Art. XI. PERIODICAL LITERATURE.

1. *Edinburgh Review.* Vol. 1, 2, &c.

IF periodical criticism is good for any thing, it cannot be less needed in the case of periodical literature, than of any other class of the productions of the press. It is indeed a subject of wonder, that periodical publications should have existed so long, and have come at last to occupy so great a portion of the time and attention of the largest class of readers, without having become subject to a regular and systematic course of criticism. We trust it will appear that we shall have rendered an important service to the progress of the human mind, in setting at least an example of this species of control; in showing how great has been the need of it before it existed, how much of evil it is calculated to prevent, and how much of positive advantage it cannot fail to secure.

Periodical literature is so wide a field, that though we shall not interdict ourselves from any part of it, we shall select for our province more particularly that portion, with respect to which the demand for the service which we thus desire to see rendered, will, to every intelligent mind, appear to be the strongest. The review of books, with the influence which it has in giving direction to the taste for reading, has long been a department of literature the effect of which has been very imperfectly appreciated. For a considerable number of years this field has been to such a degree occupied by two rival, celebrated, and successful publications, that the old have sunk into insignificance: the attempt to elevate new ones, has hitherto proved abortive; and it will hardly be incumbent on us, unless with casual exceptions, to bestow much of our attention upon the rest.

Another circumstance renders criticism peculiarly necessary in the case of the publications to which we have alluded; we mean, the Edinburgh and Quarterly Reviews: under the guise of reviewing books, these publications have introduced the practice of publishing dissertations, not only upon the topics of the day, but upon all the most important questions of morals and legislation, in the most extensive acceptation of these terms. Whatever occasion, therefore, there can be for that species of censorship which criticism exercises over those who assume the task of supplying nourishment to the human mind, it is presented by the publications in question, and with peculiar circumstances of aggravation.

Of these circumstances, some they have in common with other periodical publications; some are peculiar to themselves. One law to which periodical literature is subject is attended with consequences, the good and evil of which have never yet been sufficiently analysed, though it is of the highest importance that they should be familiarised to the public mind. If a work is published, not periodical, and possesses real merit, it can afford to be overlooked for a time; and though it may be little noticed for the first year, or years, may count with tolerable certainty upon that degree of ultimate fame to which it is entitled. Not so with periodical literature. That must have immediate success, to secure so much as existence. A periodical production must sell immediately, at least to a certain extent, otherwise it cannot be carried on. A periodical production must be read the next day, or month, or quarter, otherwise it will not be read at all. Every motive, therefore, which prompts to the production of any thing periodical, prompts to the study of immediate effect, of unpostponed popularity, of the applause of the moment. To catch at this applause is then to be regarded as a grand characteristic of periodical literature; and the good and evil consequences which arise from it deserve to be diligently traced, and correctly estimated.

On the favourable side it may be affirmed, that as the diffusion of all the good which is derived from reading, must be in proportion to the diffusion of this which is its instrument, this peculiarity in periodical literature is an eminent advantage. By consulting the public taste with continual anxiety, the pleasures of reading are perpetually supplied to the greatest possible number. The number of those who love reading and the number of those who derive pleasure from periodical literature, are the same. To it, therefore, we are, it may be said, indebted, for the grand source of general intelligence; that is, the grand source of the greatest possible good.

The most effectual mode of doing good to mankind by reading, is, to correct their errors; to expose their prejudices; to refute opinions which are generated only by partial interests, but to which men are, for that reason, so much the more attached; to censure whatever is mean and selfish in their behaviour, and attach honour to actions solely in proportion to their tendency to increase the sum of happiness, lessen the sum of misery.

But this is a course which periodical literature cannot pursue. To please the great body of men, which is the object of the periodical writer, he must flatter their prejudices. Instead of calling in question the opinions to which they are wedded, he

must applaud them; and the more he can furnish such men with reasons for being more in love with their opinions than before, the more he is sure of commanding their approbation, and of increasing their zeal to promote the reputation of his work.

The most mischievous of all erroneous opinions are those which lead to the injury of the great number of mankind, for the benefit of the small number; which tend to make it the interest of the small number, by giving them the power, to oppress the great number in all practicable ways, and to brutalise them for the purpose of rendering the oppression more easy, and more secure. That these are the most mischievous of all opinions, is proved by merely telling what they are. That literature is useful only as it contributes to the extirpation of these detestable opinions, is so far true, that deprive it of this tendency, and it is doubtful whether it would not be more of a curse than a blessing. These, however, are the very opinions which periodical literature is under the strongest inducements to promote, and the discouragement of which it is utterly unsafe to undertake. It is obvious what is the general course it will pursue.

The opinions, on the propagation of which the success of periodical writings depends,—immediate success, that success which is essential to their existence,—are the opinions in vogue; the opinions of those whose influence is the most extensive, who can go farthest in creating or hindering a reputation. But what is the class most instrumental in setting the fashion, which exercises the greatest control over the opinions of other men? The answer is not uncertain. The people of power compose it. The favourite opinions of people in power are the opinions which favour their own power; those opinions which we have already characterised as being the grand instruments of evil in this world, the ultimate and real cause of the degradation and misery of the great mass of mankind. To these opinions periodical literature is under a sort of necessity, under an inducement which generally operates as necessity, of serving as a pandar.

It is a common observation, that notwithstanding the influence of error in the world, arising partly from ignorance, partly from the influence of interested opinions in high quarters, the opinion of the wise and distinterested, though they are small in number, always, or at least generally, prevails at last, and becomes the opinion of the world. That there is this tendency in the opinions of the wise, is certain; and it is the ground of all our hopes for the amelioration of mankind. When an opinion, founded on truth, and tending to good, is once declared, and when there is the means of making it generally

known, and of calling to it continually the attention of mankind, it is sure to make its way, and by degrees to bear down all that opposes it.

Here, however, the characteristic malady of periodical literature is most clearly seen. Instead of aiding this beneficent progress, it is opposed to it. The success of those important opinions, the progress of which involves the overthrow of the opinions which are dearest to the classes by whom power is exercised for their own benefit over the rest of the community, and dear to them for this reason, that they tend to the support of the power which they so employ, is *slow*. Periodical literature depends upon *immediate* success. It must, therefore, patronise the opinions which are now in vogue, the opinions of those who are now in power. It will obtain applause, and will receive reward, in proportion as it is successful in finding plausible reasons for the maintenance of the favourite opinions of the powerful classes, and plausible reasons for the discountenance and rejection of the opinions which tend to rescue the interests of the greater number from the subjection under which they lie to the interests of the small number. In this view, it is evident, that, so long as the interest of the smaller number is the predominating interest in any community; so long periodical literature is the natural enemy of the most important and beneficent class of opinions, and so long may the balance of its effects be expected to be decidedly in opposition to them. We say the balance of its effects, because there is no doubt that occasionally, from various motives, the more important of which we shall think it expedient to describe, the periodical press displays exertions both in opposition to the opinions which tend to confirm abusive powers in the hands of the few, and in favour of the opinions which tend to rescue from these powers the interests of the greater number.

After the mass of the people have become a reading people, a reward is held out for writings addressed peculiarly to them. The opinions of the people will, of course, be consulted in such writings; and those opinions which are peculiarly recommended to the powerful classes by the circumstance of their favouring the existence of those powers of theirs, which may be used for their personal purposes, will not be the peculiar objects of applause. But it is with the more numerous, as it is with the less numerous classes; they have some opinions which are just as well as important, and they have others which are erroneous.

It is of very little importance, in addressing the people, to continue recommending to them right opinions, which they

already possess. Labour of such a kind is labour thrown away. The really useful effort, in the case of the people, as in the case of any other class, is to contend against erroneous opinions, and introduce to them ideas which, though full of important consequences, are as yet strange, and perhaps revolting, to their minds. From this undertaking it is now sufficiently evident to our readers that the periodical press is debarred. It cannot wait for that success which depends upon the slow progress of just opinions, and the slow removal of prevalent errors. It must aim at that immediate applause which is bestowed only for immediate pleasure; for gratification administered to the mind in its present state; for encouragement of the favourite idea, flattery of the reigning prejudice.

We have seen, during some late years, in this country, since the talent of reading has become more general, periodical publications, addressed in a particular manner to the more numerous class. They are cheap publications, from the circumstances of the purchasers; and they have been worse than they otherwise might have been, from the characters of those who have been the principal instruments in their production, and who, had they been wiser and better men (for, with little exception, they have been very defective in one or other, or both, of these requisites), might have obtained as much success, with less subservience to the errors of those whom they have addressed. It is abundantly apparent, however, even on a cursory inspection of the writings to which we have thus alluded, that the principal influence to which they bend is that of the favourite opinions, right or wrong, of those to whom they look for their reward. That writings produced under this influence can hardly fail, where men are as ill instructed as they still are in this country, and where partial and sinister interests so greatly preponderate, to have a greater tendency to evil than good, we imagine cannot, after what we have stated, be regarded as matter of doubt.

The two publications which we have already pointed out as destined to be the principal objects of our attention in this department, are addressed to the aristocratical classes. From the circumstances belonging to them it will appear that they may be regarded as almost exclusively addressed to those classes. To what degree they have been subservient to the interests of those classes, in other words, hostile to the interests of the more numerous class, it would be premature in us, and perhaps hardly fair, as yet, to pronounce. That can be properly determined only by evidence adduced; and that evidence will be among the results of the examination to which we mean to subject them. It is enough in the meantime to estimate correctly the induce-

ments to this fatal subserviency under which they have been placed.

Assuming that they agree in this main and characteristic circumstance, of being addressed to the aristocratical classes, upon what principle, we may be asked, do we account for the great diversity which appears in their tone and character; a diversity so remarkable, that they are not regarded as competitors, but as enemies, as tending not to the same, but to opposite ends; as promoting irreconcilable opinions, the one upholding what the other endeavours to destroy? The elucidation of this point is of great importance, in laying the ground-work to our future labours in this department. It is in fact a point, the elucidation of which goes far into the philosophy of British history, and will therefore, if we can perform it satisfactorily, demand a rather more than ordinary portion of attention, on the part both of our readers and of ourselves.

We use the term "aristocracy" in a somewhat extended signification; and as we shall for the most part adhere to that use of it, we are under the necessity of expounding somewhat carefully the sense we thus attach to it, and of requesting our readers to bestow attention enough upon this explanation to retain it in their memory for future purposes. We do not use it in the mere sense of a titled nobility; nor in that of the families possessed of large fortunes. These are connected circumstances, but of secondary, rather than primary import. Wherever a government is not so constituted as to exist solely for the good of the community, aggregately considered, its powers are distributed into a certain number of hands, in some cases bearing a greater, in some a less proportion to the whole community; but a number always small in comparison with the population at large. This body, sharing among them the powers of government, and sharing among themselves also the profits of misrule, we denominate the aristocratical body; and by this term, or the aristocratical class, or in one word, the aristocracy, we shall be careful to distinguish them. The comparatively small number possessing political power compose the real aristocracy, by whatever circumstances, birth, or riches, or other accident, the different portions of them become possessed of it.

The aristocracy in some countries consists almost entirely of the lords of the soil. This in former times was the case in almost all the countries of Europe. And in those which have made the smallest progress in knowledge and civilisation, it is to a great degree the case at the present moment. In countries still more sunk in barbarism, as in Turkey, and in most Asiatic

countries, the military hordes compose almost the whole of the efficient aristocracy, and are not hereditary. In our own country, the aristocracy is a motley body; and it imports us to be familiarly acquainted with the ingredients of the compound. If we assent to the doctrine of the Edinburgh Review, — and we are willing, for the present, to take it upon their showing, — we must conclude that the powers of government are centered in the House of Commons, and are there substantially and ultimately exercised. * If this be the case, it is only necessary to enquire, of whom the House of Commons is composed, and by whom the members are sent there; because in their hands, of course, the powers of government are efficiently lodged. It will not be necessary for us to go into the minute details, or indeed into any disputed subjects. For the conclusions which concern our present purpose the broad and incontrovertible matters of fact will suffice. The owners of the great landed estates have the principal influence in sending members into the House of Commons. They possess the representation of the counties exclusively. The members for the counties (Middlesex has more of the nature of a town) are returned by a combination among the leading families, and commonly by a compromise between the two parties, the one being a Whig and the other a Tory. In respect to the boroughs it is not necessary that we should descend to a particular enumeration. Mere notoriety will suffice for our present purpose. That a large proportion of them are in the hands of the same great families, either to nominate or effectually to influence the return of the members, will not be denied; because men in their senses do not make affirmations with respect to matters of fact which every body who knows them possesses sufficient grounds to deny.

There is a certain number of the boroughs, the constitution of which is such, that the electors find it for their interest to sell their votes on each occasion to the highest bidder. It is proper, though it is somewhat of a deviation from the present purpose, to remark, that this class of the boroughs is a general subject of vituperation, to those who, from their influence as landed proprietors, determine the election in counties, and in the boroughs over which their influence extends. Unhappily their influence sets the fashion in morality as well as in dress; and their long-continued cries have made it be regarded as peculiarly infamous in the electors in boroughs to sell their votes. But why should it be more infamous in a poor elector to sell his vote in a borough, than for a rich lord of the soil to sell his vote in par-

* Vol. x. pp. 411, 412. &c.; and vol. xiv. pp. 287. 300. &c.

liament? "Why is the one traffic infamous, the other honourable?" For this reason, and this alone, that the great men influence public opinion more than the little men: the case would otherwise have been directly the reverse; the conduct of the rich lord would have been the most infamous, as in degree it is unquestionably the most highly mischievous. The case of the elector in the borough who sells his vote to the highest bidder, and that of the man who in a borough or a county gives it habitually to the lord, are essentially the same. Each, with little or no regard to the fitness of the man for whom the vote is given, follows his own interest. The elector who places his vote habitually at the disposal of his landlord, does so because his landlord could, and he fears would, do him injury, if he acted otherwise. The elector who takes money for his vote, does so for the immediate benefit which it yields. It is the part of men who are not legislators, but drivellers, to whine against people for following their interest. In legislation the only enquiry is, how to make the interest of men and their duty coincide. What we desire is, to place the right of voting for members of parliament on such a footing, that it shall not be for the interest of the voter to give his suffrage from any other motive than the verdict of his conscience, preferring the fittest man. And for that we are called Radicals, and other names intended to be opprobrious, by those whose interest it is that the right of voting should never be placed on any better than the present foundation.

To return to the mode in which the boroughs, so constituted as to make it the interest of the electors to sell their votes to the highest bidder, affect the composition of the British aristocracy; —it is evident that they open a door of admission into the governing body to monied men.—Such men, in considerable numbers, do by such means, as well as by what is called the purchase of a borough, that is, of the means of intimidation over the wretched electors, originally possessed by some neighbouring lord of the soil, become members of the House of Commons; and thus the class of monied men become sharers in the possession of the powers of government, and form a portion, though a minor, and hence a subordinate, portion, of the aristocracy of England.

In the composition of the aristocracy of England, the importance of its two props deserves much and careful consideration. Its two props are, the Church, and the Law; by the Law, we mean here the professional body.

We need not lengthen our investigation by representing the influence which religion exercises over the minds of men. It will be allowed to be great. It is evident of what importance it

is to an aristocracy, that is, a small number, exercising, and for their own advantage, power over the great number, to be able to turn this influence, the influence of religion, to their own purposes. It is manifest how great a support to their power they may derive from it. Now it is obvious, that the short and effectual method of being able to turn the influence of religion to their own purposes, is to obtain an influence over the teachers of religion. It is equally easy to discover a sure expedient for their obtaining an influence over the teachers of religion. It is to form them into a corporate and dependent body, with gradation of emoluments and power, from something small, to something very great; retaining the nomination to the enjoyment of those emoluments principally in their hands, and admitting the body to a share in the power and profits of the aristocracy. In the aristocracy of England, accordingly, the church, or the organised priesthood of the state, is to be regarded as a real and efficient part. Of the mode in which it acts as a portion of the aristocracy, and receives its share of the profits of misrule, the details must be left for future opportunities.

