

## **The Rhetoric of Moral Justice and Political Expediency: William Ewart Gladstone vs. Viscount Palmerston in British Parliamentary Debates on The First Opium War**

---

Tomoyasu KIMURA

### **0 Introduction**

In the conclusion of an article of the 8th Research Bulletin of Nagoya University of Foreign Studies (pp.197–229), the author said to himself, “Which idea was politically more expedient, Gladstone’s or Palmerston’s, to their contemporary people?” and in order to find an answer to this question, he made up his mind to read all the speeches made on April 7th, 8th and 9th, 1840. He did, and a careful reading of each speech made in the British parliamentary debates gave him a certain impression of William Gladstone and his way of argumentation, but he also noticed his impression is different from the description of Gladstone given by Kondo Kazuhiko, a Japanese historian, who writes as follows:

“The young statesman who was confident in his faith, his civilized way of life and his sense of justice delivered a harsh criticism of Foreign Secretary Palmerston’s ‘unjust and iniquitous war’. The parliamentary debates which lasted until April 9th were concluded with a majority of only 9 votes (262 votes against vs 271 votes for the war). Gladstone’s speech was character-

ized by his command of factual detail and robust argument, with which he denounced his opponents' arguments and captivated the whole audience of a parliamentary debate for the sake of shared faith, civilization and justice.” (Kondo 2013, pp.211–212, translated by the author)<sup>1</sup>

Although he was apparently trying to make an objective description as a historian, Kondo spoke so well of Gladstone that the author was led to feel Gladstone was so persuasive that he contributed to achieving the small majority. Is this true? Now let him begin with the primary source of his study, *Hansard's* British Parliamentary Debates.

### 1.1 The UK *Hansard*

Kondo introduced *Hansard* as an adscript term in his book (*Ibid.*, p.211) when he referred to a long speech of about 8,500 words by Gladstone, so the author uses this source as his primary one. According to Wikipedia, which was retrieved on August 27th, 2021, “*Hansard* is the traditional name of the transcripts of Parliamentary debates in Britain and many Commonwealth countries. It is named after Thomas Curson Hansard (1776–1833), a London printer and publisher, who was the first official printer to the Parliament at Westminster.”

Thanks to the Internet, also with the help of volunteers, it is now easy to get access to the UK *Hansard*, which is currently being digitised to a high-level format for on-line publication. We can review and search the UK *Hansard* from 1803, with the exception of standing committees. In addition, since 2010, historic copies of *Hansard* have been sent to India in its original volume format and transformed from the original bound versions into plain text by optical character recognition (OCR) and put on the Internet to enable easy research. It is even pointed out that “There are still many ‘typos’ from the OCR process”, and the author does find many typos in each speech text, so, as he has corrected them, he has confirmed the number of words in the speech.

## 1.2 A Brief Description of Each Speaker and His Speech

In the British parliamentary debates held on April 7th, 8th and 9th, 1840, a total number of 25 speakers made a speech and here is a list of the names of those speakers and their brief descriptions which go as follows:

1. Sir James Graham, 2nd Baronet (**47 years old** when he delivered his speech on **April 7**, 1840; **Submitting** his motion as Member for Pembroke at the time of his delivery; and his speech was 14,621 words long.) (**15,411**) **Speech 1**
2. Mr. Thomas Babington Macaulay (**39 years old** when he delivered his speech on **April 7**, 1840; **Opposed** to the motion as Member for Edinburgh and the Secretary at War at the time of his delivery; and his speech was **6,600 words long**.) **Speech 2**
3. Sir William Webb Follet (**43 years old** when he delivered his speech as Member for Exeter on **April 7**, 1840; **Paired off** but felt bound to vote with Sir Graham; and his speech was **7,413 words long**.) **Speech 3**
4. Sir George Staunton, 2nd Baronet (**58 years old** when he delivered his speech on **April 7**, 1840; **Opposed** to the Motion as Member for Portsmouth at the time of his delivery; and his speech was 3,067 words long.) (**3,212**) **Speech 4**
5. Mr. Sidney Herbert, 1st Baron Herbert of Lea (**29 years old** when he delivered his speech on **April 7**, 1840; **Seconding** the motion as Member for Wiltshire at the time of his delivery; and his speech was **1,339 words long**.) **Speech 5**
6. Sir Benjamin Hawes (**43 years old** when he delivered his speech on **April 8**, 1840; **Opposed** to the motion as Member for Lambeth at the time of his delivery; and his speech was **2,847 words long**.) **Speech 6**

7. Mr. Frederic Thesiger, 1st Baron Chelmsford (**45 years old** when he delivered his speech on **April 8**, 1840; **Seconding** the motion as Member for Woodstock at the time of his delivery; and his speech was 9,602 words long.) (**9,621**) **Speech 7**
  
8. Sir George Staunton, 2nd Baronet (**59 years old** when he gave some supplementary explanation on **April 8**, 1840; his explanation was 145 words long.)
  
9. Mr. Charles Buller (**33 years old** when he delivered his speech on **April 8**, 1840; **Opposed** to the motion as Member for Liskeard at the time of his delivery; and his speech was **8,334 words long.**) **Speech 8**
  
10. Mr. William Ewart Gladstone (**30 years old** when he delivered his speech on **April 8**, 1840; **Seconding** the motion as Member for Newark at the time of his delivery; and his speech was 8,432 words long.) (**8,471**) **Speech 9**
  
11. Sir Henry George Ward (**43 years old** when he delivered his speech on **April 8**, 1840; **Opposed** to the motion as Member for Sheffield at the time of his delivery; and his speech was 2,010 words long.) (**4,375**) **Speech 10**
  
12. Mr. Frederic Thesiger, 1st Baron Chelmsford (**46 years old** when made this reference on **April 8**, 1840; **Seconding** the motion as Member for Woodstock at the time of his reference; and his reference was 19 words long.)
  
13. Sir Henry George Ward (**43 years old** when he delivered his speech on **April 8**, 1840; **Opposed** to the motion as Member for Sheffield at the time of his delivery; and his speech was 2,365 words long.)
  
14. Mr. George Palmer (**68 years old** when he delivered his speech on **April 8**, 1840; **Seconding** the motion as Member for South Essex at the time of his

delivery; and his speech was **2,704 words long.**) **Speech 11**

15. Sir James Weir Hogg, 1st Baronet (**50 years old** when he delivered his speech on **April 9**, 1840; **Seconding** the motion as Member for Beverley at the time of his delivery; and his speech was **4,056 words long.**) **Speech 12**

16. Sir Stephen Lushington (**57 years old** when he delivered his speech on **April 9**, 1840; **Opposed** to the motion as a judge and Member for Tower Hamlets at the time of his delivery; and his speech was **4,961 words long.**) **Speech 13**

17. Viscount Sandon—Dudley Ryder, 2nd Earl of Harrowby (**41 years old** when he delivered his speech on **April 9**, 1840; **Seconding** the motion as Member for Liverpool at the time of his delivery; and his speech was **6,345 words long.**) **Speech 14**

18. Mr. John Cam Hobhouse, 1st Baron Broughton (**53 years old** when he delivered his speech on **April 9**, 1840; **Opposed** to the motion as Member for Westminster at the time of his delivery; and his speech was **6,707 words long.**) **Speech 15**

19. Sir Robert Peel, 2nd Baronet (**51 years old** when he delivered his speech on **April 9**, 1840; **Seconding** the motion as Member for Tamworth at the time of his delivery; and his speech was 9,001 words long.) (**11,030**) **Speech 16**

20. John Russell, 1st Earl Russell (**47 years old** when he expressed his wish on **April 9**, 1840; **Opposed** to the motion as Member for Stroud and Colonial Secretary at the time of his delivery; and his wish was 24 words long.)

21. Sir Robert Peel, 2nd Baronet (**51 years old** when he delivered his speech

on **April 9**, 1840; **Seconding** the motion as Member for Tamworth at the time of his delivery; and his speech was 2,029 words long.)

22. Henry John “Harry” Temple, 3rd Viscount Palmerston (**55 years old** when he delivered his speech on **April 9**, 1840; **Opposed** to the motion as Member for Tiverton and Foreign Secretary at the time of his delivery; and his speech was 1,481 words long.) (**9,768**) **Speech 17**

23. Mr. William Ewart Gladstone (**30 years old** when he corrected his speech on **April 9**, 1840; **Seconding** the motion as Member for Newark at the time of his correction; and his correction was 39 words long.)

24. Henry John “Harry” Temple, 3rd Viscount Palmerston (**55 years old** when he delivered his speech on **April 9**, 1840; **Opposed** to the motion as Foreign Secretary at the time of his delivery; and his speech was 8,287 words long.)

25. Sir James Graham, 2nd Baronet (**47 years old** when he delivered his speech on **April 9**, 1840; **Concluding** his speech as Member for Pembroke at the time of his delivery; and his speech was 790 words long.)

Although there were 25 speakers in these debates, John Russell’s wish is excluded from this list of speakers, for wish is not a speech. Then Sir Staunton’s supplementary explanation is included in his speech, whose number is changed into 3,212 words. In the same way, Sir Graham made a speech twice, but the last speech is regarded as his conclusion, so this 790-word speech is added to his first one: If Sir Ward’s, Sir Peel’s and Viscount Palmerston’s speeches are renumbered in the same way, they will become 4,375, 11,030 and 9,768 words respectively. The average number of words in all the speeches is 6,658 words, and that in the speeches that second the motion is 7,376 words, so Gladstone’s

speech is not excessively long, but a little longer. William Gladstone actually made a speech of 8,471 words, which is still a “long” speech by our present-day standards. Then why did a parliamentary speech tend to be long in those days? As was pointed out in the article of the author (2021 Kimura, p.205), all of these speakers lived in the days when the “most influential medium of expression was speech-making, in parliament or, increasingly, on public platforms,” and this “remained so until the coming of broadcasting and television.”

