

For whatever reason Mulock's days in Ireland were now drawing to a close but before he left the island he wrote to the Earl of Clarendon:

*"My lord,*

*From the personal kindness I entertain for your lordship, I could wish it were in my power to proffer to England's foreign secretary the customary complement of a happy new year. But a truthful anticipation of assured evil forbids any such delusive courtesy. Never have so much universal "moaning, lamentation and woe" been compressed into an equal period of time since the creation of the world as will be experienced within the commenced year.*

*As my instructive researches lie out of the sphere of statesmanship, they may possibly be scoffed at by the incredulous; but as I happen to know that your lordship reads the sacred Scriptures, I would briefly say that my fearful foreviews of coming events are derived from that "more sure words of prophecy which shineth as a light in a dark place."*

*From the Word of Inspiration, Romans xl 21, 22, I gather assuredly that the gospel of the grace of God has passed away from the Gentiles to return to them no more forever. And not without just cause. All truth, all righteousness flowing from obedience to Christ's commandments have ceased from among men, and very specially from self-styled Christendom.*

*Therefore, I boldly affirm that peace is taken from the earth, and that neither the arts of diplomacy nor the efforts of war can restore that vanished blessing. You cannot have peace without Christ, the Prince of Peace, and he hath been despised and rejected by the Gentile nations.*

*But I have heavier tidings still. It is not merely war – universal, implacable, havocking war – which is about to desolate the earth; not merely the transference of dominion, the revolutions of states, the overthrow of dynasties, with which mankind are now menaced. I tell the foreign secretary of Great Britain that society itself – the whole frame and system of antichristian polity among nations – is on the point of being broken up.*

*No one laboured more earnestly than I did, in my humble position, to divert this calamitous consummation. But the decree of the Most High has gone forth, and the dreadful results must follow."*<sup>i</sup>

It was at this juncture that an outcry developed against Prince Albert, fomented in (and by) the press which may have led Mulock to return to England. Prince Albert did not always enjoy popularity amongst the nation's leading figures and when it was reported that a senior military officer had allegedly refused to drink the customary toast of health to the Prince at a regimental dinner, accusations emerged that the Prince was influencing Queen Victoria against the wishes of her ministers and intruding into political matters in a manner in which he had no right. Thomas Mulock, ever ready in a cause celebre came to the fore once again and wrote to the Prince:

*"May it please your Royal Highness – I have recently read, with much pain and indignation, articles that appeared in the public journals, containing most unjust and anti-Christian accusations against your Royal Highness; and, moved by sincere sympathy and loyal duty, I beg leave to offer, with unfeigned respect, the following observations to your Royal Highness:-*

*The charges audaciously preferred against your Royal highness may be comprised under two heads – first, that your Royal Highness improperly interposed your advice to the Queen on affairs of state; and, secondly, that your Royal Highness is invariably present when her Majesty grants audiences to her ministers. Upon each of these points I will say a few words:-*

*It is utterly incorrect to allege that your Royal Highness is disentitled to give advice on affairs of state to your royal wife. It is true that your Royal Highness cannot act as the political head of the state; but when the Queen voluntarily selected your Royal Highness to be her, Consort, you became her head by sacred right of marriage; and your Royal Highness is bound, by that superior relation, to afford all advice and assistance to her Majesty in executing the arduous responsibilities of royalty; and for her Majesty to forgo that help would be to deprive herself of the most important and impartial counsellor in her dominions! For what object can your Royal Highness have in view, but that the best interests of the British Crown may descend unimpaired to your royal posterity? Depend upon it, Sir, that no*

*presumed principle of public polity can or ought to sever your Royal Highness from your assigned rightful headship over the Queen of these realms.*

*The peculiar position of a female sovereign renders it highly decorous and eligible that on all interviews with her ministers the Queen shall enjoy the protective presence of your Royal Highness, and the manly, open interference of your Royal Highness should be wisely considered as an effectual safeguard against even the surmised exercise of sinister influence.*

*In the hope that these Christian considerations will prove cheering and sustaining to your Royal Highness, I have the honour to be, your Royal Highness's obedient servant,*

*Thomas Mulock.*

These kind, supportive thoughts donated to the Prince at a delicate moment received acknowledgement, perhaps as befits a gentleman, upon which Mulock, able once more to plunge himself into the public eye, subscribed his letter to the Prince and its reply from the Prince's secretary, to the *Freeman's Journal*:

“Windsor Castle, January 5<sup>th</sup> 1854.

Sir,

I am commanded by his Royal Highness Prince Albert to acknowledge the receipt of your letter, and to thank you for your kind communication – I have the honour to be, sir, your very obedient servant,  
C. Grey.”<sup>ii</sup>

The outcome was an outcry in many newspapers; indignation that Mulock should have written to the Prince in the first place; astonishment that the Prince should have replied, and accusations that the Prince's acknowledgement of the letter was nothing less than that the Prince agreed with Mulock's summary of the Prince's entitlement to advise the Queen on matters of state and particularly on Foreign Affairs! The contention raged; was argued but could not be ignored and suspicion was voiced that the conduct of the Prince, because of his personal connection with so many European Courts, could amount to an act of treason:

“Rumours are still in circulation about Prince Albert's interference with the foreign affairs of this kingdom. No satisfactory evidence has yet been adduced that these rumours are well-founded; and perhaps we are not far from the truth when we say that if they are not altogether destitute of truth, they are considerably coloured. ....Meanwhile Prince Albert is not without a friend. The clever, but somewhat notorious Thomas Mulock – known principally as the writer of many columns of abuse against the Duke of Sutherland (which he has since acknowledged to be unfounded), and as the justifier and defender of Louis Napoleon for the massacre on the Boulevards of Paris in December, 1851 – has come to the rescue of the Royal Consort. With characteristic impertinence, Mr. Mulock addresses Prince Albert from the Emerald Isle, and offers a letter of condolence to His Royal Highness, under the “unjust and anti-Christian accusations,” which have been brought against him. The motives which have prompted Thomas Mulock to this generous act, we are told, are “sincere sympathy, loyal duty, and unfeigned respect,” for the Prince Consort. We are not warranted perhaps to call this statement in question; but it so happens that some of those who know a little of what Mr. Mulock has said and done, speak significantly of diamond rings and gold pins glimmering in the distance. In 1851, Mr. Mulock was the only British subject, so far as is known, who undertook the defence of the extraordinary conduct of the Emperor of France; and for this he was rewarded by a diamond ring. Did he anticipate a similar substantial recognition of his good deeds, when he addressed Prince Albert, with the view of letting him know his position in this realm, and the duties belonging thereto? Of course not; he is far above all such sinister motives – nothing but the hope of “cheering and sustaining His Royal Highness” under the “anti-Christian accusations,” impelled Thomas Mulock to a duty so delicate. We rather suspect, however, that this gentleman's opinions about government – the exact position of the Sovereign – and the extent to which her marriage transferred her responsible duties to her husband, will find very few supporters in the United Kingdom. It has been very generally believed – and the belief acted upon – that as regards the public business of this nation, the Prince Consort occupies a neutral position; but according to Mr. Mulock, he is Her Majesty's principal adviser! The maxim, “Save me from my friends,” was never more applicable than here; for assuredly nothing could more seriously injure the character, the popularity, and the happiness of the Prince, than a claim put forward in his behalf, which, if practically carried out, would virtually make him King or Dictator of Great Britain. The address of this inveterate letter-writer might have passed as a good joke – or perhaps been accepted as evidence that he was labouring under a malady which we need not name – if the Prince had treated it as it deserved, and as his high position became him. But in an unguarded moment, he condescends to instruct his private secretary to write a reply, thanking the veritable Mr. Mulock for his “kind communication.” In every sense such a step is unfortunate, and, in the circumstances, and considering the “condoler,” unbecoming one possessed of the

shrewdness, sagacity, and superior intelligence of Prince Albert; and one is driven to the conclusion that his case is cheerless indeed, when he feels so grateful to Mr. Mulock's 'kind communication'.<sup>iii</sup>