As the security for person and property, the things most dear to men, depends upon the law, to be sure of possessing the requisite knowledge of the law, is to every individual a matter of the last importance. If the law were as simple and clear as it might be made, every man of competent understanding might have all the knowledge of it requisite for his guidance and security. But where the law has been rendered exceedingly complex and obscure, nobody understands it but those who devote themselves professionally to the study of it. The class of lawyers become, in such circumstances, a class of very great importance. Men look to their knowledge as the principal ground of their security; they acquire a habit of trusting to them in almost every important transaction of their lives. In proportion as they have much to risk, that is, in proportion as they are rich; and in proportion as they are timid, that is, averse to run risks;—they fall into a state of absolute dependance upon the lawyers. It is evident from this explanation, that as it is of great importance to the aristocracy to be able to use the influence of the teachers of religion for their own purposes, it is of great importance to them also, to be able to use the influence of the lawyers for their own purposes. To this end they are obliged to admit them to a requisite share in all the advantages of the aristocracy. It is known to every body how unintelligible a mass the English law is; how extensive a sway the tribe of lawyers exercise over the actions of their countrymen; and to how considerable a share in all the distinctions of the aristocracy, and all the profits of misrule, they are

admitted. Details we reserve for occasions as they arise. The general facts, as we have stated them, are too notorious to admit of dispute. Accordingly, the share, which the Church and the Law are treated with, in the good things of the aristocracy, insures their strenuous exertions in its support; and, at all times, whatever is noxious in aristocratical opinions and prejudices has had the great majority of both those bodies for its zealous supporters: all those doctrines which have for their object to secure the interests of the great number against the usurpations of the small number, and all the individuals who promote those doctrines, have been, at all times, to the great majority of lawyers and churchmen, the objects of the most bitter persecution.

From the developments which we have thus afforded, we think a pretty clear conception of what is meant by the aristocracy of this country, politically considered, may easily be drawn. The more efficient part of it is undoubtedly that small number of leading families, probably not two hundred in all, which return a majority of the members of the House of Commons. This oligarchy is really and truly the governing power of the country. This governing power, like other governing powers, is obliged to make sacrifices to convenience; and in order to have instruments, and secure the services of those who would be dangerous enemies, is constrained to make a partnership concern, and to deal out certain minor shares: those are the shares of the monied interest, the church, and the law. Men of talent, as a class, have been sometimes represented as a constituent part of the House of Commons, and thence of the aristocracy; but, we think, erroneously. If they come in independently, by the purchase of a seat, they come in as monied men. If they come in as the nominees of this or the other great landlord, they come in as mere attornies of the aristocracy. They are servants in an office; they are not a part of the aristocracy, any more than their butlers or stewards.

We are now drawing to a close with that development which we have deemed necessary, as enabling us to characterise two publications which are addressed to the aristocracy of this country, and which, notwithstanding their agreement in this leading circumstance, exhibit so much diversity in their more obvious appearances.

There is only one particular more into the analysis of which, as a preliminary explanation, it will be necessary for us to enter. The aristocracy of this country are naturally, in their political proceedings, divided, under the guidance of their interests, into two sections. The Quarterly Review follows the one section: the Edinburgh Review follows the other. The

one of these sections is commonly known under the title of the ministerial party. The other is known under that of the opposition party. What are the interests which preside over the formation of the ministerial party are sufficiently obvious; and as they are in general correctly estimated, we are under no inducement to spend many words in explaining them.

As the benefits, periodically arising from the engrossment of the powers of government in the hands of the few and the consequent employment of them for the benefit of that few, have to be divided; and as the division in this country is confided to a fixed individual, called the King, who thus acts as the head of the aristocratical and governing body to whose interest it is more conducive to give up the division to such a functionary, than to run the risk of those destructive contests, which, but for such an expedient, it would be apt to occasion; — all that part of the aristocracy, who either are satisfied with the share which they receive, or think they have a better chance of such a share by meriting the favour of the present distributors than by any other course they can pursue, range themselves under the King's immediate advisers, and lend their influence to the promotion of all their designs. This class of motives is so obvious, and the operation of them so well understood, that we may now pass to the consideration of the interests which operate to the formation of the other section of the British aristocracy.

To all candid and intelligent readers it is unnecessary to remark, that we are here tracing the interests which predominate in the several situations which it is our object to explain It is obvious, that all enlightened legislation proceeds upon a calculation of those interests, and that it is the business of true philosophy to form that calculation exactly. It is not therefore necessary for us here to enter into the motives of a different sort, which may bear a share in ranging this or that individual in the one or the other party. One man may adhere to the ministry, because he approves of their conduct; another may join the opposition, because the conduct of the ministry appears to him to be wrong. All that is necessary here is, to caution unwary reasoners against allowing those motives which may predominate in the breast of individuals, from occupying that place in their reasonings which belongs to those motives which act upon the class as a class, and by which, as a class, they must be governed. It would be absurd to say that a comparatively small number of men formed into a class by possessing all the powers of government over the great number, and the means of using those powers for their own advantage, will not, as a class, be actuated by the

desire to render that advantage as great as possible. This being admitted, and it being clear that a man would render himself contemptible by denying it, the only care of the rational man is, to ascertain the course of action to which that desire must conduct the class; and having done so, to make it known to others. This is the course which it is now our endeavour to pursue; and our anxiety is to guard our readers against the delusion which is so often practised, of turning away the attention from the consideration of the motives which must govern the class, by holding up to attention the other motives, which always may, and very often do, actuate individuals. There is not a more fertile source of false reasoning, in matters of government, than this.

If, in the class who share among them the powers of government, there is one part who are pleased with the share which they receive of the advantages, or prefer the prospect which they have of sharing under the favour of the existing distributors; there is also, naturally, a part who are not pleased with the share which they receive, and who are willing to prefer any tolerable chance of sharing by other hands. These are they who, in this country, form themselves into what is called the opposition. The interest which actuates the conduct of this section of the aristocracy, are somewhat less obvious, from the modifications they undergo, than those which actuate the ministerial section. The immediate object of the opposition is to effect a change of the hands by which the distribution of the advantages is made — to obtain hands through which their share will be enlarged. The means which these interests prescribe to them for the attainment of this object, afford a clue to the labyrinth of their conduct. The grand expedient for driving a minister from his situation is, to deprive him of support in the House of Commons; to lessen as much as possible the number of those who vote for, increase as much as possible the number of those who vote against him. There are minor expedients, court intrigues, and others, but this is so much the leading and established course, that we may, for the present purpose, overlook the remainder. The plan, therefore, is, to excite disapprobation of the principles and conduct of those who retain the distribution, and to excite approbation of the principles and conduct of those whom they wish to hold it in their stead. In this the Opposition are under the necessity of endeavouring to reconcile courses which are rather opposed to one another.

The primary object, of course, is, to discredit the ministry, and augment the favour of their own leaders with the aristocratical class. But in order to do this the more effectually, it is expedient to

produce as much as possible of the same effects upon the public at large, including the middling and lower classes. Public opinion operates in various ways upon the aristocratical class, partly by contagion, partly by conviction, partly by intimidation: and the principal strength of that current is derived from the greatness of the mass by which it is swelled. It is the interest of the Opposition, therefore, to act, in such a manner, or rather to speak, — for speaking is their action, — so as to gain favour from both the few and the many. This they are obliged to endeavour by a perpetual system of compromise, a perpetual trimming between the two interests. To the aristocratical class they aim at making it appear, that the conduct of their leaders would be more advantageous even to that class, than the conduct of the ministry, which they paint in colours as odious to the aristocracy as they can. On the other hand, to gain the favour of the popular class, they are obliged to put forth principles which appear to be favourable to their interests, and to condemn such measures of conduct as tend to injure the many for the benefit of the few. In their speeches and writings, therefore, we commonly find them playing at *seesaw*. If a portion of the discourse has been employed in recommending the interests of the people, another must be employed in recommending the interests of the aristocracy. Having spoken a while on the one side, they must speak a while on the other. Having written a few pages on the one side, they must write as many on the other. It matters not how much the one set of principles are really at variance with the other, provided the discordance is not very visible, or not likely to be clearly seen by the party on whom it is wished that the delusion should pass.

In this game, of aristocratical, and popular, it is sufficiently evident on which side, at last, the winnings remain. There are two sufficient reasons which determine the point. In the first place, it is the aristocracy through whose decision exclusively the object of the Opposition must be attained, — that of ejecting the ministerial party, and giving possession to them. They must, therefore, be very careful not to excite any suspicion that they are in reality less favourable to the aristocratical side of the account than those whom they wish to supplant. And, therefore, whatever the zeal of which they make show in favour of the people, it must still appear to the aristrocacy, that it bears upon no points of which they have any occasion to be afraid; that it leads to the diminution of none of the advantages which the monopoly of the powers of government bestows upon them. There is another, and a perfectly sufficient reason in favour of the same tendency, that the opposition themselves are a section

of the aristocracy; a section that wishes, and hopes, to be the leading section; and which, therefore, cannot be expected to aim at the diminution of advantages which are its own.

From this development of the interests and views of the two sections of the aristocracy in this country, it is clearly seen what may be expected to be the aim and tendency of the publications, particularly periodical, which look for success to the favour and applause of the one or the other. Those on the ministerial side have, as far as the interests of the aristocracy are concerned, a more simple course to pursue. They advocate them directly, and with enthusiasm, affected, or real. The aristocracy are spoken of as the country. Whenever the interests of the country are named, it is the interests of the aristocracy that are meant. The aristocracy are all in all. Compared with them, every thing is of trifling importance. With respect to the interests of the ministerial section, the business of the writers on that side is, to beat down the pretensions both of the opposition section of the aristocracy, and of the people. The people are represented as altogether vile, and any desires which they may exhibit to see the powers of government so disposed of, that they may have some security that these powers shall not be employed for the benefit of the aristocracy at their expense, as inconceivably wicked; as contrary, above all things, to religion; also contrary to law, and to order. The opposition section of the aristocracy are arraigned on two accounts; first, as attaching blame to the ministers for factious purposes, namely, to put their leaders in, and the ministers out, without being able to show, that the conduct of the ministers is not as good for the country, that is, the aristocracy, as that of the opposition leaders would be; and secondly, a still more dreadful odium is endeavoured to be cast upon them, by representing the professions which they are obliged to make in favour of the people as acts of support to these hideous pretensions of the people about securities for good government, which tend to the overthrow of the church and the state.

The course which is necessary to be pursued, by such periodical publications as adopt the vocation of promoting the cause of the opposition section of the aristocracy, will be easily understood, after what has been already said, without many words for its elucidation. The seesaw of the party must be recommended; and the more of skill and pains is bestowed upon this object, the more of approbation may be expected. It is called the middle course. Every art is used to gain it reputation, under the title of moderation, and by the application of bad names to the two sets of opinions, between which the party oscillates, and which it is in reality putting forward by turns. The set of opinions, purely on

the side of aristocratical power, are called despotical. Those which support the demand of effectual securities in favour of the people are declared anarchical, and are commonly stigmatised by some nickname in the slang of the day; jacobinical, for instance, at one time; radical, at another. They have a method worth observing, by which they prove that the party holds a middle course; by which term *middle* they always desire to be understood *wise*. When the people blame the party as aristocratical, and produce actual declarations of opinion on the part of its leaders which go the full length of the aristocratical pretensions, the writers ask how you can misinterpret their words so far, when they can produce you other declarations of opinion which go to as great an extent in favour of the popular demands. This proceeding they reverse, when charged as democratical, on the part of the aristocracy. They do not allow that two contradictory opinions on one and the same point, destroy one another, and should be regarded as no opinion at all. They hold that two contradictory opinions are good for nothing, each of them by itself; but that, both together, they form another nice opinion, exactly in the middle way between both.

It is essential, in writing upon this plan, to deal as much as possible in vague language, and cultivate the skilful use of it. Words which appear to mean much, and may by those to whom they are addressed be interpreted to mean much, but which may also, when it suits the convenience of those who have used them, be shown to mean little or nothing, are of singular importance to those whose business it is to play the game of compromise, to trim between irreconcileable interests, to seesaw between contradictory opinions.

Language of this description is peculiarly needed in making declarations which are meant to gain favour with the people. A party which is itself a section of the aristocracy, which desires to please the aristocracy, and by means of pleasing them to become the distributors of the good things which the possession of the powers of the government bestows upon the aristocracy, risk nothing by speaking explicitly in favour of their privileges. What is requisite is to have vague terms at command, when it is necessary to speak in opposition to these privileges. Aristocratical domination, in the abstract, may be spoken of as something exceedingly hateful, or pregnant with the worst of consequences. The people may be exhorted to be on their guard against it. They may even be told that the ministers have no other object than to introduce it; and that this alone is a sufficient reason for hating them, and for using every exertion to turn them out. In the meantime, great care must be used not

to remove any part of the veil which conceals from the view of the people, the real amount of aristocratical power in this country. When any specific measure is proposed, which would really operate to the diminution of that power, — choosing the members of parliament by ballot, for instance, — it must be loudly decried, and every thing must be done to attach to it, if possible, the apprehension of evil consequences. On the other hand, if a measure is proposed which has the appearance of being calculated to diminish the power of the aristocracy, but which in reality has no such tendency, perhaps the very reverse, such as the disfranchisement of the boroughs called rotten, giving the representation to the counties, then the epithets of praise must be collected. The man who brings forward such a measure as this, must be hailed as the first of men; the man who should accomplish it, must be described as the most happy.

One important part of the business of writers on the side of the opposition section of the aristocracy, one of the qualities by which they can most effectually recommend themselves, is, being ingenious in the invention of schemes of this description; schemes which may have the appearance to the people of being calculated to add to their securities, but which would, even if accomplished, leave the power of the aristocracy untouched. Of this class of plans one example is seen in that which we have already mentioned, diminishing the number of borough members to augment that of county members. Another example is seen in the doctrine about representation by classes; by which it is attempted to persuade the people, that they have securities enough, provided every class is represented in the House of Commons; that is to say, the landed interest represented, the mercantile interest represented, the army, the navy, the law, the people represented; though it should appear that the people have no real, efficient control over one man in this composition; that they have not the choice of so much as six, out of six hundred; and that even a bare majority, chosen and influenced by the aristocracy, would determine in the long run, and on the real balance of the account, the nature of the government.

Having thus seen what are the motives which operate upon the two sets of periodical writers who address themselves to the two sections of the aristocracy, we have anticipated much of the general matter which will be applicable in criticising, in detail, the Edinburgh and the Quarterly Reviews. We have already stated, that the Edinburgh Review is addressed to the aristocracy on the side of the opposition section; the Quarterly Review is addressed to it on the side of the ministerial section. We shall see in our progress how truly they have obeyed the

springs which we have represented as operating generally upon the conduct of publications produced in similar circumstances.

It will be understood that we have been speaking of the political part of these two publications; including, in the political pale, the two props of the aristocratical polity, the political religion of the country, and the law, in both senses of the term. As to the literature of the Quarterly and Edinburgh Reviews, in the more confined sense of the term,—the poetry, and other works of imagination and entertainment, the mathematics, chemistry, and so on,—these publications have lain under no peculiar bias from situation; and the goodness or badness of their articles on these subjects must be ascribed to the accidental qualities, moral or intellectual, of the writers. As far as their criticisms on these subjects may appear worthy of notice, they will be reviewed in other departments of this section of our work.

One word of a personal nature seems to be required. We have described the interests which operate to withdraw periodical writers from the line of utility, and we have represented it as nearly impossible for them to keep true to it. What! Are we, it may be asked, superior to seducements to which all other men succumb? If periodical writing is by its nature so imbued with evil, why is it that we propose to add to the supply of a noxious commodity? Do we promise to keep out the poison which all other men yield to the temptation of putting in? If we made such a pretension, our countrymen would do right in laughing it to scorn; and we hope they would not fail to adopt so proper a course. We have no claim to be trusted, any more than any one among our contemporaries: but we have a claim to be tried. Men have diversities of taste; and it is not impossible that a man should exist who really has a taste for the establishment of the securities for good government, and would derive more pleasure from the success of this pursuit, than of any other pursuit in which he could engage, wealth or power not excepted. All that we desire is, that it may not be reckoned impossible that we may belong to a class of this description.