The average age of all the speakers was about 45 years old, so Gladstone was in the younger group. He was actually the second youngest speaker in these debates. When these debates were conducted, Gladstone is said to have “delivered a harsh criticism of Foreign Secretary, Lord Palmerston’s ‘unjust and iniquitous war’” as a young member of parliament who was a rank-and-file member of the Opposition led by Sir Robert Peel.

### 1.3 A Method of Speech Criticism

As was seen in the previous section, there were 17 speeches in the debates in question, and it is impossible to treat all of them one by one here in this paper. This paper will focus on two speeches by Gladstone and Palmerston because they are directly related to the present research question: “Which idea was politically more expedient, Gladstone’s or Palmerston’s, to their contemporary people?” and all the others will be referred to in understanding these two more deeply.

In judging a speech, this author adopts **the artistic standard**, rather than the results standard, the truth standard or the ethical standard, for he does not think the results of these debates have anything to do with whether a speech is good or bad, he is not sure of the effectiveness of the speech by the degree to which it establishes or furthers the truth, and in judging a speech, he does not care whether a speaker is a good man or not, or whether his motives are good. He is most concerned with the ways in which a speaker uses language and thought to give effectiveness to truth, to portray his intentions and to move audiences to

the desired responses.

In judging the artistic merits of a speech, the author will first try to understand what went on in the speech (**description**), then consider why it went on (**analysis**), then determine the meaning and effect of the rhetorical methods employed (**interpretation**) and finally judge the quality and worth of the speech (**evaluation**).

With respect to the standards for critical judgment and the tools of criticism, the author uses *Post Communication—Criticism and Evaluation—* (Cathcart 1966).

## 2.1 Description and Analysis of Gladstone's Speech (Speech 9)

As far as the 17 speeches in question are concerned, they were recorded as the minutes of the British parliamentary debates conducted on the 7th, 8th and 9th of April, 1840. Each speech is a single, long and unbroken piece of writing, without any paragraphs, so the author divides that long piece of writing into several paragraphs for the sake of convenience to understand more clearly Gladstone's and Palmerston's speeches, and each paragraph is outlined. Let's begin with Gladstone's.

The first paragraph begins with "Mr. W.E. Gladstone said,..." and ends with "...the object which they had in view." In this paragraph, Gladstone points out that Mr. Charles Buller, a previous speaker called "the honorable and learned Gentleman who had just sat down", mentioned two important points on which "the Opposition side of the House" that Gladstone belongs to, had agreed with him, although he had declined to support the motion of Sir James Graham. Since Sir Graham belongs to the same side as Gladstone, he is called "Friend." These two points were: (1) Captain Elliot ought to have been furnished with larger powers and more specific instructions; and (2) courts ought to have been established in China by her Majesty's Government having authorities over the conduct of British subjects in that part of the world. And these points were necessary



because the jealousy of the Chinese towards strangers was well founded. The passing of the Act of 1833 strengthened such tendency of the Chinese.

The second paragraph begins with “The hon. and learned Gentleman...” and ends with “...the noble Duke had retired from office.” In this paragraph, Gladstone compares two different instructions to Lord Napier, and finds the Duke of Wellington better and quicker in responding to Lord Napier than the noble Lord (Palmerston) in that the noble Duke gave “the most ample instructions within a short period”: “It is not by force and violence that his Majesty intends to establish a commercial intercourse between his subjects and China; but by the other conciliatory measures so strongly inculcated in all the instructions which you have received.”

The third paragraph begins with “It had been truly observed...” and ends with “...The noble Lord had neglected to give the necessary powers and instructions to Captain Elliot, while he had ordered him to obtain that which the Chinese had always refused to concede.” In the third paragraph, Gladstone quotes the words of Mr. Thomas Macaulay, the Member for Edinburgh, who was the Secretary at War in her Majesty’s Government with Palmerston: “the only charge against the Government was a charge of omission.” Palmerston had not carried out the intentions of the Legislature, for the Act of 1838 authorised the Government to furnish the superintendent with powers more stringent than those which had been formerly entrusted to the supercargoes (of the East India Company).

The fourth paragraph begins with “The next omission charged against the noble Lord...” and ends with “...when that bill was under consideration?” This paragraph answers a question Charles Buller aroused in his mind: Why did Sir Graham, Gladstone’s right hon. Friend, object to the clause which gave a power of deportation? Gladstone is sure that his friend’s opposition was a justification of the noble Lord, who thought that the powers which the Act of 1838 would have conferred were right and necessary and essential for the prosperity of Britain’s trade with China. In spite of this state of affairs, the noble Lord just said that

Sir Graham “had insisted on the clauses giving those powers being withdrawn from the bill,” so Gladstone goes on to the next stage of argument: what was the position of the House of Commons when that bill was under consideration?

The fifth paragraph begins with “The House, at that time, had...” and ends with “...as a justification of the conduct of the noble Lord?” This paragraph begins with the fact that the House of Commons had no information as to the actual state of affairs in China, followed by a detailed explanation of “a justification of the conduct of the noble Lord.” Gladstone even says, “The noble Lord had kept all that information to himself, and had refused the House an opportunity of forming a sound decision on the subject...” “When, therefore, the House had no knowledge of the actual position of affairs, and when the noble Lord had perfect knowledge of the state of the opium trade, and of the determination of the Chinese Government to put it down,” what on earth can the House do? Nothing! That is why Sir Graham objected to the bill which had been brought forward.

The sixth paragraph begins with “If the noble Lord thought...” and ends with “...the Chinese themselves were not in earnest in their desire to put it down.” In this paragraph, Gladstone makes such a suggestion as never made by anyone else: “...it was still open for the noble Lord to resign the office which he held.” Instead of pursuing such a course, however, the noble Lord remained silent as to such important issues as the erection of a court in China and the opium trade. That is why the noble Lord should be blamed for not granting such powers as those which would have been granted by the bill and for not showing any willingness to suppress the opium trade with the Chinese.

The seventh paragraph begins with “The quantity of opium raised and exported to China...” and ends with “...it was connived at by the inferior functionaries of China.” This paragraph shows a clear difference between the opium trade before 1836 and that after that year. Before 1836, the Chinese, especially the inferior functionaries of China, had connived at the trade in opium, but, since an imperial edict was issued, that trade had begun to be put to a stop in the most

strict and positive terms. That means, when the Chinese had openly declared that they would no longer allow the trade in opium to be carried on, the noble Lord should have joined the Chinese in suppressing the opium trade while carrying out the intentions of Parliament.

The eighth paragraph begins with “Let them, however, look at the state of the trade...” and ends with “...in the ingenious defence of the hon. and learned Gentleman who had just sat down?” In this paragraph, two important edicts were issued by the Emperor of China: One edict was to command that all persons engaging in the purchase or sale of opium should be severely punished; and another edict was issued against foreigners engaged in the opium trade, commanding them to depart at once from the country. Of course, Captain Elliot told his boss, the noble Lord, that “the Emperor had issued the most strict edicts, commanding all parties engaged in the opium trade to give over their traffic,” but nothing had been done.

The ninth paragraph begins with “On the 12th of April 1837,...” and ends with “...which he founded the China Courts Bill.” Although there was some evidence from Mr. Lyndsay, an executive of the East India Company, that the viceroy himself was concerned in the opium trade, according to some information Charles Buller got, the general spirit of the imperial government in China was most adverse to that trade. In fact, on the first of May 1837, the boats concerned in the opium trade was removed to Whampoa, and there the prohibition was enforced. Fully aware of this crisis, Captain Elliot suggested the propriety of sending out a commissioner to negotiate with the court of Peking, but of this the noble Lord did not approve. Instead, he came down with that garbled statement upon which he founded the China Courts Bill.

The tenth paragraph begins with “Now, the noble Lord at that period...” and ends with “...the legitimate and praiseworthy object which they had in view?” In this paragraph, Gladstone points out how sincere and earnest the Chinese Government was in suppressing such an illegal trade as the opium trade, but

demonstrates how cunning the noble Lord was in his instructions to Captain Elliot, who made such a statement as this: “His government had no knowledge of the existence of any but the legal trade, and that over an illegal trade he could exercise no power.” No one could doubt that Captain Elliot was quite as well aware of the existence of the illicit as of the legal trade. But the tenour of the noble Lord’s instructions was—“Don’t confess that you know anything at all about it.”

The 11th paragraph begins with “On the 20th of November, 1837,…” and ends with “...the opponent of the Chinese government in their attempt to remove the offending ships?” In this paragraph, too, Gladstone presents many important facts as to the responsibility of the noble Lord, but the most outstanding endeavour was to obtain for Captain Elliot a recognition in his diplomatic character. During the whole year of 1837, many seizures of opium were made, and many bloody encounters took place. Captain Elliot at last assumed an active position, stopped the trade in the river, and declared that it was a lawless traffic, and so far met the demand of the Chinese government. With this the Chinese government appeared to be content for a time. But, so long as the ships engaged in the smuggling trade were not removed, China could have no security that its intentions would be faithfully carried into effect. Captain Elliot at last set his face deliberately against the removal, supported in this course by the noble Lord.

The 12th paragraph begins with “On the 12th of September, 1838,…” and ends with “...the British residents at Canton.” Both the Chinese imperial and provincial governments had used every lawful endeavour to stop the opium trade, and resorted to every proper means of making their intentions known to the British Government, but they had been treated with contempt and neglect—with the same contempt by the noble Lord at home as by the British superintendent at Canton. As a result, an attempt was first made to execute a native Chinese in the very square of the factories on September 12th, 1838, and in the month of November, a native was actually strangled in the square of the factories. This was

interpreted as a gross and meditated insult to the flag who had been themselves, in effect, the cause of the death of that unhappy man.

