be repeated and enlarged by somebody with larger authority than the admiral of a squadron.

³ See E. G. le Barbier de Blignières, Le contrôle anglo-français en Egypte, lettre de M. de Blignières à M. Clemenceau (Paris, 1882); previously published in La Revue Politique, July 1882; arguing that the control had benefited Egypt and concluding that what Clemenceau called the Egyptian national party, headed by Cherif Pasha, could work with it.

⁴ Not traced.
I could not remember my authorities, but I might have quoted Goldsmid, Rowsell & Lyons.¹

801. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville [P.R.O. 30/29/126]

10, Downing Street. Aug 14. 82.

It occurs to me to submit two things for consideration.

1. If the Sultan is very fractious as to the Convention, ought we to justify our stiffness by referring to the Sultan’s conduct towards Arabi in general & significant terms which might be understood to mean the decoration but might also intimate more? Indeed his long hesitations are another formidable fact, patent to all the world.²

2. Could Dufferin,³ with reference to the alarms at Smyrna & elsewhere, express a hope that the other Powers would give them special consideration with a view to the safety of Europeans, in as much as we are so heavily charged already at the Canal & in Egypt for purposes admitted to be material in the general interest?

802. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone [Add. MS. 44174, fo. 196]

18, Carlton House Terrace. Aug 18/82.

I wish you a pleasant cruise. It will be charming if it ends with the Downs. We can put you all up at Walmer together with the Skipper, at a moment’s warning.

In the meanwhile you must give me full discretion to declare peace or war, & promise to defend whatever blunders I commit.

803. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone [Add. MS. 44174, fo. 198]

Walmer Castle. Aug 21/82.

Last night’s news⁴ was very good as far as it goes.

¹ Gladstone returned no. 800 having written on it his reply: ‘So much the more reason for using the opportunity offered by De B[lignière’s] pamphlet to notice the matter in the Press? W. E. G. Aug. 12’; later note by Granville, ‘Gladstone agrees now that this would not be desirable. G.’; no reference in Gladstone’s note of the cabinet, 12 Aug., Add. MS. 44643, fo. 168.

² See to Dufferin, tel. No. 527, 15 Aug., ‘continue to resist the reference of the military convention to the conference’, not using Gladstone’s suggestion, F.O. 78/3396; see also p. 382, n. 4.

³ Cf. Granville to the Queen, 10 Aug., demurring at her suggestion that a warship be sent to Smyrna, where disorders had broken out, P.R.O. 30/29/41; to Dufferin, tel. No. 526, 15 Aug., instructing him as in paragraph 2 of no. 801, F.O. 78/3396. 

⁴ i.e. from Dufferin, tel. No. 350, 20 Aug., reporting that when Turkey repudiated the draft military convention, agreed to, 18 Aug., he had cancelled all friendly assurances so far given in the Egyptian question F.O. 78/3398; cf. Gladstone to Granville, tel. 20 Aug., ‘much approve Dufferin’s 350’, P.R.O. 30/29/126.
Childers has been pressing me much to break off relations with the Sultan at once, if he retains the prohibition on the export of mules.\(^1\)

I have told Dufferin he may say anything short of that, but that to break off relations at this moment would be very inconvenient.\(^2\)

Dufferin seems to do very well.

I am afraid the weather has been too rough for pleasure.

I am ordered to Osborne to sleep or to lunch. I have written to be excused, but I do not yet know with what result.\(^3\)

---

804. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

Iwerne Minster House, Shaftesbury. Aug 25. 82.

I am starting for London but before I go I write a line with respect to Lyons’s letter of the 22d.\(^4\) The continuity of the entente with France may mean more than one thing: but do you think we are sufficiently secured against its meaning the revival or prolongation rather of the secret engagement between Salisbury and Waddington?\(^5\) This I take for granted we should not at all like. It is possible that Lyons may not know of its existence.

I am afraid that little or no prospect of yachting remains.

I am astonished at this place, so rapid a creation.

---

805. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

10, Downing Street. Aug 29. 82.

On Friday Aug. 28, without a word to me, our friend Courtney (who has done very well here) went off to Russia, to remain till the first week in October. Rather strong? I have written him a mild note. Off for Hewarden.

---

\(^1\) See to Dufferin, tel. No. 514, 10 Aug., instructing him to get permission, refused locally, for the embarkation at Smyrna of mules bought for the use of troops in Egypt, F.O. 78/3396; and Childers to Granville, 20 Aug., as here described; and negative reply, 21 Aug., P.R.O. 30/29/118; and mins. by Childers and further tels. to Dufferin, 12, 14, 15 Aug., F.O. 78/3396.

\(^2\) To Dufferin, unnumbered tel. from Walmer, 21 Aug., as here described, F.O. 78/3396; see p. 438, n. 1.

\(^3\) See exchange of letters and telegrams between Ponsonby and Granville, 18–20 Aug., P.R.O. 30/29/41. Gladstone wrote on no. 803: ‘answ. The prohibition seems only one degree short of actual hostility. This induced me to agree as in my tels. of yesterday to London if you were ready’.

\(^4\) To Granville, private, 22 Aug., on Duclerc’s pleasure at Lyons’s saying that the entente had not been impaired by Britain’s sole action in Egypt; and advising action as if ‘there has been no solution of the continuity of the entente’, P.R.O. 30/29/172.

\(^5\) See p. 406, n. 2.
806. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

Hawarden Castle. Sept 2. 82.

On Mallet's letter of Aug. 22¹ about the Notables, I am glad to observe that he favours the idea of some amount of self-government for Egypt.

1. With him, I am against the plan described as that of Cherif: while I think ministerial responsibility is a notion for which Egypt is hardly ripe.

Sultan's idea seems to me much better but they should, if this plan be adopted, deal gently with the trials.

I do not quite understand what is the extent of the Khedive's legal powers but I agree with Mallet that it is desirable to keep the present Chamber if possible. When a great act is revoked as having been extorted, a great blow is struck at good faith as between governors and governed.

2. Do you know anything about this keel-hauling business?² The look of it is not pleasant: even apart from the apparent expediency of encouraging officers promptly to return to their allegiance. Should not the Khedive—if the facts are as they seem—be warned against any form of punishment likely to alienate British and European sympathy from him?

At the best he has no strength to spare.³

Here, a splendid harvest is on the ground but the glass low with intermittent rains.

807. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Walmer Castle. [2 September 1882].

What shall I tell Redesdale?⁴

I hope you think the convention⁵ negotiation stands well. It is not clear to me that the Sultan will accept it after all.

[P.S.] Lacaita is spouting Dante to Georgy Fullerton & Cheney.

¹ To Granville, private, on his preference for the chamber of notables' revising its own organic law in Egypt over Cherif's proposal to dissolve the chamber and issue a new law off his own bat, P.R.O. 30/29/160.

² The newspapers reported that this punishment had been inflicted upon the surrendered rebel leaders in Egypt.

³ See to Malet, tels. Nos. 444, 445, 6 Sept., giving details of the reported tortures and instructing him to make strong representations to the Egyptian government, but not using Gladstone's suggestion, F.O. 78/3447; see also no. 815.

⁴ See Redesdale to Granville, 2 Sept., asking whether Gladstone knew there were four bills down for the Commons in the autumn session, which it was understood was to take no business except the new rules of procedure, P.R.O. 30/29/152.

⁵ See from Dufferin, tel. No. 379, 1 Sept., reporting agreement on the text of the military convention for Turkish intervention in Egypt, F.O. 78/3398; to Malet, tel. No. 439 confidential, 1 Sept., informing him, F.O. 78/3447.
808. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

Hawarden Castle. S. 3. 82.

The whole matter to which Redesdale refers has been explained in the House of Commons.¹

1. We have promised to propose nothing fresh except under unforeseen emergency.

2. We mean to ask for all day & every day.

3. Private members will find it very hard under these circumstances to get on, & we can give them no countenance, unless it be in some very special case.

I send you Spencer’s last note.² He seems to have behaved admirably.

P.S. 1. I am quite satisfied about the Convention—almost equally either way.

2. I receive various letters about the keel-hauling.

3. I should think it better (Malet No 430) to pay the Administration than the Coupons of the Unified Debt.³

809. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

Hawarden Castle. Sept 3. 82.

I have cut out of my letter to Richard⁴ all the matter on which you had a doubt, although it was a private and personal communication.

I am not sure, however, that I have exactly your point of view for the Salisbury treaties, though I acquiesced in the non-publication,⁵ and feel the great difficulty of the question. Of all the outrages he committed, even including the fibs, I am inclined to believe his three secret treaties, two of them still unpublished, were the most outrageous. I by no means think that they are not to be alluded to, though I admit the question of where

¹ For Gladstone’s statement, 14 Aug., that parliament would reassemble, 24 Oct., to resume the debate on the resolutions on procedure interrupted, 1 May, by the Irish crisis, that these would have precedence and be taken from day to day until passed, Hans. Parl. Deb. ccixiii. 1695–8.

² See to Gladstone, 1 Sept., reporting the Dublin police riot of 31 Aug.; two letters, 2 Sept., describing his measures to quell it, the dismissal of men and the enrolment of special constables, Add. MS. 44390, fos. 132, 134.

³ See from Malet, tel. No. 430, 2 Sept., reporting Egypt’s inability to meet all her obligations, and her intention to pay the coupon and not her administration, F.O. 78/3449; to Malet, tel. No. 463, 13 Sept., in the opposite sense to Gladstone, giving Colvin’s reasons for paying the coupon, F.O. 78/3447.

⁴ Of 31 Aug., urging in his defence against a charge of militarism, that Britain was bound ‘by actual covenants, some of them’ secret, Add. MS. 44545, fo. 187; see Granville to Hamilton, 2 Sept., agreeing that the allusion should be omitted, Add. MS. 44174, fo. 200; and Hamilton’s note on the copy.

when and how to be most difficult. In the Egyptian debate near the close of the Session I advisedly made an allusion intended to be intelligible to Northcote and conveying a sort of challenge to him to deny if he could.

I am not aware of having ever during my half a century heard of such a thing as a secret treaty, except the three—I believe—made by Salisbury in his two years: if indeed he was not just about a fourth in the matter of Herat, when he was put out.

It is my opinion that, in justice to Parliament and the country, means ought to be found for making such proceedings impossible & I am inclined to consider whether it may not be right, without going into particulars, to allude to his system as a system, and to denounce it: such is the wrong done by it to Parliament and the country.

Are my 'facts' right.

5. Treaties in the half century except Salisbury o

Salisbury 3

I hope your harvest has not suffered.

810. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Walmer Castle. Sep 6/82.

'Unberufen' there seems to be a lull in diplomatic matters.

I had some doubts at first, but believe you and Malet are right about the notables. I have told him so. I will also give him your opinion about the payment of the administration.

The Queen² and the Press are strong against the convention. But now that the military & naval commanders think their assistance advantageous, I have as strong an opinion that in a political point of view, the balance of argument is in favour of it—

Dilke is here, always on or in the sea.

He is strongly in favour of the convention.

He has not alluded to his own case, since he has been here.

811. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

Hawarden Castle. Sept 7. 82.

1. I observe that attempts are still being made to tighten upon us the language of the proposed closing Protocol of the Conference upon its adjournment.³ And without doubt it is well to be in agreement with every-

¹ i.e. on Cyprus, Tunis, and Egypt.
² See the Queen to Granville, daily tels. 29 Aug.—1 Sept.; and Ponsonby to Granville, 31 Aug., 2 Sept., 4 Sept., protesting against the military convention and the landing of Turkish troops in Egypt, P.R.O. 30/29/41.
³ Recording Turkey's reservation to herself of the right to appoint a date for a further meeting of the conference, see abstract of the protocols of the conferences, 23 June to 14 Aug., E. Hertslet, The Map of Europe by Treaty (1891) iv. 3092; see below, p. 417, n. 4.
body. Still, I hope you will not agree to any words which would make us dependent upon all and each of the powers for our eventual settlement in Egypt. Is not the following a possible combination: that Russia and perhaps Austria should sell Egyptian interests to the Sultan against some boon to themselves? Each has selfish aims to prosecute, and neither can be supposed to care much for Egyptian liberties.

Happily the question of the Protocol, or of any Protocol, does not burn—for us at any rate.

2. The Queen though on the whole taking the right side shows a good deal of one-sidedness about the admission of the Turks and their landing: not apparently seeing that there are pros as well as cons in the question.\(^1\) However it is all in good humour.

3. I am not sure whether you go to Balmoral but I hope you will contrive, if you do, to take us on your way either northward or southward.

4. Dilke if with you will be amused I think if he looks at the reporting of Ashmead Bartlett in the accompanying 'England'\(^2\)—I presume at the Baroness's\(^3\) expense.

Fine weather now, and a steady glass.

---

812. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Private.

Walmer Castle. Sep 7/82.

I send you 2 telegrams which Childers has forwarded to Sir Garnet, and which he has sent to me—

It is not clear whether he is right or wrong about preventing the Turks landing if the submission takes place previously, but he ought not to have been in such a hurry to send the order—unless he has obtained your permission.

It may be an excellent thing to do, but it is not obvious how it is to be defended.

You will also observe that I have not taken upon myself to promise an early decisive action.\(^4\)

[P.S.] Dilke\(^5\) agrees with me.

---

\(^1\) See, for example, the Queen to Gladstone, 4 Sept., copy enclosed in Ponsonby to Granville, 4 Sept., P.R.O. 30/29/41; Guedalla, ii. 207–8.

\(^2\) Ashmead Bartlett's editorial asserted that 'it was through the subservience of the British Cabinet, especially represented by Sir Charles Dilke, to the French Republic, that the bulk of our Egyptian difficulties arose', England: The only National Conservative Weekly Newspaper for all Classes, 26 Aug., p. 8d; no allusion on 2 Sept.

\(^3\) i.e. the Baroness Burdett-Coutts, his brother's wife; see no. 295.

\(^4\) See to Childers, 7 Sept., asking him to cancel Wolseley's instructions to prevent the landing of Turkish troops after the surrender of the Egyptian rebels; and reply, P.R.O. 30/29/118; see also to Malet, tel. No. 451, 8 Sept., telling him and adding that Wolseley's instruction, that the Turks should not land until he had fought a decisive action, still held, F.O. 78/3447.

\(^5\) Was at Walmer Castle from 5 to 8 Sept.
Hawarden Castle. Sept 7. 82. 11.30 Pm.

1. The Messenger who has come & returns tonight will telegraph to you from London that in my own mind I am clearly against changing our course as to the Turks on account of a proceeding the mala fides of which is not established, and the results of which in the language of the Proclamation are mixed; mixed, subject to a fresh engagement that the evil shall be corrected, while the good will remain.

I fear there would arise a doubtful wrangle about good faith, and a quarrel with the Sultan under circumstances highly unfavourable to the tranquillity and security of the East. A rupture on this ground would be a more angry rupture than if we had done it at an earlier stage.

This being so, I do not desire a meeting in London on the point but am quite ready to come as stated in my Telegram.2

2. I have sent your Telegram3 to Pauncefote with two verbal changes which perhaps he will think himself authorised to adopt.

3. I quite agree (you may recollect it was my opinion at the first) that we should specify something about equitable trial according to civilised usage.4

4. I did not see the two Childers Telegrams beforehand but I did not see mischief in them while I think your remark as to jurisdiction of the W.O. incontestable.5 I did not look upon the words as absolutely ruling that the Turks, if they arrive after submission, should not land. But on consideration I agree with you that it would be a serious matter even to suspend their landing on the ground of their arriving after submission, and I am very doubtful whether we ought to administer such a snub to them. I agree therefore in your request to Childers and I will send him a copy of what I am now writing to you.

---

1. Relates to the publication in Cairo of a proclamation against Arabi, worded differently from that agreed upon between Dufferin and the sultan; Malet to Granville, tel. No. 435, 7 Sept., F.O. 78/3449.

2. See exchange of tels. between Granville and Gladstone, 7, 8 Sept., agreeing that negotiations should not be broken off and a meeting was unnecessary, P.R.O. 30/29/126.

3. i.e. to Malet, tel. No. 451 (see p. 415, n. 4); draft with Gladstone's changes, sent to Pauncefote for telegraphing, in F.O. 78/3447.

4. See Childers to Granville, 7 Sept., sent in no. 812 and returned in no. 813, doubting whether Britain ought to demand a fair trial for Arabi and the other rebel leaders, lest this make her responsible for the fairness, P.R.O. 30/29/118.

5. Granville to Childers, 7 Sept., objecting that the instructions to Wolseley (p. 415, n. 4) trespassed upon political issues outside the jurisdiction of the W.O., not traced.
814. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone  
Walmer Castle. Sep 7/82.

I got the private telegram from Dufferin,1 just after I had written to you this morning. I do not know what answer you will give to my question.2 Brett has written to Dilke to tell him that Tissot had asked Nat Rothschild, what were the plans of the Gov as to Egypt, and whether we should like to renew the Treaty of Commerce—& that Rothschild had answered that he could not say anything as to the 2d question but as to the first, it was clear that England must secure the future predominance. To which Tissot answered 'naturally'.

815. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone  
Walmer Castle. Sep 8/82.

I have telegraphed about the keel hauling. I suspect it was applied to some mutinous sailors, not to military prisoners.

I return Spencer's letter. He seems to have done admirably, but his handwriting does not improve.3

816. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone  
Walmer Castle. Sep 8/82.

You will see by the telegrams that Bismarck does not wish for more declarations and that Kalnoky has backed out of the proposal he made.4 I did not think I was justified in departing from the words upon which we had agreed.

I am glad the messages to you are good humoured—Mine are full of surprise & indignation.5

I do not think there is much chance of my going to Balmoral. If so I will bear in mind your pleasant invite—

Dilke is gone, but I have sent him England.6

[P.S.] Herbert Bismarck comes here on Sunday, on his way from Ostend to the Isle of Wight.

1 Of 6/7 Sept., saying that the Turks' behaviour about the proclamation against Arabi would justify the dropping of the proposed convention, P.R.O. 30/29/190.

2 See to Gladstone, tel. 2.30 p.m., 7 Sept., repeating Dufferin's tel. and asking whether he might give him discretion to act as proposed, P.R.O. 30/29/126.

3 No. 815 replies to no. 808.

4 See from Elliot, tel. No. 90, 6 Sept., for Kalnoky's proposed verbal change in the protocol to close the Constantinople conference, F.O. 7/1037; see from Ampthill, No. 354 most confidential, 7 Sept., for Bismarck's proposal to abandon it and allow the conference to die a natural death, F.O. 64/1007.

5 See nos. 810, 811; see also the Queen to Granville, tels., 7, 8 Sept., 'surely the Convention falls through', '... surely you are not going to trust him [the sultan] now', P.R.O. 30/20/41.

6 See p. 415, n. 2.
817. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

H[awarden]n. Sept 8. 82.

Viewing
1. The Queen's persistent uneasiness1 about this Turkish Convention and disembarcation: and also in some degree
2. The likelihood of an early forward movement and crisis shortly thereafter
3. The questions which may arise with the Turks in the event of their arrival after the submission.

I have been thinking whether it would be well in itself, and respectful to the Queen, if I were to announce2 to her that I would call the Cabinet in the middle of next week (I take for granted the Turks cannot then have landed) on say Wednesday afternoon.