There is another motive, as selfish as that which we ascribe to any body, by which we may be actuated. We may be sanguine enough, or silly enough, or clear-sighted enough, to believe, that intellectual and moral qualities have made a great progress among the people of this country; and that the class who will really approve endeavours, in favour of good government, and of the happiness and intelligence of men, are a class sufficiently numerous to reward our endeavours. No matter what our motives may be, the public will soon see whether our actions continue true to the ends which we profess; and that is all by which their interests can be affected; all, therefore, about which they need to care.

Of the two works which are to form the principal objects of our attention in this department, the Edinburgh, and Quarterly Reviews, we shall begin with the Edinburgh Review, both as it was the first in its commencement, and as it is by far the first in importance.

It originated at Edinburgh in the social studies of a small number of men, then mostly young, whose pursuits were literary, and who had already excited great expectation of future eminence. The reputation of the parties attracted attention; and the superiority of the performance to the mean articles which then filled the pages of the existing reviews, the novelty of mixing disquisitions of the reviewer with the notice of books, the tone of severity naturally piquant, and the wit and irony by which it was frequently enlivened, go far in accounting for the extensive circulation which it speedily acquired.

When it first appeared, and for some time afterwards, it was not decidedly attached to the opposition section of the aristocracy. At that time indeed the opposition party had only begun to effect a resurrection from that inhumation which it suffered from the aristocratical terrors engendered by the French revolution. It showed, however, from the beginning, that disposition to compromise which suited exactly the purposes of an opposition section, as soon as it renewed its strength. At first the seesaw was performed between those opinions which were necessary for obtaining the favour of the aristocracy, and those opinions which had obtained the sanction of philosophy, and which, without renouncing the character of philosophers, men could not abjure. To obtain, if possible, the good opinion of both aristocrats and philosophers, the doctrines of both were put forth. High examples, in this country, had already been set, and most successfully, of this species of authorcraft. With as servile doctrines as ever had been propagated under the guise of law, Sir William Blackstone, in his Commentaries, had mixed a portion of the liberal opinions which philosophy had not only sanctioned, but to which at that time, preceding the French revolution, it had given reputation and fashion. The other instructive example to which we allude, is that of Paley, in his Principles of Moral and Political Philosophy; where, with many liberal doctrines, to which the progress of the human mind had given birth, there is a predominating mixture of opinions, the object and tendency of which is to keep the human mind for ever shackled and debased. And to this mixture, there is no doubt that a great portion of the splendid success of these celebrated works is to be ascribed.

In proof of this observation with respect to the Edinburgh

Review, we may appeal to the first article in the first number. It is a Review of *Mounier, de l'Influence des Philosophes.* For the aristocrats, a great part of it is in the Antijacobin tone; concurring with the fashionable opinion, that of the Revolution and all its imputed evils, the cause is in a great measure to be ascribed to the philosophers. For the philosophical part of the public, again, a portion of it is employed in representing philosophy as perhaps the foremost among the causes of good. We quote but one passage:—

'That there were defects and abuses, and some of these very gross too, in the old system of government in France, we presume will scarcely be denied. That it was lawful to wish for their removal will probably be as readily admitted; and that the peaceful influence of philosophy, while confined to this object, was laudably and properly exerted, seems to follow as a necessary conclusion. It would not be easy, therefore, to blame those writers who have confined themselves to a dispassionate and candid statement of the advantages of a better institution; and it must seem hard to involve in the guilt of Robespierre and the Jacobins, those persons in France who aimed at nothing more than the abolition of absurd privileges, and the limitation of arbitrary power. Montesquieu, Turgot, and Raynal, were probably, in some degree, dissatisfied with the government of their country, and would have rejoiced in the prospect of a reform; but it can only be the delirium of party prejudice that would suspect them of wishing for the downfal of royalty, and for the proscriptions and equality of a reign of terror. It would be treating their accusers too much like men in their senses, to justify such men any farther on the score of intention: yet it is possible that they may have been instrumental in the Revolution, and that their writings may have begun that motion, that terminated in ungovernable violence. We will not go over the commonplace arguments that may be stated to convict them of imprudence. Every step that is taken towards the destruction of prejudice, is attended with the danger of an opposite excess: but it is no less clearly our duty to advance against prejudices; and they deserve the highest praise who unite the greatest steadiness with the greatest precaution. At the time when the writings we are speaking of were published, there was not a man in Europe who could discern in them the seeds of future danger. So far from denouncing them as the harbingers of regicide and confusion, the public received them as hostages and guides to security. It was long thought that their effects were inadequate to their merits: nothing but the event could have instructed us that it was *too* powerful for our tranquillity. To such men, the reproach of improvidence can be made only because their foresight was not prophetic; and those alone are entitled to call them imprudent, who could have predicted the tempest in the calm, and foretold those consequences by which the whole world has since been astonished.

'If it be true, therefore, that writers of this description have facilitated and promoted the Revolution, it is a truth which should detract

but little either from their merit or their reputation. Their designs were pure and honourable; and the natural tendency and promise of their labours was exalted and fair. They failed, by a fatality which they were not bound to foresee; and a concurrence of events, against which it was impossible for them to provide, turned that to mischief which was planned out by wisdom for good. We do not tax the builder with imprudence, because the fortress which he erected for our protection is thrown down by an earthquake on our heads.

'There is another set of writers, however, for whom it will not be so easy to find an apology, who, instead of sober reasoning and practical observation, have intruded upon the public with every species of extravagance and absurdity. The presumptuous theories and audacious maxims of Rousseau, Mably, Condorcet, &c. had a necessary tendency to do harm. They unsettled all the foundations of political duty, and taught the citizens of every existing community that they were enslaved and had the power of being free. M. Mounier has too much moderation himself, to approve of the doctrines of these reformers; but he assures us, that instead of promoting the revolution, it was the revolution that raised him into celebrity; that they rose into reputation, after it became necessary to quote them as apologists or authorities; but that, before that time, their speculations were looked upon as brilliant absurdities, that no more deserved a serious confutaion, than the Polity of Plato, or the Utopia of Sir Thomas More.— With all our respect for M. Mounier, we have some difficulty in believing this assertion. Rousseau, in particular, was universally read and admired, long before he was exalted into the Revolutionary Pantheon; and his political sagacity must have had some serious admirers, when he was himself invited to legislate for an existing community. Whatever influence he had, however, was unquestionably pernicious; and though some apology may be found for him in the enthusiasm of his disordered imagination, he is chargeable with the highest presumption, and the most blameable imprudence. Of some of the other writers who have inculcated the same doctrines, we must speak rather in charity than in justice, if we say nothing more severe.'

We must leave this passage, though it is plausibly worded, to speak for itself. That Raynal should be enumerated among the sober-minded writers, Condorcet among the inflammatory, must surprise any one who has read them. Though two classes of writers are here spoken of, one with praise, the other with blame, it is really not easy to say to which of them, in point of consequence, the greatest quantity of evil is ascribed.

Observe, however, the real doctrine. It is laudable to put forth such writings as those of Montesquieu, Turgot, and Raynal: this is for the philosophers. It is wicked to put forth such writings as those of Rousseau, Mably, and Condorcet: this is for the aristocrats. — Observe also the implied consequence of what is here said, the restraint upon

freedom of discussion which is covertly recommended. To put forth enlarged theories respecting government, pointing out what is really necessary to afford securities to the people, and how much, under every existing government, those securities are wanting, ought to be prohibited. "Presumptuous theories and audacious maxims have a necessary tendency to do harm." But who is to judge what theories are presumptuous, what maxims audacious? All must be permitted, or none; or government, that is, the party interested against the people, must judge. Upon what principle the classification of the writers is made, it would be absurd to attempt to divine. Any classification answered the purpose of seesaw. It was enough to have one cluster to praise, another to blame.

There is another remarkable specimen of the seesaw, in the same number.

'In a subsequent part of his pamphlet, Mr. Godwin sets the doctrine of the particular and general affections in so clear and masterly a light, and in a manner so very superior to any thing we find in Dr. Parr's sermon on the same subject, that we have great pleasure in laying the passage before our readers.

'"For, after all, though I admit that the assiduities we employ for our children ought to be, and must be, the result of private and domestic affections, yet it is not these affections that determine them to be virtuous. They must, as has been already said, be brought to a standard, and tried by a criterion of virtue.

'"This criterion has been above described, and it is not perhaps of the utmost importance whether we call it utility, or justice, or, more periphrastically, the production of the greatest general good, the greatest public sum of pleasurable sensation. Call it by what name you please, it will still be true, that this is the law by which our actions must be tried. I must be attentive to the welfare of my child; because he is one in the great congregation of the family of the whole earth. I must be attentive to the welfare of my child; because I can, in many portions of the never-ceasing current of human life, be conferring pleasure and benefit on him, when I cannot be directly employed in conferring benefit on others. I best understand his character and his wants; I possess a greater power of modelling his disposition and influencing his fortune; and, as was observed in Political Justice (p. 132.), he is the individual, in the great distribution of the class needing superintendance and supply among the class capable of affording them, whom it falls to my lot to protect and cherish. I do not require that, when a man is employed in benefitting his child, he should constantly recollect the abstract principle of utility; but I do maintain, that his actions in prosecuting that benefit are no further virtuous than in proportion as they square with that principle."'

This is going a great way for philosophy. What follows is a devout offering at the shrine of aristocratical bigotry and insolence.

'Aware of the very superior manner in which Mr. Godwin's complaint is now accustomed to be treated, we had great hopes, upon reading so far, that a radical cure had been effected: but we had no sooner entered upon his remarks on population, than this pleasing delusion was dispelled, and we were convinced it was a case for life. The great expedients which this philosopher has in store to counteract the bad effects of excessive population (so ably pointed out by Mr. Malthus), are, abortion and child-murder. In gratitude for these noble remedies of social disorder, may we take the liberty of suggesting to Mr. Godwin, the infinite importance of shaving and blistering the crown of his head, of keeping the *primæ viæ* open, and of strictly pursuing an antiphlogistic regimen. By these means we have sometimes seen the understandings of great philosophers wonderfully and rapidly improved.'

There is one doctrine, to which we shall have frequent occasion to advert, because it is a favourite with the Edinburgh Review. It is a doctrine expected to please both aristocracy and people; and ample use is accordingly made of it. The doctrine is, that irregular and tumultuary ebullitions of the people in favour of liberty, are of singular importance.

It is not from such irrational effervescence, that the aristocracy have any thing to fear. It is not a mobbing populace that can act with perseverance and consistency sufficient to overcome the defences which guard the undue powers of an aristocracy. If, then, the people can be gulled, by these false demonstrations of liberty, into a belief that they possess good government, the security of the aristocracy is increased; and the doctrine which leads to support this delusion, is a doctrine entirely to their taste.

On the other hand, by pompous talking about the public spirit of the people, about independence of mind, and so forth, displayed and generated in the turbulence of an election, it is expected that the vanity of the people will be piqued; and that they will be persuaded to believe they are something, by that which effectually proves they are nothing. The passage where we find this doctrine first set forth in the Edinburgh Review, is an early one. It is in the first volume (p. 384.), in the article on *Dernieres Vuës de Politique et de Finance par M. Neckar.*

'The only foundation of political liberty is the spirit of the people; and the only circumstance which makes a lively impression upon their senses, and powerfully reminds them of their importance, their power, and their rights, is the periodical choice of their representatives. How easily that spirit may be totally extinguished, and of the degree of abject fear and slavery to which the human race may be reduced for ages, every man of reflection is sufficiently aware; and he knows that the preservation of that feeling is, of all other objects of political science, the most delicate and the most difficult. It appears to us, that a people who did not choose their representatives, but only those

who chose their representatives, would very soon become indifferent to their elections altogether. To deprive them of their power of nominating their own candidate would be still worse. The eagerness of the people to vote is kept alive by their occasional expulsion of a candidate who has rendered himself objectionable, or the adoption of one who knows how to render himself agreeable to them. They are proud of being solicited *personally* by a man of family or wealth. The uproar even, and the confusion and the clamour of a popular election in England, have their use: they give a stamp to the names *Liberty*, *Constitution*, and *People:* they infuse sentiments which nothing but violent passions, and gross objects of sense *could* infuse; and which would never exist, perhaps, if the sober constituents were to sneak, one by one, into a notary's office to deliver their votes for a representative, or were to form the first link in that long chain of causes and effects, which, in this compound kind of elections, ends with choosing a member of Parliament.'

The first article in the second volume is a specimen of the sacrifices which are made to the taste of the aristocracy. It is almost wholly antijacobin. It is a review of the work entitled *Etat de l'Europe*, by that instrument of the Holy Alliance, Gentz. It is an elaborate display, and a general adoption, of his views, respecting the admirable governments and the prosperous condition, of the several countries of Europe, before the French Revolution; and respecting the weakness in the design, and the misery in the effects, of that great convulsion. "There was nothing in the internal situation of the European kingdoms that required such a stormy reformation, as the Revolution threatened to accomplish; and this revolution, so far from being the last link in a long chain of disasters and abuses, was, in fact, a most grievous and unexpected interruption to their career of prosperity, and can in no degree be justified by the pretended disorder and desperation of their affairs." Even in this article the other scale is not entirely forgotten. Something is thrown into it by a pointed condemnation of that popular object of attack, the partition of Poland.

A most singular species of morality is preached in the Edinburgh Review, at times: as, for instance, in the article on Belsham's Philosophy of the Mind, in the first volume.

'Mr. Belsham has one short argument, that whatever is true cannot be hurtful. It is the motto of his title-page, and is afterwards repeated, with equal emphasis, at every time of need. "If the doctrine be true," he contends, "the diffusion of it can do no harm. It is an established and undeniable principle, that truth must be favourable to virtue." (P. 312.) To us, however, this principle, instead of being undeniable, has always appeared the most questionable of postulates. In the declamation of Plato, or the poetry of Akenside, we admit it with little scruple, because we do not read

Plato or Akenside for the truths they may chance to contain; but we always feel more than scepticism, when we are assailed by it in a treatise of pure philosophy: nor can we account for an almost universal assent it has received, from any other circumstance, than the profession and habits of the first teachers of morals in our schools, and of the greater number of their successors. It was a maxim of religion, before it became a maxim of philosophy; though, even as a religious maxim, it formed a very inconsistent part of the optimism in which it was combined. The Deity wills happiness; he loves truth: truth therefore must be productive of good. Such is the reasoning of the optimist. But he forgets, that, in his system, error too must have been *beneficial*, because error *has been*; and that the employment of falsehood for the production of good, cannot be more unworthy of the Divine Being, than the acknowledged employment of famine and murder for the same purpose. There is, therefore, nothing in the abstract consideration of truth and Deity, which justifies the adoption of such a maxim; and as little is it justified by our practical experience. In the small events of that familiar and hourly intercourse which forms almost the whole of human life, how much is happiness increased by the general adoption of a system of concerted and limited deceit! for it is either in that actual falsehood, which must, as falsehood, be productive of evil, or in the suppression of that truth, which, as truth, must have been productive of good, that the chief happiness of civilized *manners* consists; and he from whose doctrine it flows, that we are to be in no case hypocrites, would, in mere manners, reduce us to a degree of barbarism beyond that of the rudest savage, who, in the simple hospitalities of his hut, or the ceremonial of the public assemblies of his tribe, has still some courtesies, which he fulfils with all the exactness of polite dissimulation. In the greater events of life, how often might the advantage of erroneous belief be felt! If, for example, it were a superstition of every mind, that the murderer, immediately on the perpetration of his guilt, must himself expire by sympathy, a new motive would be added to the side of virtue; and the only circumstance to be regretted would be, not that the falsehood would produce effect, since that effect could be only serviceable, but that perhaps the good effect would not be of long duration, as it would be destroyed for ever by the rashness of the first daring experimenter. The visitation of the murderer by the nightly ghost, which exists in the superstition of so many countries, and which forms a great part of that complex and unanalysed horror with which the crime continues to be considered after the belief of the superstition itself has ceased, has probably been of more service to mankind than the truths of all the sermons that have been preached on the corresponding prohibition in the Decalogue. It is unfortunate that with this beneficial awe unnecessary horrors have been connected; for the *place* continues to be haunted, as well as the *person*; and the dread of our infancy is thus directed, rather to the supernatural appearance, than to the crime. But if superstition could exist, and be modified, at the will of an enlightened legislator, so as to be deprived of its terrors to the

innocent, and turned wholly against the guilty, we know no principle of our nature on which it would be so much for the interest of mankind to operate. It would be a species of prohibitive religion, more impressive, at the moment of beginning crime, than religion itself; because its penalties would be more conceivable and immediate. Innumerable cases may be imagined, in which other errors of belief would be of moral advantage; and we may therefore assume, as *established and undeniable*, that there is nothing in the nature of truth which makes it *necessarily* good; that, in the greater number of instances, truth is beneficial; but that, of the whole number of truths and falsehoods, a certain number are productive of good, and others of evil. To which number any particular truth or falsehood belongs, must be shown, in the usual way, by reasonings of direct experience or analogy; and hence, *in a question of utility*, the demonstration of mere logical truth cannot justly be adduced as superseding the necessity of other inquiries. Even though the contrary of that postulate which Mr. Belsham has assumed could not have been shown from *other* cases, it would not *therefore* have been applicable, without proof, to the great questions which he discusses; for these questions comprehend all the truths that are of most importance in human life, which are thus the very truths from which the justness of the assumed principle is most fully to be demonstrated or denied.'