Another editor thought that Mulock's letter was a mere 'cockcrow':

"One Thomas Mulock, of Killiney, near Dublin – we would not rob the sister island of her jewel – has offered himself as champion to Prince Albert. Stories are flying here and there – old wives stories, doubtless – which impeach the wisdom, moderation, and political neutrality of the Queen's consort; and here jumps up a spasmodic gentleman, who assumes that these old wives' stories are true, and therefore tells the prince to his face that a man in his high station is above the necessity for being wise, moderate, and neutral. A most acute and loyal subject, doubtless! Thomas Mulock has the effrontery to say to the Queen's husband: "Depend upon it, sir, that no presumed principle of public polity can or ought to sever your royal highness from your assigned rightful headship over the Queen of these realms." We are not going to discuss the first principles and English constitutional law with Thomas Mulock; but we entertain a slight suspicion that if the Queen of these realms had been a coster-monger's wife, and Thomas Mulock had commented on her conjugal rights in the style here addressed to the Queen and Prince, he would have taken little by his motion beyond a Christmas box on the ear. As it is, he gets a letter of thanks."<sup>iv</sup>

Not all of the public comment was adverse to Mulock's view:

"Concurring as we do to a great extent in the sentiments expressed by Mr. Thomas Mulock in his letter to HRH Prince Albert, which will be found in another column, it scarcely occurs to us as requisite to state who Mr. Mulock is, for it is the point of principle and not the expression of opinion by which we desire to be guided in a matter of such moment as this. Sufficient, however, that Mr. Mulock is a gentleman long and intimately associated with the world of letters - that in Moore's *Life of Byron*, and in Colonel Mure's *Journals in Greece*, honourable mention may be found of his name; that besides having himself exercised the influence of his pen as a public writer in many eminent public journals in England, Scotland, Ireland, and the Continent, Mr. Mulock is the father of one of our most promising novelists – Miss Mulock, the authoress of *Olive &c.*."

Criticism of Prince Albert was explicit in another editorial:

".....The note in the subjoined correspondence, signed "C. Grey," is an unmistakeable adoption on the part of Prince Albert of the propositions offered for the purpose of "cheering and sustaining his Royal Highness" by the writer of the letter to which that note is a reply. Thus Prince Albert formally concurs in the assertion that in him is vested "a rightful headship over the Queen of these realms," which warrants him in interfering in "the arduous responsibilities of royalty." In order to preserve that headship entire and safe from "even the surmised influence" of so gay and gallant a courtier as Lord Aberdeen, the Prince declares his right to "interpose his protective influence" between the Queen and harm "in all interviews with her ministers."

Whoever this Mr. Mulock may be, he has the merit of having brought this delicate question to an issue. It will now be scarcely possible for ministers to check action in reference to an allegation which being admitted, needs no investigation as to its truth, and cannot be got rid of by vague mystification. If this letter, signed "C. Grey," be genuine, Prince Albert has acknowledged the entertainment of opinions which would naturally lead to the course of conduct attributed to him.

The wisdom of the authors of our great Revolution, provided against the dangers with which such opinions or conduct are fraught, by the famous Act of Parliament (12<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup> William the Third cap 2), which excluded foreigners (even though naturalised) from every office of civil or military trust. The disqualification was pointedly repeated, and rendered more precise, by the scarcely less famous statute of George the first (1<sup>st</sup> George the First, s2, c4); and by it, says Mr. Hallam, "The narrow prejudices of that monarch were well restrained from gratifying his corrupt and servile German favourites with lucrative offices." The question is now to be considered, and it will, we trust, be honestly and fearlessly considered by parliament, whether it was wise to nullify what is in fact the fundamental law of England in favour of the House of Coburg and the German favourites of the present day. That was, however, done by an act (3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> Victoria, cap 1), which repealed, *pro hac vice*, the statute of George the First, and permitted the omission from the act naturalising Prince Albert of the restrictive clause still required in all naturalisation acts by that statute. To what extent his Royal Highness has availed himself of this omission, and of his "Headship over the Queen," may be in some degree justified by the facts in the Court Guide. His Serene Highness Prince Albert of Sax Coburg Gotha is now Field Marshall; His Royal Highness is Colonel of the Grenadier Guards and Rifle Brigade; a Privy Councillor, and K.G., G.C.B., K.T., K.P., G.C.M.G., and Grand Master of the Order of the Bath; Lord Warden of the Stannaries, Chief

Steward of the Duchy of Cornwall; Governor and Constable of Windsor Castle, and Master of Trinity House; and moreover entitled to take what liberty he pleases with the royal arms in reference to his paternal coat.”<sup>vi</sup>

Any expectation of a response from Prince Albert was to lead to disappointment:

“The Prince Consort and the Prince’s Comfort:- We have looked in vain for a repudiation of the letter signed “C. Grey,” in which Prince Albert accepts the comfort offered him by Mr. Mulock, and adopts the “headship over the Queen of these Realms” assigned to him by that gentleman. The *Morning Post* calls for a denial of the authenticity of this princely comment upon our constitutional law; but the *Observer*, the *Times*, and the *Morning Chronicle*, are silent, while the *Spectator* sees “some basis of sense in Mr. Mulock’s Hibernian nonsense.” Our contemporary thinks Prince Albert might safely give his wife a certain lecture upon any subject he pleases, even though it were a “mad, not to say, a wicked” one; but that Lord Aberdeen might insist upon shutting His Royal Highness out of the royal closet when state secrets are in agitation. In the meanwhile the public take the commonsense view of this painful matter, and stifling public comment upon it, or pronouncing it to be un-genteel will not get rid of it. As to Mr. Mulock, we believe, he feels the comforting of princes to be his vocation. He displays, we have heard, a diamond pin on his manly heart, as the reward of his former kind and sustaining communications to Louis Napoleon.”<sup>vii</sup>

Noticing that one un-named correspondent had expressed doubt as to the authenticity of the correspondence Thomas Mulock hastened to correct the impression:

*“To the editor of the Daily News,*

*Sir,*

*It appears to me a wise general rule that public writers who subscribe their names are not bound to notice the observations of anonymous scribblers; but as a correspondent of your journal has dared, indirectly, to impugn the genuineness of letters which passed between Prince Albert and myself, I wish to say, for the satisfaction of your readers, that the respective autographs were duly exhibited to the editor of the Freeman’s Journal, in which the correspondence originally appeared.*

*As for my letter, so unpalatable to “H.E.F.,” I can only reaffirm that the views it contains are irrefragably true, whether people like them or not; nor can I consort to ignore Christianity in favour of the London journalists.*

*That his Royal Highness the Prince should command his secretary to return a polite and cordial answer to a friendly and respectful communication will not surely be imputed as a fault by Englishmen who uphold the courtesies of life. As for the motives ascribed to my humble self, I can afford to smile at the splenetic supposition of “place-hunting.” I saw Prince Albert assailed by nearly the whole power of the London press, and simply from a love of truth and justice I espoused the cause of his Royal Highness, feebly, I admit, but with honest and, let me add, disinterested intentions.*

*Trusting to the well-known impartiality of your ably-conducted journal for the insertion of this letter, I remain,  
Sir, your obedient servant,*

