

South Park

28th Feb.

My dear Abbot

Nothing can be more
just & honorable than
your proposal to undress
the Duke - as it appears
he entertained the notion
that I had intended to call
him to an acct. of which
I was not aware yesterday.
I gave my letter ^{of the 8th} to Miss
Erving to read, when she
at once said, Mr. Banger
is directed ag^t. the Peer, not

against the Duke - & as ^{they}
the letter enclosing the article
of the Herald was received
at the same time by you,
& did not point to the Duke
but to the Peer, I am of course
disposed to exonerate my
English from the mistake,
as I say "Shew over me
believe that the Duke was
imputed to him deception
& Treachery" - but it is
wells to discuss this point -
I am rejoiced that your
indignation led to the discovery,
for I venture upon my honor

if Shaw or any Man on such
a case, had come to me asking
me to ascertain the Duke's
declarations, with the menace
of a hostile alternative directed
ag^t. the Duke, I should have
been very much disposed to
have anticipated his force
& have kicked the fellow
to the Devil. I confess it
grieves me, that the Duke
should for a moment suppose
me capable of being a party
to any such measure - or that
it should be thought I
would have tolerated such
an intention. I considered

Shaw in a very simple case, was
acting like a Madman, in making
arrangements to fight a duel
with a Peer in a case in
which the Duke's declaration
would set matters to right -
& this impression was increased
when I found from W. Jocelyn
that he wd. previously resign
the Recordership - Now.

I must bear this blow as
well as I can - the first
& main point is to do justice
to Shaw by re-instating him
in the Duke's opinion as a
Gentleman incapable of
meditating such an insult.

insult ag^t the Duke - I shall
be guided by G^r. M^r + the Duke's
wishes, as to the donee I am to
adopt towards Shew -

I have not said a word to
Paul or any living soul except
myself, & as Paul thought
the Duke had treated Shew
ill during the dispute (according
to Shew's acc^t.) I shall not
say a word to him, or risk having
any further misunderstandings.

I could reproach you
as one of my oldest & best of
friends for letting me remain
in the dark so long, but my
delight greatly preponderates

that thro' your mistake will
be rectified without injury to Shaw,
for that has become an important
day - Ever My Dear & Affectionate
Yours most sincerely

A. Handcock

(Copies) Mary Herold office
26 Oct 1840

(P. 24)

"The Editor of the M: Herald presents
his Complts to Sir Frederick Shaw
informs him, in reply to his note
of the 24 inst, that he has not
rec^d - any answer to the letter
which he wrote to Ireland -
a circumstance which he cannot
account for, except upon the possibility
of the temporary absence of the post -
However he has written more urgently
by this post, requiring an answer by
return - which answer he will have
much pleasure in handing to Sir
Frederick Shaw without delay"

(P. 25)

Princess Louise
Dublin
28 Oct 1840

Sir

I have rec^d your Letter of the
26th of this Month, with surprise
& I must confess with a feeling
of indignation that I find it very
difficult to suppress;

On the 25th of last Month you
show an Editorial Article in the
M: Herald to be made the vehicle
of a most scandalous imputation
affecting my honour & Character
namely - that, in effect the
Duke of Wellington had declared
that

2^d That I had deceived & betrayed
him. & the Article states that you
make the Charge upon the Authority
of an Irish Peer, to whom His Grace
made the declaration & whose name,
if I enquired for it, was at my
Service — I do enquire
for it — and instead of
giving me the name as I had
the fullest right to expect, on
the Moment — you write to say
you cannot give an answer
to my enquiry until you have
written to Ireland, which you
will endeavour to do by the
next of the night of the following
day: I then wait until two
posts after your answer from
Ireland sh^d have arrived & been
communicated to me, & again
write to you to know if I am
to expect any other reply to my
first letter. & by your answer
to that last come to hand
I am informed that you have
not yet received any answer
from Ireland & expect one
to delay for another post
to pass to & from Ireland;
I protest ag^t such delay is
most unnecessary. & tho^t
I am perfectly certain you
answer

³ never will receive the authority of
any Peer or gentleman or person
of veracity for that which I
know never happened - yet,
rather than run the risk of being
thought in any degree precipitate.
I will wait until Monday next.
(The regular course of the post
could bring me your answer on
Saturday Evening) In case I do
not see or before Monday receive
the letter which you seem to
expect, or one from yourself
containing a sufficient reason
to the contrary - it is my intention
on that day to write requesting
you to insert in the Morning
Herald Newspaper the correspondence
between us upon this subject,
I have sent a copy of it for insertion
in a Dublin Newspaper that
Evening.