We shall hereafter have various occasions to examine this doctrine, and to show the applications of which it is found to be susceptible, in defiance of all the jesuitry of party. We may leave it safely, at present, when we cannot afford so many words as would be necessary for its exposure, to the reflections of our readers. The public mind has now certainly got beyond this standard of ethics. On the other side, the actions consecrated as virtues by the prevailing cant, whether they have or have not any connection with the sources of human happiness, are spoken of with a reverence truly edifying: as in the article in this same volume on M. Neckar's *Reflections sur la Divorce*, where the ancients are considered very immoral for not including all the conditions, included by us, in the marriage contract; as also in the article on Madame de Stael's Delphine, in the second volume, where we may remark, by the way, the singular contrast between the mode in which the same lady is there treated, and in an article in a subsequent volume, in which we shall hereafter see she is held up as nearly the first of all human beings. At the latter period, however, she was in England, and in fashion too, especially with the opposition part of the fashionable world. In 1803, about ten years preceding the laudation, the language was as follows: —

'This dismal trash, which has nearly dislocated the jaws of every critic among us with gaping, has so alarmed Bonaparte, that he has seized the whole impression, sent Madame de Stael out of Paris, and,

for aught we know, sleeps in a nightcap of steel, and dagger-proof blankets. To us it appears rather an attack against the Ten Commandments, than the government of Bonaparte, and calculated not so much to enforce the rights of the Bourbons, as the benefits of adultery, murder, and a great number of other vices, which have been somehow or other strangely neglected in this country, and too much so (according to the apparent opinion of Madame de Stael) even in France.

'It happens, however, fortunately enough, that her book is as dull as it could have been if her intentions had been good; for wit, dexterity, and the pleasant energies of the mind, seldom rank themselves on the side of virtue and social order; while vice is spiritual, eloquent, and alert, ever choice in expression, happy in allusion, and judicious in arrangement.

'To conclude.—Our general opinion of this book is, that it is calculated to shed a mild lustre over adultery; by gentle and convenient gradation, to destroy the modesty and the caution of women; to facilitate the acquisition of easy vices, and encumber the difficulty of virtue. What a wretched qualification of this censure to add, that the badness of the principles is alone corrected by the badness of the style, and that this celebrated lady would have been very guilty, if she had not been very dull!'

The second volume is, we think, distinguished, by its contributions to the aristocratical politics and morality. Among the more remarkable specimens, the article on Belsham's Memoirs of George III. have attracted our attention. We quote the two first paragraphs, to show the indignation with which the writing of party pamphlets under the guise of history is deemed worthy. We presume it will not be reckoned much more laudable to write party pamphlets under the guise of reviews.

'The preceding volumes of this history had created in our minds so little expectation of merit in those which are now presented to the world, that we cannot with propriety say that we have been disappointed. There is a [illegible] in the very title-page of this work; for if the reader expects to find in the "Memoirs [illegible] Reign of George III." any thing like an history of that period, he will find himself dolefully mistaken. By the illiberality, party spirit, and intemperate ardour for the propagation of his political opinions, which Mr. Belsham displays, he has forfeited the title of historian, for the more appropriate, though less respectable, name of zealot, or pamphleteer. The bitter and licentious spirit in which he had indulged his pen throughout his former volumes, has now risen to a height more intolerable to the reader and disgraceful to the writer. It appears that Mr. Belsham's habits of writing, like all other evil habits, increase in virulence, in proportion as they proceed; and unless the wholesome discipline of criticism be administered, the press may, at some future day, groan under a still more highly accumulated mass of personal abuse and intolerant zeal.

'By stripping these volumes, however, of their title to the rank of history, to which they have assuredly no more claim than a book made up of political registers and party pamphlets can pretend to, we have greatly abridged to ourselves the unpleasant task of censure; and by thus bringing their merits and defects to the decision of an inferior standard, we have allowed greater latitude to the author's eccentric excursions, and greater indulgence to his violations of decency and propriety. It may be proper, however, to hint, that the former are always observable, when a low factious citizen comes under the cognizance of the law; and the latter, whenever a prime minister, a Tory, or an alarmist, is honoured by a mention in his annals.'

Observe with attention the notion relative to freedom of discussion inculcated in the following use of the term "libellous."

'After detailing the principal articles of the petition for reform of Parliament, presented by the "Society of the Friends of the People," this libellous oracle thus delivers itself:—

'"Whoever reads this celebrated petition, and still retains the opinion, that the Parliamentary representation of this kingdom needs no reform, may be regarded as in a state of mind far beyond the reach of facts or of argument."'

When it is remembered what that petition was—a petition to be allowed to prove at the bar of the House, a fact which is in reality too notorious to be denied, that a decided majority of the House of Commons is chosen by somewhat less than two hundred great families; and when the state of mind, which in the teeth of such a fact can deny the need of reform, is described as inaccessible to the evidence of facts or argument;—to hold forth such a description as libellous, that is, according to the law of England, punishable, worthy of fine and imprisonment, is to propagate a doctrine, the character of which we wish not to pronounce.

We request attention to the acts which in the following passage are presented to the reader under the title of "exertions" of government.

We admire, too, the lofty and contemptuous style in which Mr. Belsham treats the exertions of government at that period.

'"Notwithstanding the great predominance of the spirit of loyalty, and the numberless addresses of duty and allegiance transmitted from all parts of the united kingdom, and the perfect security of the government, a mean and merciless spirit of revenge displayed itself in the prosecution and punishment of very many petty offenders, accused of the vague and indefinable crime of sedition—amongst whom were several printers and booksellers; so that it became extremely dangerous to publish any tract or pamphlet reflecting in any manner upon the measures of government: and the liberty of the press was silently and virtually annihilated."'

We should have been happy to find something in this volume,

which we could have placed in the popular, to balance the mighty weight in the opposite scale; but after turning over the pages with some attention, we have found nothing that would answer the purpose. This, be it remembered, was a period in which the aristocratical tide was running very high. When the war was just renewed with France, when the courage of volunteering, and the fear of a French invasion, were the passions of the day, aristocratical opinions alone were a marketable commodity.

It is curious to observe on what occasions the Edinburgh Review sometimes chooses to introduce a favourite portion of the aristocratical creed: the occasion, for example, of Bishop Watson's proposal for paying the national debt, where is inculcated the importance of keeping a large fund of the matter of corruption at the disposal of the crown.

'Besides, we confess that, sincere as our attachment is to the ancient privileges of the people, we cannot contemplate, without some alarm, so sudden a shock as the power of the crown must necessarily receive by the change. We can call the projected reduction of patronage by no other name than a violent change in the balance of the constitution; and this consideration alone should have no small weight with us, in these times, when the unhappy experience of our neighbours has so strongly recommended to practical stafesmen that predilection, which every wholesome theory had long before encouraged, for the most gradual alterations in political systems.'

At this time much respect was professed for the old government of the Bourbons. Mr. Stephens, the author of "A History of the late War," is blamed for calling it tyranny and despotism. Such language is stigmatised as "revolutionary verbiage." In the article on the correspondence of Louis XVI., he is represented as having been always a friend to reform. It is affirmed, that designs against his crown had been avowed from the beginning of the Revolution; and his Christian charity is celebrated in the same sort of strain, commonly denominated cant, as would have become the class of fops described in the article in the first volume on Rennel's Sermons.

'A class of fops not usually designated by that epithet — men clothed in profound black, with large canes, and strange amorphous hats — of big speech, and imperative presence — talkers about Plato — great affecters of senility — despisers of women, and all the graces of life — fierce foes to common sense — abusive of the living, and approving no one who has not been dead for at least a century. Such fops, as vain, and as shallow as their fraternity in Bond-street, differ from these only as Gorgonius differed from Rusillus.'

We pass over the fourth and fifth volumes, which are in much the same spirit with the second and third, except that there seems

a disposition to avoid grappling with any important and tender subject. Political economy, indeed, obtains a due share of attention; and the abolition of the slave trade begins to be recommended, — two subjects upon which the Edinburgh Review has rendered important service. And upon these subjects, as well as upon that of Catholic emancipation, which has been laboriously handled, a remark is required.

These are precisely the description of subjects which suit a publication, pursuing the career which has been pursued by the Edinburgh Review. The hold possessed by the aristocracy upon the powers of government, was not likely to be weakened, by any opinions propagated on the subjects of political economy, and the slave trade; not even on that of Catholic emancipation; for though the anile and priest-ridden portion would certainly make a clamour, and feel apprehension for the consecrated prop, the more manly portion, having some respect for the reputation of good sense, would have little respect for matronly fears, and would neither cry down nor discard a publication which attacked them. These were subjects, therefore, on which a reputation with the liberal, the enlightened, and the disinterested part of the public, might be courted, without risking much with the aristocratical and the prejudiced.

It is curious that at this time the Edinburgh Review forced even political economy occasionally into prostitution to the aristocratical system. An instance is afforded, which we must briefly notice, even in one of the volumes which we said we should overlook.

At the period in question, the favourite object with the aristocracy was the pursuit of war, even with an expenditure which laughed to scorn every other specimen of national prodigality which the world had ever beheld. Towards a new argument in favour of this unparalleled waste, thousands were situated nearly like the Eastern sovereign in respect to a new pleasure; they were ready to give mines for it.

It will not be denied that a bold attempt was made to furnish such an argument in the following memorable passage: —

'But the evils of increasing capital, like the evils of increasing population, are felt long before the case has become extreme; and a nation, it may be observed, is much more likely (at least in the present state of commercial policy) to suffer from increasing wealth than from increasing numbers of people. Are there no checks provided by the constitution of human nature, and the construction of civil society, for the one, as well as for the other of these evils? Mr. Malthus has pointed out the manner in which the principle of population is counteracted; and we apprehend that causes nearly analogous will be found to check the progressive increase of capital. Luxurious

living, and other kinds of unnecessary expenditure — above all, political expenses, and chiefly the expenses of war — appear to us to furnish those necessary checks to the indefinite augmentation of wealth, which there was reason *a priori* to suppose would be somewhere provided by the wise regulations of nature.'

It is not the incorrect political economy which we here mean to expose. Other occasions will present themselves for that purpose. What we wish should obtain attention is, the spirit which is manifested by the declaration, that " a nation, situated as ours, is much more likely to suffer from increasing wealth, than from increasing numbers of people:" and that in such circumstances, the expenses of war are a blessing!

We shall have many occasions to point out where the Edinburgh Review has lavished the language of condemnation upon the extravagance of ministers. Can we contemplate a more perfect specimen of seesaw, than this?

In the sixth volume, and in the year 1805, (we think it material to notice the time) a counterpoise begins to be placed in the popular scale, which had long remained so unequally supplied.

In reviewing Talleyrand *Sur les Colonies*, &c., they introduce a paragraph in favour of that which the few, by whom the powers of government are usurped, have so much occasion to dread; the prevalence of enlightened principles, persecuted, under the name of theory, by the said few, the patrons of practice, and eulogisers of " things as they are."

' The papers now before us, are evidently dictated by this train of reflection; but they have assumed a more general form, and contain a variety of discussions upon the principles of colonization. Independent of the epigrammatic force and eloquence of their style, and of their more substantial merits as sound and ingenious speculations upon a subject of equal difficulty and importance, they cannot fail to interest us in their practical applications. They were the result of actual observation in countries where the author had access to the best information, or was actually engaged in affairs. They were drawn up with a view to influence the conduct of France, under a government in which he soon after bore an active part. Subsequent events prove, that they were not without effect in shaping the measures of that ambitious power. These tracts, it should be observed, however, appear in a form purely speculative; their reasonings are general and philosophical; formed indeed upon facts, but guided by large, scientific views; by an appeal to principles at every step; and by the kind of argument that inferior statesmen deride as theoretical, while their adversaries are conquering the world by the combinations to which it leads. The views of political economy by which our author seems to have been guided, are liberal and enlightened. He knows thoroughly the best doctrines of the science, and is fully impressed with their truth. It will be difficult indeed for our readers to believe that

the writer of some of the passages which we mean to extract, is a leading personage in the present fiscal administration of France. And, however much the recollection may lead us to lament so striking an instance of talents and knowledge enslaved by sordid principles, it is comfortable to think, that there are, among the rulers of that country, some whose lights are superior to their conduct, and that the justness of their original views may one day triumph over the gross ignorance and petty ambition of their more powerful co-adjutors.'

The article on "Bailly's Memoirs" is in a tone much more in opposition to the antijacobin spirit, than any thing which occurs before. The following passage seesaws pretty remarkably with some already produced. Having spoken of the occasion which had been taken from the French Revolution to "involve in discredit the principles of political philosophy, to give strength to prejudices, and to sanction abuses," it goes on: —

'The same circumstances which have thus led us to confound what is salutary with what is pernicious in our establishments, have also perverted our judgments as to the characters of those who were connected with these memorable occurrences. The tide of popular favour, which ran at one time with a dangerous and headlong violence to the side of innovation and political experiment, has now set, perhaps too strongly, in an opposite direction; and the same misguiding passions that placed factious and selfish men on a level with patriots and heroes, has now ranked the blameless and the enlightened in the herd of murderers and madmen.

'There are two classes of men, in particular, to whom it appears to us that the Revolution has thus done injustice, and who have been made to share in some measure the infamy of its most detestable agents, in consequence of venial errors, and in spite of extraordinary merits. There are none indeed who made a figure in its more advanced stages, that may not be left without any great breach of charity, to the vengeance of public opinion: and both the descriptions of persons to whom we have alluded only existed, accordingly, at the period of its commencement. These were the philosophers or speculative men, who inculcated a love of liberty and a desire of reform by their writings and conversation; and the virtuous and moderate, who attempted to *act* upon these principles, at the outset of the Revolution, and countenanced or suggested those measures by which the ancient frame of the government was eventually dissolved. To confound either of these classes of men with the monsters by whom they were succeeded, it would be necessary to forget that they were in reality their most strenuous opponents, and their earliest victims. If they were instrumental in conjuring up the tempest, we may at least presume that their co-operation was granted in ignorance, since they were the first to fall before it; and can scarcely be supposed to have either foreseen or intended those consequences, in which their own ruin was so inevitably involved. That they are chargeable with imprudence and with presumption, may be affirmed, perhaps, without fear of contra-

diction; though, with regard to many of them, it would be no easy task, perhaps, to point out by what conduct they could have avoided such an imputation; and this charge, it is manifest, ought at any rate to be kept carefully separate from that of guilt or atrocity. Benevolent intentions, though alloyed by vanity, and misguided by ignorance, can never become the objects of the highest moral reprobation; and enthusiasm itself, though it does the work of the demons, ought still to be distinguished from treachery or malice. The knightly adventurer, who broke the chains of the galley-slaves, purely that they might enjoy their deliverance from bondage, will always be regarded with other feelings than the robber who freed them to recruit the ranks of his banditti.'