*Thomas Mulock.*

*Killiney, near Dublin, January 14<sup>th</sup> 1854.*<sup>viii</sup>

Some comments were not without a trace of humour though containing stinging irony:

“More Comfort for the Prince Consort:

The time has long gone by when the title of “The King’s Friends” was assumed by a vile, though powerful, faction which the inexperience and youthful predilections of George the Third forced into a mischievous existence. Fortunately for the British monarchy and for the liberties of the human race – so far as the human race is free – the epithet has sunk out of memory under the reign of the “Good Old King’s” present successor. There is now neither faction nor party of “Queen’s Friends;” for partisanship is merged in the hearty, respectful, and truthful affection of the entire nation. Nevertheless, the Earl of Bute does not want a man to stand before the Court Newsmen as his successor: nay, the mantle of that eminent courtier has a chance of sharing the fate of that of St. Martin, and of being divided for the use of two successors. There cannot, indeed, now be either King’s friends or Queen’s friends; but with the homage of Mr. Mulock and Mr. C. C. Greville at his feet, the Queen’s Consort cannot complain of a want of “Prince’s friends,” to be saved from whom would seem to be just at this moment a very suitable aspiration of the Princely mind. Mr. Mulock has been friendly enough to remove all doubt from the fact of the adoption of that gentleman’s constitutional views as to the royal office by Prince Albert:-

“As a correspondent of your journal (the *Daily News*) has dared (writes Mr. Mulock) indirectly, to impugn the genuineness of letters which passed between Prince Albert and myself, I wish to say, for the satisfaction of your readers, that the respective autographs were duly exhibited to the editor of the *Freeman's Journal*, in which the correspondence originally appeared.”

So, then, the grateful thanks for *kind* advice and sympathy conveyed by “C. Grey” were genuine, and the Prince does consider that in interfering between the throne and the responsible ministers of the country, he has been exercising no more than a “rightful headship over the Queen.”

Mr. C. C. Greville is not less friendly. He has come forward to prove that Prince Albert has acted as a Privy Councillor without having been sworn in the usual manner – a main part of the customary oath being, we believe, an obligation to secrecy in reference to matters of state. Mr. C. C. Greville, it appears, took upon himself to admit his Royal Highness to the council-table under circumstances which left him free to communicate respecting all that might pass there with Czar or Pope – with Henri of Chambord or Leopold of Belgium, just as he might, in his wisdom see fit. But, in taking this course, Mr. C. C. Greville was, it appears, fortified by advice. He took the opinion of the “oldest inhabitant” upon the point of constitutional law; and having consulted the late Duke of Sussex, incontinently made the Prince a member of Her Majesty’s most honourable Privy Council, with full licence to tell to whom he pleased all he heard and saw there.

We perceive that Mr. Roebuck has tartly repudiated the honour ascribed to him by the *Daily News* of being sufficiently independent of spirit to bring this whole affair of Prince Albert under the influence of daylight in the House of Commons. The honourable gentleman never intended to make an inquiry upon the subject, and in the present state of the representation, we dare say no other honourable gentleman will venture to do so. This attempt to stifle the public feeling will, nevertheless, bring but small comfort to the Prince. It will merely strengthen suspicions which at present are but vague, and it will direct attention to the monstrous accumulation of lucrative offices of high trust upon an individual to whom not even sycophancy can attribute the possession of qualifications necessary for filling some of them. The emoluments of a Field Marshall, of the Colonelcy of two Regiments, of the Lord Wardenship of the Stannaries, of the Rangership of Windsor Forest, &c., &c. This great pluralist, doubtless, knows how to receive; the duties belonging to the military appointments he cannot even make a pretence of being able to perform. The baton he holds, and the triplicate pay he receives, are the rightful property of three old soldiers, and for them they would be reclaimed if there was a spark of manly spirit in active existence in the House of Commons.<sup>ix</sup>

Amidst the hubbub came rumours, conjectures and allegations:

“The Stories about Prince Albert:

“Public Opinion” is half-inclined to sacrifice Prince Albert at the shrine of rumour. A whisper, which was first insinuated for party uses, has grown into a roar, and a constructive hint has swelled into a positive and monstrous fiction. That those who seek the presence of the Queen find Prince Albert with her Majesty, is a fact which rather won the sympathy and esteem of the English public; but then it was said that he attended meetings of the Queen with her ministers; next, that ministers were made aware of his presence – that, however reluctant to proceed with business before a third party, they found it necessary to do so – that it even became necessary to defend their opinions before the Prince – that the Prince, in fact, interfered with their counsel to their Sovereign – that he not only influenced the Royal mind, but, possessing the power of free communication with foreign courts, he constituted an unlicensed channel for information between the confidential council of the Queen and the cabinets of foreign potentates, perhaps to the enemies of England – that, in short, Prince Albert was a traitor to his Queen, that he had been impeached for high treason, and finally, that on a charge of high treason he had been arrested and committed to the Tower! This was the story, not only told in all parts of England a day or two back, but by some believed!

Full sway has been allowed to the accumulation of what is called “popular feeling” on this subject, by the absence of any public contradiction; and indeed, to a certain extent, the assertion that the Prince Consort is not without some share in the Royal Councils is almost admitted. Amongst the many eager calumniators, his Royal Highness finds not a few defenders, and one direct avowed sympathiser, - that is, if we may trust a correspondence first published in the Dublin papers, which has not been disavowed. Mr. Thomas Mulock of Killiney near Dublin, has immortalised his name in history by exchanging letters with the Prince Consort. Mr. Mulock insists upon the Prince’s right to advise his wife – as a husband, as a councillor chosen by herself, and as having “an assigned headship over the Queen of these realms.” On “these Christian considerations” Mr. Mulock cheers and sustains his Royal Highness; and in reply, Prince Albert’s equerry, Colonel Grey, acknowledges the receipt of the letter, “thanks” the writer for “his kind communication.” It will be observed that Mr. Mulock rests his doctrine partly on the voluntary appointment by the Queen of a councillor, on the

subordinate position of the female sex, and on the headship acquired over the wife, albeit Queen, by the sacred rite of marriage. There is some basis of sense in Mr. Mulock's Hibernian nonsense. An influence over the wife no social relations can destroy, and no British man would wish to destroy; so much must be conceded. An influence acquired by faithful affection is equally praiseworthy. The exercise of that influence exists by an irrefragable right – the impossibility of preventing it. It has generally been considered upon something like evidence, that the Prince used great taste and discretion in the exercise of his undoubted right.

It is to be hoped, however, that his Royal Highness does not take his law, either civil or political, from the opinion which Mr. Mulock has volunteered upon the case laid by him before the public. The notion that a Queen Regnant is, for any civil, political, or public purposes, in the subordinate position of a *femme convertée*, is untenable. The civil law, however, is of far less importance than the constitutional law. No one, we believe, would be prepared to deny to the royal wife the sustaining protection of a husband in many cases of difficulty or trial. The Queen has a right to command the presence of any one of her Privy Councillors upon any occasion whatsoever. On the other hand, it is scarcely to be presumed that the Queen could be conscious of any trial or difficulty in the presence of her freely-selected and faithful ministers. Those ministers would inevitably share, as men and as subjects, the desire that every wish of the Queen, as monarch and as lady, might be gratified if possible; and they could not of course make difficulties. Nevertheless, the responsibility which they undertake carries with it correlative rights; and Queen Victoria has already found that a public minister could exercise his right of objecting to the approach even of personal friends to the Sovereign, in an official capacity or on certain occasions. At the time of "the Bedchamber Plot," Sir Robert Peel's motives were misunderstood, because in fact his own actions had not given that key to his character which enabled us subsequently to understand him better; but public opinion has generally ratified the right which he claimed on that occasion. No personal promise can alienate Prince Albert's inherent right of free communication with his personal friends, his relations by blood and marriage in foreign courts; a right, however, incompatible with any positive right of presence at an interview between the Sovereign and the ministers, should the ministers desire to keep the interflow confidential between the Crown and themselves as responsible servants of the Crown. Any communication that might afterwards take place between the Royal lady and her husband would be entirely beyond the pale of ministerial intervention or responsibility, and they could have nothing to do with it either to sanction or forbid. But should the question arise, their right to decline an interview with the Crown in the presence of a third party, enjoying rights incompatible with the constitutionally-secured secrecy of that interview, could not be gainsaid.