The 13th paragraph begins with “This was a subject...” and ends with “instead of systematically and deliberately taking measures to defeat those efforts.” In this paragraph, Gladstone begins to criticize the second speaker of the debates, Mr. Thomas Babington Macaulay, for his use of “all the armoury of ingenuity and eloquence” to prove that the Chinese government was not justified in taking effectual means for crushing the opium trade, which he even calls it “mere mockery.” Macaulay said in his speech, “If under the eye of an English society—consisting certainly of persons, some of whom were suspected of being concerned in the trade but many of whom were of the highest respectability—the traffic could not long be carried on without producing acts having some appearance of piracy, what could they expect when no man would have any judge of his own conduct but himself?” And Gladstone goes on to suggest “Her Majesty’s Government would have unquestionably evinced a more sincere desire to discharge their duty satisfactorily had they manfully encouraged those efforts of the Chinese government, instead of systematically and deliberately taking measures to defeat those efforts.”

The 14th paragraph begins with “Another theme of the indignant denunciation of the right hon. Gentleman opposite...” and ends with “...measure would have produced other and very different measures on the part of the Chinese.” In this paragraph, there were three points on which Macaulay had complained about in relation to the motion submitted by Sir Graham: 1) The Chinese had indiscriminately confined the innocent with the guilty; 2) The legitimate and illegitimate trade in China was conducted by the same hands, and was centred in the same houses; (3) and piracy had been created and the present illicit traffic was converted into something much worse. To any of these complaints, Gladstone responds logically. To Complaint (1), “the whole British community, almost to a man, had been engaged in that illegal traffic.” In fact, 200 persons had been con-

fined. The circumstances being so notorious, the guilt being so undeniable, the Chinese government were justified in acting against the entire community, the more especially, because there was no possibility of fixing the guilt upon individuals. To Complaint (2), “it was of importance to show that the Government of China, before it had resorted to violent measures to suppress the opium trade, had exhibited great moderation in the measures which it had adopted; and that by appeals to individuals and their agents, by serious warnings, by the constant confiscation of the opium found in the possession of natives, and in a word, by every means that could be devised, it had attempted to prove the sincerity of its endeavours to put an end to that illegal traffic. And to Complaint (3), “the trade in opium had already generated piracy, not only on river, but also all along the coast of China.” So Gladstone is sure that if the the British Government had sent away the ships engaged in the opium trade, that measure would have produced other and very different measures on the part of the Chinese.

The 15th paragraph begins with “The right hon. Gentleman opposite...” and ends with “...the difficulties that were before him to establish the necessity for the interference of the Legislature.” “Shall we establish at our own expense a preventive service on the coast of China to put down the smuggling of opium into that country!” also asks Macaulay, and Gladstone answers, “If the opium smuggled into China came exclusively from British ports, then we required no preventive service to put down this illegal traffic.... If we had stopped the exportation of opium from Bengal, and broken up the depot at Lintin, and had checked the growth of it in Malwa, and had put a moral stigma upon it, we should have greatly crippled, if, indeed, we had not entirely extinguished, the trade in it.” Gladstone is quick and clear in answering a question by Macaulay.

The 16th paragraph begins with “Then, said the right hon. Gentleman...” and ends with “...it must tell still more strongly in favour of strengthening and multiplying his powers?” Macaulay says, “Our Sovereign has been insulted in the person of her representative.” But Gladstone responds to such a statement as

follows: "...the Chinese authorities had never formally acknowledged Captain Elliot as the representative of the Sovereign of this country, and that they had only recognized him as a person appointed to reside at Canton to preserve order in the regulation of the trade, and in no other character whatsoever." He goes on to say that "Captain Elliot was placed in a situation in which he could not, from want of powers, fulfill the task that was imposed upon him." But whenever Captain Elliot implored the noble Lord to interfere either one way or the other, and to prepare measures either for the suppression or for the legalization of the trade, he was met by the noble Lord with a total and contemptuous silence.

The 17th paragraph begins with "Now, Captain Elliot,..." and ends with "...these smuggling transactions." On the 13th of March, 1839, Captain Elliot made up his mind to direct British subjects to resist by force of arms any attacks that might be made by the Chinese government upon the opium vessels at Lintin. The noble Lord had recognized that act of Captain Elliot. He could not be allowed to acquit himself of his responsibility for that act. Captain Elliot declared it to be his intention to defend, not only the persons of British subjects, but also the property which they had engaged in these smuggling transactions.

The 18th paragraph begins with "Was the House of Commons, he would ask, ..." and ends with "...the great principles of justice were involved in this war." In this paragraph, Gladstone asks two rhetorical questions: (1) Did the present motion submitted by Sir Graham have no bearing upon the war now about to commence?; and (2) did it have no reference whatever to the real merits of the case? And he answers those questions himself clearly: (1) "it was a useful maxim not to attend to any allegations of party motives. They were weapons which were used daily by both sides; they were useful to excite cheers—but than such cheers nothing could be more worthless"; and (2) "There were real merits in this case, for the great principles of justice were involved in this war."

The 19th paragraph begins with "You will be called upon,..." and ends with "...to the renewal of the legal trade." Again, Gladstone emphasizes how wrong

Captain Elliot was whatever he said about the Chinese authorities, although the Chinese were justified in saying, “We have no other alternative than to expel these smugglers from China...” That is why Gladstone is urging the Ministers to “show cause their intention of making war upon China,” for they are “bound to show to us (the Opposition) and to the world what the insult is for which the British are to demand reparation.

The 20th paragraph begins with “The Chinese were anxious...” and ends with “...whilst residing within their territories.” In this paragraph, there is a controversial passage, which will allow Gladstone’s political enemies to attack him: When Gladstone says, “The Chinese were anxious for the renewal of the legal trade,” Captain Elliot says, “No, we will go to Lintin, we will establish ourselves there, we will maintain our right to procure provisions there, and at Lintin we will remain till more favourable circumstances arise.” So Gladstone suggests that the whole House of Commons should think more about what this passage means (originally, “what this language really amounted to?”). This is the way Gladstone interprets “this language”: It was a claim on the part of the British merchants to go to the very focus of smuggling; and this afforded a suspicion—a seemingly well-founded suspicion—to the Chinese, that it was their intention that the opium trade should be resumed there. The Chinese had no armament ready wherewith to expel us from Lintin. They therefore said, “We will resort to another mode of bringing you to reason. We will expel you from our shores by refusing you provisions.”

The 21st paragraph begins with “I am not competent to judge...” and ends with “...the noble Lord has been equally neglectful of his duty.” No other parts of Gladstone’s speech have expressed his indignation so vividly over the noble Lord’s failure in his duty or his intention to make war upon China than this, whatever eloquent terms Macaulay used to defend Palmerston. Gladstone first confutes Macaulay like this: “The right hon. Gentleman opposite spoke last night in eloquent terms of the British flag waving in glory at Canton, and of the



animating effects produced on the minds of our sailors by the knowledge, that in no country under heaven was it permitted to be insulted. Then Gladstone agrees with him in “the animating effects which have been produced in the minds of British subjects on many critical occasions when that flag has been unfurled in the battle-field.” Why is that so? “It is because it has always been associated with the cause of justice, with opposition to oppression, with respect for national rights, with honourable commercial enterprize.” But what is happening to that flag? “...now, under the auspices of the noble Lord, that flag is hoisted to protect an infamous contraband traffic, and if it were never to be hoisted except as it is now hoisted on the coast of China, we should recoil from its sight with horror, and should never again feel our hearts thrill, as they now thrill with emotion, when it floats proudly and magnificently on the breeze. No, I am sure that her Majesty’s Government will never upon this motion, persuade the House to abet this unjust and iniquitous war.”

The 22nd paragraph begins with “The circumstances which were represented...” and ends with “...Yes, I want to hear that declaration from himself.” This paragraph summarizes the opinion that Gladstone has been expressing: (1) the interference of the noble Lord should have been for the suppression of the trade in opium; and (2) the war was not justified. Gladstone declares once again that “it was not his duty to have allowed the contraband trade in opium to have gone on to the extent which it reached”, but he felt more and more doubtful whether the noble Lord has read all those despatches from Captain Elliot.

The 23rd paragraph begins with “The noble Lord has done all in his power...” and ends with “...that great and awful responsibility.” Now in the last paragraph, Gladstone asserts that “The noble Lord has done all in his power to keep us in the dark with respect to them (the question of the opium trade and the question of war), but he is more concerned about the possibility of making it much worse, for it seems the noble Lord will put the whole House of Commons “in one vast, rude, and undigested chaos which the wit of man is incapable of comprehending.” “Be

the trade in opium what it may—be it right, or be it wrong, we (all members of the House of Commons) are now called on to give an assent to a war caused by the indolence and apathy of the noble Lord.” As far as Gladstone is concerned, he “will never flinch from the assertion which, he has already made, that the noble Lord is chargeable for the results of both.”

## **2.2 Interpretation of Gladstone’s speech**

When the British parliamentary debates were conducted on April 7th, 8th and 9th, 1840, Gladstone belonged to the Opposition and made a speech in opposition to her Majesty’s Government which supported the trade in opium and proposed a war with China. The first speaker of these debates was Sir James Graham who submitted a motion against the opium trade and the war. Gladstone was the 9th speaker and there were seven other speakers: Mr. Macaulay (opposed to the motion), Sir Follet (paired off but felt bound to vote with Sir Graham), Sir Staunton (opposed), Sir Herbert (seconding the motion), Sir Hawes (opposed), Mr. Thesiger (seconding), Mr. Buller (opposed). So the purpose of Gladstone’s speech was to defeat the government in his arguments and persuade the whole House of Commons to vote down the government’s proposal. To achieve this purpose, what rhetorical devices did Gladstone use, how effectively did he use them, and what impact did he have on his immediate and remote audience?

As was often the case with other speakers, Gladstone began his speech by using to his advantage what his previous speaker said while commenting on that speaker characterized by “that ability and ingenuity for which he was distinguished.”