If you agree in this view please to telegraph to me on receipt of this letter.3

Thanks for the information about secret engagements.4 They are more numerous than I had supposed. I see only two however which do not relate to operations of war & which stand in quite a different category. These two are Ld Aberdeen5 with Portugal in 1842, which appears quite unintelligible: and Malmesbury in 1852, when the Treaty made appears to me objectionable as well as needless.

The pranks of Salisbury are not included in the paper.

818. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

Hawarden Castle. Sept 9. 82.

I have ordered out the summons. Another fidgetty telegram from Balmoral since I did it. She is a little like Sherborne,6 who used to see one side of a question so clearly.

I understand or seem to understand Tissot, and, if I understand, agree.7

---

1 Cf. Gladstone to Granville, tel. 8 Sept., reporting a tel. from the Queen identical with that sent to Granville, 8 Sept., and his reply that the sultan being always untrustworthy, his object was to extract good from the untrustworthiness, P.R.O. 30/29/126.
2 Gladstone wrote first 'make an offer to'; cabinet met, 13 Sept., and decided to override the Queen's wish and allow the military convention to be signed, if the terms of the proclamation against Arabi were amended as Britain wished, see Add. MS. 44643, fo. 175.
3 Not traced; but see Ponsonby to Granville, 9 Sept., expressing the Queen's pleasure that the military convention was to be submitted to the cabinet, P.R.O. 30/29/41.
4 Not traced.
5 Gladstone wrote first 'Palmerston'.
6 Hamilton in copying 'Sherborne' wrote after it '(sic Q y Sherbrooke)', Add. MS. 44545, fo. 193.
7 See no. 814; Gladstone interpreting Tissot's 'naturally' as 'inevitably' or 'in the course of nature'?
It is reasonable to conjecture that, if & when the military matter is well over, our position in Egypt will 'naturally' be something like that which Russia now has in Bulgaria, not the result of stipulation, but of effort and sacrifice crowned by success.

819. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Walmer Castle. Sept 9/82.

The vigour of the Balmoral telegrams goes on crescendo. I am glad to be able to answer this evening that you intend to have a cabinet next week.

820. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

Hawarden Castle. S 10. 82.

I send you herewith the Queen’s recent letters chiefly on Egyptian matters (The Reflector, is I assure you worthy of notice from all who need light—were it not an insult to your eyes, I would ask leave to send you one.)

In that of the 8th, received today, she touches a point on which I think we might send a word to Wolseley in case he should not have it before him.

The submission of Arabi, I take it, should be to the Khedive, and should not be accepted in any other form?

If you agree in my suggestion about the submission, perhaps you would let Childers know and he might telegraph it—as (in my view) it involves nothing new, but only something that might be overlooked by the General.

821. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

Hawarden Castle. Sept 11. 82.

I do not know whether you see the Contemporary Review but I think

---

1 See the Queen to Granville, tel. 9 Sept., on her failure to understand the last instructions to Dufferin (tel. No. 569, 9 Sept., on modifications to be made in the military convention, F.O. 78/3396) and on the sultan’s perfidy, P.R.O. 30/20/41.

2 No. 820 in Gladstone’s hand in the Gladstone papers and probably returned to him with the Queen’s letters.

3 One of 8 Sept., on her fear that the sultan’s new pliability meant that he contemplated agreeing with Arabi against the khedive and behind Britain’s back, Gucdalla, ii. 208–9; no other traced.

4 A device for throwing the light of the candle on to the book one was reading, Morley, iii. 388.

5 See Childers to Granville, 12 Sept., sending copy of Childers to Wolseley, tel. 12 Sept., instructing him to arrange, for political reasons, that Arabi’s submission, when made to him, should be in form to the khedive, P.R.O. 30/29/118.
this article by Evans is worth your looking at particularly the middle and closing part. He brings a charge of a distinct breach of faith towards himself.¹

822. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone [Add. MS. 44174, fo. 220]

Walmer Castle. [12 September 1882].

I have asked Childers to telegraph.

Nothing I should like so much as a reflector, that would throw some light borrowed from you upon me.

823. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville [P.R.O. 30/29/126]

10, Downing Street. Sept 13. 82.

I send you over a reflector of my own first, by way of experiment. Please let me know whether it answers.

824. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone [P.R.O. 30/29/126]

Foreign Office. Sep 13/82.

The Austrians at the time appeared to me to have a strong case against Evans. If I remember right they found his correspondence with some of the Leaders. Evans' family and friends admitted to me that he had been exceedingly indiscreet.

The Emperor let him go, as soon as it was possible for him to intervene.

I have no doubt that much that he says about the Austrians is true, but it is an ex parte statement.²

825. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville [P.R.O. 30/29/126]

10, Downing Street. Sept 15. 82.

Fresh cause for thankfulness and mutual congratulation.³

I am afraid your feelings will be damped by seeing the inclosed paper.⁴ But it seemed to me that the time had come for trying to put together the

¹ See A. J. Evans, ‘The Austrian War against publicity’, describing the press censorship, the order for his expulsion from Ragusa during the Bosnian insurrection, 1881, his arrest, despite a promise to the British consul, and his 7 weeks' imprisonment, Contemporary Review, Sept. 1882, xlii. 383.

² Gladstone returned the letter, having written on it his reply: ‘The only point to which I wished to draw your attention was the distinct & public charge of breach of faith on p. 395 [i.e. the repudiation of the consul's agreement] W.E.G. S. 14’.

³ See Granville to Malet, tel. No. 474, 19 Sept., for the dropping of the negotiations over the protocol to close the conference and over the military convention, Turkish intervention being rendered superfluous by the victory at Tel-el-Kebir, 13 Sept., F.O. 78/3447.

outlines of a plan of action, according to what I conceive to be the general ideas of yourself & of our colleagues. It stands of course as a first sketch for correction.

826. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

10, Downing Street. Sept. 16. 82.

1. It seems important to draw the line as far as we can between the work
   a. to be done with the Khedive and before the Conference
   b. to be done in the Conference, with our initiative.

Now I suppose the division to be somewhat as follows.

a. With the Khedive
   (1) The military & police organisation, as matters of immediate need, with a view to the evacuation
   (2) The arrangement of the local institutions.

b. With the Conference
   (1) International obligations
   (2) In these I understand the Controll is included & this I imagine cannot be kept away from the Conference
   (3) Relations with the Sultan
   (4) Suez Canal.

2. It is very important to do the whole quickly. But the Khedive work ought to be completed or far advanced, I suppose, before the Conference work begins.

Now I come to my point. We cannot get much for these purposes out of our admirable General.

It is the work of civilians. Are the civilians on the spot adequate to such large nice and weighty work?

Dufferin would be capital,¹ but he is nailed to Constantinople.

Some advantage would be found in sending a man from home, possessed of all our views.

Would it be right to think of Goschen, or Derby if he has action enough in him.

Please to consider the whole of this note as a series of queries, intended to open up the case, & commended to your thoughts.

There is heavy work to be done.

Read Standard article² of today on a Protectorate: a Protectorate which I incline to think would be worse than annexation.

¹ For Dufferin's special mission to Egypt, see nos. 834, 835, 847, 850, 853.
² Showing that 'we have plucked out the root of anarchy' in Egypt, pointing out the disadvantages of annexation, and arguing that these did not attach to a protectorate, see the Standard, 16 Sept., p. 48.
We have now reached a point at which to some extent the choice lies between more intervention & less; and the question is fairly raised whether we are to try to prepare Egypt for a self-governing future.

I believe our choice has been made.

827. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

[Add. MS. 44174, fo. 222]

Private. Walmer Castle. Sep 18/82.

I send you a crude minute—containing only a general idea as to the way of dealing with the Control.

I trust you will not think I depart too much from the paths of virtue and self abnegation.

I shall be in town this afternoon, and will attend the committee on the Canal tomorrow morning.

828. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

[P.R.O. 30/29/126]

Hawarden Castle. Sept 18. 82.

Since I telegraphed, & received your welcome but not unexpected reply, I have had a very heavy blow in learning the death of the Dean of Windsor.

My belief is that he has been cognisant of every Crown appointment in the Church for nearly a quarter of a century, and that the whole of his influence has been exercised with a deep insight, and a large heart, for the best interests of the Crown and the Church. If their character during this period has been in the main more satisfactory to the general mind of the country than at some former periods, it has been in no small degree owing to him.

It has been my duty to recommend I think for fully forty of the higher appointments, including twelve which were Episcopal. I rejoice to say that every one of them had had his approval. But I do not scruple to own that he has been in no small degree a help and guide to me; and as to the Queen, whose heart I am sure is at this moment bleeding, I do not believe she can possibly at this moment fill his place as a friendly adviser either in ecclesiastical or in other matters.

Apart from this sad subject I meant today to suggest to you as an outline

1 Not traced; became the proposal to France of 23 Oct., see p. 449, n. 1.
2 Tel. 12.25 p.m., 18 Sept., commenting on Dufferin’s tel. No. 409, 17 Sept. (reporting changes the sultan wanted in the military convention, F.O. 78/3398), that he was ready to put an end quickly to these barren communications, P.R.O. 30/29/126; cf. to Dufferin, tel. 18 Sept., instructing accordingly, F.O. 78/3396; and p. 420, n. 3.
3 This and preceding paragraphs are printed from Gladstone’s copy, Morley, iii. 93.
of what you might work for (I suppose in the Conference) something like this:

a. Khedive to be released from requiring assent of foreign Governments to dismissal
b. To announce intention of using European aid
c. To place the offices of those who are to do the work of the Controul on the tenure of good behaviour
d. And the appointment at least of the head to run for (seven?) years. We I apprehend should have the start.

829. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

Hawarden Castle. Sept. 19. 82.

You will have seen in my last note signs of proximity in our views about the Controul.

I have not seen Malet & Colvin’s & Money’s opinions but I do not anticipate difficulty on the details. And I think we are quite agreed that, by hook or by crook, the first head ought to be British by arrangement with the Khedive.

But two points in your Memm move my apprehensions.

1. That if there is an absolute consent of foreign powers required for the dismissal of an Egyptian officer, we shall find ourselves in conflict with the real national party.

2. That if we require a right to be present at all Cabinet Councils, we shall run some risk of being again in the position of political responsibility for the general Government of the country, in which we have been entangled last year & this.

I have put down my view as far as it is formed, & without reference to any point of divergence, in the short Memm within.

I must go southward again for the funeral of the Dean of Windsor: and I mean also to go to that of Dr. Pusey if I can shake off sufficiently the remains of a cold.

Enclosure

There are preliminary questions of importance, the consideration of which I find it difficult to sever from the question of the Controul in Egypt.

1. Does England desire to assume a definite responsibility for the internal government of that country?¹

2. Is there to be any limitation of self-government in Egypt, except such as is involved in

¹ The following notes on the enclosure are Granville’s marginal comments; here he wrote: ‘No.’
a. The prerogative which may still be reserved to the Sultan
b. The securities necessary for the discharge of international obligations.¹

3. So far as the immediate or financial objects of the control are concerned, is it not the fact that the interests of all the European nations in regard to them are identical?²

4. As the subjects of foreign intervention and of the Control will come before the Powers, and as our means of acting upon the Powers in the last resort can only be by breaking up the Conference, it is assumed that in considering our proposals on these subjects we shall have regard to their being such as we can in the main persistently adhere to.³

I shall dispose of the first and second questions by answering them with a negative.

But it remains open to us to exercise our influence upon the Khedive, anterior to the Conference, upon matters that are within his jurisdiction.

In my view the first thing to be done, after provisions for the peace of the country is to divide the revenues,⁴ and to make over to Egyptian control those revenues which are not necessary for the discharge of international obligations. This I suppose can be done with and by the Khedive.

Then comes the question what are to be the arrangements for the reserved revenues to secure their due application. This I presume must go before the Powers.⁵

And here also it is that there is a danger of conflict with national aspirations, which we should especially struggle to avoid.

I presume

1. That the Powers will impose upon Egypt in the most stringent terms the obligation to meet her engagements.⁶

2. That they may even devise summary remedies⁷ to operate in the event of non-payment (such as the appropriation of Customs Revenues, or an embargo upon ships, or otherwise).

The Khedive may also, in anticipation of the Conference, narrow the question by undertaking before the world to make use of European aid in regard to these revenues.⁸

¹ 'No.'
² 'No because the object of the control was the good of the country,—an object not so strongly entertained by the other powers.'
³ 'Yes.'
⁴ 'They are now divided—Customs[,] Railways[,] 4 Provinces are attributed to the Law of Liquidation. Public domains[,] Daira for the personal debts. Salt[,] revenue of the other 11 Provinces[,] Post office[,] Judicial fees and Octroi are under purely Egyptian control.'
⁵ 'Not necessary, as it has already been done by the law of liquidation and Khedivial decree.'
⁶ 'Already done.'
⁷ 'This is provided for by appeal to the Govt.'
⁸ 'In the case of the 4 Provinces, [collection] is in the hands of Egyptians—the Customs House is in the hands of an Englishman, but this is not obligatory. I presume you would not wish to strengthen the bondholders against the Egyptian element.'
And in particular that the Chief Officer set over them
a. shall be appointed for a term of (seven) years¹
b. shall not be dismissed except upon proof of malversation by a regular & public judicial investigation²
c. If not himself a Minister, shall have the right to be present at any Council of Ministers which shall treat of matters in any way touching the said revenues³
d. Shall be a subject of one of the Powers principally interested in the due provision for meeting the charge of the Egyptian Debt.⁴

Is it necessary to go beyond this, so far as the Chief Officer is concerned?⁵

830. **Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone**

[Add. MS. 44174, fo. 224]

Foreign Office. Sep 19/82.

Childers
self
Dilke
Sir Auckland Colvin
Sir Louis Mal[l]et
Sir H. Norman
Sir H. [sc. R.] Thompson
Sir Cooper Key
Sir Andrew Clark[e]
Pauncefote⁶

discussed Egypt for two hours. They were unanimous—but we meet again next week when we hope to have Northbrook to consider a draft report in favor of ‘Free navigation of Canal’ coupled with more influence on the administration.

Destruction of all Fortresses, (which implies neutralization of Egypt.)
Further enquiries about Railway etc, & about organization of army.
I am afraid Childers is far from well. He goes away on Friday evening.

Tenterden is seriously ill.
I condole with you on the loss of the Dean. He is a great loss to all—

sleep at Algy West’s tonight & come back tomorrow.

After talking with Colvin, I propose to admit the Egyptian directors of

¹ 'The chief officer[s] (on the Egyptian side—hitherto 2 controllers) have been so nominated.'
² 'Yes.'
³ 'This is the important point. The Controller is valued by Riaz and Cherif as the only buffer against the Caisse publique & against the separate administrations.'
⁴ 'Yes.'
⁵ 'He ought to be present at all the Councils, & be restricted from any vote or power of coercion.'
⁶ Granville's Suez Canal Committee remained in being, 1882–6.
the Public domains & of the Daira[,] members of the Board of Public Debt.¹

[If] Rowsell is invalided we could get the Khedive to appoint Colvin in his place—

He was the most Egyptian of those at the Committee.

831. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

Hawarden Castle. Sept 20. 82.

I write a hasty line before going southward to the funerals of Dr Pusey at Oxford and of the Dean at Strathfieldsaye: with the hope of returning in the course of Saturday night.

Many thanks for the report of Egyptian matters. I do not doubt the Committee understand (what you do not happen to mention) that they are a Committee on the Canal: not on Egyptian affairs generally—and they seem to have made real progress.

It just occurs to me to start this point. Perhaps you might put in force provisionally (with due decency)² some of the financial arrangements which will have to be eventually considered by the Conference?

[P.S.] I am due roughly Sat. Paddington 10.15

Downing St 5–7½ Pm.

832. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Private.

I send you a few notes on your valuable paper.³ I gathered the facts from a conversation with Colvin.

You will see that Goschen in acknowledging the Colvin Malet papers which I sent him confidentially, backs up Colvin’s view that the Controllers were buffers in Egyptian interest, against the Bondholders’ representatives.⁴

I go to Walmer tonight to come back next week but am on a hair trigger if you send for me to London.

I protest against your going through the fatiguing work, of paying a last mark of respect to Wellesley & Pusey. Surely in your case, a few words would be equally gratifying to the relatives, as your presence.

¹ Boards for Domains and the Daira estates, 1878, each comprised an Egyptian, an Englishman, and a Frenchman; the caisse de la dette publique, 1880, was international.

² The bracketed phrase was interpolated by Gladstone between the lines.

³ See enclosure in no. 829 and marginal notes.

⁴ See from Colvin, 13 Sept., sending his paper on the future financial arrangements for Egypt; the paper, 9 Sept.; mem., 20 Sept., of Colvin’s comments on Malet’s proposals, P.R.O. 30/29/167; from Malet, private, 5 Sept., giving his proposals, P.R.O. 30/29/160; from Goschen, 19 Sept., commenting that these papers evaded the main question of how much Britain would have to yield to France and the bondholders against the real interests of Egypt, P.R.O. 30/29/150.
833. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

Oxford. S. 21. 82.

Thanks for your note of yesterday. I think we are well on the same lines: and I have nothing needful to suggest except (what I think you will concur in) that we ought not to be involved in the kind of responsibility for advising and therefore supporting the Khedive with which we found ourselves saddled under Salisbury's arrangement.

2. I send you a cool letter from Blunt—to whom you will see I have not given encouragement.

3. Your observation about the funerals is most kind but my feelings towards Wellesley would not allow me to think of staying away, and this being so, I did not like to pass by Dr Pusey's. He was most kind to me as an undergraduate at Oxford.

[P.S.] I think I understand the position of the Controul in Egypt as you describe it.

My going to London is uncertain.

834. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Walmer Castle. Sep 21/82.

When you suggested sending a strong man to Cairo, the idea smiled to me much.

Goschen would probably do the work best, but he has unjustly a flavour of bondholder about him, and there are other objections.

I feel certain that Derby would refuse, and notwithstanding his great abilities, we do not know that he has much initiative or power of construction. I was on the point of telegraphing to Dufferin to ask him whether he could go at once, but I have since had some doubt.

The more quietly & less ostentatiously the work is done the better. It appears from all accounts that Malet is at present omnipotent, and at the same time persona gratissima.

If Dufferin, as ambassador, and with still pleasanter manners, were there for a time he would overshadow him, & possibly weaken his permanent influence—

What do you say?

The Khedive has telegraphed to Sinadino to say that he has the strongest opinion that it is necessary to deal most severely with Arabi and the principal ringleaders. What answer shall I give if any.

1 See nos. 788–90.

2 Not traced; nothing between Blunt to Hamilton, 1 Aug., denying any communication with the rebel leaders since the bombardment of Alexandria, and Blunt to Gladstone, 27 Sept., in Add. MS. 44110.

3 See nos. 826, 847, and 850.
I am inclined either to hold my tongue, or to say that we do not wish to interfere with the Khedive, as long as there is a fair trial, & there are not many executions.¹

I forgot to tell you that Childers begged me to take the chair at the Committee² at the War office, as he had made the excuse of its being a diplomatic committee.