It does not yet appear that the question has arisen. These stories about Prince Albert, flowering in the report that he has gone to the Tower, stand upon no particle of evidence; and in the gross they refute themselves by their monstrous invention. From the discretion which the Prince has shown in time past, it is now most improbable that the question will ever be permitted to rise.<sup>x</sup>

Direct opposition to the Prince's involvement in political was also clearly expressed:

"In antagonism to the opinion of Mr. Mulock the *Morning Herald* asserts the absolute necessity of His Royal Highness abstaining from taking part in the councils of Her Majesty's Cabinet, "from which, as a *foreigner*, independent of other causes, he is, by the laws and constitution of England, virtually and absolutely excluded." And to show that the Prince has no right to a seat or to be present at a meeting of Her Majesty's ministers, even though he is the first subject in these realms, gives the following extract from 'Blackstone's Commentaries,' chapter 5, supposing the passage may have escaped His Royal Highness's notice:-

"As to the qualification of members to sit at this Board (the Privy Council), any natural born subject of England is capable of being a member of the Privy Council, taking the proper oaths for the security of the government, and the tests for the security of the Church. But, in order to prevent any persons under foreign attachments from insinuating themselves into this important trust, as happened in the reign of King William, in many instances, it is enacted by the Act of Settlement, statutes 12 and 13 William 3<sup>rd</sup> cap 2, that no person born out of the dominions of the *Crown of England*, unless born of English parents, *even though naturalised by Parliament, shall be capable of being of the Privy Council!*"<sup>xi</sup>

Interest in the communications between the Prince and Thomas Mulock had by now extended the length and breadth of the country:

"We have heard the question frequently asked of late – what has become of Thomas Mulock? And the reply generally given was, that he had obtained a local habitation somewhere in the north of Scotland. The letter-writing propensities of this individual are not altogether unknown; but he is better known to the public – at least that portion of it who took an interest in the hot education controversy a few years ago – as having sat for his portrait to Mr. Hugh

Miller of the Witness, who handed him down to immortality in one of his most powerful and stinging articles. Since that time Mr. Mulock has been remembered by not a few, though his whereabouts had become a matter of conjecture. It now seems that on leaving the Highlands, he returned to his native Erin, and from 'Killiney, near Dublin,' indited the other day a letter of condolence to His Royal Highness Prince Albert. "With much pain and indignation" the writer has read the articles that have appeared in the public journals, containing "most-unjust and anti-Christian accusations against His Royal Highness," and "moved by sincere sympathy and loyal duty," he begs to tender him two observations, or to use his own words, "Christian considerations which may prove cheering and sustaining to his Royal Highness." The first remark is, that Mr. Mulock thinks the Prince is entitled, nay, ought, to "afford all advice and assistance to Her Majesty in executing the arduous responsibilities of Royalty," in virtue of that "rightful headship over the Queen" which he has acquired by the "sacred rite of marriage." The second observation we give in full:- "The peculiar position of a female Sovereign renders it highly decorous and eligible that in all interviews with her ministers the Queen should enjoy the protective presence of your Royal Highness; and the manly, open interference of your Royal Highness should be wisely considered as an effectual safeguard against even the surmised exercise of sinister influence." These observations are not worthy of reply. They come from a man whose name carries no weight, and whose petty officiousness affords suspicion of interested motives.

Did the Prince notice this? He did, and that very politely, by commanding his secretary "to acknowledge the receipt of the letter, and to thank (Mr. Mulock) for his kind communication." What does this mean, but that the Prince is quite of Mr. Mulock's mind, and thanks him for his expositions? Had his Royal Highness entertained a different opinion – had he felt, as he ought to feel, that to tax him with the interferences for which he is blamed was a slur cast upon his honour – he would have returned no thanks, but a short and sharp demurrer of Mr. Mulock's doctrines, and with a denial, in addition, that he was guilty of the political offences laid to his charge. That this is not done is, we say, another presumptive evidence that the Prince is guilty, and that he is not ashamed of his guilt.

There seems now to be little doubt on the national mind of the truth of the rumoured "unconstitutional interferences." Even the *London Standard* has taken up the subject, in a late number we find the following:-

It would, at best, be but affection in us if we were to attempt any longer to disguise the fact, that at the present moment there is a deep-seated feeling of distrust, anger, and discontent breeding in the minds of Englishmen, in consequence of certain events that have taken place, which may end in more active measures of bitterness and hostility, should the present unconstitutional influence of Her Majesty's cabinet and the Horse Guards be any longer persisted in. It is very much to be regretted that this feeling against His Royal Highness is becoming almost universal throughout the country; indeed, there is not a club, a coffee-house, or a tavern, or in fact, any place of general resort, where the conduct of the Prince has not been discussed pretty openly, and in anything but gentle terms.

The *Daily News* says: Confidence in the Prince is giving way, and instead of popularity, resentment has taken possession of the public mind.

The *Standard* thus smartly concludes:-

In order that he (the Prince) may no longer be ignorant that he has no right to a seat or to be present at a meeting of her Majesty's ministers, even though he is the first subject in these realms, we give the following extract from Blackstone's Commentaries, chapter 5, which, probably, his Royal Highness has never perused:-

"As to the qualification of members to sit at this Board (the Privy Council), any natural born subject of England is capable of being a member of the Privy Council, taking the proper oaths for the security of the government, and the tests for the security of the Church. But, in order to prevent any persons under foreign attachments from insinuating themselves into this important trust, as happened in the reign of King William, in many instances, it is enacted by the Act of Settlement, statutes 12 and 13 William 3<sup>rd</sup> cap 2, that no person born out of the dominions of the *Crown of England*, unless born of English parents, *even though naturalised by Parliament, shall be capable of being of the Privy Council!*"

With the law of the land open before them, Englishmen naturally ask what business Prince Albert has to interfere with her Majesty's ministers, or in any other business but his own?