You have mistaken my address
as I am not Sir Inglethorpe
& will add my proper address
in a Postscript to this letter
I have the honor to be Sir

Y^r Obed^t Serv^t

To the Editor

of the Morning Herald

but such an observation w^d have
been but natural from a Man who
was meaning to ask for satisfaction,
in case he found that the Duke had
so expressed himself.

Time passes; for you told me
that Mr Soelwyn was coming over
immediately. otherwise I sh^d not
have been in such haste to do as you
desir'd, & to show of. letters to the Duke;
but I should at once have reason-
ed stated with you. When I found that
I could do no otherwise than show
th^e, I was sure that by making no com-
ments to the Duke, I sh^d avoid doing
mischief. — I merely showed of.
letters

letter to the Duke; heard what he said;
went to my room & wrote to you
what he did say, taking care to leave
out his angry expressions (such as
kicking him to the Devil &c.); &
from that day to this the subject has
never been alluded to, except when
he showed me Mr. Shaw's letter to him.

That letter was unfortunately ex-
worded as still to leave the impressions
which you & of the Dth had given.

I go tomorrow to Paul's. I stay
there till Monday; & then go for a
week to Dr. Ege's.

I shall leave word here for my
letters to be forwarded.

Your most kind friend
W. A.

South Park, Cambridge
Oct. 24. 1840

My dear Abbot

I think your letter
places the case before the
Duke in the true light -
As for myself, I shall do
nothing at present - but
I hope the Duke will
write to Shaw - when he
reflects that if letter
permitted him to address
the Duke, & that his object
is simply to protect himself
vs. a calumny falsely put

Mr W. Bond

Charles Abbot
Drayton Manor
Surrey



Dublin
29 Oct 1840

My dear Harbidge

I send you a copy of
the Liberator 2nd letter & my
reply - my friends here
wanted me to publish on
Monday - but not to give
notice to the Liberator that I
do so - I thought it more
perfectly above board and
gentlemanlike to apprise
him of the course I meant
to take & therefore I left that

Right Dear

Sir Henry Harbidge

is - with regard to the
Duke - quite agree in your
view - you will not think
I had too much in my last
letter to the Editor in the statement
that I knew the declaration
had never been made -
and as I wish to be to the
last degree scrupulous in my
opinion to the Duke's name
or authority - I wish you
would write me in so many
many words - tho' I think
your last letter amounts to
the same -

cc you are authorized to

state that De Dale never
made any such declaration
as that attributed to him
since in the Morning Herald
of the 29th - if kept
H. D.

I only want that for
my own satisfaction, without
the least intention of using
your name - unless I shall
have occasion to refer to you
personally. - It seems
not and impossible that I may
set De Peers name - Westcott
absolutely denies it - to Henry

who is absent - is the only one
I wish to see - I then I think I will
write to him on the terms of an
apology - giving credit of
my correspondence with the Editor
I adding the words as on the
other side "I have authorized
to state that the Duke of W-
never made such a declaration
I then I think he must retract -
of course if he persevered coolly
without offering me any personal
insult. I then must again apply
to the Duke himself -

I have had a satisfactory &
kind answer from L. B. Russell
I may have to write to the Peer
St. Sunday - to I think he had to hear
from you on that point. I never offered

Mr W. Noble

Charing

Charles A. Smith

Dayton

Garnworth



I have read in the
words at the end of
my letter to say that
the whole had better
stop here. I fear that further
explanations w^d do us good. You had a copy of my
Mr De la Harpe's explanation to the Duke;
& therefore he was not the
exact truth.

Deighton Manor

Saturday 31st Oct 1840

It is very difficult to advise
what had best be done. I certainly w^d
say that nothing more ought now to be done.

My letter to the Duke tells him plainly
that we had all misunderstood the
purpose & object of G^r's letter; & well it
w^d have been if Mr Shaw had been so-
-tified with the astonishing letter which I
wrote to you on the 8th of Oct^r; for by that
letter he gained his object of the Duke's
denial. But unfortunately Mr Shaw
wrote what I thought an indiscreet letter
to the Duke; saying as it were to push him
(with the Duke's previous retention of G^r's
letter)
to the wall; & telling him that his answer
would

would be published. This certainly
did the reverse of pleasing the Duke,
he bearing always in mind the letter with
regard to: deane I showed to the Duke. I
should say that the least offensive thing
that could happen to Mr Shaw, would be
for the Duke to have returned no answer.