This article is in itself as instructive an example as can be found, of the craft and mystery of compromise; of trimming, and seesaw. If one sentence is in favour of truth and freedom, another is in favour of prejudice and servility. To balance such passages as the former, we have others, in the following strain:—

'We are very much inclined to do justice to the virtuous and enlightened men who abounded in the constituent assembly of France. We believe that the motives of many of them were pure, and their patriotism unaffected: their talents are still more indisputable; but we cannot acquit them of blameable presumption and inexcusable imprudence. There are *three* points, it appears to us, in particular, in which they were bound to have foreseen the consequences of their proceedings.

'In the *first* place, the spirit of exasperation, defiance, and intimidation, with which from the beginning they carried on their opposition to the schemes of the court, the clergy, and the nobility, appears to us to have been as impolitic with a view to their ultimate success, as it was suspicious perhaps as to their immediate motives. The parade which they made of their popularity; the support which they submitted to receive from the menaces and acclamations of the mob; the joy which they testified at the desertion of the royal armies; and the anomalous military force, of which they patronised the formation in the city of Paris, were so many preparations for actual hostility, and led almost inevitably to that appeal to force, by which all prospect of establishing an equitable government was finally cut off. Sanguine as the patriots of that assembly undoubtedly were, they might still have been able to remember the most obvious and important lesson in the whole volume of history, that the nation which has recourse to arms for the settlement of its internal affairs necessarily falls under the iron yoke of a military government in the end, and that nothing but the most evident necessity can justify the lovers of freedom in forcing it from the hands of their governors. In France, there certainly was no such necessity.'

The following passage is a laboured panegyric upon the actual composition of the English House of Commons: with the declaration of a general principle worthy of all admiration:

'No representative legislature, it appears to us, can ever be respectable or secure, unless it contain within itself a great proportion of those who form the natural aristocracy of the country, and are able, as individuals, to influence the conduct and opinions of the greater part of its inhabitants. Unless the power, and weight, and authority of the assembly, in short, be really made up of the power, and weight, and authority of the individuals who compose it, the factitious dignity they may derive from their situation can never be of long endurance; and the dangerous power with which they may be invested, will become the subject of scrambling and contention among the factions of the metropolis, and be employed for any purpose but the general good of the community.

'In England, the House of Commons is made up of the individuals who, by birth, by fortune, or by talents, possess singly the greatest influence over the rest of the people. The most certain and the most permanent influence, is that of rank and of riches; and these are the qualifications, accordingly, which return the greatest number of members. Men submit to be governed by the united will of those, to whose will, as individuals, the greater part of them have been previously accustomed to submit themselves; and an act of parliament is reverenced and obeyed, not because the people are impressed with a constitutional veneration for an institution called a Parliament, but because it has been passed by the authority of those who are recognised as their natural superiors, and by whose influence, as individuals, the same measures might have been enforced over the greater part of the kingdom. Scarcely any new power is acquired, therefore, by the combination of those persons into a legislature: they carry each their share of influence and authority into the senate along with them; and it is by adding the items of it together, that the influence and authority of the senate itself is made up. From such a senate, therefore, it is obvious that their power can never be wrested, and that it would not even attach to those who might succeed in supplanting them in the legislature, by violence or intrigue, or by any other means than those by which they themselves had originally secured their nomination. In such a state of representation, in short, the influence of the representatives is not borrowed from their office, but the influence of the office is supported by that which is personal to its members; and Parliament is only regarded as the great depositary of all the authority which formerly existed, in a scattered state, among its members. This authority, therefore, belonging to the men, and not to their places, can neither be lost by them, if they are forced from their places, nor found by those who may supplant them. The Long Parliament, after it was purged by the Independents, and the assemblies that met under that name, during the Protectorate of Cromwell, held the place, and enjoyed all the form of power that had belonged to their predecessors; but as they no longer contained those individuals who were able to sway and influence the opinion of the body of the people, they were without respect or authority, and speedily came to be the objects of public derision and contempt.

'As the power and authority of a legislature thus constituted is perfectly secure and inalienable on the one hand, so, on the other, the moderation of its proceedings is guaranteed by a consciousness of the basis upon which this authority is founded. Every individual being aware of the extent to which his own influence is likely to reach among his constituents and dependants, is anxious that the mandates of the body shall never pass beyond that limit within which obedience may be easily secured. He will not hazard the loss of his own power, therefore, by any attempt to enlarge that of the legislature; and feeling, at every step, the weight and resistance of the people, the whole assembly proceeds with a due regard to their opinions and prejudices, and can never do any thing very injurious or very distasteful to the majority. From the very nature of the authority with which they are invested, they are in fact consubstantiated with the people for whom they are to legislate. They do not sit loose upon them, like riders on inferior animals; nor speculate nor project experiments upon their welfare, like operators upon a foreign substance. They are the natural organs of a great living body; and are not only warned, by their own feelings, of any injury which they may be tempted to inflict on it, but would become incapable of performing their functions, if they were to proceed far in debilitating the general system.

'Such, it appears to us, though delivered perhaps in too abstract and elementary a form, is the just conception of a free representative legislature.'

There is a return to the malignant language of antijacobinism, in the review of the "Continuation of Belsham's History of Great Britain," in the same sixth volume.

'The events which took place in the Neapolitan territory, after the French armies had been driven from Italy by the victorious Suvaroff, are narrated with considerable spirit; but in a manner which betrays the author's decided predilection for the Revolutionists, and his detestation of all by whom the interests of the Royal party were espoused. His narrative is faithfully taken from the "*Sketches*" of the excellent Helen Maria Williams; of course he becomes quite impassioned, and by far too noisy, for the propriety of history. That the Neapolitans were incapable of enjoying a free government, he is, however, obliged to admit: it follows, therefore, that the project of a republican constitution was as absurd as it was wicked; and that the only remedy against greater evils, was the re-establishment of the government which had been unwarrantably pulled down. But although we are not disposed to weep with Mr. Belsham over the prostrate democracy of Naples, we are not therefore inclined either to justify or palliate the excesses of those by whom it was overthrown. It must, however, be recollected, that the Royal government, in a justificatory memorial which it afterwards published, strongly disavows the charge of proscription; but our author neither adverts to this or any other document,—having gone no farther, apparently, in search of authorities, than to the said Sketches of Miss Williams.

'From these excursive details our historian then returns to objects more immediately connected with British annals; but it is only for a little while that he stops to shed the lights of history upon our dark and disordered political system; for he soon starts away to expatiate upon topics which seem to have greater charms for him. Meantime, he adverts to the expedition to Holland in 1799; the account of which is done up from the disaffected newspapers of that time, in Mr. Belsham's own happy manner. It seems, indeed, not to be so much the intention of our historian to give a just account of the objects of that expedition, and the real causes of its failure, as to sneer at the military talents, and ridicule the despatches of the British commander-in-chief.'

Think of "disaffected newspapers," and "the military talents of the British commander-in-chief"! It seems as if a page of a ministerial daily paper, had slipped into our hands.

From the sixth to the ninth volume, there is nearly a blank with regard to the great branch of politics, the securities for good government. In the ninth volume, there is an article which goes over a great part of the field of government, and which, beside the usual characteristic of being on both sides of the question, is one of the most remarkable specimens of the use of words without ideas, and of forms of expression covering ignorance with the semblance of knowledge, that we could at present point out, fashionable, and popular, and of course prevalent, as this mode of composition is. We present the following passage in proof of our remark: —

'It has sometimes struck us, that the bias which is found in some theoretical writers upon legislation in favour of established systems, and in others towards changes, may partly be accounted for by the character of the country and government for which their labours were designed. In the ancient republics, the sovereignty was generally exercised by the whole body of the people, liable to the natural turbulence and instability of all democracies, and, in those of Greece, to a certain constitutional levity in the national character. The beautiful fabrics of civil polity might be swept away by the surge of a moment, whenever the factious, who loved sedition, or the ambitious, who aimed at tyranny, should rouse the madness of the multitude. Against these perils of innovation it was difficult to devise a barrier compatible with the supremacy of the public will. The legislators of antiquity were not, however, deficient in their endeavours to secure the stability of their institutions. The proposer of a new law among the Locrians, we are told by Demosthenes, *wore a rope about his neck;* if it failed of adoption, his life was an instant sacrifice to the sanctity of the established constitution. Less violent, yet powerful, checks were imposed by the laws of Athens and Rome. The people, jealous as they were in the extreme of their legislative rights, submitted to a previous negative in the Nomothetæ of the one, and in the senate of the other. At Rome, indeed, this corrective of

innovation was, in a great degree, done away by the plebiscita, which passed by a vote of the tribes, without the authority of the senate, and acquired, at a pretty early period, the complete force of what were more strictly called laws. But there was yet another tie by which the prudence of ancient legislators bound together the systems they had framed. This was superstition. They called in a force to which the physical power of the multitude must yield, and appealed to an authority by which its acknowledged sovereignty might be lawfully controlled. For them the voice of the gods was raised in oracles; for them the mysterious symbols of fate were displayed in auguries; to them the divinities of woods and fountains taught more than fallible wisdom could have discovered. The worship, the ceremonies, and processions of antiquity, were mingled with the laws of civil regimen, and cast over them a veil of reverence and regard that made innovation sacrilege. None but the patrician families could tend the sacred chickens of the augural college. The privilege may not seem invaluable. But if it was declared that these chickens refused to eat, an assembly of the people was that instant dissolved, their clamours silenced, their leaders appalled, and not a wreck left behind of the clouds that hung over the public tranquillity. And this distinction was the last to fall before the gradual progress of the plebeian claims.

'In absolute monarchies, on the contrary, the genius of the constitution, and commonly the prejudices of the people, resist with a sort of inert force every species of innovation. Theoretical writers are therefore led to throw their weight into the opposite scale, and to counteract that 'froward retention of custom' which baffles all their schemes of public improvement. The abuses likewise of such governments are commonly much more flagrant, and the grievances more substantial, than in those of a republican form; and while these naturally rouse the indignation of enlightened and patriotic men, the dangers of that turbulent fermentation, which is apt to attend political change, seem generally far less, where the prince, and not the people, administers the remedy. During part of the last century kings aspired to be philosophers, or listened at least to those who bore the name; some looked for power, and some for reputation, in the destruction of ancient usages. The fancy of the theorist was inflamed; his projects became more extensive and less gradual, when he had but to persuade a single man of their possibility and excellence. It may be noted, that although innovations are rare in absolute monarchies, yet when they do take place, they are likely to be almost as sweeping and as sudden as in democracies themselves. For these forms of government, as Mr. Burke has well remarked from Aristotle, have striking points of resemblance in their arbitrary nature and their disregard of private rights. The promulgation of a legislative code by a single edict, changing at once, upon however specious principles, the ancient customs of a nation, associated with all their notions of right, especially as to property;—prejudices which it is so dangerous to disturb; interwoven with the plans of so many individuals for their domestic happiness; familiar, by long habit, to the popular under-

standing, and accommodated, in all those petty occasions which cannot be foreseen, to the exigencies of social life; — is a piece of infatuation and tyranny which none, one would think, but a prince in the barren ignorance of the purple, or a 'bookish theorique' in the presumptuousness of speculation, could approve. Yet Filangieri admires the celebrated project of Catharine, her philosophical code of Russian laws, and the absurd mockery of delegation from the dispersed and ignorant boors of her vast empire. 'She left to her kingdom the choice of its delegates, and consequently of its legislators. Under such circumstances, not a single peasant could doubt of the value of the new code, or could hesitate a moment on the preference between it and the ancient system.' The total neglect into which we understand this code to have fallen, is an answer to such an absurdity. We are far from charging Filangieri with that infatuated abhorrence of existing institutions which distinguished the early times of the French revolution. In certain passages he appears aware that reformations cannot be hastily taken up or suddenly executed. But the general bias of his schemes is, to make all provision against the sluggish spirit which adheres to every thing that is old, and very little against the turbulent spirit which grasps at every thing that is new. His institutions are laid out for a free government; but he lived under arbitrary power, and naturally thought most of the evils which he saw around him. From this error, and from one very common with speculative men, that of attributing more wisdom, and virtue, and influence, to the imaginary magistrate, than a real individual will ever possess, we find positions advanced, from which we shrink as wild and dangerous, and projects brought forward which appear visionary and absurd. Let the following be a specimen.

'"The first step to be taken is to create in the public a wish for the proposed reformation. A change in the constitution of a country is not the work of a moment; and to prepare the way for it, the inclinations of the people should be gradually led towards it. They should be made fully sensible of the inefficacy of their established laws, and be convinced their hardships and oppressions are owing to them. The ablest writers should be employed to state the errors and inconveniences of the old system, and the propriety as well as the necessity of abolishing it, and adopting a more advantageous one. When these efforts are successful, and the public wish is united with the force of government, one of the greatest obstacles is surmounted, and there is no reason for any further apprehensions from a passionate and ungovernable attachment of the multitude to their ancient usages. * * * * * When this first step is taken, another naturally follows. Having prejudiced the public opinion against its ancient laws, it should be inspired with a confidence in the proposed ones; and the arguments intended to produce this necessary predilection, ought to be plain and striking, and, in some degree, flowing from the public sentiments," &c. (Vol. I. 57.)

We invite our readers to try, as a useful exercise, what ideas they can extract from this passage: or what explicit principle of

approbation or disapprobation for any species of institution. The seesaw here is so rapid, that, as in the swift succession of the prismatic colours, the mixture becomes confusion. The ancient republics are "beautiful fabrics of civil polity," but nevertheless such wretched fabrics, that "they might be swept away by the surge of a moment, whenever the factious who loved sedition, or the ambitious who aimed at tyranny, should rouse the madness of the multitude." There is a class of writers who love change, and a class who hate it, seemingly for its own sake. We are sorry the writer did not inform us where they are to be found. From habit, and from the love of ease, all men are averse to change, where the prospect of some considerable good is not presented to them. Under a long-continued system of misrule, those who profit by it are averse to change from self-interest, those who suffer by it from bad education. Men of no description are anxious for a change, but from the hope of advantage. Is the prospect of advantage not a legitimate principle of action? Why does the Edinburgh Review endeavour by vague imputations to throw discredit upon that which is the source of every benefit to man? Every improvement is change. Why, instead of language which deserves no better name than that of aristocratical slang, did it not give us some principle by which to distinguish the advantages which are yet to be pursued, and which ought to engage all our ardour, from those which are more imaginary than real, and which may not be worth what must be risked in the pursuit of them?

We quote the following passage for the sake of contrasting it with an opinion, the support of which is exceedingly laboured in the next volume.

'The predominant character of the British system of government, though it is essentially republican, is certainly rather adverse than favourable to innovation. It partakes, indeed, rather of the nature of an aristocracy, on a very large and liberal basis, than of any other polity; and the genius of an aristocratic commonwealth is of all others the most hostile to any change. Though the direct share of the monarch in legislation has become nominal, that of the House of Peers is very real and effective; and, on looking narrowly into the spirit which has generally actuated that assembly, we shall perceive, that new projects in legislation have encountered a very marked discouragement within its walls.'

Hear now what is said, at p. 413. of vol. x. —

'The balance of the constitution now exists, in a great degree, in the House of Commons; and that assembly possesses nearly the whole legislative authority.'

The following is the same idea more expanded —

'The advantages of this arrangement are, as we have already intimated, — that the collision and shock of the three rival principles, is either prevented or prodigiously softened by this early mixture of their elements, — that by converting those sudden and successive checks into one regulating and graduated pressure, their operation becomes infinitely more smooth and manageable, and no longer proceeds by jerks and bounds that might endanger the safety of the machine, — while its movements, instead of being fractured and impeded by the irregular impulses of opposite forces, slide quietly to the mark, in the diagonal produced by their original combination.'