The *Morning Advertiser* – whose bold and unflinching exposure on this painful subject we are compelled to admire – on Saturday last puts certain questions, evidently meant for assertions, in regard to Lord Palmerston's late resignation. It would seem from these questions, that some days previous to the Noble Lord's resignation, on 15<sup>th</sup> December, he forwarded a paper on sanitary regulations for large towns, to her Majesty for signature, which was

returned unsigned, and very much interlined in the hand-writing of another party. His Lordship was highly offended at this interference, and had the document re-copied as it originally stood, and sent again for the royal signature, which it this time received. Lord Aberdeen then called and lectured the Home Secretary for the disrespect he had shown to the highest personage in the realm. Resignation was the immediate consequence, and Lord Palmerston was only induced to return to office on receiving the assurance that his functions as Home Secretary should not again be interfered with. Such is the story, and certainly it is quite in keeping with the known character of his Lordship.<sup>xii</sup>

One editor thought Mulock's "ridiculous letter of sympathy, addressed to his Royal Highness, has had one decidedly good effect – that of inducing more influential persons to stand forward and claim a fair and manly treatment for the Prince."<sup>xiii</sup>

Quite naturally the whole episode did not pass unnoticed and in a note written in January 1854, the Duke of Sutherland referred to Mulock and a conversation with Lord Hatherton:

January 13<sup>th</sup> 1854

"My Dear Sir,

Have you seen in the *Times* (I think) a letter from Mulock to Prince Albert approving of his advising the Queen as her husband – a well written letter I think. Lord Hatherton gives an entertaining account of Mr. M having written frequently to Lord Clarendon and having been angry at some advice of his (Mulock's) not being taken and on that account writing an abusive letter – and afterwards again expressing regret at having done so and saying Lord Clarendon was in the right and the same sort of thing to the *Freeman* about the Queen's visit to Dublin, offended that his advice was not taken, that her entrance should be in state – and afterwards begging pardon and saying it was right as it was done. There seems to have been a violent storm raised against Prince Albert. Exaggeration always works mischief."<sup>xiv</sup>

Thomas Mulock did not remain silent for very long and hastened to defend his opinion in a letter to the editor of the *Freeman*:

*"The Reputed Responsibility of the Ministers of the Crown:*

*One of the most plausible of the envenomed charges recently urged against His Royal Highness Prince Albert by the misled portion of the London press was connected with the responsibility of ministers, which important security for the well being of the British State was said to be invaded by the irresponsible interference of the Prince Consort. Now let us examine a little closely into the truth of this grave allegation, and see whether the tables may not be turned upon the ministers themselves. The ministers constitute a cabinet, of which body the law of England yields no recognition. The very name of cabinet is a mere soubriquet invented in the latter days of Charles the Second. Well, then, if no collective responsibility attaches to the cabinet, from whence is derived the individual responsibility of its members? - clearly from the offices which they respectively hold. But what responsible office does Lord John Russell hold? He is assumed to be the leader of the House of Commons, but that position, as chief talker, implies no real responsibility on his part as an alleged minister of the crown; and, if I mistake not, the Marquis of Lansdowne is equally void of official responsibility. What office does his lordship fill?*

*The Whigs when in power have not been remarkably scrupulous in preserving the purity of the so-called constitution. In 1806, during their short-lived and very absurd administration, they introduced into their cabinet the late Earl of Ellenborough, who at that time was Chief Justice of the King's Bench. Mr. Canning prefaced a motion on the subject with a most powerful speech, in which he objected to Lord Ellenborough's being a cabinet minister on two grounds:- First, that as the chief criminal judge his impartiality might be questioned in cases of crown prosecutions; and, secondly, that no man could be a fitting responsible minister except he held some high departmental office, which marked him out as an employed servant of the Crown!*

*Thomas Mulock.*<sup>xv</sup>

Comments concerning Thomas Mulock naturally continued:

"People who believe in the *Advertiser* often ask, "Who is Mulock?" – the man who wrote the other day in such a ridiculous manner to the Prince Consort – as though he said, with a compassionate pat on the back, "Never mind, Prince, what people say; don't be cast down; Mulock will defend you." This individual began life as a lecturer, and in that capacity went over the kingdom with more profit to himself than to the public. His daughter is the authoress of a very superior novel, called "Olive" – a book that the reader may ask for advantageously, supposing it to be hitherto unknown to him, when he next draws from the shelves of the circulating library. In volume III of Moore's *Memoirs and Correspondence* you will find the following curious entry, at the date November 6<sup>th</sup> 1820:



“Took Bessy to attend Mulock’s first lecture on English Literature. One of his figures was rather awkward, if pursued too minutely. He talked of persons going to the well-spring of English poetry in order to communicate what they have quaffed to others.”

By the April of 1854, Mulock had left Ireland and returned to Stoke, where his address was given as the North Staffordshire Hotel. From there wrote to the *Staffordshire Advertiser* concerning the late payment of labourers’ wages and the practice of payment being made in beer houses. It was a legitimate complaint that expressed sensible opinion and amply portrays the blatant failings of a section of the community that should have offered far more socially responsible procedures:

*“KEEPING BACK THE WAGES OF THE HIRELING” A MAIN CAUSE OF JUST DISCONTENT IN THE  
MANUFACTURING DISTRICTS.*

Sir,

*I trust you will enable me, through your widely circulating columns, to turn public attention towards the salutary consideration of a subject much more important to the working classes than most of the themes seized hold of by agitating demagogues, who mislead and irritate the minds of their distressed dupes. The rate of wages constitutes the chief topic of angry complaint at the present time, and yet nothing is more clear than the certainty that this matter can be adjusted in no other way than by employers making agreements with individual workmen, which agreements would be enforceable by law. No employer should ever combine with his fellow capitalists to settle a common rate of wages; and it is also his duty not to negotiate with committees or other parties professing to represent associations of workmen. If each employer were to deal thus with individual operatives, combinations would be broken up, and strikes would speedily cease – wages would be adjusted upon proper, yet mixed principles, embracing the great interests of the employers, and the righteous recompense of the labourer. At this time all is confusion – the masters combining to control the men, and the men confederating to intimidate the master – a state of things pregnant with peril. Nor should the present evil of monster meetings be overlooked; and it appears to me that the home secretary is not without blame for permitting assemblages which are un-convened by lawful authority.*

*Quitting these topics, I will now briefly address myself to the question raised by the heading of this letter, and I find from large inquiry that great injustice is inflicted upon workmen in consequence of the tardy payment of wages and the improper modes of paying them. I lay it down as an incontrovertible truth, that when a day’s work is completed the employer becomes the debtor of the workman; and according to the equity of the Levitical law, wages were payable on the going down of the sun. Modern usage, however, extends the hiring to a week, and weekly payment of wages would seem necessarily to follow; but in practice this is not the case, and a fortnight, three weeks, or a month, and more will be found to elapse before men, ostensibly hired by the week, can obtain a settlement of their wages. Collieries, iron-works, railway companies, many mill owners, and in short manufacturing establishments of all kinds pursue, each in their peculiar system of exaction, a course of conduct which, in effect, and however coloured, amounts to a fraudulent withholding of weekly wages. We may well ask how are workmen, and especially workmen with families, supplied with necessaries during the period of postponed payment? I reply, either by getting ruinously into the books of petty traders, or of being constrained to apply for orders on ‘Tommy-shops’ and in either case they are at the mercy of the shopkeepers – both as to the quantity and quality of goods delivered them. Resort to an open market is out of the question, and infinite evils result from these compulsory modes of dealing – instead of each man receiving his weekly wages, and laying them out as advantageously as he can.*

*On examining closely the pleas urged by the employers, it will be found that undue parsimony is at the bottom of the practices as unjust and injurious. To pay regularly each week would probably occasion some little effort in providing the suitable funds, and some additional expense in the cashier’s department; but if a concern is profitable, why should such considerations have any weight? And if they are not profitable, so as to afford a needful machinery for rendering justice to their men, why, the sooner they are abandoned the better.*

*In these critical times it will be found politic, as well as just, to consult the proper interests and comfort of the labouring classes. To effect this object, I look upon the payment of weekly wages as indispensable; and where masters do pay weekly wages to their men, a further improvement would be to have each man paid on the premises, instead of sending gangs of men to receive their wages at public houses where a stated contribution is always expected, and where men are tempted to squander their earnings in drink, while their families are famishing at home. In a second letter I will, with your permission, give a few details corroborative of my views, or rather the views of all persons who advocate the cause of the poor against oppression, direct or indirect.<sup>xvi</sup>*