Gladstone was good at showing how serious it was for the noble Lord to omit to comply with the provisions of the Act of 1838 and take any notice of the recommendations of Sir G. Robinson or Mr. Davis, the successors of Lord Napier by using a metaphor of understatement as follows: “A son starved his father to death, but that was only a sin of omission. A rebellion took place, the

magistrates were not on the spot, the military were not called out, the peace of the country was disturbed, and several lives were lost, but these were only sins of omission. All those disasters which the country had witnessed arose only from sins of omission, and such was the character of the omissions of the noble Lord.” The effective repetition of “only” makes the last sentence all the more impressive: such was the character of the omissions of the noble Lord.

Gladstone was successful in leading the whole House of Commons to listen to a question Charles Buller, his previous speaker, aroused in his mind about the fact that Sir Graham, who submitted the motion, objected to the clause which gave no power of deportation, followed by the disclosure of an important fact of the House when the Act of 1838 was under consideration.

Gladstone was logical in his argumentation based on facts he obtained after a thorough investigation, so if all these facts he had come up with were true, even the mere presentation of the facts would be persuasive and many listeners in the House of Commons would have been much impressed. Sir Stephen Lushington, a judge, was one of them and said, “The hon. Member for Newark, . . . had gone the whole length. He respected that hon. Member—he admired his talents—he knew the hon. Gentleman to be a powerful champion in every cause he thought to be right, but he owned he should never cease to reprobate the argument which the hon. Gentleman used last night, or to avow his abhorrence of the doctrines the hon. Gentleman endeavoured to maintain.”

Thinking of a relationship between the noble Lord and Captain Elliot, Gladstone used a metaphor from the Bible: “he had acted the part of an Egyptian task master, commanding his officer “to make bricks without straw” (Exodus 5:7). On the 23rd of November Captain Elliot received notice of the intention entertained by the Chinese government with respect to the parties engaged in the smuggling of opium, and an edict was issued commanding the merchants to leave the country in half a month. Captain Elliot, however, decided to resist this removal of the smuggling merchants. In the meantime, the noble Lord remained

idle and took no steps.

Almost every time after giving a detailed explanation of important facts, Gladstone was effective in asking such rhetorical questions as “Was it to be expected after this that the Chinese government would continue to communicate with Captain Elliot, when he—the professed agent of the British Government—declared himself unable to keep her Majesty’s subjects at Canton in obedience to the laws of the Chinese empire?” and “Were they to waste time in fruitless negotiations, and decline to adopt other more cogent means of effecting the legitimate and praiseworthy object which they had in view?” The answers to these questions must be obviously clear to every Member of the House.

Gladstone was effective in making a distinction between the Chinese Government and the British Government in their attitudes toward the opium trade: the noble Lord knows everything but the British Government gets little information.

These words, “systematically and deliberately” obviously indicate the attitudes of the British Government, or rather, those of the noble Lord at home and Captain Elliot at Canton, and what follows “instead of” suggests the present state of affairs in the House of Commons.

In his arguments, Gladstone was almost always successful in defeating his opponents in a debate, but quite rarely failed. “...then of course they poisoned the wells. (Cheers from the Ministerial benches). I am ready to meet those cheers. I understand what they mean. I have not asserted—I do not mean to assert—that the Chinese actually poisoned their wells. All I mean to say is, that it was alleged that they had poisoned their wells.” Due to this part of his speech, Gladstone became a target of severe criticism later.

A novelist<sup>2</sup> cites part of the following passage (bold-faced) as the most impressive words of the First Opium War: “I am not competent to judge how long this war may last, or how protracted may be its operations, but **this I can say, that a war more unjust in its origin, a war more calculated in its**

**progress to cover this country with permanent disgrace, I do not know, and I have not read of.”** Why did he quote this part? Was it because Gladstone became one of the greatest prime ministers or it shows the immorality of the opium trade? Whichever the answer may be, it does have a great impact on readers of the novelist’s book, some of the remote audience of this speech.

If a similar expression is repeated at regular intervals, it may attract special attention from the immediate audience (members of the House of Commons, in this case). Three similar phrases are accumulated so effectively that they are incorporated into the last part of the sentence: The circumstances which were represented to the noble Lord in July, 1837; the circumstances which were afterwards brought to his knowledge in May, 1838; and the circumstances which he learned in April, 1839; were all of them circumstances which called upon him for more powerful interference, no matter what the object of that interference was. The cause and effect relationship is expressed so effectively that one sentence clarifies Gladstone’s opinion, another declares the righteousness of the Chinese and the other sentence makes it clear as an effect of those two that the merits of the noble Lord rest on a very, different footing: (Cause 1) the interference of the noble Lord should have been for the suppression of the trade in opium, and that the war was not justified; (Cause 2) justice,...is with them (the Chinese), and, that whilst they, the Pagans, and semi-civilized barbarians, have it, we, the enlightened and civilized Christians, are pursuing objects at variance both with justice, and with religion; and (Effect), in whatever sense the noble Lord ought to have interfered, one thing is clear, that he ought to have interfered with spirit and effect.

What impact does the last sentence of Gladstone’s speech have on the minds of the immediate audience in the House of Commons on April 8, 1840? It is clear that Gladstone has found the Lord Palmerston responsible for the question of the opium trade and that of war, and if the House of Commons thinks it fit not to negative the motion of Sir Graham, Gladstone and Graham will join the

Ministers of the ruling party in taking responsibility for the results of the vote, but if not, it will be the responsibility of the ruling party alone. Gladstone says, “On his head (the head of the noble Lord) and on that of his colleagues, that responsibility must exclusively rest, unless the House shall think fit to negative the motion of my right hon. Friend by its vote on this occasion, and if it does, it will become a voluntary participator in that great and awful responsibility.” “if it does, it will become a voluntary participator” sounds soft, but on second thought, it will become the bitterest criticism of the Ministers in charge, for it exactly means the Opposition Gladstone and Graham belong to can not take any responsibility for the opium trade or making war upon China.

### **2.3 Evaluation of Gladstone’s speech**

Speaking of the First Opium War, part of Gladstone’s speech is often cited, but why? Is it because Gladstone is one of the greatest prime ministers in Britain? If so, doesn’t this fact prevent us from evaluating his speech in terms of speech criticism? It is true that Gladstone has a good command of factual detail and robust argument as we read each paragraph (made up by Kimura for the sake of convenience), but did his speech made on April 8th, 1840, at the age of 30 really contribute to the small majority in the vote at the end of the debates?

One of the most striking facts of Gladstone’s speech is that, when he found the noble Lord (Palmerston) hopeless as Foreign Secretary, he suggested that Palmerston should resign: “...if those powers were essential, and if the Legislature refused to grant them, it was still open for the noble Lord to resign the office which he held.” Gladstone was only 30 years old and had been a Member of Parliament for seven years, while Palmerston was 55 years old, serving as foreign secretary from 1830–1834. When he made his speech this time, he was holding the same position for the second time. This author cannot imagine how a young politician could make a suggestion to a career politician’s resignation, so he could not help admiring Gladstone’s courage. Gladstone was so serious

about his career that he could not but do so even to a senior politician when that politician was found to be chargeable.

Another passage the author would like to cite in Gladstone's speech is this: "The right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Macaulay) spoke last night in eloquent terms of the British flag waving in glory at Canton, and of the animating effects produced on the minds of our sailors by the knowledge, that in no country under heaven was it permitted to be insulted. We all know the animating effects which have been produced in the minds of British subjects on many critical occasions when that flag has been unfurled in the battlefield. But how comes it to pass that the sight of that flag always raises the spirit of Englishmen? It is **because it has always been associated with the cause of justice, with opposition to oppression, with respect for national rights, with honourable commercial enterprise**, but now, under the auspices of the noble Lord, that flag is hoisted to protest an infamous contraband traffic, and if it were never to be hoisted except as it is now hoisted on the coast of China, we should recoil from its sight with horror, and should never again feel our hearts thrill, as they now thrill with emotion, when it floats proudly and magnificently on the breeze." However eloquently his political opponent spoke, Gladstone never failed to notice problems he discerned from his strong sense of moral justice and point out what is lacking (bold-faced) in the words of such an eloquent speech.

Gladstone was assertive throughout his speech. The author felt so especially when he said, "All that information, however, the noble Lord had carefully excluded from the papers which had laid on the Table, and not one word was to be found in them from beginning to end having relation to opium. When, therefore, the House had no knowledge of the actual position of affairs, and when the noble Lord had perfect knowledge of the state of the opium trade, and of the determination of the Chinese Government to put it down—when there was nothing on the Table of the House but a garbled and most imperfect statement—..." and thought Gladstone had made such a statement based on facts he

obtained from his thorough investigation. His assertiveness works well as long as there is no error in his investigation, but what would happen if he should make an error? Since he himself corrected himself after Palmerston made his first speech, it was clearly his error to say about the Chinese that "...of course they poisoned the wells." The Hansard transcripts go as follows: "...and then of course they poisoned the wells. (Cheers from the Ministerial benches). I am ready to meet those cheers. I understand what they mean. I have not asserted—I do not mean to assert—that the Chinese actually poisoned their wells. All I mean to say is, that it was alleged that they had poisoned their wells." As "it was alleged that..." suggests, Gladstone has just "stated the circumstance, but had no evidence of the fact." Gladstone did not tell a lie, but he was in fact not to blame for this. It is true, however, that he was misunderstood. This part was taken up by many speakers after Gladstone in the parliamentary debates, and even noted by Kamikawa (1967, p.116), a Japanese scholar of political science.

Gladstone was only a 30-year-old rank and file member of the Opposition when he made this speech. Although this speech itself was mentioned apparently as a "good speech" reflecting the climate of opinion among the British public, we should not regard him as an established speaker but still as a young man well on the way of becoming a great orator in the future.

### **3.1 Description and Analysis of Palmerston's Speech (Speech 17)**

It is true that Sir Graham was the last speaker, but Viscount Palmerston was actually the last as Sir Graham first submitted his motion and concluded his speech at the end of the debates. As you read all speeches in the debates and notice it soon, the noble Lord (Viscount Palmerston) and Captain Charles Elliot were mentioned in all the speeches and severely criticized for their conducts. In other words, Palmerston was treated as a "bad man," but here it must be remembered that we do not adopt the "ethical standards" for speech criticism. Instead, we depend on the artistic standards for that purpose, so Palmerston's



speech will be described and analyzed in this respect. As we did for Gladstone's speech, we will have a careful look at each paragraph.