My prejudice against Colvin has gone off. He is much stronger in favour of leaning as much as possible to the Egyptians, than any of the other experts I have seen.

If you come to town, pray see him.

835. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville³ [P.R.O. 30/29/126]

[Henley-on-Thames]. S. 22. 82.⁴

1. I quite agree that Bondholderism, or the flavour of it, and doubt as to initiative, may properly put aside the names I suggested. Of Dufferin I had thought first, as best of all, but had supposed the Conference might detain him: whereas on the other hand his having work in Egypt might be a barrier to any premature meeting of the Conference.

There is much to be said for Malet, and nothing that I know against him: but Dufferin has given such very high evidence of his diplomatic and executive qualities, and would carry such weight as Ambassador, that I hope you will carefully consider his name.⁵

2. I have for the moment given up London: but I had a long conversation there with Colvin and was most favourably impressed.

3. On Colvin’s paper of Sept. 20,⁶ and the specification of nationalities for members of a Council I make two remarks.

   a. Nationality is one thing when the choice lies with the foreign Government, quite another when it does not.

   b. I see an Austrian & an Italian, but are not the Italian interests very large & the Austrian small? I name this only as a suggestion not a conclusion.

4. I am very sorry to say I have forgotten (old age) Redesdale’s point.⁷

¹ See to Malet, tel. No. 486, 29 Sept., recording conversations with Sinadino on the treatment of the rebel leaders who had surrendered, and his reply on Selborne’s advice, as here proposed, F.O. 78/3447.
² The Suez Canal Committee, see no. 830.
³ Granville to Gladstone, 22 Sept., announcing Tenterden’s death, Add. MS. 44174, fo. 236, not printed.
⁴ Written on Hawarden notepaper with Gladstone’s note, ‘tomorrow’ against the address.
⁵ See nos. 826, 834, 847, and 850.
⁶ i.e. Colvin’s mem. of comments on Malet’s suggestions for the future financial administration of Egypt, see p. 426, n. 4.
⁷ See p. 412, n. 4; Redesdale’s 2nd letter, 8 Sept., thanking Granville for no. 808, but
5. The Queen and the Khedive are in the same sense about Arabi. I shall be very glad if he can be hung without real inclemency. If we were the actual Governors, I should wish to take no life except for crime. But he will probably prove to be a criminal; and again his case is peculiar and if the Khedive, a mild man, without his being a criminal, thinks fit to put him to death as a concerter of rebellion and a traitor to Egypt, with a view to public security, I agree with you and do not see that we need interpose a negative.

I shall write in this sense to the Queen.

[P.S.] I send you [a] copy of mine to Childers on return of troops. Evidently you are the proper Chairman.

836. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

No 2. [Henley-on-Thames]. Sept 22. 82.

Thinking further over Arabi's case, and having talked with Phillimore upon it I find it impossible to overlook—in framing my own view—his most traitorous correspondence with the Sultan; traitorous not only against the Khedive but against the liberties of Egypt.

I had not previously taken this into view. It pretty nearly brings me to the view pure & simple that (unless there is doubt about the facts), he should be hanged. This is Phillimore's idea. It may be difficult to decide how much of his guilt to make known if this course is taken. In haste at post time.

837. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone


Hamilton tells me you will not come to London tomorrow. I am rather glad for myself. I have a meeting at Dover, neighbours to dinner, & am not quite ripe yet for a conversation.

complaining that Gladstone had not understood; and 3rd letter, 20 Sept., explaining he meant the necessity to put an absolute, not a conditional ban on legislative business in the autumn session, P.R.O. 30/29/152; see also no. 839.

1 The Queen to Gladstone urging severe treatment of Arabi, not traced.

2 See from Childers, 21 Sept., asking how rapidly the forces in Egypt should be reduced, down to what strength, and whether the Indian troops should come away first, Add. MS. 44130, fo. 98; and reply, 22 Sept., that they should come away before October if possible, be reduced to 12,000, and the Indian forces come away first, Add. MS. 44546, fo. 4; copies, P.R.O. 30/29/126.

3 His host.

4 Hamilton wrote, 22 Sept., that Gladstone would go to Pusey's funeral in Oxford, visit Phillimore at Henley, and go back to Hawarden, mistakenly expecting that this meant he would not go to Dean Wellesley's funeral, P.R.O. 30/29/126.
Coppice, [Henley-on-Thames]. Sept. 23. 82.

I am much concerned to hear of Tenterden’s apparently very sudden death.¹

It is well that you do not anticipate difficulty in the succession.²

We learn now that the Dean’s³ illness was very well known, & the issue dreaded, but all was kept secret, why I do not know, and the Queen was unaware any thing was wrong (apparently) until Sunday, on the evening of which he died, & when she telegraphed to me to inquire.

I wrote to you yesterday in haste my second thoughts about Arabi.

Certainly the night has not shaken them.

This is an ugly quarrel with Lesseps⁴ who is as it were on the ground & will require tender handling. But his conduct is sufficiently impeachable. Remember I am quite ready to tell my story about his abominable misrepresentation of the Khedive.

[P.S.] To reach home I hope tonight.

Hawarden Castle. Sept 25. 82.

We go as near as we can to Redesdale in spirit but the House of Commons would not stand our laying down an absolute proposition against everything but procedure. We must, were it only for ourselves, leave I will not say a door open but power to open a door. For instance there has been a clerical error in the Income Tax Acts (better not to mention just now) which Courtenay [sc. Courtney] will have to correct.

But we have every motive to lean in the direction he desires & are much confirmed by his authority.

¹ Granville to Gladstone, 22 Sept., on Tenterden’s death and the advantage of promoting someone already in the F.O. to succeed, Add. MS. 44174, fo. 236, not printed.
² Pauncefote, the senior assistant under-secretary, was named.
³ Dean Wellesley; see no. 828.
⁴ See complaints of British shipowners, and of the naval commander, of Lesseps’s telegraphing British movements to Arabi after the French withdrawal from joint action in Egypt; and from Malet, No. 664 confidential, 4 Oct., sending copies of the telegrams; and from Lyons, No. 1011 confidential, 15 Sept., for French intervention to restrain Lesseps, all F.O. 78/3488.
⁵ Bill to exempt the capital element in property annuities and salaries from tax was the only bill down for the autumn session and it was deferred, C. J. 501. For Redesdale’s attitude see nos. 807, 808, 835; and Granville to Gladstone, undated scrap, on his being ‘affectionately paternal’ to the liberals, Add. MS. 44174, fo. 263, not printed.
This proposal\(^2\) is not likely to smile to you. But there is some difference between originating and completing & the speculative element is removed. They do not say that it would give a majority of shares to H M's Govt.

Controul, as now, whether dual or single seems to me impossible. I agree very much with N[orthbrook]'s summing up, reserving the question whether Notables sh[oul]d advise or legislate: & I hope for the smallest possible army.

[P.S.] For Ireland, I believe more in Spencer than the Pope.

I think you would be disposed to read the inclosed letter,\(^4\) and if so it had better be before I answer it. I had lost sight of Mr. Palgrave for some time, and was not aware that I stood so unreasonably high in his good graces. He is manifestly a man of great talents and attainments but I should be glad of your judgment in any attempt to estimate him as a guide.

I asked the Chancellor whether we were right in agreeing to have British officers on the Court, where the leaders of the rebellion were being

\(^1\) Granville to Gladstone, 24 Sept., proposing to give the civil list pension, vacant by the death of Sir George Grey, to Sherbrooke and referring to Sir R. A. Cross's renewed application, Add. MS. 44174, fo. 238; and reply, 26 Sept., that such pensions were not given to political opponents, P.R.O. 30/29/126, not printed; see also Cross to Gladstone and reply, 15, 20 Sept., Add. MS. 44476, fos. 236, 269; and nos. 479, 480, and p. 274, n. 2; Granville to Gladstone, 30 Sept., inquiring whether Bright might not have a claim, Add. MS. 44174, fo. 254; see also p. 447, n. 2.

\(^2\) The docket describes it as to buy more Suez Canal shares.

\(^3\) No. 841 is a covering note returning letters: from F. Leveson Gower objecting to Arahi's execution, not traced; from Northbrook, 20, 21 Sept., on an efficient army and police as Egypt's first need and the civil administration desirable, P.R.O. 30/29/138; mem. by Colvin on Egyptian army and administration, printed for the cabinet; from Errington, not traced, see p. 298, n. 4.

\(^4\) From Palgrave on Egypt, not traced; but see below, no. 851.
tried]—telling him at the same [time] what Lord Charles Beresford had
given me as a message from Cherif & Riaz, that they were most anxious
that there should be an Englishman present, with authority to prevent
mistakes, to signify the wishes of the English Gov and to prevent evidence
being taken of an extraneous character, which was not necessary for the
case of the inculpated, & might be inconvenient.

Beresford said that the Khedive proposed to execute thirty, by Beres-
ford’s advice had reduced it—not to ten as suggested but to 15—

You will see the Chancellor objects to English officers forming part of
the court, approves of an Englishman as a sort of assessor, & deprecates
with me ten executions—Indeed inclines to mercy, if no crimes are proved
against Arabi—

Please telegraph your views.²

I shall be in town tomorrow afternoon.

844. **Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone** [Add. MS. 44174, fo. 246]

Walmer Castle. [26 September 1882].

I send you also³ a henpecker letter from the Chancellor.⁴

I propose to tell him that I will mention his wishes respecting his
brother in law again to you—that you would have every wish to meet his
personal wishes but that I believed his brother in law’s claims were not
thought abstractedly to be as strong as many candidates.

The notion of his succeeding to Redesdale is chimerical. Tenterdens
chance was small, but he had served under both parties, & never voted.
He might have [been] accepted as a compromise on the part of the Tories
who have rather had no candidate, & the Gov who have not votes enough
to carry one.

But I believe he would have failed.

Morley wishes for the place, & has a superior claim to the support of the
party—the Tories would infinitely prefer him to an unknown new liberal
Peer.

¹ From Selborne, 25, 26 Sept., as here summarized, P.R.O. 30/29/141; but see also
to Malet, tel. No. 487, 29 Sept., authorizing the attendance of Sir Charles Wilson at the
court martial set up to try Arabi and the other rebel leaders, F.O. 78/3447.
² See cryptic instruction on the back of no. 843 for tel. to Granville: ‘Execution twice,
execution rebellion once.’
³ i.e. in addition to that sent in no. 844.
⁴ Of 25 Sept., asking for a peerage for George Leslie, Lady Selborne’s brother, and
suggesting his succeeding Redesdale as chairman of committees in the Lords; and reply,
29 Sept., as here suggested and confirmed, 28 Sept., P.R.O. 30/29/126, P.R.O. 30/29/141.
845. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

The case as it stood about Wolseley's Peerage in its first phase was extremely complicated and I do not think Goschen seems clearly to apprehend the nature of a Minister's promise which can always be thrown over at headquarters unless [the] said Minister is prepared to resign.

When, however, we spoke of the Peerages, I started the idea of a Viscountcy on military grounds but Childers (I think it was he) said the Duke of Wellington was first made Baron only. I suspect this is an error. And I should have no reluctance to re-open the question on military grounds, if it be thought prudent.

There is another point in it—he ought to have a further grant of money. Sir Garnet has accepted. It is a question therefore only of continued acceptance.

If we were misled as to Wellington, and acted in error, that is an equitable ground for re-consideration.

It will be necessary I think to consult Childers.

846. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

Hawarden Castle. Sept 27. 82.

In regard to this very vague intimation about the Suez Canal, I agree with you that to continue and complete is not the same thing as to begin, but on the other hand I do not think more can be said than that there is no call absolutely to close the door and prevent ourselves from knowing what is really offered or intended.

There are several remarks which occur, & which are not very encouraging.


2. I do not relish the idea of squabbling at the Board, and think that while the management is in Paris we should make little of it.

3. I doubt whether any sort of case could be made for further dealing with the Suez Canal in the proprietary way, unless it were for a clear & complete job.

4. In approaching the question we should consider what precedents we

---

1 For the Queen's opposition to this in Mar. 1881, see nos. 430-4, 438, 442, and in Apr.-May, nos. 480, 493, 494, and Sept., no. 525; a barony was now conferred with a parliamentary grant to support it.

2 See p. 431, n. 2.

3 See mem. by the two British Suez Canal Directors, 16 Sept., on measures to counter possible future hostility of the company to Britain, showing what prevented an increase in the number of British directors and favouring the khedive's altering the concession, F.O. 78/3481.
may set up for the United States on the Isthmus of Panama, and possibly for Russia on the Bosporos.

5. More hopeful in my eyes than this method is the political one opened by the Lord Chancellor’s paper.¹

847. **Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville**

[Penmaenmawr]. Sept. 29. 82.

I write from Penmaenmawr where we are staying with Lucy Cavendish, to return home probably on Monday certainly not later than Tuesday. Gibson is staying here: he freely admits the improvement in Ireland.

I have read with much interest Ld C. Beresford’s observations of Egypt, & shall be glad to see him in London if occasion offer.

There is nothing I think more clear in the Egyptian matter than that the dual action must be abolished.²

But France may struggle to keep it alive: what ground are we to take
1. That it has absolutely failed?
2. That it has de facto disappeared together with the revolution and anarchy (which it helped to bring about)?

I incline to think both propositions may be maintained.

Have you thought further about Lord Dufferin & Egypt.³

The Times rather threatens a flood of Egyptian discussion in the House of Commons. I hope not. But it will be well that things should be disposed of before, or after it?

Dufferin would be able to work more freely & rapidly, with the weight attaching to him than Malet singlehanded?

848. **Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone**

Walmer Castle. Sep 30/82.

Hartington came to see me yesterday, on his way from Newmarket to Balmoral.

He discussed Egyptian affairs at great length, & in a spirit of cooperation, not of objection. He will utilize his leisure in the north studying the papers.

He is much exercised over the coming session.

¹ i.e. of 14 Sept., that the British occupation of the Canal, 20 Aug., was illegal and proposing the Company’s moving to Cairo and the khedive’s modifying the concession, P.R.O. 30/29/141, F.O. 78/3488, P.R.O. 30/29/35, fo. 32.

² See nos. 826–9, 841; see also min. by Granville, undated, that he was about to prepare Tissot for a proposition about the future of the dual control in Egypt, F.O. 27/2557.

³ See nos. 826, 834, 835.
He has some new arguments against insisting on the bare majority cloture—founded on expediency not on the merits of the thing—and he proposes to remove a difficulty as to yielding, by a withdrawal of a difficulty created by himself.

He says that on one occasion you said that you had never attached the importance others did to cloture, but that if the bare majority was given up, you would prefer not raising the question at all—and that he had answered that it was impossible for him to acquiesce in the total abandonment, as he had pledged himself more strongly to some sort of cloture, than any other member of the Gov—

He now sees the advantage of our making some concession [so] that he is willing to waive all considerations founded on his personal position.

I did not give any opinion, but I urged him strongly to write his views fully to you.¹

849. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville


On the papers received today I have only two observations to make.

1. On recruiting for the Khedive in India. Is this a peremptory and final reply?² Should we not keep the door a little open if possible.

2. On Malet & Fitzgerald respecting the number and salary of Europeans in Egypt.³ Though Malet seems so well satisfied, I confess I think the number large and the amount of Salaries very formidable & I hope that in the coming arrangements both will be much reduced.

P.S. Please to look at inclosed Tel. from the Queen⁴ with my reply by Tel. and post⁵ & consider whether to seal the matter by getting an answer from Malet to say what is in truth sufficiently obvious. The time for considering such a matter would be, if at all, on the eve of the further reduction.

¹ See nos. 852, 863.
² See to Malet, tel. No. 490, 29 Sept., recording the failure of the project for recruiting for the new Egyptian army in India, about which Malet had earlier been told to sound the khedive, owing to the opposition of the Indian government, F.O. 78/3447.
³ See Malet to Granville, 12 Sept., sending Fitzgerald’s statistics, F.O. 78/3441; and from Malet, private, 12 Sept., pointing out the small number of Europeans employed, 2 per cent. of the civil service, P.R.O. 30/29/160; cf. Parl. papers (1882) lxxxii. 89, 189.
⁴ Of 30 Sept., protesting against the reduction of the army in Egypt, Guedalla, ii. 212–13; figures (explaining that it would place Britain ‘at a disadvantage with respect to Europe’) were left untranslated in Gladstone’s decipher printed by Guedalla; cf. H. Seymour’s decipher, sent to Granville, P.R.O. 30/29/126.
⁵ For tel. 30 Sept., promising a statement by post, see P.R.O. 30/29/126; and, for the statement, Guedalla, ii. 213.
Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Walmer Castle. Oct 1/82.

The Queen has written & telegraphed1—Speedy trial of prisoners, every hold on Egypt short of annexation—continued occupation by the whole army, & Ld Beaconsfield’s garter to Dufferin. I have not yet given a direct answer to the two first points.

I send you my answers to the two last2

[P.S.] I have thought much about the rather ostentatious step of sending Dufferin to Cairo.3

I am still rather afraid of its weakening Malet’s position, & while I am sure that Goschen (if there were not other objections) would be better for the work of reconstruction I am not at all sure that Dufferin is. I will talk it over with Northbrook and write again from London.

Are you giving attention to the financial arrangements.

Have you ever said anything civil to the Queen about the D. of Connaught, & his safety.4

Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Walmer Castle. Oct 1/82.

I return this clever & interesting letter from that very clever man Palgrave—5

I am afraid he is quite untrustworthy—So queer in his mind [and] character, & so fanciful intellectually.

He was a Jesuit—is now a free thinker—and was a secret agent of Napoleon [III].

1 The Queen’s letter, 29 Sept., P.R.O. 30/29/31; her tels. 15 and 17 Sept., insisting on ‘a preponderating influence’ and ‘a firm hold & power in Egypt’; and tel. 30 Sept., reporting her protest to Gladstone against reducing the troops, P.R.O. 30/29/41.

2 i.e. to the Queen, 30 Sept., submitting that the G.C.B. was more appropriate for diplomatic service; and tel. 1 Oct., assuring her of the retention in Egypt of sufficient troops to maintain Britain’s hold, without exposing men to ennui and the risk of illness, P.R.O. 30/29/41; cf. p. 257, n. 3, nos. 471, 479, 480, 534, 536, and p. 469, n. 2; for Dufferin’s G.C.B. on his return from the Egyptian mission, 15 June 1883, see vol. ii, p. 46, n. 3.

3 See no. 847.

4 The Queen’s letter of 29 Sept. complained of Gladstone’s failure; Ponsonby, 15 Sept., wrote that the Queen was hurt that Gladstone in writing to her of Tel-el-Kebir had not mentioned the Duke, who commanded the brigade of Guards, P.R.O. 30/29/41.

5 See no. 842; see also Gladstone to Palgrave, 4 Oct., regretting that Palgrave had been moved so far away by the late administration and noticing the number of points on which he had independently reached the same conclusions as Granville and himself, Add. MS. 44546, fo. 15.
He is certainly not in his place in Siam, but I do not know where he could be safely employed.

I remember thinking his travels, those of Sir Samuel Baker, and those of Lord Milton afforded the most curious contrasts it was possible to imagine.

852. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

No 1. 10, Downing Street [sc. Penmaenmawr]. Oct 2. 82.

It certainly was my apprehension when we first approached the subject of procedure that a closing power would cost more than it was worth. But a total withdrawal from it, though better in my view than the acceptance of the two thirds, would cost us a good deal in another way for the value & importance of the thing are I think much overestimated by friends[,] utterly caricatured by foes—and fools.

I think a concession is desirable & have almost arrived at the conclusion that there is one form in which it might be tendered with a great aggregate economy of time if accepted, with a serious strengthening of our position if refused and with no loss of credit in either case.

It is to offer with respect either to all the Resolutions, or to those which seriously innovate, (viz.

a. Closing Power
b. Delegation
c. Supply)

to take them as Resolutions binding until the close of next Session 1883.

The experimental adoption of such serious changes is rational.

There is, with much factitious, much real fear of the Closing Power. Experience would dispel it. Solveretur ambulando.

In Session 1883, the re-trial of the Resolutions would take place subject to the Resolutions.

At the beginning of this year, the Speaker recommended a plan similar in principle.

[P.S.] I look upon this subject as the last of those, which I am bound to try to work in the H. of C: while I feel all that is due to others, who have a longer avenue of the future to look down.

I send copy to Hartington.

1 See W. G. Palgrave, Narrative of a Year’s Journey through Central and Eastern Arabia (1865); Sir Samuel Baker, Eight Years’ Wanderings in Ceylon (1855); The Albert N’Yanza . . . (1866); The Nile Tributaries and Abyssinia (1867); W. Wentworth Fitzwilliam, Viscount Milton, The North West Passage by Land . . . (1865).

2 See no. 848.
This is an omnibus letter.

1. Direction to Dufferin about the Porters disposed of by Telegram.
2. Proposal of Garter
3. Keeping the Army in Egypt I have read your’s, & send you mine.
This kind of correspondence makes me sad, much beyond the mere trouble of carrying it on.
4. Bright has no title to a first Class pension. I will inquire whether he has a title to a second: though I have no idea that he would take it.
5. About Dufferin’s going to Egypt. I certainly should have been glad of a man stronger in position & experience than Malet, and Goschen is clearly impossible. But you know your man much better than I do; and I am satisfied.
6. I do not quite know what you mean by the financial arrangements’. In England, yes. In Egypt, no.
7. I spoke to H.M. of the honour paid D. of Connaught by Wolseley. Have you any reason to think I ought to say more.
8. We return to Hawarden tomorrow, and expect Northbrook 9th, Spencer 14th.

[P.S.] 9. Some day I must tell you, in view of the future, about the Windsor Deanery & Chapter.

I hope you will not think that I took too great a responsibility upon myself in sending the fierce telegram tomorrow.

If you had been at Hawarden I should have been willing to lose a little time in getting your permission. But the case seemed urgent—there may be some explanation, but I cannot guess what it is.

The Sultan acting against the advice of his Ministers, prevented the Muleteers engaged by us to leave Turkey.

---

1. To Dufferin, tel. No. 600, 1 Oct., instructed him to break off diplomatic relations with the porte if it continued to refuse to release the muleteers arrested at Smyrna (see no. 803), F.O. 78/3396; Gladstone to Granville, tel., approving, not traced.
2. See no. 850.
3. i.e. correspondence with the Queen, see no. 850.
4. Answers Granville to Gladstone, 30 Sept., not printed; see p. 431, n. 1.
5. See no. 850.
6. i.e. to Dufferin, see n. 1 above; ‘tomorrow’ was perhaps a slip for ‘yesterday’.
He yielded to our remonstrances, and gave them permission, but on their return, he tries to arrest them all.

It appeared to me important to prevent the fait accompli—and I hope but am not sure that the threat will be sufficient.

855. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Walmer Castle. Oct. 2/82.

I agree with you that the Control must be abandoned.¹ I do not think the French will struggle much for it, but will try to substitute something in which they have a fair share.

I am not sure that it has absolutely failed.

It may have been unpopular, but as long as the Englishman & Frenchman acted together, & retained their moral power, for they had no absolute power, they did a good deal of good work—the suspension of their work, during the late crisis is not conclusive against them either for the past or for the future.

And I do not think that the control can be said to have lapsed. In order to put an end to it, it will require a revision of the Khedivial decree appointing it, and it will be better if possible to have a previous agreement with the French.

It is important that the decree treated it as a provisional arrangement.

Salisbury without consulting the office, was persuaded by Blignières to agree to this arrangement which was substituted for Goschen's plan, which gave predominance to England.

It has the inherent fault of the Controllers having no real power, and no real responsibility—of all good working depending entirely upon the good understanding of the two men who are to work it. It is unpopular in Egypt, and excites jealousy in Europe.

With respect to Dufferin giving weight to Malet²—the difficulty I feel at this moment, is not that of persuading the Egyptians to do what we wish, but [th]at [of] arriving at the plan which we ourselves desire.

856. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

18, Carlton House Terrace. Oct 3/82.

Your omnibus letter is of course perfectly satisfactory to me.

My question as to ‘financial arrangements’ referred to the way of dealing with the control, (which I conceive to be decided by us as far as non continuance goes) and the concomitant arrangements.

¹ See nos. 826–9, 841.

² See no. 853. Dufferin was approved as special commissioner for Egypt, 29 Oct., and arrived in Cairo, 7 Nov.
Northbrook & I are perfectly agreed as to the draft report which we believe will be adopted tomorrow by the War Office Committee.\(^1\)

I will send it to you.

I saw Rivers Wilson on his way to Paris, and told him he had a plausible opportunity, & to speak to Charles Lesseps, as a fellow commissioner, at present ignorant of the views of the Govt, to mention the serious view taken in England of the present position of the Company, and to throw out without entering into any details how advisable it would be for the leading men of the Company to consider, what amicable arrangement could be arrived at, to soothe the justifiable feeling of the English.

Gustave Rothschild told Wilson as a fact of which he had positively been assured by his first broker, that the English Gov were in the market for 100,000 shares and had already bought 30,000—

This looks as if it were the action of the parties about whom Rose spoke.

I find that we have 7/16ths of the shares 177 out of 400,000—

I believe I meet Henry Ponsonby at Deal Castle tomorrow evening for dinner. I will ascertain about the Duke of Connaught.

857. *Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville*  

10, Downing Street. [sc. Penmaenmawr.] Oct 3. 82.

Omnibus letter

1. I have not a word to say against Pauncefoot [sic] whom indeed I rather expected you to name.\(^2\) The objection to violent overleapings is great.

2. You were quite right in acting ‘sharp’ on the matter of the porters.\(^3\)

3. Redesdale I fear looks at every thing out of blinkers, and has no side-lights.\(^4\) He is quite right to deal freely with me. (I was his servant at Montem in 1823—in an Albanian dress!)

4. I am far from thinking the Controul has *entirely* failed.\(^5\) But it seems to me that in the face of France we are entitled to say it has failed, and for this reason. It afforded Arabi the pretext, \& in the face of the world the justifying reason, on which he founded his movement, disturbed Europe, \& cost us our lives \& our millions. This being so the parties to the Controul, did not act jointly in upholding it, and in meeting the consequences it had entailed. Therefore I think we are in a condition not to go before France with a request, which would involve us in much risk, but in the most delicate manner to convey to them our full belief that they with us

---

\(^{1}\) i.e. on the Suez Canal, see no. 830; report not traced.

\(^{2}\) See Granville to Gladstone, 1 Oct., formally proposing Pauncefote as permanent under-secretary F.O. *vice* Tenterden, discarding an earlier idea of Granville's to appoint a junior man, T. H. Sanderson, Add. MS. 44174, fo. 260, not printed; see p. 430, n. 1 and no. 872.

\(^{3}\) See nos. 853, 854.

\(^{4}\) See Granville to Gladstone on Redesdale's affability, Add. MS. 44174, fo. 263, not printed; p. 430, n. 5.

\(^{5}\) See no. 855.
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will see it cannot be maintained. Affording a pretext for disturbance in Egypt—justly irritating to any genuine national feeling that may exist—tending to excite jealousies in some European quarters—and having entirely failed to sustain itself by force against force—this provisional arrangement has been tried and found wanting. After the great disintegration in Egypt we have had to consider what is the safest basis for the future as against the dangers encompassing [us] on so many sides; we have concluded that this basis is to be found in freedom & self-development, as far as may be, for Egypt, & we ought to anticipate the concurrence of France which has often done generous acts in a generous policy. I have made rather a long story of it.

5. A foolish letter of Bright's.¹ The old Adam, as I call it, once more got the upper hand in him for a moment.

To H[awarde]n this afternoon.

858. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville [P.R.O. 30/29/126]

Hawarden Castle. Oct 5. 82.

I think there is an answer, which would generally be thought sufficient, to the difficulty you see² in the way of my proposal to take the pinching Resolutions for the term[,] expiring at the close of next Session[,] only.

I admit that if the closing power depended for its exercise upon the majority the Tories in their present humour might ascribe to it a crafty view in proposing an experimental plan with a view to a temporary forbearance.

But the majority has no power whatever to initiate—it rests absolutely with the Speaker. This we say is clear under the present wording: but if not, we wish it to be clear & therefore should make it so.

The Tories are not in a position to impute any mischief to Brand whom they have always lauded as impeccable: and to whose scruple, some think scrupulosity, they owe their best card, the anti Bradlaugh campaign.

There is no discredit in proposing the experiment: there would be some in withdrawing altogether now we have gone so far—the words already voted would have to be negatived.

I mentioned the plan to Dodson who seems to approve of it.

859. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone [Add. MS. 44174, fo. 274]


I have telegraphed to Malet that permission will be given to British

¹ To Gladstone, 23 Sept., protesting against the punishment of Arabi, since Britain could not punish as he was not a rebel against her, and the khedive could not punish since he had not surrendered to him, Add. MS. 44113, fo. 187; see also p. 445, n. 5.

² Granville's letter seeing a difficulty in the proposal contained in no. 852, not traced.
officers to serve temporarily in the Egyptian Force, but that we should wish to know on what conditions.\textsuperscript{1}

It seems rather difficult to impose the conditions you suggest, and in any case it would seem hardly necessary, as no officers will be ordered to join. English officers are serving under him in the Turkish Gendarmes.

I have receive\[e\]d the enclosed from Monson. What have you settled about the vote of thanks.\textsuperscript{2}

The case against the Controul is admirably put in your last letter, \& it will be most useful when we broach the subject. I am not sure that it would be unwise to do so at once, as far as this particular point is concerned.\textsuperscript{3}

\textbf{860. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville} \hfill [P.R.O. 30/29/126]

\textit{Hawarden Castle. Oct. 5. 82.}

1. About the officers my meaning was this. I thought Baker was to be the head of the police or gendarmerie, \& that the officers were asked for the military force. Indeed I should suppose it doubtful whether they ought as army officers to enter what I suppose to be Baker's force.\textsuperscript{4}

I cannot but feel sorry that Malet fêted him; if the statement be correct.

2. You send me no inclosure from Monson.

3. In the matter of votes of thanks, I presume they will be immediate: but it is for the Departments to initiate, \& look up the points of precedent.

4. I do not yet see what there is in the matter of Egyptian finance, about which I ought to move. If I understand it rightly, the plan of handing over the business of the Controul to the Debt-Council seems to me a very clever one.

5. As to Egyptian institutions, I just mention an idea that occurs to me. If the Notables cannot be trusted to vote the Budget could the Provincial organisation be turned to account in any way,

- starting with a normal sum
- requiring consent to any increase
- distributing the amount, \& leaving it to each Province to find it

This is a bare, a very bare, conjecture: there may be little in it, or nothing.

[P.S.] 6. I expect 'more kicks than halfpence' from a struggle for increased influence in the management of the Canal, and think the lines of

\textsuperscript{1} See tel. No. 497, 5 Oct., answering tel. No. 501 from Malet, 3 Oct., as here reported, F.O. 78/3447; Dufferin later provided that British officers seconded from the active list could only serve under British officers on the active list; cf. nos. 886, 887.

\textsuperscript{2} i.e. by parliament for the Egyptian victories.

\textsuperscript{3} See nos. 857, 871.

\textsuperscript{4} Baker having been dismissed from the British army, it was improper for British officers on the active list to serve under him.
the Chancellor’s Mem.\(^1\) more likely to be fruitful. What a front of brass old Lesseps has—& he is training up the young one to follow him.

861. **Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville**  
Hawarden Castle. Oct 7 82.

I send you a letter from Mrs O’Shea, and copy of my reply.\(^2\)  
I think that if communications continue, Trevelyan or R. Grosvenor had better take my place.  
Please to send on to Hartington and Spencer.

861A. **Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone**  
Walmer Castle. Oct 8/82.

I fancied that you had already put an end to the correspondence with Mrs O’Shea. I quite agree that Dick Grosvenor would be the right channel.  
Would not the first two paragraphs of your answer be sufficient—if there is an objection to your replying to the present communication through Grosvenor.  
Spencer is here, and agrees that the remainder of the letter goes further than is prudent in a communication from you to Mrs O’Shea.  
I will send on the correspondence to Hartington.

862. **Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone**  
Walmer Castle. Oct 8/82.

It appears the Queen thinks you have never alluded to Connaught.\(^3\)  
You could bring him in somehow, coupled with an allusion to what you had previously said.

863. **Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville**  
Hawarden Castle. Oct 9. 82.

I have received and answered Hartington’s letter.\(^4\)

---

\(^1\) See no. 846.  
\(^2\) Mrs. O’Shea, 6 Oct., forwarded Parnell’s offer of support in the autumn session in return for a scheme for the management of Irish business in the Commons and further land legislation, see Hammond, 308-9; for Gladstone’s reply, 7 Oct., doubting whether land legislation and procedure could both be taken in the autumn, see Add. MS. 44546, fo. 17.  
\(^3\) Cf. no. 850.  
\(^4\) Hartington, 7 Oct., argued against enabling the Speaker to close debate, if empowered by a bare majority, preferring a two-thirds majority, because the Opposition
I own I read it with some surprise, when I called to mind that he, more than any other member of the Cabinet, overrode me when I wanted the Cabinet, at the beginning of this year not to propose a Clôture as not being worth the trouble it would cause us: he insisting, that it was of considerable value in itself and that under the protection it [gave] anything else that was necessary could readily be had.

It helps to show me, what I have long thought, that he is not in his right place, and to make me very desirous to get him there.

I think the Cabinet will have to meet not later than the 21st. Do you think it will be needed earlier?

864. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

Hawarden Castle. Oct 10. 82.

I have struck out the last or complimentary paragraph of my letter to Mrs O'Shea, in deference to your and Spencer's opinion (for I do not think it exceptionable) and I have substituted a paragraph proposing that in future R. Grosvenor should be the medium of intercourse if any be desired.

I could not strike out (but have a little qualified) the paragraph about the local principle, for without it the letter would have been hardly civil and absolutely repellent.

I feel quite certain that the local principle is essential to any scheme of devolution: and I have only given it as my personal opinion.

In my opinion Parnell has behaved on the whole well for the last five months, and his improved behaviour has been of real value to the cause of law and order.

2. I write to Sherbrook[e] to offer him the pension. If he declines, I am disposed to let it remain in abeyance.

might agree and so give opportunity to end the bitter party strife; Gladstone, 9 Oct., doubted whether the Opposition would agree, since it did not share the liberal aim of facilitating legislation, and rejected the two-thirds majority as a change of front, Add. MS. 44146, fos. 46, 83.

1 For cabinet meetings, 20, 21, 24 Oct., and the naming of a cabinet committee, Kimberley, Hartington, Childers, and Northbrook, for Madagascar, the Congo, and other questions pending with France, 24 Oct., see Add. MS. 44643, fos. 176–80.

2 i.e. the paragraph acknowledging the spirit of the mem. on procedure which Parnell, 'exercising his right as an M.P.', had submitted to Gladstone.

3 'As respects procedure, it is certainly my personal opinion that, in any plan of Devolution which Parliament ought, or is likely to adopt, regard should be had to the local principle, and a reasonable scope be given to it. One of the powerful arguments in favour of such plans is their tendency to promote the passing of measures in which particular parts of the U.K. are particularly interested.'

865. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone


I am afraid that the 21st is rather late for our first cabinet.
The Egyptian questions will take up one Cabinet. I suppose Hartington
will wish to discuss procedure.
There are several questions pending between us and the Fr[ench] Gov,
on which I should like to have the opinion of the Cabinet or what would
probably be better, of a Committee of the Cabinet.
Many thanks for the suggestion as to the provincial assemblies in Egypt.

866. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

Hawarden Castle. Oct 12. 82.

1. Undeniably you hit me hard in the matter of date for the first
Cabinet, and I have fixed Friday 20th at 3.
2. I think that as regards the only very urgent question[,] of Procedure,
al will have seen Hartington’s letter and mine, and will be ready to judge
as between the three lines laid down.¹
3. If I am a few minutes late for the Cabinet please to begin with
recitals about Egypt, or let Kimberley review Bulwer (rather an ‘awkward
customer’) and Cetewayo.²
4. I have spoken to Northbrook, and written to Childers, in an intro-
ductive way, about G.C.B.³
5. Have you seen Cadorna’s Tract upon Egypt?⁴ I have read the
‘Appendix’ which is of itself a luminous, able, & equitable discussion of the
whole outlook. I remember how highly you thought of him at the time of
the London Conference of 1871.
6. I send you a letter from Bright.⁵ It is most kindly meant: but alack!

¹ i.e. (a) to allow the Speaker to close debate when empowered by a bare majority,
b) by a two-thirds majority, (c) to pass all the resolutions for an experimental period;
see nos. 852, 863.
² See Bulwer (Natal) to Kimberley, No. 102, 3 Oct., proposing the division of Zulu-
land into three, (a) under the returned Cetewayo, (b) under a second chief Usibebu,
(c) a reserve for those who disliked Cetewayo; reply 30 Nov., limiting the size of the
reserve, C.O. 179/142.
³ i.e. on 12 Oct., offering G.C.B., Add. MS. 44546, fo. 20; see no. 868.
⁴ See Carlo Cadorna, Le Relazioni internazionali dell'Italia e la questione dell'Egitto
(Sept. 1882), arguing that both the interests of Egypt and of the powers demanded that
the question be treated as a European one and discussing in the appendix the situation
since July; and Gladstone to Cadorna, 12 Oct., thanking him for sending a copy, Add.
MS. 44546, fo. 22.
⁵ To Gladstone, 11 Oct., renewing his protest about the punishment of Arabi (no.
857) and asking whether Britain was to be thief-catcher to the creature we call the ruler
of Egypt, Add. MS. 44173, fo. 193.
the 'Old Adam' is up again in him, & he comes 'within a measurable distance' of talking nonsense in one place at least.

[P.S.] Duke of Sutherland\(^1\) wants us to buy the Egyptian Railways, only 20 m if we look sharp. I tell him I will report it to you.

---

867. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Walmer Castle. Oct 13/82.

I return you Bright’s letter. Some of it is twaddle, but whatever may be our duty in the matter, I sympathize more with his extreme [view], than [with] that of those who privately clamour for the execution.

Thanks about the Cabinet.