In this same month the *Staffordshire Advertiser*, in commenting on the publication of an Autobiography of William Jerdan, drew attention to the assessment of George Canning contained in the work:

“In the autobiography of William Jerdan, recently published, appears an exceedingly well written sketch of Canning, for which the author states he is “indebted to a friend who admired and loved Mr. Canning like himself.” That friend was Thomas Mulock, esquire, whose knowledge of, and intimacy with the distinguished orator and statesman, pre-eminently qualified him to form a just opinion of his character. The following is the extract:

*“I can truly affirm that of all men whom I have known, he was the most worthy of being loved and honoured. His intellectual powers were a splendid cast, and comprised within the radiant range every variety of mental supremacy. But Canning’s private beauty of character far transcended his incomparable public displays. In affectionate amenity of manner, flowing from unquestionable kindness of heart, I never met his equal. The friend was never lost in the statesman, and his cordiality was not chilled by the elevated region to which his great talents necessarily raised him. On the death of Mr. Pitt no rising statesman bade so clearly for future pre-eminence as Mr. Canning. In every department of public distinction he was facile princeps. In all the ingratiating arts of oratory, in the skilful strife of debate, in the triumphant power of unrivalled pleasantries, an intellectual jocoseness of the finest and raciest order, and withal, a command of dignified declamation which never failed to captivate even hostile members, Canning held a bright superiority, before which subordinate stars ‘paled their ineffectual fires.’ To these high qualifications as a senator, he united the useful capabilities of a thorough man of business; not, of course, the technical correctness of mere official routine, but a concentration of mind in dispatching affairs of moment, or matters of minor importance, so as to do what is required to be done with accuracy, conscientiousness, and even avoidance of undue delay. Gifted with these great endowments for a noble career, Canning only assumed his proper position when on the sudden dissolution of ‘All the Talents’ administration the seals of the Foreign Office were conferred on him. No better minister ever filled that important post, for he was the vigilant guardian of British interests without arrogating for Englishmen rights which clashed with the institutions of other countries. Canning’s removal from office consequent upon his unfortunate difference with Lord Castlereagh is up to this hour a vague spot in history. The truth is, that Canning by his marriage connections became entangled with the aristocracy more than was meet for a brilliant parvenu, whose power consisted mainly in the dignity of his independence. The government grandees cajoled him, but furtively sided with Lord Castlereagh, and a denouement took place which deprived the state for a long season of the service of Canning as a minister of the crown. But as a member of the House of Commons, how effective was his eloquence; as the chosen candidate for Liverpool, how widespread and nationally encouraging were those popular addresses which went home to the hearts of his immediate constituents! To write the biography of Canning is to write the contemporaneous chronicles of Europe and the world, as every theme affecting the political and social condition of all civilised communities was by turns illuminated by his genius, which gave a comprehensive character to his statesmanlike views, and when again in the cabinet his just influence was commensurate with his universally acknowledged ability. At length, the almost perennial premiership of Lord Liverpool fell with the fading facilities of that excellent nobleman, and all eyes were turned upon Canning as the proper pilot of the realm. This glorious popularity and the royal election were disastrous to poor Canning, who, after an ineffectual conflict of five months, sank under the relentless animosity of his former friends. The sorrowful singularity of this loss of a great man consists in the fact that he was harassed by the enmity of his former political friends, because he sustained upon just principals the cause of the Roman Catholics, which they (the Tory Protestants) subsequently espoused from motives of mere expediency. Canning was the truest friend the Irish Roman Catholics ever had for he repudiated the monstrous notion that Catholic emancipation was a religious question. Five months of indefatigable official exertion – of irritating parliamentary contention with implacable adversaries – acting upon the sensitiveness of his nervous system, brought poor Canning to what we are accustomed to call a premature grave. But I who mourned his loss am, nevertheless persuaded that he had fulfilled his mission. To the close of his splendid career his ruling wishes were for the prosperity of the state he so long served and adorned, and, in my humble judgement, England never possessed a more upright and patriotic statesman than George Canning.”*<sup>xvii</sup>

The Dublin Evening Mail, in noticing Jerdan’s reference to Mulock, described him as ‘The Pheux Chevalier’ continuing:

“Knight Errants of old were wont to go abroad with lance in rest, and an eye out for signals of distress, ready to do battle for any Princess in difficulties, whom they might discover in tears by the way side. But the sympathies of our contemporary Paladin, Mr. Thomas Mulock (why not Sir Tom of that ilk?) seem to incline him to the harder sex. The ladies he leaves to the protection of their own irresistible charms, and offers himself as a champion for Princes. He swears not by the fair hand of any Dulcinea, but defies the whole world in behalf of the spotless virtue and irreproachable beards of Field Marshals and autocrats. It is no idle chivalry.

While in reference to Jerdan's comment on the three letters: "An odd coincidence, truly, for the advocate of Prince Napoleon to subscribe himself by such a name. A pretty device to inscribe upon the shield of a foe to calumny in high places – "Satan!"<sup>xviii</sup>

The following week brought the second of Mulock's letters on the subject of the payment of workmen:

*"KEEPING BACK THE WAGES OF THE HIRELING" A MAIN CAUSE OF JUST DISCONTENT IN THE MANUFACTURING DISTRICTS, WITH A WARNING ON STRIKES.*

Sir,

*A fortnight's interval since the publication of my first letter, has afforded me scope for increased earnestness of enquiry into the practical bearings of this important subject, and I am more than ever convinced of the ruinous results of the vile system which defrauds the weekly labourer by the non payment of weekly wages. If men are hired by the week – and if that specified hiring can be enforced by the employer so as to protect his own interests – how can we vindicate the culpable carelessness or covetousness which withholds the weekly earnings of the hireling, and makes him the crawling creditor of an imperious master? To enumerate the evils flowing from this unjust practice would be endless – all regular, upright dealing becomes impossible. The workmen are either sucked into the vortex of 'Tommy Shops,' or sink into the slavery of book-debt to petty huxters. All the advantages of open markets are lost to innumerable families – and be wages ever so high, the day of payment merely occasions a part settlement with shopkeepers, instead of yielding a command of money to purchase necessities at the best hand. But if we survey another side of the subject, the mischief is quite as deplorable. At collieries, iron works, etc., where men earn large wages, the postponed payment frequently throws a bulky sum into the hands of the labourer; and tired with toil, and full of money, he stays at the alehouse (where by means of improper arrangement he is statedly paid), and sottishly squanders his earnings during "days of drunken avoidance of work to his own great injury, and very often to the detriment of his employer, who may be in want of all his available hands." This last class of cases was named to me regretfully by an agent of Lord Grenville, who had failed to perceive that the evil grew out of the non-payment of wages every week. Railway Companies, it should be remarked, not only pay wages fortnightly, but they reserve a week's wages in hand, as a sort of guarantee for continued service – as if the law of the land did not provide a sufficient remedy for neglected labour, where contract was unfulfilled! The delayed payment of weekly wages on the part of railway companies is the more inexcusable, forasmuch as they drive a ready money trade, which furnishes them with abundant 'change,' which other paymasters cannot so readily procure. The recent strikes of railway porters are of evil example, for the urgency of public necessities caused the company to succumb – and thus they surrendered to violence what they ought to have wisely anticipated in the way of seasonable justice and liberality. With reference also to a suggestion offered in my former letter, as to the payment of wages on the premises of the employers, I would further remark, that even this arrangement proves abortive where the men or women are paid, not individually, but in squads of recipients. One person takes it in turn to distribute wages among a certain number of work people, and he is paid for his trouble by a small deduction from each man or woman's assigned amount; and small as such deduction may be, it swells into an important sum by the end of the year. It will be argued, that to pay each individual worker would entail additional expense on the employer. But why not? Surely it is the bounden duty of the employer to pay the full amount which he stipulated to give in exchange for labour, and if the payment falls short of this, it is, in effect, a positive fraud upon the oppressed creature who has executed **his** part of the contract. By regular weekly payment to each individual operative, the employer would render signal benefit to society, and he would have the answer of a good conscience by honestly completing his contract with the humbler class whom he statedly employs.*