The first paragraph of the first speech begins with "Viscount Palmerston would at that late hour, and after a three nights' debate..." and ends with "...he was about to address to the House." Here in this first paragraph, the noble Lord says he will "endeavour as much as possible to compress into the narrowest limits which were consistent with a clear and plain statement, the observation which he was about to address to the House (of Commons).

The second paragraph begins with "If the resolution of the right hon. Baronet..." and ends with "...than they had hitherto been." In this paragraph, although he pays due respect to Sir Robert Peel as the leader of the Opposition, the right hon. Gentleman who had just sat down, the noble Lord focuses his attention to the content of the motion submitted by Sir James: "a motion so feebly conceived and so feebly enforced." So he even suggests that "If it were desired to obtain support from the enemies of the opium trade or from the enemies of war, the resolution should have been more direct," for "The case before the House would require a more definite resolution is not a question as to whether certain answers to certain letters should have been more or less precise." According to Palmerston, "our relations with China were more friendly, and our (commercial) intercourse more prosperous and successful, than they had hitherto been."

The third paragraph begins with "He spoke, of course, of the relations as to our legalized trade...." and ends with "...any vessels stationed outside the harbour?" In this paragraph, Palmerston sides with Captain Elliot as his boss: "All the Gentlemen who had spoken on the opposite side, with a few trifling exceptions, had, he was gratified to say, dwelt upon the conduct of Captain Elliot in terms more of approval than of criticism. He is happy to say this, for it was a principle which ought always to be kept in view in party contests, that whilst they struggled for power, which was an object of honourable ambition, and whilst they attacked each other with all the skill which they could command, the

servants of the Crown performing important duties on foreign stations, in which duties they had no personal interest, should be unaffected by the proceedings of parties in that House.”

Now he feels obliged to defend his officer Captain Elliot on two points. One of the points is that, although it had been said that Captain Elliot encouraged the contraband traffic in opium, those who held that opinion should have read once again the papers which had been laid upon the table would have seen that “from the first to the last he endeavoured to discountenance the traffic to the utmost of his power.” It was also said that Captain Elliot made preparation to protect the opium vessels from attack, but this was a mistake. His preparations were made for the protection of the cargo ships. In support of this assertion, Palmerston refers to Sir Staunton, who said “in a speech so eminently deserving its attention (the attention of the House of Commons), that there was no law in China authorizing the authorities of that country to seize upon any vessels stationed outside the harbour.”

The fourth paragraph begins with “With regard to Captain Elliot,...” and ends with “...in point of fact, in self-defence.” In this paragraph, Palmerston mentions two good acts of Captain Elliot: “in one instance he saved the crew of a ship from starvation, and in the other,...it was to protect a fleet from attacks.

The fifth paragraph deals with another public servant, Lord Napier, whose career was short and unfortunate. Palmerston says he does not think Lord Napier had throughout displayed good judgment and discretion.

The sixth paragraph deals for the first time with Gladstone’s speech, which Palmerston thinks includes “a great mistake.” “The hon. Member (for Newark) has assumed the fact, and had said, ‘of course they poisoned the wells.’” In the minutes of *Hansard*, this mistake is followed by a remark in parentheses: (Cheers from the Ministerial benches). Doesn’t this suggest that the Ministers, including Palmerston, had been trying to find fault with Gladstone’s speech, which includes few mistakes? Gladstone himself says in his speech: “They

(allegations of party motives) were weapons which were used daily by both sides; they were very useful to excite cheers—but than such cheers nothing could be more worthless.

After his first speech, Palmerston sees Gladstone correct himself: “in the hearing of the noble Lord, He (Mr. Gladstone) at the time said, he stated the circumstance, but had no evidence of the fact.” This statement will turn out to be used to the advantage of Palmerston.

The first paragraph of the second speech of the noble Lord begins with “Viscount Palmerston thought he had guarded himself...” and ends with “... that casual expression might have led the country to suppose.” In this paragraph, Palmerston reiterates how dangerous it is for anyone to assume something in his own mind as a fact, without having ascertained whether the charge was true or not, and treat it as a matter of course, and he does not wish it to go forth for the honour of the House or for the honour of the country.

The second paragraph begins with “There was another observation...” and ends with “...during the Administration of the right hon. Baronet, the Member for Tamworth.” In this paragraph, Palmerston feels sympathy for Mr. Thesiger, the seventh speaker in the debate, who has recently returned to the House. In fact, at the beginning of his own speech, “Mr. Thesiger, in rising to address the House for the first time, said, that he had...” As a result, when he said “the origin of all these evils was the instructions sent to the superintendents, and the orders in council in 1833,” “not only had the hon. and learned Member for Woodstock dealt his back-handed blow right and left on his own friends,” but said, “look at the letter written by the Duke of Wellington to Lord Napier on the receipt of the first account.” So Palmerston begins to wonder whether Mr. Thesiger is more interested in the fact that the Duke of Wellington answered a letter the day after he received it than the substance of the letter of the noble Duke. He even suggests Mr. Thesiger should have known these facts: “the origin of the evils of which the resolution before the House took notice, were sanctioned in the first

place by the right hon. Baronet, the Member for Pembroke (Sir Graham), and afterwards confirmed and enforced by the noble Duke during the Administration of the right hon. Baronet, the Member for Tamworth (Sir Peel).

The third paragraph begins with “He had been much condemned...” and ends with “...They did not choose to say so, but they implied it.” Because he was much condemned for not answering the representatives he received with sufficient promptitude, Palmerston is now telling the House that there have been two letters he answered precisely in the same way as the Duke of Wellington, and he goes on to ask a very important question about the “mysterious terms of ‘precise instructions and sufficient powers,’” for Palmerston has been criticized for not having furnished the superintendents with “those instructions and powers which it would have been the straight course to have pursued.” He is now wondering why “not one of these hon. Members, not even the right hon. Baronet (Sir Peel) himself, who went nearest the mark, had ventured to say, ‘the powers you ought to have given were, to expel from China, by your authority, every man who were engaged in the opium trade, and to drive away every ship by which that trade was carried on.’” He is not happy they “did not choose to say so, but they implied it.”

The fourth paragraph begins with “That, however, was a monstrous and arbitrary power,...” and ends with “...continued to exist down to the present time.” In this paragraph, Palmerston begins to explain to the House what the powers and instructions which ought to have been given to the superintendents really means: “That...was a monstrous and arbitrary power,...and one which he asserted it was never meant or intended to have been given by the legislature, and never asked for by the Government”; “the instructions given on that occasion were those invariably given to every consul or officer who was sent to any foreign station—instructions to collect statistical information, to afford protection to all British interests and British subjects—to mediate between British subjects and the Government of the country, and to report any matters which he might deem worthy of forwarding as information to the home Government” There is

another problem the Government were accused of neglecting to establish: the court of criminal and admiralty jurisdiction. And this court had been constituted, and continued to exist down to the present time.

The fifth paragraph begins with “Then he might be asked,...” and ends with “...what had passed.” This paragraph mainly deals with a defect in the China bill of 1837: the inconvenience arising out of a transaction between two merchants. In the bill that Palmerston introduced in 1837, there was a court of criminal and admiralty jurisdiction, but there was no court of civil jurisdiction capable of enforcing a debt due by one British subject to another. The first year, a revised bill failed in the House of Lords in consequence of its have been intimated by Lord Ellenborough, but in the following year, Palmerston brought the bill forward a second time in the House of Commons. Night after night he endeavoured to persuade the House to proceed with that bill, but was obliged to postpone it from time to time at the request of hon. Members. It at last came on and passed, however.

The sixth paragraph begins with “The right hon. Baronet was reported...” and ends with “...for those courts had actually been established.” In this paragraph, it is pointed out that Sir Robert Peel and “many of his hon. Friends behind him” objected to the principle of establishing any court in the territory of an independent sovereign, without having had the previous consent of that sovereign. Palmerston joins Sir Peel in disapproving of the absolute power which is given for the deportation of British subjects, but he wonders why Sir Peel still objects to a power given to the court upon trial and judicial sentence to condemn a person to be sent from out the jurisdiction of that court. He would like to know “upon what possible grounds” Sir Peel and his friends object to a power given to the superintendent of expelling by his authority British subjects from out the jurisdiction of that court. Palmerston is more surprised when he hears Sir Peel state his opinion like this: “...so far from being favourable to the extension of the powers of those courts, he thinks they ought to be withdrawn altogether.”

So Palmerston concludes that “it was difficult for any government to exculpate itself to the satisfaction of parties who entertained such differences of opinion,” and clearly says that the courts the present government has been criticized for not having established did actually exist.

The seventh paragraph begins with “The memorandum, however,...” and ends with “...about the legalizing of the opium trade.” In this paragraph, the memorandum plays a key role in summarizing it. The memorandum of the Duke of Wellington recommends: (1) some rules of practice should be framed for regulating the proceedings of the courts, although Palmerston notices that there was great difficulty in framing such rules, ... as the courts were ordered to conform their practice to that of the English courts. Some simple rules of practice, which might be carried into execution without the assistance of gentlemen of the legal profession, should be put in place; (2) some alterations should be made in the instructions to the superintendents. The superintendents were then instructed to go to Canton and reside there and powers should be given to that officer similar to those which had been conferred on the supercargoes.; (3) It will be in the power of the Government hereafter to decide whether any efforts shall be made at Peking, or elsewhere, to improve our relations with China, commercial as well as political; and (4) till the trade returned to its usual and peaceable channel, a stout frigate and a smaller vessel of war should always be within the reach of the superintendent.