I did not allow the War Office\(^2\) to report on the Egyptian Railways, but they were (in Childers’ absence) unanimous against Andrew Clarke’s suggestion.

---

868. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

Hawarden Castle. Oct 14. 82.

1. I have sent H.M.s letter & inclosures from D. of Connaught\(^3\) on to Hartington. I have also told Seymour to send you a telegram (so far as we can decipher it) against interference about Arabi.\(^4\) Nothing very helpful here.

2. Here is Childers’ reply\(^5\) (Northbrook appeared to be of the same mind). What do you say to it? and what to his request for Morley? As a rule, we require K.C.B.s to be C.B.s in the first instance. If this be all, perhaps political officers might without much inconvenience be excepted. Morley is I imagine an excellent U.Secretary.

3. I had a remarkably nice note from Pauncefoot [sic] in answer to a congratulation that I sent him.

4. Also most gracious letters from Sir G. & Lady Wolseley.\(^6\)

---

\(^1\) See to Gladstone, summarized in Sutherland to Granville, 17 Oct., P.R.O. 30/29/153; and reply, 12 Oct., as here described, Add. MS. 44546, fo. 22; see also cabinet decision, 20 Oct., that ‘Malet should not risk himself upon it’, Add. MS. 44643, fo. 176.

\(^2\) For W.O. committee, see no. 830.\(^3\) Not traced.

\(^4\) Cf. the Queen to Granville, 11 Oct., P.R.O. 30/29/31 and tel. 11 Oct.: ‘Think it quite preposterous that an English counsel should defend a foreign rebel’; and tel., 13 Oct., repeating her tel. to Gladstone: ‘... we have no right to interfere further. Surely the Khedhive can refuse British counsel interfering in the defence’, P.R.O. 30/29/41.

\(^5\) See to Gladstone, 13 Oct., refusing G.C.B., since he wished to remain plain Mr. Childers as long as he was in the Commons, and suggesting Lord Morley, his under-secretary, for K.C.B., Add. MS. 44130, fo. 108.

\(^6\) From Pauncefote, thanking for Gladstone’s congratulations on his appointment as permanent under-secretary, F.O.; from Lady Wolseley saying that she was deeply touched by Gladstone’s words of appreciation to her husband; both 12 Oct., Add. MS. 44477, fos. 80, 82.
5. While writing I have received your long Tel. with your reply to the Queen. Excellent—cela donne à penser et à faire des recherches.

6. Sherbrooke declines—in a very nice note.²

7. Münster is here, with Houghton.

[P.S.] With regard to the overture for getting rid of the Sultan,³ I do not suppose we should have a right to deprive the creditors of the security (!) of the Turk as debtor.

869. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Walmer Castle. Oct 16/82.

I should like to talk over Childers & Morley.⁴

It is more than probable that the first fears that his health will not allow him to remain long in the Commons. His trip abroad has not cured him.

I believe that Morley has done as well as possible. But if he has it, an announcement must be made that Childers refused the G.C.B. & I do not think this should be known. It tends to lower the value of one of the few honors, which a Prime Minister has to grant.

When Sir Robert Peel extended the Bath he ought to have taken it himself.

There is also the question which it would be well to discuss with Northbrook, whether the Admiralty could be passed over—and there is the minor but not unimportant question of the rule as to the C.B. But I only throw out these ideas for consideration.

Your argument about the Turk and the debt appears to me to be sound. I am for depriving him of all real power, but making any diminution of it as little ostentatious as possible. It may be in some circumstances very useful to bring him forward, and as Bismarck is ready to offer no opposition to our wishes, it would be unwise to go against the only point to which he holds, viz the nominal connection of the Sultan with Egypt.

870. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

Hawarden Castle. Oct 17. 82.

1. Like you I do not feel quite clear about the K.C.B. for good Under Secretary’s service. Onward movement is the proper mode of recognition.

¹ Tel. 14 Oct., denying that Britain had no responsibility for Arabi’s trial, P.R.O. 30/29/41; Granville to Gladstone, tel. 12.2 p.m., 14 Oct., repeating his tel. to the Queen, P.R.O. 30/29/126.

² 12 Oct., declining the vacant civil list pension because his pecuniary position would make it improper for him to accept, Add. MS. 44102, fo. 204; see p. 431, n. 1, and p. 444, n. 4.

³ i.e. as suzerain of Egypt.

⁴ No honour was offered to Lord Morley.
I told you Northbrook was satisfied with his present Riband (no, I find the orthodox spelling is Ribbon).

2. Besides the argument of the Debt, I am averse to establishing Egyptian Independence on account of the heavy shock it would impart to the general fabric of the Ottoman Empire, about which I for one have been steadily conservative, I think like you, not from love of it but from dread of the evils of a general scramble for the spoils.

I wish that letter which Karolyi wrote to me when the present Government was formed might prove to be the permanent rule of Austrian policy in the Balkan Peninsula.

3. I presume, and hope, that we shall keep to very limited utterances about Egypt & though we may have to listen to[,] yet shall for ourselves eschew[,] discussion on the particulars of the coming settlement.

Ought we to do more than

*a. to recognise our obligation to restore stable order.

b. without admitting that the Protocol is formally in force, or that any one is entitled to interfere with us in our proper business, yet we mean to labour in an interest which is that of each and all.

c. In a sense favourable to self-government as far as a prudent regard to circumstances will permit.

d. With a careful observance of established international rights,

e. and avoidance of whatever might tend to disturb the general tranquillity of the East.*

4. I hope, as I said in a Telegram, that you have been able to make a beginning with France in the matter of the Controul.

871. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville


1. I have not received from London your answer to the 'Balmoral message' but I have stood upon a message of acquiescence which the Queen had sent me. I do not doubt we are in harmony but H.M.s system of dual correspondence is most objectionable.

2. If you touch any practical matter respecting Egypt tomorrow

---

1 See nos. 866, 868; Northbrook had been made G.C.S.I. at the end of his Indian viceroyalty in 1876.  
2 See p. 121, n. 6.  
3 i.e. closing the Constantinople conference; see p. 414, n. 3, and p. 417, n. 4.  
4 The starred passage is scored down the side and the sentence "b" put in square brackets by Granville.  
5 To Granville, tel. 16 Oct., P.R.O. 30/29/126.  
6 See the Queen to Granville, tel. 17 Oct., renewing her protest against Arabi's being defended by British counsel, P.R.O. 30/29/41; copy of Granville's reply, not traced.  
7 For the cabinet, 20 Oct. ('conversation on the Controul. Various opinions') adjourned to 21 Oct., when the draft on the control was read and amended; and for two memoranda by Gladstone; see Add. MS. 44643, fos. 176–9.
connected with the Drafts, please let it be Draft A.¹ In that I should be quite prepared to soften the 3d Paragraph.²

3. I do not know how it is proposed to deal with the matter of the Canal Dues, after this opinion of the Egyptian lawyers.

4. In drafts B & C, I am very anxious to know the exact effect & the amount of change from the old system of Controll, which I look upon as having given Arabi his main lever. Is it your idea now to preserve foreign intervention, & the controll of foreign Governments, but to confine it to the Debt & the revenues affected thereto? Do you propose to tie up Egypt to this for 10 years or for 5? Will the Controllers as such, or the Commissioners who replace them, cease altogether to be general & official advisers of the Khedive?

5. In Draft D³ I became a good deal alarmed at the notion of a sole guarantee by England. I fear that to such a guarantee Palmerston's definition would not apply. Have we any sole guarantees now in force, and what? (I do not rule on Armenia which hangs upon an impossible condition, & which is a warning not a precedent.) Do we know of such guarantees (recently & effectively) given by other countries? Does not a sole guarantee imply a permanent command over the actions of the Government? I do not, as at present minded, know how to look it in the face.

6. We must try tomorrow whether we can settle what to do with regard to the Closing Power?⁴ Northcote (and perhaps Parnell?) should have such notice as we can give them.

872. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

10, Downing Street, Oct 24. 82.

I send you the draft reply⁵ the Treasury propose about your office establishments. There are some considerations involved of which I was not aware & which ought to be before you. I do not doubt you have considered the future, & you will see it is not proposed to decline.

¹ i.e. to Lyons, No. 1198 confidential, 23 Oct., opening negotiations with France for the abolition of the dual control and the establishment of alternative arrangements, F.0. 27/2557; Colvin, 18 Oct., had been sent back to Egypt, but instructed not to exercise his functions as controller.

² i.e. by the omission of the description of the alternative arrangement as one 'which would excite less jealousy and afford better opportunities for self-development on the part of the Egyptian people'.

³ For the cabinet's approval, 21 Oct., of draft D to Lyons, proposing the neutralization of Egypt, by act of the powers if possible, and a new firman from the sultan to the khedive, limiting his rights as suzerain, see Add. MS. 44643, fo. 177.

⁴ See nos. 848, 852, 858, 863, 866.

⁵ Not traced. It approved the appointment of Pauncefote as permanent under-secretary vice Tenterden, but made an objection on non-financial grounds, see reply, undated, docketed 24 Oct., thanking and meeting the objection and agreeing that better than P. Currie's appointment, Add. MS. 44174, fo. 296, not printed.
873. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone


I thank you for sending me your secret and painfully pregnant letter to Spencer. 

I quite agree that, in normal cases, a man near or beyond 70 years of age, who entered public life some fifty years earlier, may even without a complete breakdown of health, claim to retire from active work.

But I have always declined to discuss the future with you, on the basis of your voluntary retirement at a fixed date, and indeed I have felt confident that you would find it impossible when the time came.

Your case is not normal. Your bodily and mental strength are exceptionally strong. What young or middle aged man possesses in an equal degree the capacity which you describe as necessary for a prime minister and which you are afraid may fail you.

The hold you have on the country is extraordinary. The power you possess to confer exceptional advantages on it, is exceptional.

It may seem unfriendly to you, although you will not believe it to be so, that I cannot aid or abet you in striking such a blow on the liberal party, or one which they would so deeply deplore, and I fear resent.

I have forwarded your letter to Hartington.

874. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

18, Carlton House Terrace. Oct. 29 [1882].

I wrote a line to you last night suggesting an informal cabinet today. Could you call on me before Church.

My gout seems better but I am not very active.

---

1 No. 873 is printed without the first and last sentences in Fitzmaurice, ii. 302; cf. nos. 571, 577.

2 i.e. of 24 Oct., summing up and expanding a conversation at Hawarden on his retirement before the end of the session, because the tasks for which he had accepted office were to a degree done, because of his age and his increasing disinclination to his work; min. by Gladstone, 27 Oct., that the letter had been sent to Granville and Hartington; note on the letter 'seen H[artington]', Add. MS. 44309, fos. 156–91.

3 i.e. the letter to Spencer; prompted by no. 875, Hartington wrote, 12 Nov., that Gladstone's retirement would cause the whig and radical sections of the party to fall apart since he could and would not take charge of the kind of legislation wanted by the radicals; Gladstone replied, 13 Nov., doubting whether any question impended upon which whigs and radicals could not join, Add. MS. 44146, fos. 101, 107.

4 No. 874 has been wrongly bound with the letters of 1881; on 29 Oct. 1881 Gladstone was in Hawarden and Granville in Walmer and a meeting in London could not have been casually arranged. 29 Oct. was a Sunday in 1882.
875. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

10, Downing Street. Nov 11. 82.

Your letter of the 28th to me, commenting on mine to Spencer, states in the best manner, as was to be expected, the pith of what was to be said against my announcement. But I think you must yourself feel that it does not touch my central and conclusive reason, which is inability, inability of brain, to face the legislative work that must come on, immediately or very soon after the great question of procedure is disposed of. I do not speak of this topic lightly: I felt, during the Session of this year, even on measures not of the first order, my mental inability to do again what I had done on the Irish Land Act. No person except the person directly concerned can form a judgment on such a question: and to this plea there is I think no reply, not even from colleagues or from a party.

I do not, then, deny that, after a fashion, others might by their self-denial release me from my duty to replace the leadership where I found it in 1880; or that it might possibly in given circumstances be a duty for me not to urge my age and long service as pleas for retirement; or that I ought to struggle against all mere disinclination apart from inability; or that I might, considering the singular kindness of my colleagues, still manage for a while the debating work in the House of Commons. But the simple fact is that to the constructive work which is now coming on so largely my mental force is not any longer equal, and that the abandonment of it is not compatible with the retention of my present place in the Government and in Parliament.

I think the matter is at a stage when we might perhaps converse upon it, at any rate after the niceties of the next few days, vote of censure and the like, are disposed of.

[P.S.] Please to look at the inclosed.

876. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

10, Downing Street. Nov 14. 82.

When we talked in the Cabinet of Arabi, I think the feeling was 1. that it would be well for everybody to be rid of him, 2. that he would be unsafe to public order if in the Turkish Empire.

1 Gladstone to Granville, 1 Nov., on knighthood for Oscar Clayton, returned with Granville's reply on the back, Add. MS. 44174, fo. 302; min. by Gladstone, 3 Nov., on Turkey's abortive proposal to send a commissioner to Egypt, that after Tel-el-Kebir Britain must hold herself responsible for the reorganization of Egypt, and mins. by other cabinet members, P.R.O. 30/29/143; not printed.

2 Not traced.

3 See Gladstone's note of the cabinet, 20 Oct., that agreed that 'Arabi's fate should depend upon proof of crimes'; and of that of 3 Nov., 'views on Arabi, general discussion', Add. MS. 44643, fos. 176, 181.
The Turk & the Khedive have a common interest in his expulsion. Would it be possible to arrange that by a concurrent Act Khedive should banish him from Egypt and Turk from Ottoman Empire—& would it not be for his interest to accept this and get rid of the chances of a capital conviction & condemnation. I just think this worth mentioning.

877. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Foreign Office. [15 November 1882].

At a meeting held at the H of Commons this afternoon, (Hartington Kimberley Carlingsford Childers Northbrook Dilke & I) we settled to adopt a suggestion of Pauncefote’s to urge the immediate finishing up of the preliminary investigation in order to see what is the drift of the evidence—

The draft of the telegram¹ will be sent to you—

I should like to send a private telegram² also to Dufferin, telling him to try to get a solution out there, with as little reference home as possible—Possibly to this effect—that the Khedive does not think there is sufficient evidence against Arabi to prosecute him for crimes, but to hand him over to us for safe custody, for the undoubted fact of rebellion.

The Chancellor wrote the enclosed minute—in answer to mine, where I said that I believed your account of the feeling of the opinion [sic] of the Cabinet was correct, although I was afraid of setting Arabi quite free. The Chancellor disagrees with me.³ The meeting of this morning however were all of my opinion.

Shall I come to you at the House.

878. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

Nov. 15. 82.

1. I am perfectly satisfied with the Pauncefoot [sic] suggestion & quite willing to trust the framing of the Telegram to you.

2. I do not like the notion of Arabi perfectly free; but if he be excluded from the Turkish Empire, then I should not be afraid.

¹ See to Dufferin (in Cairo), tel. No. 6, 7.15 p.m., 15 Nov., instructing him to urge the khedive to do as Pauncefote suggested about Arabi, Add. MS. 44174, fo. 307, F.O. 78/3618; cf. Dufferin’s dispatch recording tel. No. 23, 16 Nov., replying that already done, F.O. 78/3455.

² See Granville to Dufferin, tel., private, 15 Nov., P.R.O. 30/29/211.

³ See to Selborne, 14 Nov., on Gladstone’s recollection and Pauncefote’s suggestion; and min. in reply, 14 Nov., that only his confidence in Granville’s judgement prevented his preferring Gladstone’s proposal that khedive and sultan should both banish Arabi, P.R.O. 30/29/141.
3. Have you well considered whether we can or ought to take the custody of him? The notion does not please me.

4. Time is of serious importance & I would not stand upon trifles: though it seems as if we had entirely blocked the assault in the H. of Commons.

[P.S.] 5. I write from the Bench,¹ & from there I must go to Buckingham Palace to see [the] Crown Princess.

879. **Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville**

[H]ouse of [C]ommons. Nov. 15. 82.

Malet 599. Change of the Acte d'Accusation for Arabi.²

Is not this very serious? Is it not in fact an infraction of all our ideas of justice? Will you consult the Chancellor? It seems to me as if we should perhaps be compelled to press upon the Egyptian Government to adopt some summary method of getting quit of the whole proceedings for the trial of Arabi, as they are themselves apparently making them such that they will stink in the nostrils of all men.

880. **Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone**

[Add. MS. 44174, fo. 308]

18, Carlton House Terrace. Nov 16/82.

When could we have a meeting of the Cabinet to settle the important point we discussed last night, as to Arabi.

Fawcett announced to the house that the Zanzibar contract would not be renewed.³ He did not of course know that you had agreed at the request of Northbrook[,] Kimberley & myself that it should be further discussed.

A plan has been circulated which would secure a much greater saving.

881. **Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone**

[P.R.O. 30/29/126]

[17 November 1882.]

We decline to have any responsibility for military operations in the

¹ i.e. the Treasury bench in the Commons, where it was the last night of the debate on the second resolution on procedure, preventing motions for adjournment being made before the business of the day was taken; first resolution allowing closure, passed after thirteen nights' debate, in the small hours of 11 Nov., C.J. (1882) 500.

² Tel. No. 599, 14 Nov., announcing that a different acte d'accusation against Arabi was to be adopted; and Pauncefote's min. that this resulted from the prosecuting counsel's regarding the trial as a matter for negotiation with the defending counsel, F.O. 78/3449; no action taken.

³ For Fawcett's announcement, 10 Nov., that a satisfactory postal service could be provided without a subsidy, see Hans. Parl. Deb. cclxxiv. 1191.
Soudan, but the Mission of these officers to obtain information was asked for by Malet & Alison, in order that they might have information, and not by the Egyptian Gov.

Our War Office approved. I should have thought it was for the War Office, or possibly for the F.O. to pay.¹

882. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville [Add. MS. 44546, fo. 36]

[Copy]

17 Nov: 82.

1. Thanks for the salutary hint about Musurus. His conversation was futile.²

2. Please suggest the answer to Ashmead Bartlett (herewith) according to the exact state of circumstances.³

883. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone [P.R.O. 30/29/126]

[18 November 1882.]

The Chancellor & the Attorney General do not help us much.⁴

You see the importance Dufferin attaches to there being something of a penal character.

How would it do to make the conditions—Pleading guilty, deprivation of rank & fortune, & parole not to go beyond certain wide limits.⁵

884. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone [Add. MS. 44174, fo. 310]

18, Carlton House Terrace. [18 November 1882.]

I share Harcourt’s apprehensions.⁶ I do not like his word ‘transaction’.

¹ See from Malet, tel. No. 603, 16 Nov., asking Granville to authorize expenditure on Col. J. D. H. Stewart’s mission of inquiry into the Sudan, F.O. 78/3449; and copy with Gladstone’s protest, under which no. 881 is written, on the back, P.R.O. 30/29/126; and Gladstone’s note on no. 881: ‘I am quite satisfied. W.E.G. N.18.’

² Not recorded; Gladstone saw Musurus Pasha on the morning of 18 Nov.