We must always recollect that the
Duke had been led to believe that Mr
Shaw had hostile intentions against
him. I felt this so strongly, that I am
sure I was never more cautious. I confined
myself to showing of: letters; to hearing what
he wished me to write; to writing it down
verbatim; & to studiously avoiding ever
after to renew the subject: - and I am
satisfied

satisfied it never w^d have been renewed had
the letter come from Mr. Shaw which I did not
think happily worded. - I refrained even
from telling you what the Duke said, as I
was anxious to put out the flame I w^d
to blow it up.

The Duke now knows that your
letter was misunderstood; & that is all
well. I told him so in as plain terms
as I could use. He answered me by saying
that he must decline being mixed up in
an affair with which he had no concern,
& that Mr. Shaw can apply to the Editor
of the Morning Herald for information.

I see the Duke is determined not to
be brought into it. Therefore, in f^o place,
I would not write to the Duke about it. I
give you the advice wth were I you, I
should

should follow.

I came here yesterday, & with a very
bad Cold. Lady Pele has one; &
I have not seen her. I have not been
able to talk much with Pele, but I hope
Tomorrow I shall cough less & be able to
talk more. You will do quite right not
to say a word to Pele upon this misunderstanding,
with in time I doubt not blow over.

at all events the Duke knows from me
that y^r first letter was misunderstood.

Si^r G. Murray comes to day; & I^r Francis
on Monday. I shall go to him, or rather
with him, on Tuesday next.

Ever my dear Harcourt

Y^r most obed^t

Ch^r. Carteret

If Mr. Shaw were to know that y^r letter had been
misunderstood, he c^d not be offended with the word
Civil in my ostensible answer to you; but then y^r sh^d
see that he would say to all his friends, it had been

219

Boston

31 Oct. 1840

My dear Gardiner

I had you on the
other side the pen of
The Morning Herald - and
I will publish the
Correspondence on Monday
You ever
Yours truly
Wm Lloyd Garrison

W. L. G.

Lieut. Henry Gardner

31 Oct

(Copy) The Herald office
Oct 28. 1840

Sir

In your note of the 17th inst. advertising
to a particular passage in the
Article headed "The Irish Municipalities
Bill" you make the following application
— "I request that you will inform me
whether the Irish Peer referred to, stated,
or in any manner conveyed to you
that the D. of W. had declared that
he had been deceived or betrayed
by you, or used words to that
effect" you then proceed
"and if so, (that is, if the answer
to the first interrogatory should be
in the affirmative) then that, in
pursuance of your offer in the passage
which I have quoted, you will give
me the name of that Irish Peer"
In reply, I informed you that
I had written to Ireland respecting

The Subject of your application
I awaited a reply, which reply
I did not receive until yesterday
which must be my excuse for the delay
which has occurred.

I am now enabled to state - on
the same authority as that on which
the passage alluded to was quoted,
that the Irish Peer referred to, did
not assert or convey, that the Duke
of W: had declared that he had been
deceived or betrayed by you, or
used words to that effect - His
Observation was a general one.

The answer to your first enquiry
being thus decidedly in the Negative,
makes it unnecessary, according to the
terms of your own request, to proceed
further with the Subject.

I have the honor to be Sir
your obed^t. & humble Serv^t
The Editor of the Morning Herald

J. R. W. Corke and Thos
Newman House Dublin

Deception Marrow
Sunday 1st Nov. 1840

most
Private

Confidential

My Dear M.

I have received yr. letter of yester-
-day, & also the one from Mr. Shaw to you.

I do assure you that your or Mr. Shaw's
writing to the Duke upon this unfounded
subject will do all the harm imagina-
-ble; without a chance of doing good.

you have seen that without disguise
I wrote to the Duke as strongly as I c^d.
do, that neither you nor Mr. Shaw w^d.
for the whole world have done anything
that could be disagreeable to him; &
therefore he now knows that yr. letter had
been misunderstood. with this I sh^d.
have

have wished to stop; but as G. L. today
gives me reason to believe that now L. may
be written to the Duke, I do not like
to conceal from you that in his answer
he seemed much irritated at the subject
being renewed. - Neither will I conceal
from you that he did write a very dry &
what might be thought an abrupt
answer to Mr. Shaw, at the time of his
believing that G. L. manifested hostile
intentions against him. The whole
subject has so much provoked him
that I was awed by talking to him again
about it, I should only add to excite-
ment. As I have told you before I pre-
sently refrained from talking to him about
it afterwards; & it is only from your
letters

Letter that I mean the Duke's answer to Mr.
Shaw was never sent. I am rejoiced it was
not. It was not a letter with which I have been
satisfied to Mr. Shaw; & I cannot
say how glad I am that you second
thoughts the Duke did not send it.