*The strikes in some manufacturing districts are now assuming an aspect of peril as well as of inconvenience. Multitudes of malcontents have become accustomed to live upon alms supplied by their sympathising brethren, instead of supporting themselves and their families by the labour of their own hands. This state of things is full of danger. If the masters conquer in the struggle, still the men will be demoralised, and their industrial habits will be fatally injured. If the workmen succeed, capitalists will gradually retire from positions which they can no longer fill without being exposed to the humiliating dictation of discontented demagogues.*

*This miserable alternative has been insensibly produced by the erroneous conduct of the employers themselves. Urged on by the fierce competition prevalent in trade, employers have sought to make up for low profits by docking the workman of his due wages. His necessitous condition is the pitiless plea for giving him the lowest rate of recompense for his labour – "If you decline to work on my terms some other needy wretch will." And satisfied with his own sordidness, the employer never wastes a thought as to the injustice thus inflicted upon the poor man because he is poor. Instead of meeting in the employer a considerate friend, the workman often finds him to be a cold-hearted stranger to his capabilities; one who looks for the most work for the least wages, and who severs himself from all sympathy with those who serve him. God forbid that I should not cherish the belief that many masters, imbued with justice and*

*liberality, diffuse an excellent example in the manufacturing districts, but I fear they must be considered as bright exceptions to the general rule. A master is a moneyed man, intent upon aggrandising himself, without dedicating any adequate attention to the interests and comfort of the parties he employs, and the strenuous selfishness of the master engenders discontent, revolt, and recklessness on the part of his men, and this I take to be the true history of all strikes.*<sup>xix</sup>

There then came for Mulock a relative bomb-shell when a book by the American author, Mrs. Harriet Beecher Stowe was drawn to his attention. Mrs. Stowe had quoted Lock, the Duke of Sutherland's agent, as saying that Mulock, in a letter to the Duke had retracted all that he had ever said in criticism about the Highland Clearances. Offended by such suggestion Mulock made known his annoyance to the Duke:

*Stoke-upon-Trent,  
August 15<sup>th</sup> 1854.*

*"My Lord Duke,*

*I have not for long years been so much surprised as by having my attention called on yesterday to a passage in a recent published work of Mrs. Stowe's entitled 'Sunny Memories of Foreign Lands.' The passage in question is to be found in page 150 being part of a chapter on the Sutherland Estate and it runs as follows: "Having through Lord Shaftesbury's kindness received the benefit of Mr. Lock's corrections I am permitted to make a little further extract from his reply. He says 'in addition to what I was able to say in my former paper I can now state that the Duke of Sutherland has received from one of the most determined opponent's of the measure who travelled to the North of Scotland as editor of a newspaper, a letter regretting all he had written upon the subject being convinced that he was entirely misinformed.'*

*Now my Lord Duke assuming as a plain certainty that I am the party thus referred to, I ask your Grace whether Mr. Lock's misconstruction of my letter dated October 27<sup>th</sup> 1853 can possibly be justified by the truth of the case?*

*As a Christian writer I honourably avowed my regret that I had 'an acrimonious strength of expression' when engaged in reporting the results of my enquiries in Sutherlandshire, but to allege as Mr. Lock does, that I regretted all that I had written on the subject, or that I admitted myself to have been misinformed, is more than a misapprehension, it is a sheer, unqualified falsehood.*

*I hold your Grace to be utterly incapable of countenancing so rank a piece of injustice as Mrs. Stowe has been the means of palming upon the public credulity by withholding my letter – but that Mr. Lock, your Grace's authorised agent, should have lent himself to such a gross misstatement is to the last degree discreditable to that gentleman who wrote what he must have known to have been wholly incorrect.*

*I have the honour to be*

*Your Grace's obedient servant,*

*Thomas Mulock".*<sup>xx</sup>

There then came a further letter from Mulock, whose address was given as Stoke replying to a note from the Duke:

*August 28<sup>th</sup> 1854.*

*"My Lord Duke,*

*The subject to which I respectfully drew your Grace's notice did not involve any 'impression or remonstrance' on my part. I confined myself to the transcript of a passage from Mrs. Stowe's work which she quotes from a letter addressed to her by Mr. Lock and which I affirm to be utterly untrue. Setting aside any intention of Mr. Lock of 'Giving me offence or occasioning me any vexation' I may be allowed to say that his misstatements is a positive injury to my interests as well as a mischievous slander on my consistency as a public writer. At this moment the whole impression of my work on the Western Highland's is exhausted, and the fair profit of another edition will in all probability be materially curtailed by the popular circulation of Mrs. Stowe's second-hand falsehoods.*

*Thus in endeavouring to render your Grace an important service by recognising the respect due to your Grace's rank and position as a great proprietor – I have been in every way made a sufferer – and certainly not least so by Mr. Lock's unwarrantable commentary on my letter to your Grace.*

*It is for Mr. Lock to withdraw the unjust statement, or I shall certainly revive the entire subject – nay more with details which I previously forbore to publish. Why should I be injured by parties whom I meant to benefit?*

*Sore as my privations are I shall feel myself constrained in honour to return, with grateful acknowledgement, the amount lately received from your Grace, if Mr. Lock denies me the justice I require of him.*

*I have the honour to be*

*Your Grace's obedient servant,*

*Thomas Mulock*".<sup>xxi</sup>

This is the first indication other than suspicions voiced from the Highlands, that Mulock had received anything from the Duke. But how much and when it was given is the intriguing question. Following a further exchange of correspondence the details of which have not yet come to light although the general gist may be deduced, there was another note:

*September, 1854.*

*"Mr. Mulock begs leave to say in reply to the Duke of Sutherland's note that he (Mr. Mulock) had not the most distant idea of holding out any threat to his Grace.*

*Mr. Mulock simply and candidly intimated what course he should pursue in the want of Mr. Lock's refusal to act justly and honourably. It is Mr. Lock who has compromised his master, the Duke of Sutherland, not Mr. Mulock whose conduct towards his Grace merited a better return. The whole correspondence shall of course, go before the public.*"<sup>xxii</sup>

Lock, the Duke's agent had by then made contact with Mulock:

*September 1<sup>st</sup> 1854.*

Sir,

The Duke of Sutherland has sent me your letter of the 25<sup>th</sup> I had previously seen that of the 15<sup>th</sup>.

The statement of which you complain being one for which I am alone responsible, it having been written without the knowledge of any person, it is necessary that I should say so, consequently his Grace is not the person to be addressed on the subject.

You say that it misrepresents you and that it is untrue, this was not intended. The object on the contrary, among other things, was to do you that justice which at least on ..... founded on a better acquaintance with the facts entitled you to.

If you shall continue to think otherwise you have the means of setting this right, by another publication of your letter.

I avoid noticing your un-courteous language and unmeaning threats.