³ For Ashmead Bartlett’s question, 17 Nov., about the dual control and the steps taken to secure British predominance in Egypt and over the Suez Canal; and Gladstone’s reply that the khedive had spontaneously asked for the control to be abolished which had not yet been done, see Hans. Parl. Deb. cclxxiv. 1643.

⁴ See Selborne to Granville, 14 Nov., commenting on the attorney-general’s mem., 12 Nov., on the possible courses to dispose of Arabi, P.R.O. 30/29/141.

⁵ See from Dufferin, tel. No. 23, 16 Nov., urging that, if there seemed insufficient evidence to convict Arabi of crime and his banishment were decreed, it should have a penal character, and hoping he would plead guilty, F.O. 78/3455 and 3618; Arabi pleaded guilty and was banished.

⁶ See Harcourt to Gladstone, 17 Nov., reviewing the negotiations with Parnell in April 1882 to show that explanations could be made without publishing letters or reports of private conversations which he feared; and choosing ‘transaction’ to describe the Kilmainham ‘treaty’, Add. MS. 44197, fo. 135.
In English it hardly applies. In French it means a 'compromise' no more & no less.

I should like the willingness to confine themselves to a declaration such as the Chancellor suggests and which appears to me to be accurate.

But I do not know the answer to what Gibson may say.

This is all very well[,] this is what you have told us in debate, but what is the meaning of giving us a committee unless we may examine whether your assertions are grounded or not.

I[s] it impossible to get out of the whole thing, and say that Gladstone in the heat of debate, challenged an enquiry, but on examination of the matter with his colleagues it was found, that the precedent would be so bad, & so inconvenient for the future as to the deliberations of Ministers, that while you reasserted in the most positive manner that there had been no engagements, & no treaty yet no further facilities would be given for the Committee.¹

885. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

[PR.O. 30/29/126]
10, Downing Street. Nov 19. 82.

1. I concur in the desire that there should be something beyond simple banishment for Arabi, and I am quite satisfied with your outline, while I would make the local limit for exclusion to be the Ottoman Empire.

2. It is strange that Malet should send us Broadley's paper, in which Broadley alleges Borelli's concurrence with him in most important propositions (especially this, that crime cannot be proved against Arabi) and yet [does] not tell us whether Borelli really concurs or not.² But on this concurrence Arabi's or Broadley's power to whittle down the sentence greatly depends.

3. With the confidence we repose in Dufferin, I should be inclined to give him much latitude, & let him, knowing our views, make the best settlement he can.


886. Memorandum by Lord Granville for Mr. Gladstone

[PR.O. 30/29/143]
18, Carlton House Terrace. [18 November 1882].

Are not our general principles—

1. English officers of the highest calibre in active service

¹ Gladstone was provoked by Randolph Churchill to say, 13 Nov., 'there was no Kilmainham Treaty', he challenged inquiry but protested against the words of J. R. Yorke's motion, 20, 21 Nov., for a select committee to 'enquire into the circumstances under which the Kilmainham Treaty came into existence', see Hans. Parl. Deb. cclxxiv. 1369–70, 1727, 1796–8; and below, vol. ii, p. 31, n. 7.

² See from Malet, No. 795 confidential, 6 Nov., forwarding alleged agreement between Broadley and Borelli on procedure in Arabi's trial, F.O. 78/3443.
2. Not more numerous, than is necessary, or with higher salaries than is required to get good men
3. A wish to see the Police rather than the army increased
4. With as many Egyptians both officers and men as are considered safe in both forces.
5. I should like to have an Egyptian in chief command with an English officer, either as second in command or as head of the staff.
6. Mediterranean fortifications to be done away with.

887. Memorandum by Mr. Gladstone for Lord Granville

[P.R.O. 30/29/143]

10, Downing Street. N. 20. 82.

I agree with all Granville’s suggestions which I have numbered.
1. I conclude ‘highest calibre’ means the best men relatively to their ranks & posts.
5. Agreeing with this, I prefer Sir E. Wood if we must have an English Commander in Chief.
As to Baker, I think he would be best in the Soudan, next to this in the gendarmerie.¹

888. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

[Add. MS. 44546, fo. 37]

20 Nov: 82.

We have now two Garters and I suppose I must recommend. Clearly it must be Derby for one. For the other, Leinster? Bath? Lansdowne?²

889. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

[Add. MS. 44174, fo. 314]

Secret.

10, Downing Street. Nov. 20. 82.

I send these³ back to you to make sure that you see the whole. I wish you to read Hartington’s Mem. in conjunction with my note to Harcourt—which I had thought was clear enough.

¹ Cf. mem. by Northbrook, 18 Nov., preferring Wood as commander-in-chief of the new Egyptian army and regretting Baker’s presence in Egypt, P.R.O. 30/29/143; cabinet’s agreement to Wood’s appointment, 1 Dec., Add. MS. 44643, fo. 193; see also no. 903.
² See no. 891.
³ On 18 Nov., Gladstone had circulated to the ministers in town (see unprinted note in Add. MS. 44174, fo. 313), (a) a letter from Harcourt, 17 Nov., reporting that the Opposition would allow the rest of the rules on procedure to pass ‘next week’ if the one devolving some business on to Grand Committees were postponed, (b) his reply, 18 Nov., refusing, Add. MS. 44197, fos. 133, 141, (c) Speaker Brand, 18 Nov., reporting the same, but against postponement, Add. MS. 44195, fo. 138; sent in no. 889 to Granville, with mins. by Hartington and Dodson, 19 Nov., Add. MS. 44146, fo. 112, Add. MS. 44252, fo. 195.
890. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

[Add. MS. 44174, fo. 315]

Foreign Office. [20 November 1882].

These papers take me a little by surprise.
I thought that there was something to be said for concession at the beginning of this session. But I am now under the foolish illusion that the more obstinate had shown their policy to be right.
I can conceive many reasons which would make an adjournment now palatable to Cross and Stanley—
I agree with Dodson.

891. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

[PR.O. 30/29/29 A]

10, Downing Street. N. 21. 82.

Considering Lansdowne's youth, and Argyll's probable indifference, & that, Garter being above the others it is hard on all Scotch & Irish to be excluded, I lean most to Derby Leinster.¹

If you do not object.
L. has been incomparably faithful.

892. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

[PR.O. 30/29/126]

18, Carlton House Terrace. [22 November 1882].

I presume there could be no objection to this.² If you agree, I will at once consult Kimberley.

893. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville³

[PR.O. 30/29/126]

H of C. Nov. 22. 82.

It occurs to me
1. That the place must become disagreeable, perhaps even disgusting after a time, to Arabi
2. That it seems questionable whether the parole could be relied on
3. As I understand from Harcourt an Act would be required for any detention of him at the Cape.
I only submit these points for cons[i]deration.—but how could it be more difficult to guard him in Thasos⁴ than if he were banished to or beyond the Soudan, and as the Circassian officers were?

¹ See p. 257, n. 3, and nos. 471, 479, 480, 850, 853, 897, 899–901, and 917.
² i.e. from Dufferin, tel. No. 14, 21 Nov., proposing the Cape as the place of exile for Arabi in the event of his banishment, as Thassos was too near, F.O. 78/3455.
³ No. 893 is written below no. 892 on the same sheet.
⁴ For khedive's proposal of Thassos, see Dufferin to Granville, tel. No. 7, 19 Nov., F.O. 78/3455.
10, Downing Street. Nov. 26. 82.

I send you for perusal two letters which I think you have not seen: and I sum up the personal part of what I said to you last night.

I feel myself incapable of grappling with the hard constructive work that is coming on. It need not however, if I judge rightly, come on until after Easter 1883.

Whether I should go now, i.e. before the new Session, or at Easter, is open, as far as I am concerned; and it is for those chiefly concerned in any new arrangements to say whether it shall or shall not be now: I am willing to be guided by them, or (as I conceive) in other words by you & Hartington.

If I remain, still a Chancellor of the Exchequer ought to be appointed at once that he may be ready for his work.

I assume, unless otherwise informed, that Hartington’s decision not to take the office (except to make room for Derby) holds good.

I should propose therefore to offer it to Childers, who possesses, in a rare degree, every qualification for the office—and whose heart is I think set on it.

I think also he could hold it with less risk as regards his health than his present office, as the administrative work would be lighter, to a man already educated as he is.

Childers speaks of going abroad on the Prorogation.

10, Downing Street. Nov. 27. 82.

This is a note supplemental to the note of yesterday, on two points.

1. I think it worth considering whether you should write a line to Derby to say the time has now come when a Finance Minister ought to be & must be appointed: therefore to ask whether as the opening still exists he has any disposition to make use of it.

894. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

Exchange between Gladstone and Granville, 24 Nov., on Childers’s proposal for honours, Add. MS. 44174, fo. 318, not printed.

895. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

See to Gladstone, 22 Nov., saying that after the prorogation, 2 Dec., he hoped to go abroad ‘till the cabinets are near’; cf. to Gladstone, 8 Nov., sending a letter from his doctor on his inability to do parliamentary as well as office work, Add. MS. 44130, fos. 152, 177.

Granville to Gladstone, 26 Nov., reporting the fact but not the substance of a talk with Hartington on the proposed ministerial changes, Add. MS. 44174, fo. 320, not printed.

See p. 460, n. 3; for attempt to bring Derby into the cabinet, in May, see nos. 700–8.
2. The other point is prospective. It would be a great mistake in any Govt. (as it was in the last) to have the Leadership tacked on to the Chancellorship of the Exchequer as being an easy office. I certainly never worked harder than for over 9 years as Chancellor of the Exchequer. It can be made & has been made an easy office, & so can others: but with very great detriment to the public interest. In my opinion if Hartington required relief in taking the Leadership, he should have it by taking Spencer’s office, which Lord Russell held for a time under Lord Aberdeen I think.

896. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone [Add. MS. 44174, fo. 323]
Secret.
Foreign Office. Nov 27/82.

I shall be delighted to sound Derby.
But before I do so, I should be glad to know how you propose to let him in.

If Childers goes to the Exchequer, it would leave the War office open to Northbrook, and the Admiralty to Derby—but I apprehend you object to both these offices being in the Lords—

Hartington suggests that the minimum change is the best, & with that view but not in the order of merit, has given me the enclosed list.¹

We both think that Dilke going straight to the War office, would create a frightful rumpus.

I was surprised at Hartington suggesting No 2 as a possible arrangement. I thought he was determined not to go to the War office—

897. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville [P.R.O. 30/29/29 A]
Secret.
10, Downing St. Nov. 28. 82.

I return the Hartington Memorandum² with a very strong preference for No. 2.

At the same time, Childers I know understands that there is one superior claim to the Chancellorship of the Exchequer. Nor do I in the least degree doubt Hartington’s capacity for the office: but pray bear in mind what I wrote yesterday. To it I may add that when I became leader

¹ '1. Derby: India
   Hartington: Exchequer
2. Derby: India
   Childers: Exchequer
   Hartington: War Office
3. Derby: India
   Hartington: Exchequer
   Northbrook: War Office
   Dilke: Admiralty
   Childers: Duchy of Lancaster.'

² i.e. enclosure in no. 806.

Add. MS. 44174, fo. 322 and P.R.O. 30/29/27 A; for the proposal of no. 2, with the addition of Dilke to the Admiralty, to the Queen, see Letters, iii. 370–1.
in 1865–6 I had at once to abate my work as C. of E. but it was a short matter, and I had in Childers an admirable and congenial coadjutor.

Pray proceed at once with D[erby].

[P.S.] Would it be well to sound the Duke of Grafton as to the Garter?

898. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone [Add. MS. 44174, fo. 326]
18, Carlton House Terrace. [28 November 1882].

I called on Derby as soon as I got your note this morning. He was out, so I have written to him.

It is unnecessary to bother you with questions until we know his answer.

899. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone [Add. MS. 44174, fo. 327]
Secret. 18, Carlton House Terrace. Nov 29/82.

I have seen Derby—& he will send me an answer tomorrow morning.

I should say it would be in the affirmative—but I had the same conviction at the end of my first interview last summer.

He questioned me on

1°. Home rule. I alluded to your public declarations, & said my opinion was strongly in favor of letting the Irish settle their local affairs.

That the subject had not been recently discussed in the Cabinet, & that there were some who did not like any local Gov for the Irish on the ground that they used such institutions as weapons against the imperial Gov., that I did not attach importance to this objection. But that I was strongly opposed to any plan, which really weakened the connection. He said that he was opposed not to local Gov in Ireland, but was strongly adverse to any assembly sitting at Dublin.

No. 2 Egypt—He presumed that you & I wished to get out of it as soon [as] we could properly do so. I assented, adding that I was sanguine by nature & I did not believe the difficulties would be overwhelming—

3 Local Gov. He does not attach much importance to the question.

He asked what offices he was likely to have the offer of. I said I was not authorized to offer him any—that I knew you would only offer him one of

1 28 Nov., asking whether he would allow Gladstone’s dropping the chancellorship of the exchequer to be the means of opening to him one of the higher offices, P.R.O. 30/29/28 A, fo. 258; and reply, 29 Nov., saying he would call, P.R.O. 30/29/27 A.
2 No. 899 printed, Fitzmaurice, ii. 303–4.
3 Derby accepted office as colonial secretary; cf. Gladstone to Lady Derby, 18 Dec., on his pleasure, Add. MS. 44478, fo. 130; see ministerial changes announced in the cabinet, 1 Dec., and note by Granville: ‘By mentioning Childers for the Exchequer you have planted a blow, of which you are not aware. W. H[arcourt]!!!?’, Add. MS. 44643, fos. 193, 194.
high rank—and I hinted at India—he thought that was an office of great interest.

He raised the objection that Lady Derby’s deteriorating eyesight would prevent his being of social use—I answered that much as you would regret the cause, the objection would not weigh with you.

He asked what other additions there were to be to the Cabinet.

I told him I could not say, but mentioned Dilke as a person on the threshold—he praised him highly.

He asked about amendments of the land bill—I answered that there might be amendments necessary, but that even if they were good, there would be a disinclination to stir them unnecessarily.

Have I said anything misleading to him—

You did not tell me whether I was to sound Grafton for you.

900. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

[Add. MS. 44174, fo. 333]

18, Carlton House Terrace. [2 December 1882].

What answer to Hartington?

1 Archbishop Tait died, 3 Dec.; cf. the Rev. Randall Davidson to Lady Ely, 4 Dec., describing Tait’s wish for the succession to go to Dr. Harold Browne of Winchester, whom Gladstone had earlier also recommended, Letters, iii. 365–6, 331.

2 Who had written to Granville, 1 Dec., saying he thought there should be another cabinet before ‘we all separate again’ to decide what was to be done when parliament met in February, P.R.O. 30/29/27 A.
At what hour excepting from four to five, shall I call on you today—
Grafton is grateful but wishes for a short time to consider his answer.¹

902. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

10, Downing Street. 3: Dec./82.

I wholly agree to your Telegram² but have put in a verbal suggestion of
two monosyllables.
The answer to Colvin is obvious. His responsibility will be limited by
his knowledge: and if the Egyptian Govt keep him in ignorance of
material facts, they & not he will have to bear the blame for failure.
If on the other hand he were to be invested with a right, not only would
he alter the whole idea & basis of our plans but he would still be liable to
have things done behind his back by some Cabinet within the Cabinet,
while on the other hand he would have a plenary responsibility for every-
thing.

903. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

10, Downing Street. Dec. 4. 82.
The material point in the inclosed letter³ from the Prince of Wales is his
statement that Baker Pacha went to Egypt with the approval of the British
Govt.
I believe we had nothing to do with it.
That we received a certain proposal of the Khedive’s & made a reply.
Please let these be sent to me exactly.

904. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Walmer. Dec 6/82.

I could not introduce your last amendment into the draft recording my
conversation with Tissot, because it would have come into the part which
I had written & not spoken to him. But I have done so in the draft to Sir
E Malet. I will do so in the draft to the Powers.⁴

¹ For his acceptance of the K.G., see p. 469, n. 2.
² To Dufferin, tel. No. 17, 4 Dec., accepting Dufferin’s proposal for a single financial
adviser to the khedive to replace the dual control, F.O. 78/3455.
³ Sending Mrs. Baker’s complaint of Baker’s supersession by Wood as commandern-
chief of the new Egyptian army, not traced; cf. to Dufferin, tel. No. 2, 8 Nov., in-
structing him to tell Baker judiciously of Wood’s appointment; and from Dufferin,
tel. No. 22, 26 Nov., advising that Baker be retained as head of the gendarmerie, F.O.
78/3455; see also p. 456, n. 1.
⁴ See to Lyons, No. 1347, 27 Nov., recording the proposal to Tissot of the French
presidency of the caisse de la dette publique in return for the French acceptance of a single
I am going to telegraph to Dufferin a message which I have just received from E. Wood, which I hope will settle the question.¹

905. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville  
Cuffnells, Lyndhurst. Dec. 6. 82.

I wish that in a matter so important² you should follow the course of proceeding and I therefore send for your perusal a letter received today from the Dean of Durham³ with inclosures especially one of great interest from Mr Davidson.⁴ Please to return them.

906. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville  
Cuffnells, Lyndhurst. Dec. 7. 82.

I send for your perusal (though it may have been sent to you) an interesting pamphlet by General Rundall on the proposal for a Canal through Egypt by Cairo & kindred topics.⁵ It does not meet the whole case but raises many important points in connection with this large and difficult question.

I am struck with his view as to the navigation of the Nile, and it seems to me that for the agricultural prosperity and political security of Egypt this is the most weighty question. Egypt as entrepôt is another matter.

With regard to the Suez Canal, to my mind the two questions in which we have the greatest interest are 1. the rectification of its relations with the Egyptian Government and 2. the improvement of the navigation & reduction of the dues. I think my colleagues attach more value than I do to the increase of England’s share in the management, which we cannot reasonably expect in any likely circumstances to preponderate.

¹ i.e. Wood’s claim for salaries for himself, his aide-de-camp, and secretary, the high figure of which had startled the Egyptian government; see correspondence, 20 Nov. to 11 Dec., P.R.O. 30/29/143, and 170.
² The appointment of a successor to Tait as archbishop of Canterbury.
³ See from W. C. Lake, 5 Dec., sending a letter from the bishop of Dover saying that Randall Davidson had written to the Queen and one from Randall Davidson to himself, both 4 Dec., Add. MS. 44230, fo. 379.
⁴ Davidson described Tait’s wish that his successor should be the bishop of Winchester and ultimately the bishop of Truro, for communication, at Lake’s discretion, to Gladstone, ibid., fo. 386.
⁵ See Lieut.-Gen. F. H. Rundall, The Highway of Egypt, is it the Suez Canal, or any other route between the Mediterranean and the Red Sea? (1882).
7 December 1882

907. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Foreign Office. [7 December 1882].

I do not like the proposal of Blignieres or the indirect way of setting about it.

The communications should come through Lyons or Tissot—and would be considered confidential by us if required.