Let me wish you as you are an
old & greatly attached friend of the
Duke's not to write to him, in any
way, about this business, and more
that this, do I entreat you urge Mr.
Shaw not to write to him either.

I certainly do think Mr. Shaw in-
-quarily wrong headed. No letter comes
from him which does not carry with it
that impudence to my mind.

Nothing will be gained by trying to get
an answer from the Duke. Mr. Shaw
has

has seen the letter w^{ch} I wrote by the
Duke's authority; & in that letter he had
a complete disavowal of the words im-
puted to him. What can he want more?

In Heaven's sake don't write on this
subject of self to the Duke; & don't let
Mr. Shaw write. In order to save you
the annoyance of an answer I wrote to
the Duke myself most plainly that if
letter had been misunderstood. He
knows it was; but he says that he has
nothing to do with it, ^{& will not} & Mr. Shaw may
apply if he pleases to the Editor of the
M. W. — I wish to save you & Mr. Shaw
the pain of a very angry correspondence
with the Duke. Were it not that I fear Mr.
Shaw's total want of common sense & dis-
cretion, I sh^d if I were you tell him at once
that if letter of the 8th of Oct. to me was misunder-
stood

P. A.

But to be wrongfounded a man I cannot
advise you to take any step whatever.

Unless you do this, all you have to do
is to let it drop. I had most earnestly
wished not to let you know that a
very long (& very the least) letter had been
written to Mr. Shaw; & significant even
I that he thinks no answer was ever
written. It is far better that he sh^d
think so than that he sh^d have rec^d
the letter. I had also wished to con-
-ceal the Duke's misstatement, but any-
-thing w^d be better than the subjecting you
to the chance of a very angry correspondence.

Pray don't write about it, I don't wish Mr.
Shaw write. Lady Scurly by the obser-
-vation to you that it was against the Peer
& not against the Duke, showed I think
that she also mistook of letter.

I positively w^d have suspected that
letter

Letter if you had not mist that Mr.
Scobyn was our agent, & that if
I had not expected that he would present
himself in a sudden at Wabana Castle,

I had not a doubt but that the Duke
was the person to be called to account,
& so thought the only other persons who
saw it.

Not any will we have opinion
if Mr. Shaw is. I have been satisfied
with what I wrote on the Duke's autho-
-rity; I had not written a word ill
expressed letter to the Duke.

Again I say that to save you from
a very disagreeable correspondence with
the Duke, I tried to select the strongest
expressions I could to him to prove that
of better had been mis understood.
Ever most truly
yours

W. M. Shaw had had common sense
he w^d have been satisfied with the con-
-tradiction w^{ch} my letter to you gave by
the Duke's authority; & which you
now again tell him to see, at least,
the suspensions in it.

I think that hereafter, when Mr.
Shaw becomes calm & reasonable, I sh^d.
let him know that right or wrong, if
said letter to me had been entirely
misunderstood.

C. S.

Pemberton

1st Nov.

My Dear Aunt

I went out before the
Post came in & did not
return here till 11 at night
yesterday & as this day is
Saturday, & no post, I
am sending a parcel to
you by Coach, & have
my time to write a few
hurry'd lines to you -

You say it appears bad
but I continued my taste of the
gth as you did - quite the
reverse - she at once said

using the words the Duke authorized
you to convey this to Skene -

Ever Affectionate Advertiser Yr
very truly, A. Handing

Dublin

2 Nov^r 1740

My dear Hardinge

You more than
anticipated my wishes
in your most satisfactory
& kind letter rec^d - this
day - You shall be sure
that I have equally
anticipated your
advice - in making
no unnecessary use

Right Obedt

Wm Henry Hardinge

of the Duke's name as
authority in my
correspondence which
I had this day to
the Morning Herald.
I publish this evening
in the Dublin Courier
paper
that a copy of which
I will send you -
& I will direct another

to Dr. W. W. W. at

W. W. W. — your

letter is most valuable

to have in my possession

but I have no idea

that any manuscript

would exist for writing

it publicly

With many thanks

I am most faithfully

J. H. W.

(copy)

Birmingham Herald

8 Nov - 1840

Sir

I have this moment received
from you, & by it returns the
accompanying letter, as it
merely states that in a letter
which you had addressed to the
Editor of the B. & P. select in reference
to a correspondence between Dr
Alexander & me, you had said
that you had given me the
names of 2 Gentlemen as authority
for the assertion that I had
expressed an opinion to Lord
L. - that the reputation of the
Municipal Bill would break
up the Irish Protestant party.
I that the names of the 2
Gentlemen were the Mr. J. J.
Weston & the E. J. of St. Paul.
I allow me to remind you
that I never asked for those
names. You, who were
a constant & regular trustee
of mine, risked a public
statement of fact respecting
my Party's conduct, & not without
your own knowledge, without
applying to me to know whether