The last recommendation is one at variance with the principle acted on by the East India Company, and at variance also with the principle upon which the instructions to Lord Napier were founded. The East India Company had always insisted on not allowing any ship of war to go to the station at all, for fear of exciting jealousy in the minds of the Chinese. It was upon that principle which he had acted, for he had told Captain Elliot not to allow the frigate which took him out to remain at Canton; and he had also given instructions to the admiral on the station not to send unnecessarily any ships of war to that place.

The eighth paragraph begins with “There was therefore, nothing, he contended, in the memorandum of...” and ends with “...than they had expected ever to accomplish.” This paragraph mainly deals with the two points on which Lord Napier had insisted: (1) A personal communication with the Chinese authorities; and (2) sending a letter direct, instead of a petition, as formerly, to the Hong merchants. What did his two successors, Mr. Davis and Sir Robinson, say in reference to these points? Mr. Davis said in August, 1834, that Lord Napier was clear as to his instructions always to decline any but direct communication with the officers of the Government, and that Lord Napier’s letter was refused because it was not forwarded in the shape of a petition, and because it did not proceed through the Hong merchants. Sir George Robinson said the same thing, his words being, “I most fully and entirely concur in Mr. Davis’s observation in all respects.” Both successors of Lord Napier agree with each other that the superintendent should have direct communication with the viceroy, and that it was absurd that they should present a humble petition to irresponsible merchants. Captain Elliot obtained permission that his communications should go direct to the viceroy, in the shape in which he might think it right to forward them. As far, then, as regarded the constitution of the court, and the protection by ships of war, he had done everything which others proposed to do, and had accomplished more than they had expected ever to accomplish.

The ninth paragraph begins with “He had given to the superintendent...” and ends with “a forced interpretation of the act to have done so.” In this paragraph, Palmerstone makes his views clear. He gave to the superintendent instructions as to the trade, but he was criticized because those instructions were not long enough. He believes it the duty of a Minister to give his written instructions, distinctly, decisively, and without circumlocution, to write so as not to be misunderstood, at sufficient length but with not one word redundant. As to the loss of property incurred by the individuals engaged in the contraband trade, was it a fitting course for the British Government to pursue to put down the opium

trade by acts of arbitrary authority against British merchants? No, it wasn't because it is a course totally at variance with British law, totally at variance with international law, and a course of the most arbitrary kind, and liable to every possible objection.

The tenth paragraph begins with "Any Government would have been greatly to blame which,..." and ends with "...the presence of their army and navy." This paragraph is a continuation of Palmerston's claim against the acts of arbitrary authority. "Any Government would have been greatly to blame if on its own responsibility it had invested a consulate officer, at 15,000 miles distance, with powers so arbitrary. If the Government had intended to give such a power, they should have first come down to Parliament for its precise and positive sanction." Palmerston goes on to say, "If the Government had given to the superintendent the right of issuing an order for prohibiting our subjects from engaging in that trade, would that order have been obeyed?" "The superintendent's order would have been disobeyed," answers Palmerston. Then "he would have had to execute it by force, and for that purpose must have some physical force at his command. The idea of placing a number of armed men under his orders would not have been very palatable to the Chinese."

The 11th paragraph begins with "But suppose that..." and ends with "...nothing more than waste paper." In this paragraph, three important problems were posed, three possible results or responses were shown, and one practical way of solving them was suggested. First of all, if Captain Elliot had succeeded in expelling the opium trade from the Canton river, what would have been the consequence? It would be diffused over all an immense extent of district. Secondly, how does Palmerston respond to the fact that the Chinese government were anxious to put down the opium trade, out of regard for the morality of its subjects? He says he will never defend a trade which involved the violation of the municipal laws of the Chinese, and which furnished an enormously large population with the means of demoralization, which tended to the production



of habits inconsistent with good order and correct conduct, but he asks any man opposite if he could say he honestly believed the motive of the Chinese government to have been the promotion of the growth of moral habits. The answer to such a question was, why did they not prohibit the growth of the poppy in their own country? This was an exportation of bullion question, and agricultural interest-protection question. And finally, was it really our duty to co-operate with the Chinese government in putting down this contraband trade? Palmerston wonders “what the House would have said to her Majesty’s Ministers, if they had come down to it with a large naval estimate for a number of revenue cruisers to be employed in the preventive service from the river at Canton to the Yellow Sea for the purpose of preserving the morals of the Chinese people, who were disposed to buy what other people were disposed to sell to them.” Palmerston verily believes that if they had endeavoured to execute the laws of China for the Chinese government, and had attempted to establish a vigilant Police to do that in China which they were unable to do in their own country, the House would not have treated their proposals with serious levity, but would absolutely have laughed them out of court.

The 12th paragraph begins with “But if Parliament was so good natured as to attempt it, . . .” and ends with “. . . as the right hon. Member for Pembroke recommended.” In this paragraph, Palmerston mentions merit for not having given to the superintendent at Canton such powers and instructions as Sir Graham recommended for two reasons: (1) If such extraordinary powers as were asserted to be necessary vested in the superintendent, a community such as the English formed in China was likely to have its factions; and (2) if a superintendent exercised honestly his power of expulsion, on the ground of some transaction in which party feelings were interested, what torrents of abuse would be poured against him?

The 13th paragraph begins with “But it had been said, that . . .” and ends with “from her Majesty’s Government.” There was a suggestion that we ought to send

an embassy to China, but Palmerston thinks it unwise, especially when the only practical measure which we could have proposed to the Chinese government was to join with them in putting down the trade in opium. Another objection to this plan was, that when our mission, and cruisers, and coastguard had arrived in China, we might have found the trade in opium legalized by the Chinese government.

The 14th paragraph begins with “He thought that he had now made out all the points...” and ends with “...most interested in the question.” Palmerston thinks he has now made out all the points on which he rested his defence. He has answered all the points of charge against him, which has been dwelt on so much by the hon. Members opposite, and particularly by the right hon. Member for Pembroke. He is glad to hear Sir Peel declare, that it was necessary that measures should be taken to vindicate the honour of the British flag and the dignity of the British Crown.

The 15th paragraph begins with “Some stress had been laid...” and ends with “...the necessity of the case required.” In this paragraph, Palmerston expresses some hope for the result of the operations now to be undertaken in the House of Commons. He is glad to say that every Member of her Majesty’s Government had participated—that the measures rendered necessary by the acts of the Chinese authorities might not partake of a vindictive character.

The 16th paragraph begins with “It was quite foreign to the subject...” and ends with “now to be determined.” In this paragraph, a tentative conclusion of Palmerston’s judgment of the general character of the Chinese is made: (1) both cruel men and benevolent men were to be found among them, as among all other nations; (2) there were many circumstances in which great kindness and benevolence had been displayed by the Chinese; and (3) on the whole, the Chinese were not a cruel people, and there was one feature in their character which were very commendable—their aversion to capital punishment.

The 17th paragraph begins with “If a government had a quarrel...” and ends

with "...that was for the country itself to judge." This paragraph suggests one particular case in which a government could demand redress if it had a quarrel with the authorities of another country: as long as that "another country" consists of people of a humane temper. It is unlikely to be successful with people of a ferocious and uncultivated disposition or a mild character.

The 18th paragraph begins with "What, he would ask, was the opinion with reference to our present proceedings..." and ends with "...granted by the Chinese to other powers." According to Palmerston, with reference to his government's proceedings, the opinion of those Americans who had been represented as interfering with its blockade of the Canton river, and endeavouring to excite the jealousy of their friends at home against the British is shown in a memorial addressed by some American merchants to their own Government: the conduct of Captain Elliot, and that of the British government are regarded "as...cool and deliberate" and a portion of that document was read by Palmerston to the House.

The 19th paragraph begins with "Again, what was the opinion of British merchants on the same subject?..." and ends with "...his commercial operations in these parts." Then Palmerston goes on to show a letter from thirty respectable firms in London engaged in the China trade. With the permission of the House, the noble Lord begins to read the letter. After reading the letter, Palmerston never fails to point out that, "although...the majority of them are hostile to the Government generally, they come forward voluntarily, spontaneously, to say, that if the objects of the Government are not carried out, British commerce in China will be at an end," and that, "if the same indignities which had been heaped up on British subjects in China, from the time of Lord Napier's expedition down to the present period,...it would be impossible to suppose that, under such circumstances, any British merchant could, with any regard to his safety or his self-respect, continue his commercial operations in these parts."

The 20th paragraph begins with "But the right hon. Baronet, in the motion..." and ends with "...the right hon. Baronet would be spared the exhibition of his

generosity.” Palmerston’s criticism begins to focus on the motion of Sir Graham, saying it “evaded all the real and substantial merits of the question.” He even says this motion, steering clear of all the difficulties of the case and evading all the real circumstances, seems so designed as to either cripple the measures which her Majesty’s Government had adopted for the accomplishment of the objects which they had in view, or else take the matter out of their hands in order that Sir Graham and his colleagues might themselves reap the harvest of which her Majesty’s Ministers had sown the seed. Then Palmerston begins to show much of his confidence in himself and his colleagues to defeat the Graham team, who “wished now to rescue her Majesty’s Ministers from the perils which awaited them, and placing themselves in the breach to face the ruin and disaster which were to be expected from the impolitic orders which they had given. The Palmerston’s team, however, is surer that “the object of this expedition would probably be accomplished without resorting to warlike operations, and that the demonstration of the British forces acting on the mind of the Emperor of China, and on the minds of his friends and counsellors, who were different persons from Mr. Commissioner Lin, might bring him to a sense of that justice which was said generally to inspire him, he could not help hoping that these disputes might yet be brought to an amicable and happy termination.”

The 21st paragraph begins with “The right hon. Baronet had received a lesson last year...” and ends with “...what her Majesty’s Ministers had so wisely planned.” Palmerston discloses how slovenly Sir Graham was about his work: Last year, Sir Graham decided to submit a motion in relation to the affairs of the East (India) and broke through one of the floors of the Foreign Office, with weight of types accumulated in the printing of these papers; This year, the same thing happened as to the affairs of China. He submitted a motion of as long as 15,411 words, so Sir Graham was compelled to concur in a vote of thanks to the brave and gallant officers who had so ably executed what her Majesty’s Ministers had so wisely planned.

