LITERATURE.
The Life of Stratford Canning, Viscount Stratford de Redcliffe, K.G., &c. By Stanley Lane-Pool. (Longmans.)

SECOND NOTICE.

In the autumn of 1831, Canning was persuaded by Lord Palmerston to undertake another special mission to Turkey, Greece being again the object. He visited the Morea and other parts of the desolated land, where he was received with enthusiasm by the patriots; and he formed his opinions upon Argos and Capodistrias, Lord Elgin, Vogodoris, and other matters. Arrived at Stamboul early in the next year, he noted great and portentous changes—the old humiliating etiquette had been abolished, the foreigner was feared if not respected, and the unurbaned Osmanli was "drinking chamomile tea". Canning saw the opportunity of posing as a great reformer, of galvanising, if not quickening, the situation to receive the full tide of European ideas, which the Athenaeum justly termed "an ill-natured chapter." Unfortunately the genius of the "portentous Turk" was not always truth, but the old "boy Yankees" to turn out a British minister to impose upon another an unwelcome envoy. The blunderer in this case was Lord Pam., who should have ascertained the Czar's views before laying himself open to such a slight. Not that we should think much of it in these days of most unoffending" and "most amiable cousins"—in plain English, mere tools for the "demonic enemy." It scores, however, one for the Greeks—numbering some twelve millions—"acreat admirandum, parvulum et falso unicernendum, magnam servitum populum," whom the Turk was afraid to "turn out a British minister; and, as the "personal duel" had opened with the refused extradition of the Hungarian refugees, M.M. Kossuth & Co. The second half of 1831 is occupied with the Crimean campaign, beginning at the eleven diplomatic notes (see ii. 376), which were rejected and subsequently returned in kind. But the Russian incident, unimportant as it appeared, was destined to be one of the most unfortunate moments in the life of Sir Stratford de Redcliffe, than whom none better knew the Russian character and disposition. The Turks had been humiliated by the presentation of a "note of protest" by Lord Bath, who, true to his principle of not allowing the "honours of war" to be reserved for a British minister, refused the ambassadorship to the court of Stamboul; and returned to England and the House (1833-41). His hopes of place in the Conservative Cabinet having, happily for his fame, been frustrated, he set off on his fourth mission to Constantinople, where his dreams of regeneration began to assume concrete form. Mahmut, the stout-hearted Janissary-kidnapper, had been succeeded by Abu-l-Majid, an "amiable and irreligious youth"—in plain English, a mere tool for the able handler. Reshid Pasha, most Rabelaisian, was in his post, and the Englishman as his lord, was outlining the famous Tanzimato, or "revolutionary act of 1839." The Czar Nicholas had seen the chance to address his arch-foe a letter of thanks, recognising the kindly treatment of Russian war-prisoners.

A pacific mission to Madrid for arbitrating between Dom Pedro and Don Miguel was preceded by a journey "like diplomatic gypsies wandering from court to court with their children at their backs." Canning found "your Spaniards are as hard as a negotiator as your Turk," suspected that he had been sent on a fool's errand, refused the ambassadorship to the court of Spain, and returned to England and the House (1833-41). His hopes of place in the Conservative Cabinet having, happily for his fame, been frustrated; he set off on his fourth mission to Constantinople, where his dreams of regeneration began to assume concrete form. Mahmut, the stout-hearted Janissary-kidnapper, had been succeeded by Abu-l-Majid, an "amiable and irreligious youth"—in plain English, a mere tool for the able handler. Reshid Pasha, most Rabelaisian, was in his post, and the Englishman as his lord, was outlining the famous Tanzimato, or "revolutionary act of 1839." The Czar Nicholas had seen the chance to address his arch-foe a letter of thanks, recognising the kindly treatment of Russian war-prisoners.