2. It was true or not - upon
that point (altho' the statement
was not of a nature that I felt
called upon to notice of my own
accord) I have subsequently
expressed my opinion in the
Correspondence with W. Alex^r to
which you refer I wish he has
published; but, if you consider
your statement to the Public
requires authority or explanation
I have only to say that I cannot
suffer them to be supplied
thro' the medium of a private
communication from you
to me. As such seems
to be the sole object
of your present letter,
I think the proper course
for me is to send it back
to you.

Should be glad to be furnished
your usual ^{to} kind regards
Yours sincerely
G. D. Howard

Esac Buttign

Shalfeld Lane
Nov^r 28. 1840

My dear Sir

I enclose a letter which I addressed to the Editor of the Standard Newspaper some days ago, with the subject of which you are in some degree connected as in truth my only reason for addressing the Editor of the Standard, was to enable you to trace to its source a calumny respecting yourself; which I had seen that you had endeavoured to accomplish for yourself; but that your endeavours had failed; Notwithstanding that the Editor of the Morning Herald had engaged, that if required by you; he would inform you of the name of the Nobleman by whom it had been stated, that I had complained to him, that you had deceived me upon the subject of the Irish Corporation Bill.

I was considering what course I should take in order to do you justice upon this subject; when I read the leading article in the Standard of the 20th inst. I could

not doubt that the Editor would not
hesitate to make known the name
of the person who conveyed to him
a report for which I informed him
there was no foundation, more
particularly as I stated that my
only motive for applying to him
was to enable me to do you justice
this is the obvious object of my letter
to the Editor.

The Editor refused to comply
with any request; which he had
certainly a right to do if he
thought proper upon this course
I shall make no comment.

He likewise omitted
to publish my whole letter;
and leaves the publick to believe
that I cared one pin about the
Report that I had professed
that I had been deceived on
any ground whatever, excepting
that the report was connected with
your name.

The Editor offers however to
publish the whole letter if I desire
it - I did not pay for the publication
of the letter as for an advertisement.
I had no right to ask the Editor
of the Standard to publish it. He
would have treated me probably
as the Editor of another Newspaper
did you. And then would have
annoyed the publick with his
observations upon my presumption
in requiring such publication from
him.

I have therefore thought it best
to send you a copy of my letter to the
Editor of the Standard of the 21st

Just - I leave it to you to
do what you may think
proper with it; as my sole
object in writing it was
to obtain information for you
which would enable you to
discover the person who had
been your slanderer

Ever my dear Sir Yours
Most faithfully
Wellington

To the Right Hon^{ble}
Frederick Shaw

15th Nov. 1840

Month Dec. 6th 1840

1. — When the first set of
Papers were rec^d. from Sir
Howard Douglas, containing
the Instructions from ^{him} of the
6th Sep. it appeared to me
as well as to Sir Wm. Kerrie
& Colonel Drake, that the
matter referred to us, had
been satisfactory & honorably
settled by Captain ^{Douglas} & Major
Drake with Lt. Col. Fitz-Pee,
& that in all probability
we should shortly hear from
Sir Howard, that he was also
satisfied with that adjustment &

1. did not wish us to proceed any
further in the matter, referred

to us

2

— Sir Howard Douglas has on
the 26th Sep. sent a Supplemental
Instruction to me, in which he
says that "I rejoice Major
Tucker has deemed Dr. Charles'
explanation to be satisfactory
because it precludes further
interference on the part of ~~his~~ my
son. I however by no means
consider this explanation as
satisfactory, either as to the
expressions were than would
or his limitation of the Epistle
disputable to Dr. Vilett's
character." and Sir Howard
repeats that he would not
admit any explanation or

4th - Any further delay would
 however be extremely inconvenient,
 & as Sir Wm. Horvis & I take
 a different view from that
 entertained by our friend Sir
 Howard, I think it is due
 to him, to give the reasons
 which influence us in resisting
 his wishes as contained in his Supplementary
 Instructions.