'We have stated already, that the prospect of these advantages probably operated, in part, to produce the arrangement which ensured them; but it was dictated, no doubt, by more urgent considerations, and indeed, as we think, by a necessity which could not be resisted. The great object to be accomplished, was not so much to save the House of Commons from the mortification of having their bills stopped by the Lords, or rejected by the Sovereign, as to protect these two estates from the hazard to which they might be exposed from the direct exercise of this privilege. By the vast and rapid increase of wealth and intelligence in the country at large, the consideration and relative authority of that branch of the government which stands most in connexion with it, was suddenly and prodigiously enlarged. The very circumstance of its being open to talent and ambition, ensured a greater proportion of ability and exertion in its members; and their numbers and the popularity of their name and character, all contributed to give their determinations a degree of weight and authority, against which it would no longer have been safe for any other power to have risked an opposition. No ministry, for a hundred years back, has had courage to interpose the royal negative to any measure which has passed through the Houses of Parliament, even by narrow majorities; and there is no thinking man, who can contemplate, without dismay, the probable consequences of such a resistance, where the House of Commons had been zealous and nearly unanimous. It is needless to say, that the House of Lords would oppose a still feebler barrier to such a measure of popular legislation. In order to exercise their constitutional functions with safety, therefore, it became necessary for the king and the great families to exercise them in the lower house, — not *against* the united commons of England, but *among* them; and not in their own character, and directly, — but covertly, and mingled with those whom it was substantially their interest and their duty to control.

'It is thus, as it appears to us, that the balance which was in danger of being lost through the increasing power and influence of the lower house, has been saved by being transferred into that assembly; and that all that was essentially valuable in the constitution, has been secured by a silent but very important change in its mode of operation. This change we take to be, that the influence of the crown, and of the old aristocracy, is now exerted in that house by means of members sent there to support that influence; and that, in that

house, as the great depository of the political power of the nation, and the virtual representative of the whole three estates, the chief virtue and force of the government is now habitually resident.

'This last conclusion, we are persuaded, will not appear either rash or hazardous to those who consider the exclusive power which is now almost formally yielded to the House of Commons, with regard to the supplies; and the admitted impossibility of going on in the administration of the government, without the support of a decided and permanent majority of its members.'

To the last sentence is appended the following note: —

'See Hume's Essay on the Independency of Parliament; the very basis of which is, that the House of Commons absolutely commands all the other parts of the government, and may, when it pleases, swallow up the rest, and engross the whole power of the constitution.'

To this theory of the constitution, and the consequences which these reviewers deduce from it, namely, that the usurpation which has been effected upon the people's rights to place and displace, and exercise an efficient control over, the members of the house of commons, is salutary and desirable, we shall take a future opportunity of replying. On this, above all subjects, delusion is fatal; proportional pains will therefore be requisite both to discover true principles, and to make them clearly seen by the public. The little which we can afford to add to the present article, must be employed in exhibiting a few specimens more of that leading feature in the character of the Review which has occupied our attention in several of the more immediately preceding pages.

We shall pass on to a period when the Review thought expedient a much higher language on the side of the people, than it had ventured on before. The whole of the article entitled "On the Rights and Duties of the People," in the twentieth volume, though much of the language is still vague and slippery, may be given as a specimen of the new lengths which it was not scrupled, at this particular time, to go in opposition to aristocratical interests.

According to the following passage, though it had, in the previous paragraph, been allowed, that the principle of representation is the grand secret for good government, yet it is maintained, that for the people to let the powers of government out of their own hands, even to real representatives, is attended with imminent danger.

'With all these blessings, however, and they are as undeniable as they are important, the plan of delegated authority is liable to several objections — not, indeed, such as greatly to detract from its merits — but such as are well adapted to keep our jealousy awake to its abuses. It may be enough to mention one, into which indeed

almost all the others resolve themselves. The delegation of the greatest of all trusts, that of government, necessarily implies a surrender of the function itself, and with the function much of the power — and leaves the people, in some degree, at the mercy of those whom they choose for their trustees, during the whole term of the appointment. Hence the danger of those trustees abusing their delegated authority in such a manner as to weaken the control of the people over them — and, by rendering themselves more powerful and less accountable, to make the resumption of the trust more difficult. It is quite manifest, therefore, that there is nothing of which the Constitution, in a state like England, ought to be more jealous, than any step towards independence on the part of the representatives — any attempt of theirs to acquire a substantive and separate authority — either an existence not created, or attributes not bestowed by the people. From so self-evident a maxim we may deduce all the arguments in favour of parliamentary reform — all the observations which place in the strongest light the abuses in our representative system — the principles which render the septennial act by far the greatest mockery of popular rights, and breach of common good faith that ever was committed by the governors to the governed — the grounds upon which the exclusion of so many of the community from all share in the government, and the usurpation of the elective franchise by the few, are demonstrably shown to be a mere subversion of the very purpose and meaning of representation.'

The main object of the article is to maintain the utility of meetings of the people in large bodies, to declare their opinions on public measures and men. The following is a curious passage: —

'It is quite true that the adoption or rejection of specific measures ought in no case to be left with the bulk of the people. But it is equally true, that the people have a right to deliberate on specific measures — to discuss them individually and in bodies — to express the result of those deliberations, and to tender to the Legislature and the Executive Government their opinion, their advice, nay, the free expression of their wishes upon all matters of public import. This is the sacred inalienable right of the English people — it is theirs as they are freemen — it is theirs as they are both the fountain and the object of all government — it is a right, the invasion of which we conscientiously hold to form an extreme case — a case, perhaps, more easy than safe to discuss; and one which all lovers of their country, and friends to the peace and good order of society, must fervently pray against ever living to see practically moved. This right, however, was actually violated by Mr. Pitt — by the very man who did not scruple to invade the first principles of the representative system on the opposite quarter, by taking the sense of the country on a particular measure. He was the first minister who ever dared abridge the rights of Englishmen to discuss their own affairs.'

The people of England, according to this paragraph, ought to have taken arms against the government, and to have appealed to Heaven, when their rights were invaded as they were by Mr. Pitt.

After various observations to shew the importance of meetings held by the people to overawe their representatives, however purely elected, comes the following picture of the actual state.

'We have all along been reasoning upon the supposition that the parliament is really, and not in name only, a representation of the people — that its members are chosen by the nation at large — that its deliberations are the result of discussions among delegates appointed by those whose business they are to manage — that the choice of them is free, and the trust so often renewed, as to give the elector, by the mere act of election or rejection, some control over the deputy — that the representative body consists of persons sent, on the part of the nation, to resist the encroachments of the crown and the aristocracy, and not in any considerable number, of persons chosen by the crown and Aristocracy to play into their hands, and betray the people under the disguise of their trustees. But how greatly is the force of the argument increased by the actual state of the representation? Who shall say that a parliament, chosen as ours really is, requires no looking after? Who shall tell us that the crown requires no watching from the people themselves, when their regular watchmen are some of them named, and more of them paid, by the crown itself? Who shall be permitted to question the necessity of the people deliberating about their own affairs in their own persons, when such vast masses of them are wholly deprived of the elective franchise, and destitute of any semblance of representatives to speak their wishes, or to transact their business?

'The history of last session, fruitful as it is in lessons of political wisdom, offers none more striking than the one which it reads to us upon this important subject. The most weighty interests discussed in parliament were those of the manufacturing districts. The bread of hundreds of thousands was in question; and the two houses were occupied for many weeks in discussing their grievances. Those persons composed the population of Birmingham, Leeds, Manchester, Sheffield, Wakefield, Halifax, Boulton, Bury, Glasgow, and other places. Not one of those towns, some of them containing 100,000 inhabitants, has a single representative in parliament, except Glasgow; — and Glasgow is *represented* (if the abuse of language may be tolerated) by its corporation uniting with three other corporations, and the whole four sets of magistrates chusing one member; but so that the other three at all times (and two of them every other parliament) may return the member, and leave Glasgow wholly out of the question. Now, in what manner could those great and most important bodies of men have made themselves heard but through the public meetings, which they wisely and constitutionally held to discuss their grievances? In no other way could they have each obtained a hearing, or established a correspondence with

a temporary representative: — But surely in no other way could they have gained the point, which they did so nobly carry with the legislature and the executive government. In specifying these towns, we have enumerated the greater part, by far, of the manufacturing interests of England; — and they are all without local representatives in parliament. Is it asking too much, to demand that they may use freely the only means left them of sharing in the public councils — of influencing the measures for which they pay so dearly in all ways — and assemble from time to time in order to communicate with each other, and with the government, upon the matters so imminently affecting them? In truth, while so many vast branches of the community are wholly deprived of all share in the representation — while so many members of parliament owe their existence to private nomination — while the electors, who exercise their franchise the most amply, have only an opportunity once in six or seven years of changing their delegate — and while the enormous patronage vested in the crown, strews with tempting baits the whole floor of the House, and besets every avenue to it with promises and threats — he must be a stubborn lover of despotism indeed, who can deny that the people betray their own cause, and have themselves to blame for the mismanagement of their affairs, if they cease to discuss and speak out their own minds upon all fit occasions. Such a parliament *must* be *aided* by the watchful eyes of the country. If the people slumber themselves, let them not vainly hope that their *representatives* will be very vigilant, or very successful in the public cause, whatever they may be in their own.'

On the other hand, here is a passage in the very same number (xl.), which, though it is somewhat misty and oracular, nevertheless contains a view of the *beau idéal* in government, well calculated to administer consolation to the holders of aristocratical power.

'The great point, then, is to ensure a free, an authoritative, and an uninterrupted communication between the ostensible administrators of the national power, and its actual constituents and depositories; and the chief distinction between a good and a bad government consists in the degree in which it affords the means of such a communication. The main end of government to be sure is, that wise laws should be enacted and enforced; but such is the condition of human infirmity, that the hazards of sanguinary contentions about the exercise of power is a muchg reater and more imminent evil, than a considerable obstruction in the making or execution of the laws; and the best government therefore is, not that which promises to make the best laws, and to enforce them most vigorously, but that which guards best against the tremendous conflicts to which all administrations of government, and all exercise of political power is apt to give rise. It happens, fortunately indeed, that the same arrangements which most effectually ensure the peace of society against those disorders, are also, on the whole, the best calculated for the purposes of wise and efficient legislation. But we do not hesitate to look upon their

negative or preventive virtues as of a far higher cast than their positive and active ones; and to consider a representative legislature to be incomparably of more value when it truly represents the efficient force of the nation in controlling and directing the executive, than when it merely enacts wholesome statutes in its legislative capacity.

'The result of the whole then is, that in a civilized and enlightened country, the actual power of the State resides in the great body of the people, and especially among the more wealthy and intelligent in all the different ranks of which it consists; and consequently, that the administration of the government can never be either safe or happy, unless it be conformable to the wishes and sentiments of that great body; while there is little chance of its answering either of these conditions, unless the forms of the constitution provide some means for the regular, constant, and authentic expression of their sentiments,—to which, when so expressed, it is the undoubted duty and obvious interest of the executive to conform. A Parliament, therefore, which really and truly represents the sense and opinions—we mean the general and mature sense, not the occasional prejudices and fleeting passions—of the efficient body of the people, and which watches over and effectually controls every important act of the executive magistrate, is necessary, in a country like this, for the tranquillity of the government, and the ultimate safety of the monarchy itself,—much more even than for the enactment of the laws; and, in proportion as it varies from this description, or relaxes in this control, will the peace of the country and the security of the government be endangered.'

This description corresponds to what one might call a good Whig parliament; which, though it would turn out the ministry, and put in their opponents, would be much more careful to prevent any radical change, than it would be to make good laws.

The contradictions involved in this description deserve particular attention. "The main end of government, to be sure, is, that wise laws should be enacted and enforced." The best government, however, is a government which has an end more highly valued than its main end.

Was obscurity studied, or were the ideas of the writer far from clear, when he said, "We do not hesitate to consider a representative legislature to be incomparably of more value when it truly represents the efficient force of the nation in controlling and directing the executive, than when it merely enacts wholesome statutes in its legislative capacity?"—The illustration of this topic will be completed by specimens from the succeeding numbers of the Review, in our next publication, when other characteristics of the work will come under review.

2. *The Quarterly Review*, No. LVIII. — *Faux's Memorable Days in America.*

OUR brief notice of the recent travels through the Anglo-American United States had just been printed off, when the Quarterly Review for December made its appearance; and as it contains a long article on "Faux's Memorable Days," a fitter opportunity could scarcely have presented itself for estimating the candour, knowledge, and integrity of that Review, — and for developing the process by which it fabricates a representation calculated to flatter the passions and prejudices of those who entertain an instinctive hatred of responsible and economical government.

The writer seems absolutely delirious with joy at finding in Mr. Faux's journal, what any intelligent and reflecting person might easily have anticipated, and what we have distinctly admitted in our introductory remarks on emigration; viz. that every one who emigrates to or resides in a newly settled and thinly peopled country must, though assured of an adequate subsistence, submit to great physical inconvenience and privation, — that his security for person or property will not be of so high an order as in some older established communities, the slender means of the new society not admitting of an efficient judicature and police, and the absence of neighbourhood rendering character of comparatively little importance, — and that without assiduous industry he can never attain a situation of tolerable comfort.

In order that persons disposed to emigrate might know precisely what amount of inconvenience and peril they would have to encounter, we have extracted from Mr. Faux the most aggravated and best authenticated instances of both kinds of annoyance, rendering them occasionally more prominent by italic type; and, allowing for all these detractions from the advantage of ceasing to feel anxiety on the score of subsistence, or the actual pangs of hunger, we have indicated the class of persons who alone can better their situation by emigration to such a country.

After the general admissions contained in our outset, it would have been superfluous to have loaded our pages with multiplied instances in detail; but had we been disposed to do this, so many of those mentioned by Faux rest upon mere hearsay or the assertions of loose talkers, that the number of authentic facts would not have been considerably increased.

Now how has the writer in the Quarterly Review constructed

his article? Thirty-two pages, — the whole of this lengthy performance, — has he nearly filled with extracts from Faux, containing the details of individual instances of ferocity, violence, knavery, boasting and vulgarity, disappointment, failure, despondency, bad soils, bad climates, bad food, discomfort, dirt, and barbarism, — all on the debtor side of the account, without hinting at the existence of a single item on the creditor side. In Mr. Faux's journal the good and evil are pretty equally blended; descriptions of kindly soils, of successful and satisfied industry, of generosity, liberal feeling, and integrity, and of the good effects of an economical form of government, are neither unfrequent nor ill attested; indications are given of the cause of failure in many cases of disappointment: but of all this, not one word from the writer in this Review, — it would not have suited his purpose; which, from his sneers at the "Land of Freedom," and irrepressible expressions of hatred towards republican government, we may fairly assume to be, an endeavour to persuade the reader that the evils, physical and moral, inseparable from every infant state of society, are altogether the result of American institutions, or rather of the absence of a certain institution; for in the want of an established church, the Quarterly reviewer discovers the cause of every offence committed in the United States. (p. 369.) Without religion, says he, there can be no morals; without an established church there can be no religion! — at least, none that will suit this gentleman. The only religious people are those who take upon trust all that their parish priest delivers, — who, without bestowing a single thought on religion or the evidence adduced in support of it, say their prayers, go to church, nod through half the service, and pay tithes without a murmur. Those who investigate a little, — who differ from what said parish priest chooses to lay down, — who doubt the Athanasian creed, or any of the thirty-nine articles, — who are depressed with the fear of eternal flames, or elevated with the hope of eternal pleasure, — these are all, according to the charitable and expanded views of the Quarterly Review, infidels or fanatics! (p. 369.) Whatever may be the effects of religion in general as a sanction for morals, this writer himself affords a striking instance, that "that pure and reformed branch of it," the established church, is not competent to compel the observance of truth among its acquiescent votaries. *He* is no doubt an eminently pious and churchgoing man, and he is sufficiently instructed to be aware that there are many modes of making a mendacious statement besides the simple process of mendacious invention. *Suppressio veri est expressio falsi.* There is the *false by omission*, as well as the false by substitution; and of all modes of falsehood, the *false*

by omission is the most deceptious, because it contains to a certain extent the elements of truth.

Now a more base and mischievous falsehood than that conveyed by the totality of the article now under consideration, it is impossible to conceive; base, because in the face of repeatedly conflicting statements contained in the very book referred to, the reader of the article is induced to believe that the book contains none but unfavourable representations, and he is told (p. 368.), that the reviewer has given "but the smallest portion of the unfavourable account of the American population;"—mischievous, because by every species of insolence and contempt, endeavours are made to exasperate against each other two nations who have the strongest interest in preserving the relations of friendship.