The 22nd paragraph begins with “This year, however, the right, hon. Baronet ...” and ends with “...to substitute another Ministry in their place.” This last paragraph suggests how improbable it is for the right, hon. Baronet and his friends belonging to the same Opposition to win over her Majesty’s Government in this debate on the opium trade, for the Government is fully supported by its “gallant soldiers.” All the little solicitations have been employed to one Member—“Don’ you disapprove of the opium trade?” and to another, “Can you approve, even by implication, of a war with heavy expenses and increased taxation?” Believing all these little attempts to undermine the Ministers would be of no avail, Palmerston is now convinced that “those who supported the Ministers... would not desert them now, and that they would support them in resisting this motion of censure which they did not deserve, and this palpable endeavour to substitute another Ministry in their place.”

### **3.2 Interpretation” of Palmerston’s Speech**

Why did the noble Lord make a speech after all the others were made, “at that late hour, and after a three nights’ debate”? He must have been a calculating man, waiting for a good opportunity to confute all arguments against him. That opportunity did come at last.

Palmerston disregarded Sir Graham’s motion as “a motion so feebly conceived and so feebly enforced”, and repeated such a comment as this: “He repeated, the resolution was feeble in conception, and feebly supported,” probably to deliver Sir Graham a mental blow.

The reason why Palmerston cited part of Sir Staunton’s speech was that Sir Staunton had been recognized as an expert on China. His father was secretary to Lord Macartney’s mission to China and he himself was given the role of Page to Lord Macartney, who was a predecessor of Captain Elliot.

In the beginning part of his second speech, Palmerston used “casual expression” as “the expression that was hastily used” and concludes Gladstone “was

only stating that which the hon. Member would state for himself,” to make Gladstone’s speech sound as not worth listening to, no matter how powerful it may be.

Palmerston used such a metaphor as “as ever an unskilled sparrer gave to any of his friends,” to show more visually what Mr. Thesiger, a Member of Parliament, who had recently returned to the House and was not acquainted with the state of affairs in the House, had done. While he gave a back-handed blow to China, he also dealt as severe a back-handed blow upon one of his friends (Sir Graham) and his boss (Sir Peel). Furthermore, Palmerston apparently sneered at one aspect of the relationship between Sir Peel and Sir Graham (one of the Peelites) when he says, “he agreed with the right hon. Baronet, the Member for Tamworth, that colleagues in office naturally felt confidence in each other—left to one another the management of the details of their respective offices, and therefore, that nothing could be more unfair and ungenerous than to turn upon a colleague and say, “You must take the entire share of the blame for your act, because I trusted you at the time.”

Palmerston used “mysterious terms” for the “precise instructions and sufficient powers” to let the Members opposite in the House know he is strongly urging them to tell him what they really mean. Actually, Palmerston did not expect any Member opposite in the House to tell him exactly what they mean, so he went on to say himself as follows: “...the instructions given upon that occasion were those invariably given to every consul or officer who was sent to any foreign station—instructions to collect statistical information, to afford protection to all British interests and British subjects—to mediate between British subjects and the Government of the country, and to report any matters which he might deem worthy of forwarding as information to the home Government,...”

What did Palmerston give top priority to whenever he drew up any foreign diplomacy? “For the glory of the British Empire, “ wrote Chin Shun Shin, the novelist of *Ahen Sensou* [the Opium War], about Viscount Palmerston and his

political belief (2015, pp.244–245). Sure enough, Palmerston referred to this through his political opponent, Sir Robert Peel, in his speech: “He (Palmerston) was glad to hear the right hon. Baronet declare, that it was necessary that measures should be taken to vindicate the honour of the British flag and the dignity of the British Crown.” Daring to adopt Peel’s words in his speech, Palmerston appeared to have aimed at involving every participant in these debates, whichever party they belonged to, in their constant efforts to work for the glory of the British Empire part of which they are, by making such an emotional appeal.

### 3.3 Evaluation of Palmerston’s Speech

Viscount Palmerston is not so famous in Japan as William Gladstone, but it does not necessarily mean what he did for the British Empire was not so great as Gladstone. In fact, it is not easy to judge which made a greater contribution to the progress of its diplomacy or of its healthy economic development, especially in its relationship with China, Gladstone or Palmerston.

Until I read two speeches of the noble Lord (Viscount Palmerston) in the April parliamentary debates in 1840, I had thought William Gladstone made a greater contribution to the small majority in the vote following the debates, but as I knew more and more of what Palmerston said in his speeches, I began to wonder which idea was politically more expedient, Gladstone’s or Palmerston’s, in their arguments to their contemporary people.

If any reader of this paper should read all the 17 speeches during the debates, he or she would be able to notice soon how successful Palmerston was in confuting precisely, specifically and powerfully all the arguments against himself or his official, Charles Elliot.

As the author learned about Gladstone in writing his previous paper (Kimura, 2021) and Bebbington described Gladstone in *William Ewart Gladstone—Faith and Politics in Victorian Britain*—(1993, p.2), “from an early age Gladstone was trained in precise reasoning. He worked formidably hard, applying himself to

paperwork for long hours at a time.” Gladstone must have read the Blue Book (documents on Britain’s foreign diplomacy) so carefully that he could make his evidence-based arguments almost always. Quite rarely, however, he was not careful enough. As far as the 1840 parliamentary debates are concerned, there was only one such case: “of course they poisoned the wells.” But Palmerston never failed to notice it and his confutation centred on this point. That is why Palmerston said at the beginning of his second speech: “What he objected to on the part of the hon. Member (Gladstone) was...that the hon. Member, without having ascertained whether the charge was true or not, had assumed it in his own mind as a fact, treated it as a matter of course, and said they were justified in doing it for the purpose of expelling from their territory persons whom they wished to drive from their shores.”

In the debates, many speakers made long speeches, with Sir Graham’s speech being more than 15,000 words long, and some of them thought Palmerston ought to write long letters as if they imagined that “precise instructions contained in few but significant words were not proportioned to the length which they had to travel; they imagined that when you write to China, your letter should be as long as the voyage.” So Palmerston told the House it is “the duty of a Minister to give his written instructions, distinctly, decisively, and without circumlocution, to write so as not to be misunderstood, at sufficient length but with not one word redundant.” Brevity is the soul of wit!

Palmerston’s specific confutation is not limited to a group of people, but to an individual speaker. Gladstone, for example, suggested that the British Government should join the Chinese government in using every lawful endeavour to stop the opium trade since the Chinese government had resorted to every proper means of making their intentions known to the British Government. To such a suggestion, Palmerston makes the following counterargument: “He wondered what the House would have said to her Majesty’s Ministers, if they had come down to it with a large naval estimate for a number of revenue cruisers to be



employed in the preventive service from the river at Canton to the Yellow Sea for the purpose of preserving the morals of the Chinese people, who were disposed to buy what other people were disposed to sell to them...the House would have turned a deaf ear to their supplications, and would have refused to grant them a single farthing...if they had endeavoured to execute the laws of China for the Chinese government, and had attempted to establish a vigilant police to do that in China which they were unable to do in their own country—namely, to put down smuggling—the House would not have treated their proposals with serious levity, but would absolutely have laughed them out of court.”

Palmerston’s most specific arguments may be illustrated by his reading aloud to the House a memorial addressed by American merchants to their own Government and a letter from thirty respectable firms in London engaged in the China trade. The former begins as follows: “Several of our merchants at Canton, interested in the China trade, have memorialized Congress, setting for the recent proceedings at Canton, and soliciting a co-operation by the Government of the United States with that of Great Britain, in establishing commercial relations with China on a safe and honourable footing...”, while the latter starts like this: “London, April 9, 1840. TO THE VISCOUNT PALMERSTON. My Lord—we, the undersigned British merchants connected with China, cannot but view with the greatest alarm and apprehension the probable effect of the expression of any public opinion with respect to the justice and policy of the measures understood to be taken by her Majesty’s Government to obtain redress for the insults and injuries inflicted on British subjects by the Chinese government, and for the future protection of the legal trade with that country....”

And Palmerston’s powerful confutation makes his political opponents take action. Gladstone, for example, admitted his mistake after Palmerston’s first speech and said this: “I at the time said, I stated the circumstance, but had no evidence of the fact.” In his second speech which was made after Palmerston finished his speech, Sir Graham began to make poor excuses for several per-

sonal comments made by Palmerston, when he was interrupted by loud cries of “Divide, divide,” “Question, question,” from all sides of the House, but the Speaker called “Order.” Sir Graham again attempted to address the House, but his voice was completely drowned in the shouts of “Divide, divide, divide,” and he at length gave way, and resumed his seat.

Where did these ways of confutation by Viscount Palmerston come from? They must have come from his long experience as a diplomat which began in 1830. From this time on, Viscount Palmerston was to dominate British foreign policy for over 30 years, when Britain stood at the height of its imperial power.

#### **4.1 Gladstone vs. Palmerston in their Speeches**

Gladstone made a speech based on a large amount of knowledge obtained through his intensive and extensive reading, especially his careful reading of the Blue Book (documents on foreign diplomacy), while Palmerston confuted Gladstone’s arguments with accumulated experiences as Foreign Secretary.

Gladstone played a supportive role for the motion submitted by Sir James Graham and delivered a harsh criticism of the opium trade and a proposal for making war upon China, but failed to notice that there were two different views on the commercial use of opium within China. As a result, Gladstone’s arguments against the trade in opium centred on the view Mr. Commissioner Lin had, and even suggested that the British Government should join the Chinese Government in suppressing the contraband trade. To Gladstone, Mr. Lin seemed to be identical with the Chinese Government.