I suppose I had better answer\(^1\) the last despatch by saying how much we regret not having come to a confidential understanding—that the difference rests on the opinion which we hold that the continuance of the dual control, or the substitution for it of a similar arrangement, would not be advantageous to Egypt, or in the long run conduce to the good relations of England & France

that we entirely approve Lord Lyons' repudiation of the phrase victory & defeat—that the only victory has been over the common enemy—that it is true that in consequence of the resolution of the Chamber, the work was left exclusively to us, but this voluntary action has given us no victory over France—has only imposed upon us onerous obligations, from which at no distant period we hope to escape—and that there does not seem any reason, why England & France should not act in perfect harmony, although the form of joint action which created much prejudice in Egypt and in Europe should not be continued.

908. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville\(^2\)

Dec 7. 82.

I fully agree:

1. I suggest that you might have a word of acknowledgment for the friendly tone of the part of Duclerc's conversation reported in Lyons pp 12, 13.

2. Apart from your remarks as to the channel, we ought not I suppose absolutely to shut the door against any enlargement of the functions of the Debt Commission which, while innocuous in itself, might also have the effect of somewhat magnifying the French rôle.

3. But no doubt it should be understood that we cannot ask anything more from Egypt, either for our country or for both, in respect to supervision of finance: on which subject Duclerc's point of view is I think singularly false.

4. I presume that we go on without delay to the execution of the financial arrangement in Egypt as contemplated.\(^3\)

---

\(^1\) See to Lyons, No. 1444, 15 Dec., answering Duclerc's observations (reported by Lyons in No. 1244, 4 Dec.) on the British proposals for Egypt (p. 462, n. 4) as here suggested, F.O. 27/2558.

\(^2\) No. 908 is written below no. 907 on the same sheet.

\(^3\) See no. 902.
909. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

Cuffnells, Lyndhurst. Dec. 8. 82.

As the Queen has summoned me to an audience at Windsor on Monday, I write to say I shall hope to see you not later than from half past eleven to twelve on that day, as I wish to consider with you some part of what may or may not be said at that audience, particularly after the article in the Times of today.¹

She writes to express her aversion to Arabi’s going to Ceylon²—on the ground of possible mischief among the Mussulmans, whether meaning those of India or of the Island I know not.

I am due in London tomorrow between two and three—

[P.S.] In Dufferin’s able dispatch of Nov. 18³ against reviving the Notables, the phrase ‘reasonable suffrage’ is one which I read with a desire of more information, & a little doubt whether limitations familiar to us would suit the oriental mind.

910. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

18, Carlton House Terrace. Dec 10/82.

I forgot to ask you whether in answer to the telegram of Dufferin in which he says the Egyptian Gov will do what we suggest, if we will hold them harmless⁴ from the French, we may say that we anticipate no attack from the French, & that any such unlikely event would be resisted.⁵

911. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

18, Carlton House Terrace. Dec 10/82.

It seems a nice point.⁶

Your proofs as to the failing power of the Bishops have weight but are not absolutely conclusive.

¹ See first leading article announcing as likely Gladstone’s resignation as chancellor of the exchequer, his replacement by Childers, the accession to the cabinet of Derby and Dilke, and speculating on Gladstone’s full retirement and his replacement by Hartington as prime minister, The Times, 8 Dec., p. 7a.
² Proposed by Dufferin instead of the Cape (see no. 892), tel. to Dufferin, No. 19, 8 Dec., F.O. 78/3453; cf. the Queen to Granville, tel. 8 Dec., regretting that none of the Egyptian rebels had been executed, asking ‘is innocent Christianity to remain unavenged’ and asserting ‘Ceylon would never do’, P.R.O. 30/29/1261.
³ No. 7, reporting on institutions ‘favourable to the prudent development of liberty’, by an analysis of Egyptian society and concluding in favour of local councils, elected on a reasonable suffrage, but against a central representative chamber, F.O. 78/3454.
⁴ For this idiom cf. nos. 611, 752.
⁵ See from Dufferin, tels. No. 28, 1 Dec., No. 36, 4 Dec., on Egyptian anxiety about French purchases of territory from local chiefs on the Red Sea coast at the Gulf of Tajourah; and to Dufferin, No. 68, 30 Dec., asking him to suggest measures for the assertion of Egyptian rights, F.O. 78/3497.
⁶ Allusion not identified.
I see no sort of likeness between the Bishops of Winchester & Salisbury, & I cannot help thinking that the person who made the mistake expected to see the latter Bishop.

Evident fatigue on any one occasion may proceed from a slight indisposition at the time.

You are however much the best judge—and are lucky in being in possession of two such good alternatives.

If I may be allowed to say so, the 2 letters do great honour to you & the Queen.

I should like to see Dizzy’s letter recommending Ellicot.¹

912. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville  

10, Downing Street. Dec. 12. 82.

My remarks on this Draft of a Circular for the Powers² will be few but they touch especially a matter of importance on pp. 11, 12.

1. The sentence at the head of p 11 reads as if it meant that the Controul was established by a permanent decree, and modified by a provisional one.

But, as I understand we have been proceeding on the ground that the Controul-Decree was within the power & right of the Egyptian Government to abolish—and this assumption seems to lie near the basis of our proceedings.

2. In p. 12 it is stated that our acceptance of the Egyptian proposal is an acceptance ‘so far as this country is concerned’. I thought we accepted it simply.

3. At the close of the same page are words which place the Controul within the category of direct international engagements. But that means such engagements, as Egypt is not of herself competent to deal with: whereas I understand we hold the reverse as to the controul. If I am right, the sentence I have scored should be placed in p. 10, and the opening words of the next sentence transferred or modified.

The other point I wish to raise relates to the closing sentence, which deals with the two classes of subjects together and by asking the concurrence of the Powers for both alike seems to imply that they stand on the same footing.

My idea would have been to distinguish rather broadly between them. For this purpose, I suggest a statement at the end of the international or First Part, to the effect that we have submitted this outline as the initiative seemed, after what has occurred, to fall to us, & we submit it for consideration with the hope that it will be approved.

¹ Recommended by Disraeli to succeed Archbishop Longley in 1868, when the Queen preferred Bishop Tait.
² See no. 904.
Then to close Part 2 with saying that we had desired to give full information to the Powers on all those matters which were immediately connected with the peace[,] security and social order of Egypt, & on which accordingly we had thought it our duty to advise the Khedive as to the best mode of exercising his governing powers: expressing perhaps a hope that they would approve the spirit in which we had proceeded.

Thus we should avoid asking them to become judges of each measure taken by Egypt under our advice.

You will I am sure give to these suggestions such consideration as they may deserve.¹

[P.S.] I assume that the recitals about the Suez Canal are those previously agreed on.

913. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

[Add. MS. 44174, fo. 339]
10, Downing Street. Dec. 13. 82.

I send you for perusal
1. Hartington’s report.²
2. My letter to the Queen, after seeing Dilke.³
3. Her letter to me⁴—crossing mine.
4. Mine of this morning in reply.⁵

Would you wish to see me, and if so at what time?

914. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

[Add. MS. 44546, fo. 50]
[Copy]

14 Dec: 82.

Read this.⁷ I will not answer it today. It seems to be that the responsibility of selections for the Episcopal Bench is to be handed over to ‘a confidential and trustworthy source’.

I think I shall plant my foot.

¹ See note by Sanderson: ‘done’ on no. 912; and alterations in the circular accordingly, P.R.O. 30/29/143.
² To Gladstone, 12 Dec., reporting his conversation with the Queen on the proposed changes in the government, and adding that the Queen was stronger than ever against the proposal to appoint Dilke chancellor of the duchy of Lancaster, Add. MS. 44146, fo. 128.
³ Not traced.
⁴ Of 12 Dec., insisting that, if Dilke had not changed his republican principles, he could not be ‘a Minister in the Govt. of a Monarchy’, Guedalla, ii. 220.
⁵ Saying that Dilke’s assurances on the formation of the government had been considered satisfactory, and asking for particulars if he was to require further assurances, Guedalla, ii. 220–1; cf. nos. 662–4.
⁶ Gladstone to Granville, 14 Dec., on the Prince of Wales’s accepting the colonelcy of a German regiment and proposing to see Granville about an important letter to the Queen on Dilke, P.R.O. 30/29/41; reply, 14 Dec., raising no objection to the colonelcy and agreeing to meet him at 6 p.m. that day, Add. MS. 44174, fo. 343; not printed.
⁷ Probably from the Queen, not traced.
915. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

18, Carlton House Terrace. [14 December 1882]

The Dilke question seems in a fair way to be settled—the only & unavoidable objection to the change, is that it will chain the newcomer to the former—the commercial world will I think like Dilke's appointment to the Bd of Trade—& a course of political economy under Farrer will do him no harm.

I do not apprehend much difficulty with Derby.

916. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

10, Downing Street. D. 15. 82. 11 a.m.

Could you come over? The correspondence with Windsor continues smart and manifold.

917. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

Hawarden Castle. Dec. 17. 82.

Having now seen the Duclerc dispatch, I think he overshoots his mark in Par. 2. page 2. and gives us a very good position. He says (virtually), as you were to re-establish order, obviously the first condition was to re-establish the Controul: that is to say to re-establish by our arms

1. What we disapprove
2. What France declined to support
3. What was the effective & certain cause of the disorder, & would be so again.

So at least it strikes me.

I do not doubt you will be able to meet what he says of change in our tone.

---

1 i.e. Dilke to Chamberlain who was to become chancellor of the duchy of Lancaster and leave the Board of Trade for Dilke as the only way to bring him into the cabinet, see S. Gwynn and G. M. Tuckwell, The Life of Sir Charles W. Dilke (1917) i. 493-4.

2 See the Queen to Gladstone, 14 Dec., preferring Dilke over Derby in the cabinet and complaining of Derby's speech at Manchester, 13 Dec., favouring a free hand to the French in Madagascar, The Times, 14 Dec., p. 10b; and exchange of tels., 15 Dec., accepting Derby as colonial secretary, Guedalla, ii. 221; cf. vol. ii, p. 37, n. 4.

3 See Duclerc to Tissot, 13 Dec., insisting on the re-establishment of the status quo ante before new arrangements were made in Egypt, D.D.F. iv, No. 576; copy communicated to Granville, 15 Dec., F.O. 27/2597; copy printed for the use of the cabinet, P.R.O. 30/29/126. Gladstone's reference is to p. 2 of the printed version, as here described.
Things went as well at Windsor yesterday\(^1\) as could be expected. Canterbury has now been offered to the Bishop of Truro.

[P.S.] I suppose I am to write to D. of Grafton.\(^2\) If so, do not reply.

---

918. *Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone*  

Walmer Castle. Dec 18/82.  

I send you a correspondence between the Duke of Bedford and myself.\(^3\) He has out of jealousy of Derby, against whom he is always flouting, put himself entirely in the wrong, but I doubt his retracting a second time.\(^4\) If he persists I hope you will forward his resignation at once, recommending the young Duchess of Roxburghe, which you remember was the wish of the Queen.  

The Duchess of Bedford is in despair, suspects that he is doing something, & writes to Sydney to deplore it. Harcourt is in a fuss about the exchange of Chamberlain and Dilke. He says the former writes to him that he loathes the change, which his friendship for Dilke alone obliges him to accept. Harcourt fears that without Bright, and in a place which he does not like, he will soon find an occasion to separate.  

Harcourt asks whether Chamberlain might not go to the local [Government] board, & Dodson to the Duchy. I should have thought it simpler to leave Chamberlain in his present place, and send Dilke to the local [Government] Board if Dodson be moved.\(^5\)  

Chamberlain is certainly not in an amiable mood just now. What with suppressed gout, his Reform Club affair,\(^6\) which he seems to have

---

\(^1\) i.e. when Derby had his audience of the Queen on becoming colonial secretary.  

\(^2\) He wrote 19 Dec., proposing, with the Queen’s sanction, that he should accept one of the two K.G.s vacant by the deaths of Beaconsfield and the Earl of Harrowby, 19 Nov., Add. MS. 44546, fo. 53; and above, no. 901; invested, 3 Feb. 1883, as replacing Beaconsfield.  

\(^3\) To the Duke, 16 Dec., refusing to send to Gladstone his offer of the Duchess’s resignation of the mistress-ship of the robes, until he had written to Harcourt who was rumoured to have complained of the Duke’s not voting with the government; and, 18 Dec., reporting Harcourt’s reply that he only chaffed the Duke, P.R.O. 30/29/28 A, fos. 533, 529.  

\(^4\) See p. 283, n. 1, for the Duke’s earlier offer of his wife’s resignation and its withdrawal.  

\(^5\) See p. 468, n. 1; and from Harcourt, 17 Dec., protesting and proposing as here summarized, P.R.O. 30/29/29 A; and to Gladstone, 17 Dec., to the same effect, Add. MS. 44197, fo. 154; cf. A. G. Gardiner, *The Life of Sir William Harcourt* (1923) i. 464.  

\(^6\) On 12 Dec. in the action for libel and slander brought by Chamberlain’s two younger brothers (who had been black-balled at the Reform Club) against Lennox Boyd, the demurrer of the defendant was ‘overruled’; on an appeal from this decision, 19 Mar. 1883, judgement was given for the defendant.
mismanaged & this proposed change of office he is unhinged, but I doubt his quarrelling enough with his bread & butter, to separate from you.

I have taken the bull by the horns about Enfield,1 & written him a preliminary note warning him of what you may be obliged to tell him.

The weather here is lovely. We sit day & night with a window open.

Edward Delessert, a panier percé, an old friend of mine, & clever, has insisted on coming from Paris to pay me a visit here from Paris [sic]. He is a strong conservative.

To my astonishment he has just confided to me, that he is come with a message from Duclerc. I propose to tell him that I am ready to hear what he says but I must give my answer through Lyons—that these indirect communications are not the way to do business, & have failed & will fail to bring about a result.2

[P.S.] One short line please, as to Derby's reception.3

919. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Walmer Castle. Dec 19/82.

I have forwarded the papers4 to Hartington, who will get them this evening, if he is in London—Your answer is a masterpiece—My letter of yesterday mentioned some possible alternatives.

We have got a tolerably good case, if the Chancellor approves, against the French on the technical question.

Your hints will be most useful—but I rather doubt our being able to say with any truth that the Controll was the cause of that which has happened.

The controll had very little to do with the mass of Europeans who have been receiving large salaries and have excited the jealousy of the Europeans [sc. Egyptians].

I am at your orders, if as I trust will not be the case, a meeting is necessary.

920. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

Hawarden Castle. Dec. 19. 82.

1. I think I wrote to you about Derby’s reception. The lips were pinched till they were sharp as a knife’s edge.

1 To Enfield, 18 Dec., warning him that owing to Kimberley’s replacement of Hartington (in the Commons) as secretary of state for India, the under-secretary would have to be a commoner and Enfield would be replaced, not traced.

2 See to Lyons, No. 1455 A confidential, 19 Dec., recording the conversation with Delessert as here described, F.O. 27/2558.

3 i.e. by the Queen, 16 Dec.; see no. 920; cf. Letters, iii. 380.

4 i.e. those relating to Dike’s and Chamberlain’s offices.
2. Your letter to the Duke is unanswerable. I believe it is well under-
stood between us that in the main the husband of the Mistress of the Robes
is to be regarded as an independent Peer, and that he ought not to resign
unless (like the Duke of Norfolk in the affair of the Garter\footnote{1}) he means to
leave the party. I conclude from what you say that nothing can be done
through Lady Derby as a channel of communication to her sister, who
might do something? If it comes to a change shall I name only one to the
Queen? Duchess of Sutherland out of the question? I do not remember
now what H.M. said, but I shall be guided by you.

3. The contents of my envelope of yesterday will answer in part what
you say about the Dilke controversy. The purpose of my long letter is to
lead her back to Dilke gently & as a spontaneous act. Either through its
own fault or otherwise, it will probably fail. If she refuses both D[ilke] &
C[hamberlain], I am afraid you, H[artington], & I must meet in London.
At present I do not see my way to any other combination. The L.G.
Board is really Dodson's raison d'être in the Cabinet. Doubtless he would
resign for the hope of the Speakership but could we give it him? If he
wished to leave the L.G. Board it would be a different matter. Hartington
writes a very kind letter which I inclose.

4. I am sorry to say that Rosebery has inflicted on me a set of letters\footnote{2}
which appear to me astonishingly foolish, about the neglect of his country,
the necessities of his position, & the like: a tempest in a tea-kettle. It is
marvellous how a man of such character & such gifts can be so silly. Nor
does it mend yet.

'And all this trouble did not pass but grew.'

5. Many thanks for having broken ground with Enfield.

6. As to Delapert (\footnote{3}) [sc. Delessert], nothing but a message excellent
in matter can atone for a fresh resort to this vile indirect clandestine
method of communication: and that I fear we have hardly to expect.

7. I wrote fully to Harcourt\footnote{3} about the Dodson scheme. But, in the
actual position, I do not desire to shut any door.

8. Bp Benson asks a few days for consideration.\footnote{4}

\footnote{1} For the 14th Duke of Norfolk's refusal of the K.G. from Palmerston, see G.E.C.
ix. 636.

\footnote{2} 6, 10, 15, 16 Dec., from Rosebery, who had believed that a rearrangement of offices
would take Scottish business out of the Home Office and put it under himself as head of
an independent department; and pacifying replies, 7, 12, 18 Dec., Add. MS. 44288, fos.

\footnote{3} On 17 Dec., 18 Dec., arguing before and after he had received Harcourt's letter
(p. 469, n. 5) against asking Dodson to become chancellor of the duchy of Lancaster to
clear the Local Government Board for Dilke, Add. MS. 44546, fos. 51, 52.

\footnote{4} See Benson to Gladstone, 18 Dec., replying to the offer of the archbishopric of
Canterbury as here described, Add. MS. 44109, fo. 16.
921. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone  
Walmer Castle. Dec 20/82.

I send you my answer to the Duke¹—After my promise last year never to argue again against his decision in this matter, I cannot go on. But of course you start fresh, & it may be well worth trying, though I doubt the attempt being successful.

Lady Derby would be fatal—The Duchess has always been violently against the resignation—but I believe her to be absolutely without influence.

As to the successor, in case of need, you may remember that the Queen was afraid of choosing the Duchess of Roxburghe for fear of offending her mother in law, but having at last ascertained through Ponsonby that the latter was in favour of it, she became keen upon the idea, & was I believe rather disappointed when the Duke withdrew his resignation.

The Queen won't hear of the Duchess of Cleveland, and is against the Duchess of Leinster. I do not know whom else you could suggest.

There could be no harm in your giving her the choice between the Duchesses Leinster & Roxburghe.

I like Hartington's letter² very much—His proposal less. It would be better for me to take Privy Council, or Privy Seal, which I should be quite ready to do, if of any use.

Would it be possible to send G. Lefevre to the Duchy without the Cabinet, & Dilke [to] the Bd of Works. I suppose this would be difficult.

A civil line from you to Stansfeld,³ thanking him for having considered the subject of the Chairmanship (although not in the end affirmatively) would please him—or I could write it for you, but with less effect.

922. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone  
Walmer Castle. Dec 20/82.

I send you a well conditioned letter from Enfield.⁴ I hope in proper time, you will write him a line—& I suppose, when you have the Queen's approval, you will make a formal offer of the Garter to Grafton.⁵

¹ On 20 Dec., answering the Duke's insistence on his wife's resignation of the mistress-ship of the robes with a protest against 'the limits the Duke imposed on the rights of chaff', P.R.O. 30/29/28 A, fo. 531; see p. 469, n. 3. Gladstone accepted the resignation, see no. 926.