So much for the candour and integrity of our Tory scribe! Now for his knowledge, and the value of the materials with which he has filled his thirty-two pages.

Who — unless it be one whose intellect has been blinded by existing abuses — is ignorant of the leading principles which assign the various degrees of trustworthiness to the various species of evidence; of the difference between primary and secondary evidence, between direct testimony and *hearsay?* What child does not know that in passing from mouth to mouth every story either gains or loses so much, that after a certain number of transmissions it is often difficult to recognize the original narrative? Now at least one half of the facts selected with such care by the Quarterly Review from Faux's journal, rest, not upon Faux's own observation and direct testimony, but upon no better evidence than mere hearsay, and that of the weakest and most unsatisfactory kind, — the babble of loose talkers, tavern companions, and disappointed projectors. Great reliance is placed by the Review on general assertions hazarded at random, collected from few or inconclusive particulars, and mixed up with the foolish opinions of foolish individuals; and yet, after having been at the pains to devote four pages to the rendering contemptible and ridiculous an individual whose opinions Faux details at the greatest length, the writer concludes his article by ascribing to the opinions of others, so repeated by Faux, greater credit than to the statements and opinions of Faux himself, whose integrity and understanding are highly vaunted at the beginning of the critique.

The Quarterly reviewer extracts the story of "a poor fellow who was found lying in the street" (at Charlston) "in a hot broiling sun 110° by the thermometer, with both legs broken and dreadfully bruised, having been robbed of all he had: he had lain there all night, equally unnoticed by the nightly watch and the open-day humanity of the citizens; and had not an old Prus-

sian colonel offered a dollar to have him removed as a nuisance, he would have been suffered to roast and be devoured by the flies."

We omitted to select this story for extraction, not only because we deemed it somewhat improbable, but because Faux does not say that he saw the sight himself, and the narrative is accompanied with one or two minute circumstances which cast an air of doubtfulness over the whole; — for instance, the person who ordered the sufferer to be removed, is said to have called out to two slaves, "Here! July and August!" do so and so. Considering the heat of the day, it struck us as somewhat singular, that the slaves should be so appositely named July and August, in such happy succession. The same circumstance probably struck the candid reviewer as a ground for distrust, for he cautiously omits it in his extract.

The following story is also extracted in the same spirit: —

'I saw an execution lately defeated by that boasted spirit which they call liberty or independence. The property under execution was put up to sale, when the eldest son appeared with a huge herculean club, and said, "Gentlemen, you may bid for and buy these things, which were my father's, but by G— no man living shall come on to this ground with horse and cart to fetch them away. The land is mine, and if the buyer takes any thing away, it shall be on his back.'"

We omitted to select this story as one of the examples to show the degree of insecurity the emigrant might have to encounter, not because we deemed it improbable, —for in our introductory remarks we had admitted and accounted for the weakness of the judicial arm in remote and thinly inhabited districts, — but because the story does not rest on the authority of Faux, but was related to him by one Squire Liddiard; of whom we know nothing, except that by his own account he was precisely the sort of person who ought not to have emigrated to the Western States, — a London merchant, with a counting-house near the Exchange and a citizen's box at Blackheath.

Such are the stories, and so evidenced, on which the reviewer grounds his implied proposition, that the American people are so debased, and their institutions so pernicious, as to render existence among them absolutely intolerable, and our "excellent constitution in church and state" the only thing which can secure the happiness of man. These stories bear the date of 1819.

Three *years* have not elapsed since an aged pauper, in the middle of this metropolis of London, was thrust from parish to parish, from officer to officer, each contesting the liability to ad-

minister relief, till the last on whose hands he was thrown left him famishing with cold and hunger in the open streets. The wretched sufferer, unable to crawl further, laid himself down at night in a public thoroughfare near Drury Lane, where thousands passed by him regardless of his dying groans. The next morning he was found a stiffened corpse, and a coroner's jury brought in a verdict of "Died by Starvation!"

Three *months* have not elapsed since two individuals, one of them with the rank and education of a gentleman, tempted by the prospect of gaining a few pounds, made beforehand every preparation for the murder and interment of one of their familiar companions; enticed him into the vehicle which contained the sack for the concealment of his corpse; dispatched him within a few miles of this same metropolis, by beating his skull to pieces; and having deposited him in a pond close by the house at which the deceased and themselves were to have met for a convivial entertainment, sat down to supper as if nothing extraordinary had happened!

Three *weeks* have barely elapsed since a drama founded on this horrible assassination, was performed at a public theatre in this same metropolis; in which drama was produced on the stage, before a crowded and applauding audience, the identical vehicle and horse which had conveyed the miserable victim on his journey to eternity!

Three *days* have barely elapsed (Jan. 3. 1824) since, in the same county which was the scene of the preceding outrage, a special constable, James Grainge, has actually been murdered in an attempt to enforce legal process; the party who resisted being a man of education, and assisted by a beautiful woman of twenty-six!*

The story of the dying pauper is at least as afflicting to humanity, and a little better authenticated than the jocose appeal to July and August at Charlston; — and the story of James Grainge carries into effect what Squire Liddiard's story only threatens.

Now suppose A. B., an American traveller through England, had stated, among other things, the four preceding facts; suppose he had also stated the recent murders of Mr. Mumford, of Mrs. Donatty, of Mr. Smith at Greenwich, of the Marrs, of the Bonars, and as many others as he could pick up in coffee-houses and stage-coaches; suppose he were to state the number of juvenile offenders every year committed to prison within the precincts of London, the number of houses annually set on fire

* See the Newspapers for the 2d of January, 1824.

about the time of the half-yearly payments of rent, the number of paupers and amount of poor-rates, the number of bankrupts, the number of insolvents, and the amount of assets available to their creditors; suppose he had also stated such appearances as he might have observed of occasional prosperity, comfort, and cleanliness, — appearances of fertile soil, unbounded capital, and transcendent industry and skill; —

What would the Quarterly reviewer have said if a North American democratic reviewer, reviewing A. B.'s travels, should make a detailed extract of all the disparaging circumstances, omit all the favourable ones, and then exclaim, or leave the reader to imply, "These are the blessed effects of monarchical and aristocratic institutions! This is the land where King, Lords, and Commons are so happily balanced, that each plays into the hand of the other! This is the land of legitimate sway, 'attempered liberty,' and borough influence! This is the land of the established church! Federalists and sentimentalists, before you cross the ocean to gaze at empty pomp and factitious dignity, before you surrender your understandings to admire the antiquities of your half-civilized ancestors, listen to A. B. Mark well the facts we have laid before you, and then choose your dwelling, if you dare, among a people so heartless as to leave a fellow-creature to perish in a crowded street,—so cruel, as to view with approbation, at a play-house, objects which would most forcibly bring to their imagination all the details of an aggravated murder; — settle, if you dare, in a land where neither person nor property are secure,— where assassinations are the topic of the day, and the arm of the law is resisted by weapons of death!"

Would the Quarterly reviewer admit, that such a representation as this contained one spark of candour, integrity, or *truth?* Would he admit, that a reviewer who should so exclude every favourable representation in regard to England, — who should ascribe to institutions, incidents inseparable from the condition of man in the present state of society, — would he admit, that such a reviewer possessed one spark of feeling, honour, or principle? And yet this is precisely the process which, with a fiendlike exultation, this writer has pursued with regard to America.

But before we have done we shall bring home to him, yet more clearly, blind malignity against a people whose only offence, beyond the failings to which it is subject in common with his own countrymen, is the offence of having an economical and responsible government.

It is notorious, that a great proportion of those who leave this country, either for Chili or the United States, are of the lowest and most ignorant class; it is equally notorious, that they com-

monly labour under the delusion of expecting that, when they arrive in the promised land, they shall be exempt from the common lot of humanity, the necessity of labouring for subsistence; and that they frequently waste in idleness and drinking the hours and money with which they might shortly better their condition.

No man knows this better than the writer in the Review himself: he admits it expressly in page 366.; and yet he has extracted from Faux every expression of discontent from every disappointed emigrant, without in the least adverting to the cause of each individual's disappointment, though, in a variety of instances, Faux has clearly traced it to the imprudence or incapacity of the sufferer.

In a laboured article "On the Condition of the Negroes in our Colonies" (p. 476. in this same number), the Quarterly attacks Mr. Wilberforce for rejecting all apology for the treatment of slaves in the West Indies; and contends that they are, in many respects, better off than the labouring classes in England. (No. LVIII. pp. 479. 485.) But no sooner does he come to the United States,—where, as we have demonstrated (ante, p. 113.), the treatment of slaves is infinitely less severe than in the West Indies,—than our reviewer altogether alters his tone: "Though many of the planters treat their slaves well, and allow them as much indulgence as is consistent with their situation, yet negroes being, in the eye of the *American* law, a degraded class, and denied the enjoyment of equal rights, their wellbeing is entirely dependent on the personal character of their owner; and however humane their treatment may be, *we cannot agree with farmer Faux in his conclusion*, that their condition in any, much less in many, respects is better than that of paupers in his native land."

If they are a degraded class in the eye of the *American* law, are they not equally so, and that within the writer's knowledge, in the Anglo-West Indian law? If their condition in the West Indies is better than that of an English pauper, what should make it otherwise in America, where, according to his own admission, "many of the planters treat their slaves well, and *allow them as much indulgence as is consistent with their situation?*"

Our reviewer's hatred, however, is not confined to America or Americans; his own countrymen become the objects of attack for no other offence than that of preferring a residence on the other side of the Atlantic: and how is this attack conducted? Not content with filling four whole pages in the endeavour to render ridiculous and contemptible Mr. Thomas Law *, a man who, through a long and eventful life, has sustained the most ir-

* A brother of the late Lord Ellenborough.

reproachable character, this writer, with all the charity and good faith so peculiar to a moralist of the Quarterly Review, proceeds to sneer away his reputation for integrity and principle by mendacious and unfounded insinuations,—as, that he quitted England for America because he was mortified at not being a peer. Again, "This gentleman," says this writer, "accumulated (it is not said by what means) an immense fortune in India." True, it is not said by what means, for the history of his Indian life would have been grossly irrelevant in a book of travels through America; but we can take upon ourselves to say by what means he did *not* accumulate his fortune: he did not pander to the passions and prejudices of an insolent and craving aristocracy, by detailing as many as he could find recorded of those crimes and disorders which could not but have place to a certain extent in a community of ten millions, and then, with an utter disregard of truth and principle, exhibit this catalogue to the world as a representation on which men should form their opinions as to the character and condition, and the effect of the political institutions of that same community.

But we have not quite done with this reviewer. As if it were possible for any civilized society, however well organized, to exist without contribution for common purposes, as if it were not notorious to the whole world, if not to the Quarterly Review, that the several states in America receive for local purposes a revenue analagous to our county and poor's rate, and that this revenue is raised by taxes imposed in the legislature of each state,—the general government expenses of the whole United States being defrayed chiefly by the customs,—this writer, on extracting from Faux, that land in the Illinois belonging to Orator Hunt's brother was uncultivated, and selling for the *payment of taxes*, appears absolutely dancing in a transport of joy. "Avast reading, there!" he cries. (p. 365.) "Overhaul that article again! as Old Trunnion says. *Taxes*, did you say? *Taxes*, in this last retreat of suffering humanity, and the land selling to pay them!"

Yes, *Taxes!* With any man in his senses, the question is, not, whether there are *taxes*, but what is their *amount*. And this is a piece of information which, with regard to America, the Quarterly Review never will *dare* to give: still less will it dare to contrast it with the taxation endured by Great Britain. Probably the reviewer would have suppressed his mirth and transport had he anticipated that the false insinuation it was meant to convey, would have induced us to lay at once before the eyes of mankind this fearful contrast, which we should otherwise have

deferred for a season. Let him read what follows, and then call in, not Hawser Trunnion, but the Attorney-general to his assistance; for if, as Lord Ellenborough expressly laid it down, any thing is a libel which may *hurt the feelings* of any individual (meaning, of course, a dignified individual), nothing, we conceive, can be more libellous in the eyes of one of the ruling few than the columns of figures we shall forthwith *deploy*.

As we have before had occasion to state, the expenses of the *general* government of the United States;—of the army, navy, public offices, public officers; of congress; of the interest and liquidation of the public debt, and of all extensive undertakings affecting the States at large,—are defrayed, in time of peace, by a revenue derived almost exclusively from the customs and the sale of lands in the new territories of the Union.

So far, and for such extensive purposes, we have nothing beyond indirect taxation, and that to how small an amount we shall presently show.

Besides this, there is raised by direct taxation in each individual state a local revenue, called the state tax, analagous to our county and poor's rate; which revenue is applied to the following, among other purposes, which comprehend, in addition to those before stated, almost all the possible expenses of local and general government.—Judicature, including the salaries of judges, expenses of courts, rewards to prosecutors, and expenses of trial: gaols: elections: public printing and stationery: schools: roads *, bridges, and fishery-encouragement: expenses of the state parliament.—The revenue for these purposes is raised in some instances by a tax on land (exceeding in no case four-pence an acre, and in many districts not exceeding one penny); in others by a capitation tax on all males above sixteen; in others by assessments on carriages, or other articles not of primary necessity; and in the older states, by the sale of lands, and by the interest arising on monies belonging to the state. (See Statistical, Political, and Historical Account of the United States, by D. B. Warden, late Consul to Paris.)

Now our county and poor's rates, in addition to the maintenance of the poor, cover scarcely any expenses but those of gaols, bridges, and that part of the expense of judicature which is occasioned by the building and furnishing of courts, rewards to prosecutors, and some of the expenses of trial.

In addition to our county and poor's rates, we are also saddled

* These are in some places maintained by contributions of labour, or by compositions in lieu thereof.

with tithes; — paying about the fourth of the value of all the landed property of the country for the support of an established church; a blessing with which brother Jonathan has learned to dispense.*

---

* The Quarterly Review, in a laboured article on the ecclesiastical revenues, has endeavoured to prove, among other things, that tithes do not operate as a tax on the general consumers of corn, by raising the price of the article.

If, the writer argues, tithes were abolished, land of the lowest quality, which now pays no rent, — the produce being equal only to the payment of tithes in addition to the expenses and ordinary profits of cultivation, — this land would pay in rent what it now pays in tithes. But the reviewer keeps out of sight this important circumstance, that if tithes were abolished, all that portion of land would be brought into cultivation which now not only cannot pay rent, but cannot even after the first seven years pay tithe in addition to the expenses and ordinary profits of cultivation. In such case, the nearest means of supply being increased, the price of corn would fall.

The reviewer thinks he has gained a great point in asserting that there are no cultivated lands in Britain which do not pay some rent; but he is ignorant that with regard to this, the true question is, not whether the *land* pays rent, but whether *the last application of capital* to the land pays rent. Thus, suppose lands 1, 2, 3, 4, successively decreasing in fertility, it commonly happens that before 2, 3, 4, or the inferior lands are cultivated, capital can be employed more productively on those lands which are already in cultivation. It may perhaps be found that by doubling the capital already employed on No. 1., though the produce will not be doubled, it may be increased three-fourths; and that this quantity exceeds what could be obtained by employing the same capital on No. 3. In such case, says Mr. Ricardo, "capital will be employed in preference on the old land, and will equally create a rent; for rent is always the difference between the produce obtained by the employment of two equal quantities of capital and labour."—"The capital last employed pays no rent."

But admitting, if the reviewer pleases, that tithes do not raise the price of corn, and consequently do not operate as a tax on the consumer, it still remains that the clergy of the established church are supported by a modification of property the most pernicious that ever was devised by the barbarity of ignorant and superstitious ages.

It is admitted, on all hands, that tithes operate as a constant source of irritation between parson and parishioner, and as a constant check upon agricultural enterprise and improvement. They do not, it is true, prevent the person who employs his capital on land from obtaining in the long run the same rate of profit as every other capitalist, but they divert from land a great portion of capital, which,

But, to the point.—Direct taxes for the expenses of the general government in America we have seen there are *none*; tithes

but for the institution of tithes, would infallibly be employed on it, and employed to the promotion of abundance.