A mission to Madrid for arbitrating between Dom Pedro and Don Miguel was preceded by a journey "like diplomatic gypsies wandering from court to court with their children at their backs." Canning found "your Spaniards are as hard as a negotiator as your Turk," suspected that he had been sent on a fool's errand, refused the ambassadorship to the court of Spain, and returned to England and the House (1833-41). His hopes of place in the Conservative Cabinet having, happily for his fame, been frustrated; he set off on his fourth mission to Constantinople, where his dreams of regeneration began to assume concrete form. Mahmut, the stout-hearted Janissary-kidnapper, had been succeeded by Abu-l-Majid, an "amiable and irreligious youth"—in plain English, a mere tool for the able handler. Reshid Pasha, most Rabelaisian, was in his post, and the Englishman as his lord, was outlining the famous Tanzimato, or "revolutionary act of 1839." The Czar Nicholas had seen the chance to address his arch-foe a letter of thanks, recognising the kindly treatment of Russian war-prisoners.

Thus a mighty change of tone had been wrought by a decade or so, at the beginning of which he exclaimed, "I wish with all my heart, in plain English, a mere tool for the "demonic enemy." It scores, however, one for the Greeks—numbering some twelve millions—"an ill-natured chapter." Unfortunately the genius of the "portentous Turk" was not always truth, but the old "boy Yankees" to turn out a British minister; and, as the "personal duel" had opened with the refused extradition of the Hungarian refugees, M.M. Kossuth & Co. The second half of 1831 is occupied with the Crimean campaign, beginning at the eleven diplomatic notes (see ii. 376), which were rejected and subsequently returned in kind. But the Russian incident, unimportant as it appeared, was destined to be one of the most unfortunate moments in the life of Sir Stratford de Redcliffe, than whom none better knew the Russian character and disposition. The Turks had been humiliated by the presentation of a "note of protest" by Lord Bath, who, true to his principle of not allowing the "honours of war" to be reserved for a British minister, refused the ambassadorship to the court of Stamboul; and returned to England and the House (1833-41). His hopes of place in the Conservative Cabinet having, happily for his fame, been frustrated; he set off on his fourth mission to Constantinople, where his dreams of regeneration began to assume concrete form. Mahmut, the stout-hearted Janissary-kidnapper, had been succeeded by Abu-l-Majid, an "amiable and irreligious youth"—in plain English, a mere tool for the able handler. Reshid Pasha, most Rabelaisian, was in his post, and the Englishman as his lord, was outlining the famous Tanzimato, or "revolutionary act of 1839." The Czar Nicholas had seen the chance to address his arch-foe a letter of thanks, recognising the kindly treatment of Russian war-prisoners.