² i.e. to Gladstone, 18 Dec., proposing in view of the Dilke difficulty, either to take himself the presidency of the council instead of the W.O., or, if this appeared ridiculous, to sound Dodson about his leaving the Local Government Board for the chancellorship of the duchy, Add. MS. 44146, fo. 132; see no. 932.

³ Not traced.

⁴ Not traced but presumably accepting removal from the India Office, see p. 470, n. 1. He was replaced by J. K. Cross.

⁵ See p. 469, n. 2; the Duke of Grafton accepted.
923. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Walmer Castle. Dec 20/82.

You will get a short record of my conversation with Delessert. ¹ He quite understood my reticence, and wrote to Duclerc, that I thought the subject so important, that I preferred treating it par la voie diplomatique, plutôt que par celle de l'amitié.

We stand as well respecting the French, as we could do, failing a perfect understanding.

The Chancellor, Hartington and Northbrook have sent some conclusions on the draft to the Powers,² most of which though not all will be of use, I will send you the amendments.

The pressing question is respecting the Turk. Shall we communicate with him, before, at the same time, or later than with the other Powers.³

I incline to give him a short precedence, but am not sure—What do you say—

924. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

Hawarden Castle. D. 21. 82.

I see no objection to a small priority in the communication to the Turk if not such as to give him time for intriguing.

Perhaps I have not made clear my meaning as to the way in which I think the Controul (with which I associate the Secret agreement) brought us into the war. The Secret Agreement⁴ of itself prevented our taking a narrower part than France, and the Controul seemed to put upon us a moral compulsion to advise the Khedive in his difficulties. Having thus advised, & the advice having been taken, we could not abandon him in his difficulties but had to carry him through, ergo to make war. Such is my view.

[P.S.] I quite admit other causes such as multitude of European employés and unequal taxation powerfully helped to make the difficulty. But we were not tied to these, only to the Controul.

925. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

Hawarden Castle. Dec. 21. 82.

1. As Rosebery seems enamoured of his course, and likely to bring it to an upshot, I reluctantly send you the correspondence.⁵ Is he beside himself, or am I? You may, or may not, see your way to intervening.

¹ See p. 470, n. 2. ² See p. 462, n. 2. ³ This question was raised by Northbrook's min. ⁴ See p. 406, n. 2. ⁵ See also p. 471, n. 2, and further letter, Rosebery to Gladstone, 20 Dec., complying with Gladstone's request for details of his complaint about the unsatisfactory way of conducting Scottish business from the Home Office, Add. MS. 44288, fo. 137.
2. Any way the practical questions are now so near [at] hand that I ought to be prepared with an answer.
   a. am I to accept his resignation if it comes? (I do not see how I can further remonstrate).
   b. is my journey to Midlothian to go on in January as contemplated? And is it to be worked from Dalmeny?
Enfield's letter is I am sorry to say a strange & agreeable contrast.

926. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

Hawarden Castle. Dec. 22. 82.

1. Acting on your previous letter, I have recommended the (young) Duchess of Roxburghe, but in terms which leave the matter very much to the Queen.
2. Where you have failed, I do not think I could do any thing with the Duke of B[edford]. He always meets me with a quiet, firm, reserved, not unkind civility.
3. Unless Hartington charms Dodson into compliance, I see nothing for it but his (H.'s) meeting you & me in London on Tuesday.

927. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

[Copy]

Dec 22. 82.

I like the changes generally in Draft 1600. On one however I have to remark. It seems to me that the reservation introduced into No. 2 p 2 may require to be applied also to No. 3. That No. 7 if insufficient to cover No. 2 is also insufficient to cover No. 3. For suppose a case in which another Arabi had got possession of a point on the Canal bank: might not hostilities on or from the Canal itself be proper, or necessary to dislodge him? Just as we dislodged his force by shells fired on the Canal from a place of which at the moment I cannot recall the name. I have suggested in red ink a mode of drafting simply to show what I mean.

928. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Walmer Castle. Dec 22/82.

I am sorry to say the Chancellor does not quite endorse Pauncefote's legal argument against the French. I have sent it to the Law officers. I hope

1 Appointed mistress of the robes vice the Duchess of Bedford, 11 Jan. 1883; see Duchess of Roxburghe to Gladstone, 10 Jan., announcing that she had accepted the Queen's offer, Add. MS. 44479, fo. 97.
2 Not traced.
3 See Selborne's note, 20 Dec., rejecting Pauncefote's view, 18 Dec., that the khedive ceased to be bound towards the French by the arrangements of 1876 and 1879 when Britain retired from them and advising consultation of the law officers, P.R.O. 30/29/141.
they will be less acute. I agree with you that we cannot recede. But if the L[aw] O[fficers] go against us, I do not see how we are to argue. Do not answer this till you get the papers.

929. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone [Add. MS. 44174, fo. 362]

Personal. Walmer Castle. [23 December 1882].

I have rec[eive]d this correspondence with the greatest sympathy for you.

It is hard that at this moment you should receive not a heavy blow, but this sharp thorn in your side.

I doubt the use of my intervention. He is morbidly suspicious, which I do not attribute to politics, but to a point in his character, strengthened by Newmarket training.

After thinking the night upon it, it struck me that the enclosed letter¹ might be of use, either as indicating a possible course, or perhaps as something which you might forward to him.

You will observe the ingenuity with which I attack you—but my observations are not altogether without foundation.


930. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone [Add. MS. 44174, fo. 364]


I have to thank you for sending me your correspondence with Rosebery, although it has given me deep concern.

As you ask me to tell you what I think of it, I will not spare my criticisms. If you told Rosebery, which I greatly doubt, that you considered Morley stood before him for the Cabinet, I do not agree—

Morley has been longer in the Gov & has done well both in the House, and in his office, & in that sense he may be said to have good claims—but the reasons for considering under the present circumstances, that Rosebery stands first of the Peers for a Cabinet office, when the balance of Peers & Commoners [is] adjusted appear to me to be overwhelming.

My other criticism is that I do not see in your letters to him much trace of that warm affection and that remarkable appreciation of his character & abilities, just, but which would even be considered excessive by some, which you have so constantly, and in so many different circumstances expressed to me.

On the other hand, the course which Rosebery seems inclined to take,

¹ i.e. no. 930.
appears to me, a somewhat lymphatic observer, almost impossible. I can hardly believe that the friends whom he has consulted, can have advised it, unless perhaps under some misapprehension.

Rosebery has a brilliant career before him—& he once told me that it was the one thing he really cared about—But brilliant as his career may be, there will [be] no brighter episode than his connection with you, & the work you achieved together. I have not heard of any discontent at the way Scotch business has been conducted of late by Rosebery & the Lord Advocate—but of course it would be easy to get up an agitation on the subject & in any case the Scotch have a right to have the question duly considered. I suppose you would have done so, if you had had time, & I always understood that you wished to do so in conjunction with the question of ministries of Commerce & of agriculture, and with the new experiments of the grand committees.

I agree that you could hardly frame a scheme under the threat of a resignation of a friend.

If Rosebery insists upon resigning, whether it is attributed to his believing you to act unjustly to Scotland, or for other reasons, it seems almost impossible, that you should conduct the Midlothian campaign from his house—there are considerations connected with this point which it is difficult to mention in a letter to you, which I am sure will occur to Rosebery, on reflection.

I cannot help thinking that, if you gave him some more definite assurance of considering the Scotch question while reserving perfect freedom of action, & were to say only one tenth of what you have said to others, as to the standard by which you judge him, this affair so annoying to you, and so likely to be damaging to him, might be satisfactorily settled.  

931. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Walmer Castle. [24 December 1882].

I have rec[eived] a letter from Ponsonby, telling me that the Queen has heard with great surprise of the D[uchess] of B[edford]'s resignation that as the Duke intends to give a general support to the Gov, the only cause must be the dislike to the office, which she hopes is not the case.

I have forwarded the letter to the Duke merely asking him what I am to answer.

1 Gladstone wrote on no. 930, 'a. by Tel., 24th. Yours of yesterday. Thanks. May I understand you have written to Rosebery. Do not at present see what more I can do, but will review all your letters carefully', Add. MS. 44174, fo. 371.

2 Not traced, but cf. the Queen to Granville, 31 Dec., enclosing what she had written to the Duchess, P.R.O. 30/29/31.
25 December 1882

932. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

Hawarden Castle. Xmas Day. 82.

The letters, as they have come back to me, do not include one I wrote to Rosebery on Dec. 12 and I think the omission has (materially) affected your estimate of the correspondence. I have desired that it may be sent you.¹ And I am writing to him today to further the purposes of our correspondence. I send the letter.

The Dilke affair is settled,² through Hartington’s judicious intervention, and Dodson’s great loyalty to the Government.

The Bishop of Truro has definitively accepted.³

933. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Walmer Castle. Dec 25/82.

Many & happy returns of this day to you & yours.

I do not like to answer the enclosed letter,⁴ without consulting you—at this moment.

Dilke has written to tell me he hopes to go to the Local [Government] Board on Wednesday. (You have managed matters rapidly.) He urges the immediate appointment of a successor in the present heavy work of the F[oreign] office.

May I tell the Queen that I had heard from you that she had favorably received your mention of Fitzmaurice as undersecretary.⁵ Please telegraph ‘yes’ or ‘no’.

934. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Walmer Castle. Dec 25/82.

I am inclined to telegraph to Dufferin that Colvin may join the French controller in some act, if the latter wishes it, previous to the decree of the

¹ An affectionate letter explaining that only one claim to the cabinet was to be considered before Rosebery’s, and that perhaps ‘only to be put out of the way’, Add. MS. 44288, fo. 122.
² See Hartington to Gladstone, 20, 22 Dec., for Hartington’s successful persuasion of Dodson, who placed himself ‘in the chief’s hands’ and was appointed chancellor of the duchy of Lancaster, thus freeing the Local Government Board for Dilke, Add. MS. 44146, fos. 137, 140.
⁴ C. A. Cooper (editor of the Scotsman) to Granville, not traced.
⁵ See Granville to the Queen, 31 Dec., reporting the choice of Lord E. Fitzmaurice to be parliamentary under-secretary for foreign affairs vice Dilke, P.R.O. 30/29/41. The Queen approved, but see difficulties about the form of the appointment, nos. 944, 945, 946, 949, 950.
Khedive abolishing it. How does this strike you? the transaction to be explained to the Khedive.

935. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville  
[Hawarden Castle. Dec. 26. 82.]

I should answer Mr Cooper's singularly long-winded letter (I suppose such are rare with you but I should have to shut up shop at once unless I put all such at once into the mill to be read and docketed) to the effect that we are aware of the strong desire felt by so many persons of influence & authority for improved arrangements with a view to the transaction of Scotch business, & are most desirous to consider how far & in what way practical effect can be given to it: but the joint effect of emergencies in Ireland & the block in the H of C has been almost absolutely to cancel the available power to make progress in public affairs for a period of two years: hence state of arrear in all legislative & organic business (this is organic) under which Scotland has suffered seriously, England still more. It may be hoped that we shall now be able to make progress in 1883 much as we might have done in 1881 but for these causes: & the question of the best system of administration for Scotch business will have our early attention.

936. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville  
[Hawarden Castle. D. 28. 82.]

Dufferin's No 55 about the clearing out of Arabi & Co, and progress made, reminds me to say one or two things.

1. I inferred from something you wrote that I was to see some argument of the Chancellor on the Khedive's right to abolish the control—no such paper has reached me. I hope the matter is not, or will not long be, in suspense.

---

1 See p. 468, n. 3; Gladstone wrote his reply, that he had no objection to the proposed tel., on the letter and returned it; see also to Dufferin, No. 28, 28 Dec., arranging as proposed, F.O. 78/3453; and from Dufferin, tel. No. 48, 18 Dec., describing Brédif's return to Egypt and Colvin's (see p. 449, n. 1) refusal to do business with him, F.O. 78/3455.

2 Not traced, see no. 933.

3 Tel. No. 55, 26 Dec., reporting that the decree degrading Arabi and his associates had been executed and in a few days a general amnesty would be issued and the débris of the late rebellion cleared away; and tel. No. 58, 27 Dec., reporting their sailing for Ceylon, F.O. 78/3455.

4 See to Malet, tel. No. 561, 6 Nov., instructing him that the khedive might now present his demand for the abolition of the control, F.O. 78/3447; min. of cabinet decision, 7 Nov., to this effect, P.R.O. 30/29/143; from Dufferin, No. 16, 15 Jan. 1883, enclosing Egyptian note, 10 Jan., presenting the demand; with min. of British assent, F.O. 78/3565.
I do not understand
a. how we can be bound to it as a perpetual institution
b. how, if not, there can possibly be a stronger case for his putting an end to it, than he now has.

2. I hope progress will soon and rapidly [be] made as to our part in the abolition of exemptions from taxation enjoyed by foreigners—and also that before Parliament meets it will be possible to show that progress has been made in the reduction of European salaries and employés.¹

So much for Egypt.

3. I am concerned to see Times and Telegraph² raising that most dangerous and formidable question of an advance of Austria to Salonica, and I hope this is due to mere idle speculation, and not to any sign of such an intention on her part.

937. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone [Add. MS. 44174, fo. 376]
Walmer Castle. [28 December 1882].

I had not seen the letter of the 12th—³—which cuts the ground from my criticism.

I shall be anxious to hear the result of your last letter.

Will you let your secretary send me that part of my letter, which you forwarded to R[osebery] as it may be useful for me to know, in case of any possible discussion with him.

938. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone [Add. MS. 44174, fo. 378]
Walmer Castle. [28 December 1882].

I got the enclosed, & sent it to the Duke.⁴

I have just received his answer which I have forwarded to H.M.

He persists, basing it entirely on W Harcourt, a minister’s opinion, in which he agrees, & without any reference to Harcourt’s denial.

939. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone [Add. MS. 44174, fo. 381]
Walmer Castle. Dec 29/82.

I am rather in a difficulty, having authorized Lyons to say we should

¹ i.e. further subjects on which Dufferin was instructed to make recommendations; additional to institutions, on which he had partially reported (see p. 465, n. 3), the army (see vol. ii, p. 3, n. 1), and justice (see vol. ii, p. 8, n. 4); see to Dufferin, No. 1, 3 Nov., F.O. 78/3453.
² Daily Telegraph, 27 Dec., p. 4 had a leader on the 600th anniversary of the beginning of Habsburg rule, but referred only in general terms to Austria’s Balkan policy.
³ See p. 477, n. 1.
⁴ i.e. from the Queen on the Duchess of Bedford’s resignation, see p. 476, n. 2.
send our answer to the note to Tissot in the course of this week. It will be difficult to manage it.

Pauncefote produced a plausible legal argument in favor of the right to break the Dual Control.

It was submitted to the Chancellor, who picked holes in it, but advised us to refer it to the Law officers—This we did—but I suppose owing to the Xmas holydays, notwithstanding pressure, we have not been able to get their report.

If they adopt Pauncefote’s views, or give us something as favorable, it will be easy to give it in the despatch, or a summary of it. If they share the Chancellor’s doubts, of which they have not been informed, I suppose we had better omit the point.

I send you the rest of a draft—which please read carefully.

If you will send it back immediately to the F.O. I hope amended, will you give me discretion as to the mention or not of the legal argument. I may thus perhaps save my word, and send the despatch to Lyons on Saturday.

[P.S.] You will perhaps not think it quite clear that it is necessary to introduce the legal argument at all, even if it be favorable.

940. Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone

Walmer Castle. [29 December 1882]

I hear from Harcourt that he has seen Rosebery, has given him a tremendous jobation, with apparently considerable success, that Rosebery is still extremely sore, but has agreed to go to see you.

Harcourt says that R. would be satisfied with the headship of a department without the Cabinet.

1 See to Lyons, No. 1486, 27 Dec., stating that his reply to Duclerc’s dispatch, communicated by Tissot (see no. 917), had been anticipated by his instructions to Lyons of 15 Dec. (see p. 464, n. 1) and continuing as described, F.O. 27/2558.

2 See p. 474, n. 3; and the law officers’ report, 1 Jan. 1883, that ‘if consistent with her past policy’ Britain might contend that the khedive, Britain, or France might singly revoke or withdraw from the arrangements of 1876 and 1879, confidential print of law officers’ reports for 1883, p. 22, P.R.O. 30/29/357.

3 To Lyons, No. 1514, 30 Dec., replying to Duclerc’s dispatch that Britain abided by her refusal to re-establish the dual control, that she insisted on her proposal of a single financial adviser, and refused to buy France out of Egypt, F.O. 27/2558.

4 To Granville, secret, 28 Dec., recounting his interview after seeing the Rosebery-Gladstone correspondence, P.R.O. 30/29/29 A; cf. to Gladstone, 27 Dec., on the same, Add. MS. 44197, fo. 164; see also A. G. Gardiner, The Life of Sir W. Harcourt (1923) i. 466–7.
941. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

[P.R.O. 30/29/126]

To be read. Hawarden Castle. Dec. 29. 82.

1. I think that if the legal argument can be made good, its insertion would give roundness and solidity to your dispatch.

2. I have suggested a few modifications of the text.

3. Over and above these—in the absence of the legal argument—or possibly even in addition to it—I venture on suggesting the insertion at some convenient place of the accompanying paragraphs A. & B, or something like them. Or one or both may be held over for a future stage.¹

[P.S.] By all means take, as far as I am concerned, the discretion you desire.

A thousand thanks to you & the Walmer party for the kind message. If plenty of work makes a happy birthday, mine is superlative.

942. Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville

[P.R.O. 30/29/29 A]


The Rosebery tumult is appeased, various causes I think having concurred. I own however that for the present it leaves what you sometimes call 'a bad taste in the mouth'.

I am by no means assured that he has yet taken more than a superficial or newspaper article view of the question.

The question of separating Scotch business altogether from the Home Secretary's Office is a delicate & grave one.

Another is whether Scotch business really could employ a separate officer.

If, considering the interest you have taken in the matter, you will kindly take the trouble to go through the inclosed set of minutes, according to their dates, you will see a sidelight which falls upon the subject. Please send the papers back to D. Street.

[P.S.] Since I wrote this, a new report has come from Harcourt,² I cannot say that it improves the aspect of the case.

¹ Relates to the draft of No. 1514, see p. 480, n. 3; addition 'A' was an argument on the inappropriateness of the word compensation to the case and 'B' an argument that Britain gained no advantage, not shared by Europe, from the appointment of a single adviser, who need not be an Englishman.

² See Harcourt to Gladstone, 29 Dec., returning to the possibility of Rosebery's resignation of the under-secretaryship at the Home Office, Add. MS. 44197, fo. 171.
1000 thanks for the promptitude with which you have sent me some excellent amendments, and additions. I have sent the amended despatch to Lyons, and shall have kept my word.

Pauncefote rewrote his reasons, and I have heard nothing from the Law officers.

I do not much regret it. If they make out a weak case the less said about it, the better. If a strong one, it is as well to have something in reserve for the protest, which Lyons says we are to have.

I doubt the French finding it in their interest to 'bouder' very long.