The inconvenience of the
 delay is attributable to the
 mode adopted by Sir W., namely
 that in the time to be adopted
 in his behalf we are all to
 concur. It is certainly most
 agreeable to me to be associated
 with two of my earliest friends
 on whose judgement I rely

with the most perfect confidence,
& if they were at my elbow, I
have no doubt we should have
no difficulty in conveying this
toward our unanimous opinion
arising out of the Supplementary
Instructions of the 26th Sept. —

As how^r. at this season of the
year we are all dispersed, in
different parts of the Country,
I am obliged in deciding
upon my own course, to give
to them ^{in writing} the reasons by which
I am actuated, & I shall have
no objection to send this
mem^o. to Sir H^o. Douglas after
they have perused it, requesting
them to give me their opinions
for the purpose of being also
transmitted to Sir H^o. Douglas.

(3)

& if I acting on Sir Howard's Supple-
-mentary Instructions, were to
approach Mr. Charles without
referring to the previous correspondence
between him & Captain Douglas,
would Charles not have a right to
say to me at the outset "Does
Sir Howard Douglas by sending
you to me, mean to discredit his
Son's acceptance of an adjustment
which Major Clarke has received
as a satisfactory explanation?"
In what a position would Cap.
Douglas & Major Clarke be placed
by this course? I could only
answer Sir H. Douglas is
dissatisfied with my explanation
& Mr. Charles not have a right
to refuse to re-open an affair
already terminated.

6^h

6th - Can I take another course
indicated by Sir H^d - that altho'
he will not plead before such
a judge as W^d Charles, I am to
place in W^d Charles' hands a
Statement I have procured.

"Not therefore as my Statement
but as a Statement which you
have procured &c -

Any act of mine in presenting
a Statement as Sir H^d's friend
would in reality be his act.

If Sir H^d Douglas had
instructed me in consequence
of the settlement of the personal
ground of quarrel, to go to W^d
Charles & act as a mediator
by showing him Sir Ed^d Lyons'
letter & other documents, & by
convincing him of his errors,
to obtain a letter admitting

(4)

admit the inaccuracy of the Statement
& what the imputation founded upon it is
Again "I insist upon an absolute
retraction of the whole of the Statement
inference & imputation"

It must be evident to my
Colleagues unless we can review
the personal ground of general,
we have not the means of enforcing
these demands.

How can any Statement of mine
be enforced in such peremptory
terms? Where are all the
official documents? I don't
doubt the accuracy of the Statement,
but how can I enforce it, when
my Principal says "he will not
appeal to Mr. Charles as a judge" - & we say the personal
ground is closed. -

Since Sir Howard has
written these Supp. Instructions

Lord John Russell's letter has
appeared in the Public papers -
giving Sir Howard as far as his
public conduct is concerned the
fullest satisfaction & in a few
words what the Public have
read - His Lordship has I
think on the public footing &
acts of Sir H. given him a
much better satisfaction, than
any admissions, ^{would be} extracted from
Lord Charles - whose opinion
is of no importance - & who has
a right to persevere in maintaining
what opinions he pleases of Sir
Howard & his Gov^{ts}. provided they
do not when published contain
expressions personally offensive
to Sir Howard.

Looking therefore at the
Papers sent to me as definite

Instructions, I feel it to be quite impossible
to act upon them in any manner -

Under all these circumstances,
I adhere to my former opinion, that
we can take no step on the ground
of personal offence, because it has
been honorably & finally settled -

2nd - That explanation the matter by
me in a statement alleged to ^{be} my
own, would be unadvisable &
contrary to Sir Howard's ^{Instructions} ~~successor~~ who directs
to appeal to Dr. Charles &

lastly, that the most prudent
thing is to recommend Sir H^d.

to do nothing until he comes returns
to England, when according to
Major Charles's letter of the 28th
Sept. he ^{is} not precluded from
and entering into explanations
with Dr. Charles as to his public
policy "whenever Sir H^d may

think proper to do so" &c

any statement in vindication of his
public acts, may with more propriety
be addressed to the public Functionary
under whose orders he has acted -
but I really do not see any mode
by which we can acting under the
precise instructions of our friend, at
this moment be of any use to him -
& moreover, I wd strongly urge
Sir Howard, never to allow it to
transpire, that he deems the
explanation & instructions obtained
& accepted by his son from L^d Chamberlain
to be satisfactory.