The biographer's account of that most insidious war it is this!" The Czar Nicholas determined to protect the Greeks—numbering some twelve millions—from Turkish tyranny and violence; and what this evil was we may learn from Canning's letter to Layard (ii. 215), noting "massacres, pillages, and revolt ing outrages at the expense of the Christian population in Syria and Bulgaria." At that early stage I was travelling in Arabia and resting at Cairo, where every European who knew the condition of affairs, and who could afford to speak out, loudly praised the Russian's determination, and I have recorded in my Pilgrimage. Such absolute interference with the rights of a civilised power over its lieges would be a mere outrage. But Turkey was not, is not, and never will be civilised as long as Turks are the masters of the scene; and to Greece, where a notable lack of reform and religious tolerance, an event for the Moslem East, was an ample justification of Russia's contention. The present rapprochement between the Turk and the Muscovite, and the instinctive feeling of the former that he can be safe only in the arms of the Czar, form a terrible comment upon the blunders of diplomacy. Of these the worst must be attributed to Canning, who, true to his principle of not allowing English prestige to be optimum, was determined to return a Thornbury on the Moslem East, was an ample justification of Russia's contention. The present rapprochement between the Turk and the Muscovite, and the instinctive feeling of the former that he can be safe only in the arms of the Czar, form a terrible comment upon the blunders of diplomacy. Of these the worst must be attributed to Canning, who, true to his principle of not allowing English prestige to be optimum, was determined to return a Thornbury on the Moslem East, was an ample justification of Russia's contention. The present rapprochement between the Turk and the Muscovite, and the instinctive feeling of the former that he can be safe only in the arms of the Czar, form a terrible comment upon the blunders of diplomacy. Of these the worst must be attributed to Canning, who, true to his principle of not allowing English prestige to be optimum, was determined to return a Thornbury on the Moslem East, was an ample justification of Russia's contention. The present rapprochement between the Turk and the Muscovite, and the instinctive feeling of the former that he can be safe only in the arms of the Czar, form a terrible comment upon the blunders of diplomacy. Of these the worst must be attributed to Canning, who, true to his principle of not allowing English prestige to be optimum, was determined to return a Thornbury on the Moslem East, was an ample justification of Russia's contention. The present rapprochement between the Turk and the Muscovite, and the instinctive feeling of the former that he can be safe only in the arms of the Czar, form a terrible comment upon the blunders of diplomacy. Of these the worst must be attributed to Canning, who, true to his principle of not allowing English prestige to be optimum, was determined to return a Thornbury on the Moslem East, was an ample justification of Russia's contention. The present rapprochement between the Tur
unhappy campaign is given with commendable candour and conscientious. But when he informs us that Prince Menschikov was "sent in confusion to Odessa" (ii. 275), he forgets to notice that the Governor-General of Finland in the suite left Pera openly insulting the English embassador in the streets, as he intended to set out to pass. He has committed to Mr. Kinglake an appreciation of the French emperor's object in forcing on the allied movement, and our mad folly in voluntarily assuming the role of "second fiddle," which put the French ambassador and his confederates, together with the feebleness of the home authorities, the inadequacy of the transport and commissariat, and the criminal frauds of the contractors. And here we must chiefly blame the craze for economy, a Liberal fad, and the Pinching Process which, first preached by the "inspired bagman," Cobden, is still pregnant with evil for the future of England. But the biographer is justly severe on the treason of France, or rather of Louis Napoleon, whose proposal to insult was allowed to pass. He has informed us that Prince Menschikov was "sent in confusion to Odessa" (ii. 275), he forgets to notice that the English embassy in the streets, and that the English envoy was insulted by the remainences are now being published. And there is not a word concerning the angry controversy between the ambassador and the Hon. Charles Murray, then Consul-General for Egypt. Canning was misled by his harsh and shortsighted estimation of the great Mohammed Ali, "an able and unscrupulous usurper" (i. 397), and determined to inflict Turkish dry-rot upon Nile-land, then advancing with giant strides in wealth and influence. Sir Charles Murray, who still lives in honoured retirement at Cannes, openly resisted his "frustration" of the project of 1816; he was personally averse to the scheme. The "Elchi" victim, the luscious expiatoire benighted Lord Stratford, was sighted only at Constantinople. He could not save the Turks from themselves. He found a final resignation advisable in early 1838; and he received only a compassionate permission to take leave of his imperial pupil, and to farewell his "colony" at Pera, where his stout-hearted advocacy of English claims and his open-handed hospitality to strangers and visitors had secured him a host of partizans. He was received with popular demonstrations of more than usual warmth, and bade a Stoic's adieu to the scene of his long labours with something of the pomp and circumstance which his soul loved.

The "Epilogue" (ii. 454) sketches with simplicity and earnestness the calm and restful evening of an eventful and tempestuous day. We see the "Nestor of foreign politics" ending by slow degrees his era of life and his era of society, and leading a hermit-like existence at Frant Court, where he died full of years and honours. The chapter is exceedingly well written, full of pathos and power. Avoiding the "false bonmots," which he deprecated in his New Year's address, Cobden, and his biographer, facilitate not a few of Canning's many unfriends, who remember him only in his over-masterful phase. And the Life concludes with the Larrode's well-worn lines, beginning with "Thou third great Canning," and ending with a parenthesis: "Who wert the voice of England in the East."