A farmer, for instance, has taken 100 acres for a term of seven, fourteen, or twenty-one years; he is willing to lay out 100*l.* or 1000*l.* in draining, manuring, or irrigating; the improved and increased produce will just repay his expenses, with the ordinary profits of capital, but it will not do this and pay tithes too: the parson is inexorable,—of course quite regardless of himself, but he has "a duty which he owes to his successors,"—he refuses to relinquish his tithes even for a period, till the farmer shall have been indemnified for his expenses; and the farmer, who has not piety sufficient to raise the parson's income to his own loss, abandons the projected improvement. This is no imaginary or uncommon case, and within our personal experience we could point out repeated instances in which the process we have just described has literally been gone through.

Now, as the institution and maintenance of property in general can be supported on no other ground than that it is productive of general good, the most corrupt and ignorant legislatures have never hesitated from time to time to abolish such modifications of property as have been proved to be clearly pernicious to the community at large. Thus Henry VIII. suppressed the monasteries; Charles II. abolished feudal wardships, and the oppressive remnant of feudal services; and yet the feudal guardians had as good a right to certain proceeds out of the estates inherited by their wards, as the established clergy to a portion of the produce raised by their parishioners. Not only have legislatures been in the habit of abolishing modifications of property inconsistent with the general good, but it has been and is their daily practice after allowing some compensation (generally inadequate) to the individual injured, to invade property on no other ground than that on the occasion in question, the advantage to the public is so great as entirely to counterbalance the loss and inconvenience to the individual; and this in cases where the property invaded, instead of being of an objectionable kind, would, but for the projected advantage to the public, have been enjoyed consistently with the general interest of the community at large; as where the park or farm of an individual, is, against the will of the owner, appropriated by act of parliament to a canal, a road, or a fortification.

As to the time and mode of abolishing pernicious modifications of property, and the compensation or substitution to be made to the holders of it; these are questions for the enlightened and humane legislator, which at present we are not called on to discuss. However the reviewer's main argument in favour of tithes, is the advantage which he says a parish derives from the residence of a person educated as our parochial clergy usually are. As to the existence of this alleged advantage we are directly at issue with him, and shall take an early opportunity of showing that no such advantage as that

there are *none*; and the figures below will prove that the state or local taxes covering so many more objects than our county and poor's rates, do not equal those rates by nearly three quarters their amount.

The states and counties have been taken at random, the one from Warden's book, the other from returns made to Parliament, and are offered merely as a sample.

United States.	Population in 1810.	Revenue.		English Counties.	Population in 1811.	Population in 1821.	Average Amount of Poor & other Rates in 1813--14--15.
		Dollars.					£
Massachusetts.	472,040	306,333		Devon.....	396,100	447,900	283,429
South Carolina	415,115	313,026					
Maine.....	228,705	209,257		Cornwall.	225,900	262,600	120,568
New York	959,049	317,745		Middlesex	985,100	1·167,500	663,103
Virginia.....	974,622	414,133	1811				
Connecticut...	261,942	79,192	1811	Essex.....	260,900	295,300	328,031
Pennsylvania..	810,091	601,344	1815	Lancaster.	856,000	1,074,000	433,419
Delaware.....	72,674	72,163	1811	Bedford...	73,600	85,400	74,782
Kentucky	406,511	105,180		Kent.	385,600	434,600	407,459

It must be distinctly borne in mind that the whole of the above revenues, arising to the several States, is not made up of direct annual taxes, but that a considerable portion of each is acquired by the sale of lands and the interest arising from monies belonging to the state. So that it may fairly be affirmed that the whole amount of direct taxation falling in any shape upon any given amount of population in the United States, does not equal a fourth of the poor's rates and county rates alone, paid by an equal amount of population in Great Britain.

Now for the comparison of the expenses of the general government.

The whole expense of the civil government, including the salaries of the President and Vice-President, *wages of the members of the Senate and House of Representatives*; the diplomatic and miscellaneous expenses, including pensions; all the public offices, post office, mint, light-houses, surveys of land, the government of those parts called territories, and every other expense what-

---

described, exists; —admitting, however, that it does exist, it furnishes no argument in support of tithes. The residence of a parochial clergy would be much more effectually secured (as in Scotland) by the payment of a salary on condition of residence, than by the perception of tithes from two or three parishes, one of which only can be inhabited at the same time by the same percipient.

ever, which does not belong to the army and navy, — were estimated for the year 1822 at 1,664,297 dollars, or 353,613*l.**

By the British finance accounts for the year ending the 5th of January, 1821, the sum actually paid was 6,797,399*l.*; this sum, like the 353,613*l.* in America, includes all the items which do not belong to the military or naval departments. Thus the civil government here costs very nearly twenty times the amount of the civil government in America, — in other words, it costs the nation as much to be governed for one year, as it costs the Americans to be governed for twenty years; and yet America is, beyond all comparison, better governed than Great Britain and Ireland. But we do, in fact, spend more than thirty times as much as the American United States for our civil government. In the finance accounts before alluded to, the charge for management, that is, the expense attending the collection of the revenue, is set down at - - - £3,267,633

There are other sums also paid out of the gross receipts of the revenue, from which, when we have deducted drawbacks and discounts, there will remain upwards of - - 1,500,000

To which add, as before - - 6,797,399

And the annual expense will be £11,565,032

Which is nearly thirty-three times the amount of the annual expenditure in America. But it may be objected, that in America there are also charges for management: to which we reply, certainly; and that some of them are included in the 353,613*l.* which the civil government costs; and that a sum greater than all the charges of management in America, is raised in several ways for the government here at home, which is given away in pensions and payments of various kinds, and never comes into the annual finance accounts. So that the money thus raised may be set off against the expense of management in America.—Another objection which may be made is, that each of the state governments defrays its own expenses. But here again the balance will be in favour of America, the county rates, and other assessments and payments for local purposes at home, being probably several times the amount of all the state governments in America; we will, however, take them at the same sum, and then the account will remain as before stated, namely,

That the charge for the civil government here amounts to - - £11,565,032

In America to - - - 353,613

* The dollar has throughout been calculated at 4*s.* 3*d.*

or very nearly one THIRTY-THIRD the sum we are compelled to pay.

But to show still more plainly the profligacy of the system here at home, we will make a few comparisons in detail.— On the 16th of March, 1819, was "published by order of the House of Commons, a paper, No. 114., being an account of the total expense of the following offices, *viz.*: — Privy Council, Treasury, Secretaries of State, and Messengers in the Lord Chamberlain's department:"—

	£.	s.	d.
1. Privy Council office — Clerks, Messengers, Coals, &c. - - -	27,373	17	11
2. Treasury ditto - - -	103,139	17	6
3. Secretaries of State - - -	122,880	5	0
4. Messengers in the Lord Chamberlain's office	2,000	0	0
	£255,394	0	5

This is a most monstrous sum for only three of the public offices, and the porters, or, as they are called, the messengers of a fourth office; but enormous as it is, it by no means shows the actual sum these offices cost. It is not many years since a sort of exposure took place in the trade department of the treasury, when it was discovered, that clerks of 800*l.* a-year kept magnificent houses, regular sets of servants, and three or four carriages, spending, in fact, the revenues of noblemen from the fees they obtained; it is enough, however, for our purpose, to take the expense of these offices at the sums furnished by ministers themselves: let us then see what our brethren in America pay for having the business done for which these offices are appointed. The whole expense for every thing which in any way relates to the Treasury, the Secretary of State, and the Exchequer of the United States, including the expense of distributing 11,000 copies of the laws passed at the preceding Congress, was 48,035*l.*, not one-fifth part of the charge for the three offices here; and if we could ascertain the expenses of the Exchequer in addition to the three offices, as well as the pensions and sinecures, it would probably come out that the whole charge was more than a dozen times the amount paid by the people of the United States.

The expenses of the Houses of Lords and Commons cannot be accurately stated; but the finance accounts give us some items. In the session of 1822 there were voted —

For salaries to the officers of both houses -	£22,800
Fittings and furniture for ditto - -	22,500
Expenses of ditto - - -	19,055
Printing for ditto - - - -	64,677
	£129,032

In the United States of North America each of the representatives in both houses receives eight dollars, or 36*s.* 6*d.* per diem wages, during the time they are going to, remaining at, and returning home from Congress, as was formerly the case here. Supposing the Congress to sit for three months, or that the member is occupied one hundred days on the public business; then as the number of representatives in the two houses is 237, the amount of their wages will be 189,600 dollars, or 40,290*l.*; and this is possibly the best laid out money which a people can expend, and which we of course do not expend on those who, instead of being the servants of the people, are their masters, and ought not, of course, to receive wages. On this point, then, there is nothing to which we can compare it.

The American government, however, furnishes an explicit account of all its expenses under the following heads, *viz.*: —

		Dollars.
1. Senate and House of Representatives, their officers and attendants - -	314,866	125,266
Deduct wages to the members - -	189,600	
2. Firewood, Stationery, PRINTING, and ALL OTHER *contingent* expenses of the two Houses - - - -		49,000
3. Library of Congress and librarian's salary - - - - -		1,950
4. Purchase of books for the library - - -		1,000
	Dollars	177,216
	In pounds sterling	£37,608

Not one-third of the expenses which are paid here for the same objects, probably not one-fourth, when it is considered that the *stationery*, and many other items of expense, are charged to accounts not included under those for the Houses of Lords and Commons.

In our profuse way of doing business, the printing alone, it will be seen, amounts to nearly twice as much as the whole expense of the two houses in America; and if the stationery be added, to much more than twice as much.

One example in the way of printing may suffice.—In America all the public acts of the Congress are printed at length in the principal newspapers, for which the government pays at the rate of two dollars a column; and no less than SEVENTY newspapers actually insert the acts and receive the pay. The acts of Congress are printed in the octavo form on coarse paper, and they usually occupy about *one hundred pages.* Appended to these are the public treaties and other matters relating thereto; an immense number of copies are printed, of which the secretary of state for the current year causes *eleven thousand copies* to be distributed to the proper persons throughout the United States: the printing of these acts makes one of the items in the forenamed account.

The printing of each 1000 copies of the American acts cannot cost more than 30*l.*

We, however, disdain this beggarly-looking useful mode, and our acts are accordingly printed in folio on writing paper. Those of the last year occupy 1446 pages, and cannot have cost so little as 1200*l.* for a thousand copies.

Another pretty specimen of the way in which an irresponsible assembly can vote the public money, may be taken from what is called the Civil List; which is principally composed of the KING'S household, and allowances to the other members of the royal family,

And amounted in 1821, to - -	£1,064,877
Not, however, including further allowance to those members of the royal family, pensions, &c. of	439,229
	£1,504,106

But besides this enormous sum, this most monstrous charge, for what may be with more strictness called the civil list, there are other expenses which make the whole amount to 2,878,892*l.*; which is more than the whole expense of the American government, civil, military, and naval.

A considerable portion of this charge of nearly three millions is called the ordinary charge of the civil list; but besides the ordinary charge, there are enormous annual charges out of the ordinary course. In 1818 an account of these charges was printed by order of the House of Commons, in two papers, Nos. 48. and 49. of that session. The title of these papers is, "Expenses of a civil nature which do not form part of the ordinary charge of the civil list." Look at these, John Bull, and if they do not make you sick at heart, and if your gall does not rise as your sickness comes on, your apathy is extraordinary. They are comprised under the 14 following heads: —

	£.	s.	d.
1. Salaries, &c. to officers of the Houses of Lords and Commons - -	6,293	6	8
2. Expenses of the two Houses - -	1,043	14	5
3. Monuments erecting - - -	3,965	5	0
4. Conveying governors and other persons of distinction to their places of destination	3,597	13	6
5. Allowances to admirals of duty on wine drunk at their tables - -	605	11	0
6. Salaries and expenses at the receipt of the exchequer - - -	552	6	8
7. *Contingent expense at the treasury and Secretaries of State's offices* - -	54,147	15	6
8. *Deficiencies of fees made good in the same offices* - - - -	37,673	13	9
9. Works and repairs of public buildings -	50,938	4	7
10. Furniture for certain public offices -	15,592	9	5
11. VARIOUS PUBLIC SERVICES - -	177,938	19	10
12. Extraordinary disbursements of ambassadors	64,016	14	1
13. Outfit for secretary of legation at Stockholm	214	16	6
14. Presents to ministers at foreign courts -	33,565	16	7
	£450,146	7	6

Thus we see that the *extraordinaries*, as they are called, of the civil list alone, cost 96,533*l.* 7*s.* 6*d.* more than the whole civil government of America.

The *extraordinary* disbursements of ambassadors alone cost us 64,016*l.*

While the *whole* cost of all sorts of foreign ministers, ordinary and extraordinary, cost the United States 148,500 dollars; or 31,556*l.*

And yet the diplomatic business of the United States is better performed than that of any other nation whatever.

On the 3d of May, 1822, the House of Commons printed a paper, No. 285., containing an account of the whole of his Majesty's diplomatic service from 1793 to 1822; from which it appears that the charge for 1821 was - £265,962

That of America, as before -	£31,556	
Add to this agents for claims for spoliations at Paris and London - -	850	
And for relief and protection of American seamen in foreign countries - -	8,500	
And the total expense will be ———		£40,906

Less than *one-sixth* of the money expended by the government here, much less efficaciously for good purposes, but infinitely more mischievously for bad purposes. The bare charge for diplomatic services costs us more than two-thirds the amount of the whole expense of the civil government in America. Would a House of Commons freely elected by the whole people permit such things as these to exist? Would they ever have sent a minister jobbing to the empty palace at Lisbon, and paid him upwards of 14,000*l.* for a sea-airing to his family?

In the finance accounts for the year 1821 are the following items:—

Charges of management, customs - -	£1,069,280
Ditto ——————— excise - -	1,133,919
	£2,203,199

But the whole cost of the American government, including the civil government, the army, and navy, is - - - - -	£2,010,220
Or, - - - - - -	192,979

less than the cost of *management* of the two engines of exaction and patronage, the customs and excise, here at home.

On the 27th March, 1821, the House of Commons printed a "Report from the Committee appointed to prepare the Militia Estimates." It consisted of two parts, viz.: —

	£	s.	d.
1. Estimate, charge of DISEMBODIED *militia*, Great Britain, for 1821 - -	269,519	12	2
2. Ditto, Ireland - - -	125,388	18	11
Total charge of DISEMBODIED *militia*	£394,908	11	1

Being 41,395*l.* more than the whole of the civil government of the United States in all its branches.

For the present we purposely exclude all mention of our army, navy, and debt.

So much for *taxes* in America, as to which we will now leave the Quarterly reviewer to his own reflections. With respect to all the details about provincial courts of justice, we are quite willing to admit that public courts and public officers in remote and thinly-peopled districts may have some of the vices, though none of the useless parade and dignity attached to their fellows in England. We have no time to pursue the subject further, but recommending to this writer and all his tribe

the diligent perusal of the President's last address to Congress, we shall conclude with the following striking passage from the introduction to Mr. Warden's statistical work: —

"Doubtless the government of the United States is not exempt from the errors and imperfections that adhere to all human institutions. But compare its public conduct with that of the old governments of Europe. How calm and reasonable is its language; always addressing itself to the understanding and the solid interests of the people, never to their passions or prejudices. It seeks no aid from superstition, supports no gainful impostures, and uses none of that disgusting cant with which the old governments of Europe varnish over the degradation of the people. It is a stranger to state craft and mystery. All its acts are done in the face of day. It promotes knowledge, religion, and learning, without the preference of particular sects, and without debasing them by falsehoods beneficial to the ruling powers. It is the only government in the world that dares to put arms freely into the hands of all its citizens. From Maine to Mississipi, it commands a prompt and ready obedience without any other weapon than a constable's staff. In a word, it secures property, satisfies opinion, promotes the development of industry and talent with a rapidity hitherto unexampled; and with the smallest sacrifice of individual rights and property on the part of the people, it accomplishes all that the most expensive and powerful governments pretend to."