H. H.

Original of
Sir H. Knollys
in Sir H. Knollys
C. 11.

he Dr. Charles had been wrong my
course w^d. he can carry on - but

I have no free agency - we are
circumscribed & ~~followed~~ by definite
& precise instructions. I don't think

I should, acting on my own judgment;
attempt the line of a mediator

(the personal quarrel being settled)
because I think it w^d. be undignified
as regards Sir Howard's high position

& injurious to his high character
that the aggrieved party should

seek explanations ^{with} from the

aggresor by endeavouring to

persuade him (personal satisfaction

being at an end) that he was

not the disputable character

denied by the aggresor -

I never would condescend

to convince Dr. Charles that

he was in the wrong - & as

we are expressly directed but

not to place Sir H. in a position
of appearing to appeal to Sir H. as
as a judge, this course appears to
me to be quite ~~inadvisable~~ impru-
-dence.

This is very evident in the
Supplementary Instructions -
In making the Statement of my
own conduct I am to insist
(in compliance with Sir Howard's
direction) upon Sir H. Fitz-Poy's
acknowledging in writing, that
my Statement is a full complete
& unanswerable refutation of
Sir H. Fitz-Poy's letter in the
Ir. Chronicle.

In the Supple^d Instructions
Sir Howard says "I insist upon
an unequivocal admission that
the manner in which he has
connected the one with the other
is wholly false, that he admit

5^h. It appears to me desirable
in consideration of the fulness of so
highly valued a friend as Sir H.
Dungham, to endeavour to convince
him, that it w^d. be impossible
for us to act on the instructions
he has sent us.

In the instruction of the
6th Sep. Sir Howard, distinctly
says, that "he may appear to
Sir Charles Fitz-Roy for those
personalities which he has
vented on inaccurate information."
and further on he says "I
cannot permit myself in any
way to be considered as pleading
to such a judge as Sir Charles
Fitz-Roy."

The personal ground of offence
is therefore the real & only

cause of Offence on which Sir H.
wishes to have any direct comm.
with Lord Charles.

But we are all unanimous
of opinion that the personal
cause of quarrel ought not to be
revived — inasmuch as it has
been honourably & finally
settled by his Son.

Even if it had been less
satisfactorily settled, Sir Howard
could never set aside his Son's
acceptance of Sir Charles' explana-
-tion, & retractions without casting
unmerited censure upon Captain
Douglas & Major Clarke. Sir
Charles admitted them as parties
competent to call him to
an acct. for his letter in the
M. Chronicle — & if I acting

or retraction, that may have been made by W. Charles Fitz-Poy, & in the appeal which I am to make under the additional instructions, I am directed not to refer to the correspondence which has taken place between Cap. Douglas & W. Charles Fitz-Poy.

3 — On the receipt of these Papers, I sent word to Sir W. Herries on 27th Oct. & on receiving his answer I sent the whole of the Papers to him. After a careful perusal of the Papers, he again concurred with me, that it would be very improper to revive the discussion with W. C. on the personal ground of offence

3

with a suggestion that it might
be advisable to confer with
Major Clarke - & accordingly
recd. from that officer, copies
of all the Papers which had
passed between him & Mr. Charles
Fitz-roy & Mr. John Puffell.

The Major during this period
was at Bandon in Ireland,
Sir Wm. Harris in Yorkshire,
& Colonel Drake on the move
between England & Scotland.

I recd. the Papers from
Sir Wm. Harris the 22nd Nov.
& 2 ~~days~~ days ago, I informed
Major Clarke, that I wished
to confer with him on this
subject, & again find that he
has left London, his address
unknown. 4th Decy

Oakley Park
16 Dec^r 1840

My dear Hastings

Mr Drake's uncommon
kindness gives me another
letter to send you - which
I cannot resist doing -
as you may remember
(particularly after my first
letter in Oct^r) that I was
under so much anxiety in
dealing with his post name
to do that which I thought

Right Hon^{ble}

Genl Henry Hastings

would be most pleasing to him.

I had promised you I would

put your opinion also

that I had done right - &

this is my justifying to me -

As I think I said to you

before. The Duke's kindness is more

than compensation for all

that I have done thro' -

I am here [Berrisford] for a few

^{shorter} days - We have had a very

pleasant party in the

House - I expect to be in Ireland

again - early next week - and

I hope I shall have to give you

no more trouble wth my affairs

Yours most faithfully

Wm Pitt

(Copy) Northfield Sept

Dec^r 9 - 1840

Respected Sir

I show you your letter of the 3rd inst^t & I have seen in the newspapers the account of what you have published of that which I wrote & communicated to you.

It appears to me that you have exercised a sound discretion in publishing what you have done, & in withholding the remainder from publication.

I see that the ^{Editor of} Standard taunts you for withholding any part of the Correspondence - He is not complained of - The fact of his not publishing my whole letter is mentioned but without comment - excepting that he

had a right to do so if he
pleased.