Palmerston, on the other hand, played a central role in his arguments and the arguments of his colleagues against the Graham motion. Immediately after Sir Graham made a “long and elaborate speech,” Mr. Macaulay made a “powerful and eloquent speech” in which Macaulay praised imperialism while disregarding the motion as “entirely retrospective.” Many other speakers joined Palmerston in expressing opposition to the motion. As their boss, Palmerston declared a victory

of his team over Sir Graham and others, including Gladstone. Although he was a boss of Graham, Gladstone and others, Sir Robert Peel did not play the same role as Palmerston in these debates.

As an individual member of the Opposition, Gladstone made a sincere and powerful speech to give a clear indication of the policy of the party to which he belonged. As he learned more about the conducts of Palmerston and Captain Elliot, he could not help criticizing them more severely for not fully discharging their duties. He wondered why the House of Commons was called to “give an assent to a war caused by the indolence and apathy of the noble Lord.” This question was the result of his inquiry from his strong sense of moral justice.

Unlike Gladstone, Palmerston worked together not only with his team members as “gallant soldiers” but also with American merchants as well as British merchants, all of whom were engaged in the China trade. And, even though he and his officer had been treated as “bad men” in many speeches, Palmerston waited and waited as a shrewd diplomat until the last, when he began to confute successfully Gladstone and many others, including Sir Peel.

#### **4.2 Which Won This “Debating Match”?**

Which won these debates, Gladstone or Palmerston? If the result of the vote taken after those debates were the criterion of the speeches of these two men, Palmerston would be announced the winner of this “debating match,” for the motion submitted by Sir Graham and supported by Gladstone was defeated by a majority of only 9 votes (262 votes for vs. 271 votes against). This speech criticism, however, does not adopt the results standards, so the result of the vote has nothing to do with the evaluation of a speech.

If the truth about a certain state of affairs were the criterion of a speech, victory would go to Gladstone, for he spoke as if the noble Lord had lied: “The noble Lord had brought down a collection of extracts, carefully culled from the documents which had since been laid before the House, and in which there

was no information as to the state of the opium trade or as to the determination of the Chinese government to put it down. The noble Lord had kept all that information to himself, and had refused the House an opportunity of forming a sound decision on the subject.” Palmerston, however, guarded himself against being misunderstood, and said, “the hon. Member (Gladstone), without having ascertained whether the charge was true or not, had assumed it in his own mind as a fact, treated it as a matter of course,…” It is difficult, therefore, to judge who tells the truth. The truth standards are excluded from our speech criticism.

If it were the criterion of a speech whether a person or people in question are good or not, Gladstone would be regarded again as a winner of this debating match, for the noble Lord and Captain Elliot were treated as “bad people” because they were unable to discharge their duties: “they (the British Government) had been treated with contempt and neglect—with the same contempt by the noble Lord (Palmerston) at home as by the British superintendent (Captain Elliot) at Canton.” It is extremely difficult to judge which are good people, Palmerston and his “gallant soldiers” or Graham, Gladstone and Peel. So the ethical standards are not adopted for this speech criticism, either. The author read and evaluated each speech as an artistic work.

Until he read all speeches made in the course of the debate, the author had thought Gladstone and others belonging to the Opposition were defeated by people in her Majesty’s Government, including Palmerston, despite their “excellent speeches,” but he changed his mind totally after reading all speeches, especially after reading two speeches of Palmerston.

Here are a few factors for that change in the author’s mind.

First of all, who submitted a motion? Sir James Graham did, and this may be the biggest reason for the defeat of him, Gladstone and their colleagues. Graham made a speech first of all, and his speech was mentioned in all other speeches, but these facts do not necessarily mean his speech was highly valued. In fact, Palmerston regarded his speech as one “so feebly conceived and so feebly

enforced” and, began to challenge him in many respects. This was followed by Graham’s poor excuses in his last speech and virtually the last speech before the vote. Such a situation must have given a bad impression of the Opposition as a whole and there was no other chance left for his confutation.

Secondly, Gladstone’s influence was limited as far as these debates are concerned. Gladstone made his speech as a young member of Parliament at the age of 30. Powerful and eloquent as his speech was, he focused his attention on the moral aspects of the opium trade and those of the noble Lord and Captain Elliot. In 1841, when his boss, Sir Robert Peel, secured his great electoral victory, Gladstone was offered the post of Vice-President of the Board of Trade. “He protested that he was largely ignorant of economic issues. Worse still, it was a technical position, offering no opportunity for engaging with ethical issues” (St. John 2010, p.23). As this fact suggests, Gladstone’s interest was not in the economic aspects of the opium trade.

And finally, Sir Robert Peel, the boss of Graham and Gladstone was also not so interested in the opium trade or so enthusiastic about working together to defeat his opponents in these debates. As a result, even Sir Peel, whose speech was highly valued, tended to be vague in his arguments. So, as Palmerston pointed out, “Not one of these hon. Members, not even the right hon. Baronet (Sir Peel) himself, who came nearest the mark, had ventured to say, ‘the powers you ought to have given were, to expel from China, by your authority, every man who was engaged in the opium trade, and to drive away every ship by which that trade was carried on.’ They did not choose to say so, but they implied it.”

For these reasons, the author concludes that Palmerston and his gallant forces won this “debating match.”

### **4.3 Which idea was politically more expedient, Gladstone’s or Palmerston’s, in their arguments, to their contemporary people?**

Gladstone’s idea was that, since her Majesty’s proposal for making war upon

China over the opium trade was not acceptable as an “unjust and iniquitous war,” the British Government must stop the British ships already on their way to China, while Palmerston’s idea was to change the status quo in China and make the country accept the principles of free trade, equal diplomatic recognition among nations, while backing the merchants’ demands.

Gladstone said, “I am not competent to judge how long this war may last, or how protracted may be its operations, but this I can say, that a war more unjust in its origin, a war more calculated in its progress to cover this country with permanent disgrace, I do not know, and I have not read of.” This is one of the most famous phrases, but is there anything significant we can learn but the most important moral aspect of the war to remember?

Palmerston, on the other hand, responded to a suggestion of sending an embassy to China as follows: “...knowing the disinclination of the Chinese to enter into diplomatic relations with foreign states, reflecting that we had not any practical measure to propose to their government for consolidating friendship or alliance, he (Palmerston) thought that it would have been an unwise policy to send an ambassador to China, when the only practical measure which we could have proposed to the Chinese government was to join with them in putting down the trade in opium.” This is politically a proper response from an experienced diplomat, isn’t it? Thanks to such perspective in him, Palmerston must have established trust with many people, especially those engaged in the China trade.

Therefore, the author has come to believe Palmerston’s idea was politically more expedient to his contemporary people.

## **5. Conclusion**

Since he made up his mind to read all speeches made in the course of the debates on April 7th, 8th and 9th, 1840, the author has been reading them one by one. Honestly speaking, he had much difficulty in understanding any speech, but, once some parts of each speech began to make sense as he got more informa-

tion from relevant books, he made more progress. The result of his reading has already been written above.

Now that he has read all of them, he has found himself interested in another topic: what happened later between Gladstone and Palmerston. In his speech, Gladstone delivered a severe criticism of Palmerston, while Palmerston made Gladstone admit his mistake and correct himself. According to St John (2010, p.48), “Gladstone held Palmerston in the lowest possible regard, describing him as a man ‘without conviction of duty...who systematically panders to whatever is questionable or base in the public mind.’” William Ewart Gladstone, however, was Chancellor of the Exchequer in Lord Palmerston’s Whig administration from 1859 to 1865.

When Sir Robert Peel offered him the post of Vice-President of the Board of Trade, Gladstone protested that he was largely ignorant of economic issues. How could such a man possibly become an expert of economic issues? This is the next subject for this author’s research paper.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> 「信仰と文明と正義を自負する若きステイツマンは、パーマストン外相の『不義にして非道の戦争』を鋭く非難した。翌日まで延びた論戦の結果、開戦賛成（政府支持）は二七一票、反対は二六二票。ただの九票差でイギリスは『不義にして非道の』アヘン戦争に突入したのである。グラッドストンの演説は、まず確かな事実をたどりながら論敵の非をつき、続いて信仰と文明と正義をかかげてしっかり議場の空気をつかむ。」

<sup>2</sup> 陳 瞬臣著『実録 アヘン戦争』の記述（1971, pp.170–171）

## References

- Bebbington, David W. (1993). *William Ewart Gladstone—Faith and Politics in Victorian Britain*. Cambridge: Wm B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.
- Cathcart, Robert. (1966). *Post Communication—Criticism and Evaluation--*. Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc.
- Chin, Shun Shin. (1971). *Jitsuroku Ahen Sensou* [A true history of the Opium War]. Tokyo: Chuko Shinsho.
- (2015). *Ahen Sensou* 1 [The Opium War, Vol.1]. Tokyo: Kodansha.
- Clark, George. (1971). *English History A Survey*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

- Hansard. (April 7, 8, 9, 1840). *British Parliamentary Debates*.
- Kamikawa, Nobuhiko. (1967). *Guraddosuton* [Gladstone]. Tokyo: Ushio Shuppan.
- Kimura, Tomoyasu. (2021). "The Rhetoric of Moral Justice and Political Expedient: William Ewart Gladstone in His Early Years of Training and Performances of Speech-Making." *The 8th Research Bulletin of Nagoya University of Foreign Studies*. Nisshin: NUSF.
- Kondo, Kazuhiko. (2013). *Igisushu Jikko* [Ten Lectures on English History]. Tokyo: Iwanami Shinsho.
- St John, Ian. (2010). *Gladstone and The Logic of Victorian Politics*. London: Anthem Press.
- Wikipedia. (2021).
- Hansard, James Graham, Thomas Macaulay, William Follet, George Staunton, Sidney Herbert, Benjamin Hawes, Frederic Thesiger, Charles Buller, William Gladstone, Henry Ward, George Palmer, James Hogg, Stephen Lushington, Viscount Sandon, John Hobhouse, Robert Peel, Viscount Palmerston.