We have set right the
principal affair! let us
leave the rest to be dealt with
as their sentry please - We
can see hereafter what is to
be done with them - The
less intercourse we have
with them the better.

Ever, Dear Sir, yours

Most faithfully

Wellington

16th Dec 40

Right Honble

Fredrick Shaw

Remembrance House
Dublin

Confidential.

Waterbury & Wheatley
29 Dec^r: 1840

My dear Herrick,

I have carefully perused the papers you sent me relative to the affair between Sir Howard Douglas and Lord Charles FitzRoy.

I most fully enter into Sir Howard's feelings with respect to the attack made upon him in L^d. Charles's letter to Lord John Russell, and am fully aware of the use likely to be made of it in the Ionian Islands, and more particularly at Zante, to the prejudice of Sir Howard and his Government; and much as I feel individually at differing in opinion from such a kind, valued, and esteemed friend, and for whose judgment, I entertain so much deference and respect, yet, in the present instance, I cannot avoid doing so.

In the first place I am most fully confirmed in the opinion we have before given, that, after what has passed between Captain Douglas, Major Clarke and L^d. Ch. FitzRoy, and the two former having expressed themselves fully satisfied on personal grounds,

it would be improper to make a further appeal
of a personal nature to his Lordship -

It is perfectly clear that Captain Douglas made
that appeal through Major Clarke without the
knowledge of his father, with whom he could not
at the time have had any communication. His
motives for doing so were, no doubt, of the most
pious, high minded, and praise worthy description,
and, after that his ^{son} and Major Clarke had expressed
themselves satisfied on personal grounds with
the explanation given, I think, that Sir Howard
ought to accept it, although it was not satisfactory
to him, (see additional instructions) as his not doing so, would throw an un-
deserved censure on them jointly, and on his son, whose
conduct in the affair "was publicly and most strongly
"the subject of admiration" (see letter 26th Sept.) in the
Ionian Islands.

Feeling this then upon that part of the question,
I come to the next, that, of Sir Henry Hardinge's tendency
to L^d. Ch. Fitzroy the statement &c &c, which he had

had better not have been resorted to, and I am quite
sure it never would have succeeded by laying before
his Lordship "the Statement," unless it was greatly
modified - However Major Clerk's correspondence
with Lord Charles, admits of Sir Howard "placing
" his public acts and policy, as L^d. H. Commissioner
" of the Ionian Islands, in such a light as will
" satisfy his Lordship," (see Letter of 28 August) if he thinks
proper "to appeal to such a Judge" - But this is a
matter, which we have nothing to do with -

I have thus given you my ideas, more in
detail than I did on a former occasion, and
~~will be obliged if you will~~ shall be obliged if you will
forward them to Hardinge -

As I wrote you before, I hope to see you on
Tuesday next, or Monday Evening, if more convenient,
and will bring the Papers with me -

Yours very truly
T. Drake

"procured as verified by public Documents", and "leaving
it for his (L. Charles's) consideration", whilst at the
same time, Sir Howard says, that "he cannot in any
"way permit himself to be considered as pleading to
"such a judge as Lord Ch. Ritz Roy". — In this,
I think he is perfectly right, but it wholly precludes
Sir Henry from complying with the other part of
the instructions, and laying before Lord Charles, the
statement sent by Sir Howard for that purpose.

With respect to this, I would say by the way, that
if given by Sir Henry, to Lord Charles, not as
"Sir Howard's", but as a statement which he (Sir Henry)
"had procured" (see Instructions) it must be con-
siderably modified, as there are expressions in it
which, if considered as Sir Henry's own, might
bring him into personal conflict with L. Charles.

But we are agreed, that no further appeal of a
personal nature can be made to Lord Charles
Ritz Roy. — How then can his "unqualified
"admission that the manner in which he has

"connected the one with the other is utterly false",³⁷
and "an absolute retraction of the whole of this state-
ment, inference and imputation" (see additional
instructions) be insisted upon? It clearly can not.
And therefore I do not see how we can in any
way act in pursuance of Sir Howard's instructions.
They are penned, with a laudable and very natural
desire and anxiety, to set himself right in public
opinion, but are so very precise, that with our
opinion as to a further personal ~~objection~~^{appeal}, it is
impossible for us to act upon them, as they leave
us no discretionary power.

In the way of mediation I think that something
satisfactory might have been done, judging from the
words of Lord Charles's letter to Major Clarke, that if
"he (Sir Howard) convinced him of his error, he would be
"as ready to do justice to him by the most ample apology,
"as he was anxious to do justice to certain Tories &c &c
Perhaps it might have proved an experiment, which
had better