James Lock<sup>xxiii</sup>

To this Mulock responded:

*September 4<sup>th</sup> 1854.*

"Sir,

*I am in receipt of your letter of September 1<sup>st</sup>.*

*It was in your capacity of agent to the Duke of Sutherland that you furnished Mrs. Stowe with what she conceived to be authentic details respecting the Sutherland Estate: and you thought proper to falsify the contents of a letter which I had addressed to his Grace.*

*If you manfully acknowledged your error I am generous enough to overlook the erring zeal of a party chiefly responsible for the enormity perpetrated in Sutherlandshire, but as your letter reiterates the injustice towards me, I shall know how to deal with Mrs. Stowe and her unscrupulous informant.*

*I am sir,*

*Your obedient servant,  
Thomas Mulock*".<sup>xxiv</sup>

Meanwhile with ever an eye on the underdog, Mulock had given his attention to the situation of Edward Peithman, LLD, a gentleman who, allegedly, had suffered some fourteen years confinement in a mental institution, having caused some consternation in the household of Albert, the Prince Consort. Mulock, having aired his view on the matter in the *Dublin Daily Express*, was determined, if he could, not to allow his involvement to be ignored by the readers of the *Staffordshire Advertiser*, the editor of which allowed:

"We have been requested to publish the subjoined correspondence:

Letter from Dr. Peithman to Mr. Mulock:

Hanwell Hospital, August 17<sup>th</sup> 1854.

My dear sir,

I have to thank you for your kind letter, and your able defence of my case in the *Dublin Daily Express*. The medical officer of this institution seemed to dwell on the expression "one delusion," which occurs in one of the last paragraphs of your letter, and was inclined to make it a ground of restricting me in the unconditional enjoyment of my liberty. I explained to him that this "delusion" was not understood by you in a medical or morbid sense, but considered synonymous with "idea" or "error of judgement," and that the confidence I placed in the goodness of heart of his Royal Highness Prince Albert, and in his sense of justice, was a proof that I entertained no **malus animus**, and that I could not have approached the precincts of royalty with an evil intention. I was advised by gentlemen in whose judgement I had reason to place confidence, and some of whom belong to the Protection Society of Craven Street, to prepare an humble memorial to her Majesty, praying redress for the injustice I have endured in being nearly fourteen successive years, - in the full possession of my mental faculties, - immured in a dark and solitary cell of Bethlem Hospital, on the sole ground of having, in the year 1840, respectfully transmitted to his Royal Highness Prince Albert some documents and publications of mine. Not receiving an answer to this humble memorial, and having called at Buckingham Palace and enquired of the servants if I was permitted to attend the service of the chapel, I was at once - without a trial, judge or jury, consigned to the walls of another madhouse. Such an act of tyranny is unexampled in the history or modern civilisation, for I had four days previously received the official declaration that I was considered of sound mind and perfectly harmless. I committed no offence, no trespass, and to construe the act of attending a chapel into a sign of insanity is, in a Christian country, perfectly absurd.

I should be much obliged to you if you would have the goodness to alter the word "delusion" to "idea" or "error of judgement," and transmit the letter which you have kindly written in my behalf to the Visiting Justices who are entrusted with the administration of this hospital - a list of whom I beg leave to subjoin.

Thanking you for your kind exertions in my behalf,

I remain, my dear sir, your most faithful servant,

Edward Peithman, LLD.

Mulock replied:

*"My dear sir,*

*The medical officer of the Hanwell Lunatic Asylum is certainly wrong in placing so palpable a misconstruction upon a passage in my printed letter. I give the passage **in extenso**: "One delusion, however, the poor doctor evidently laboured under; he idly imagined that Prince Albert would procure him some position which might compensate for the calamities so long inflicted upon him by an unworthy abuse of the Prince's name."*

*It never occurred to me that, with the context of my letter before him, any reader would strain after the supposition that I confounded this regretted "delusion" with any conceivable morbid-ness of mind. But, to annihilate all misapprehension, I would briefly say, that by the word "delusion" I meant to convey NOT the slightest suspicion of your sanity, but my sorrow that your credulity had gone to such an extent as to indulge any expectation from the compassionate bounty of Prince Albert, who was perfectly cognizant of your wrongs - inflicted under the authority of his royal name, and who, nevertheless, refused to promote the redress which his Royal Highness might have obtained with one influential word.*

*Oh! How wretched is that poor man that hangs on Princes' favours.*

*With sincere sympathy for your situation and hoping for your speedy liberation through the upright decision of the Middlesex magistrates, - for Lord Palmerstone has no official power in your matter,*

*I am dear sir, very faithfully yours,*

*Thomas Mulock*".<sup>xxv</sup>

Whether Mulock's intervention in the doctor's cause was in any way significant is now perhaps beyond being able to establish, but in the following issue of the *Staffordshire Advertiser* came another letter from Mulock:

"Sir,

*As your excellent journal kindly opened its columns to my humble advocacy of the cause of injustice, flagrantly outraged in the personal wrongs of doctor Peithman, you will, I make no question, be gratified to learn that he has been unconditionally set at liberty by the Visiting Justices of Hanwell Asylum.*

*I have just received a letter from Doctor Peithman, dated from the Ship Hotel, Dover, and he has, I conclude, by this time reached Hanover, with the intention of submitting his case to his own sovereign.*<sup>xxvi</sup>

However laudable Mulock's intention, the matter having gained attention in Ireland, a correspondent there thought fit to advise that between 1837 and 1840, when, according to various correspondence, Peithman had allegedly been a tutor at the University of Bonn at the time of Prince Albert's matriculation there, a German Doctor of Laws named Peithman was in fact at Dublin University where he had use of a room and established a class for the study of the French language; but that his 'oddities' were such that the students who had availed themselves of this service broke away from the class. This same Doctor Peithman, the correspondent further alleged, had fostered his unwanted attention on the sister of a Noble Lord, then forced his attention onto a lady at a review in Phoenix Park, such as to necessitate the intervention of the police, and was then for a time confined in Swift's Hospital.<sup>xxvii</sup> The correspondent further asserted that Peithman was already in England and an inmate of a lunatic asylum long before the marriage of Prince Albert to Queen Victoria. Elihu Rich, in making reference to the Society for the Protection of Heirs at Law, claimed that Mulock was at the time instrumental in bringing about the release of Dr. Peithman from earlier confinement. Whether Rich had knowledge of the Society during the time that it existed is vague and it may be that he depended upon information gleaned at a later date from Mulock, or from a friend or relative of Mulock; that the information he received he gained was a little coloured.<sup>xxviii</sup> In 1855 the previously mentioned John Perceval - who appears to have become the secretary of the Society for the Protection of Heirs at Law, following Mulock's short term of office - published an account of the case in 'The Petition of Dr. Peithman, LLD.' following Peithman's return to his native land. No mention is made in that article of Mulock's involvement. Did Peithman, I wonder, cause any annoyance at Court?<sup>xxix</sup>

The editor of the *Staffordshire Advertiser* now thought fit to include Mulock's opinion in respect of a Parliamentary debate concerning troops required for the conflict with Russia, in a brief article subjoined to an editorial:

*"Let me call your attention to an important difference between the existing state of the Continent, and that which prevailed during the French Revolutionary War. All Europe was, in the latter case, either arrayed against France, or willing to join the armies of the combatants. But at present the only powers actually at war are England and France against Russia. It appears to me to be clear that permission given to us to enlist soldiers in any part of Europe, other than France, would be tantamount to a declaration of war against Russia by the state authorising such enlistment. This opens a range of hindrances to the measure not perhaps sufficiently contemplated, but which will be found very important. Let us, if we can, effect treaties which may secure for us extended military co-operation against Russia; but to arm against our enemy the subjects of sovereigns still in peaceful relations with our great foe is, in my opinion, a monstrous violation of all justice. The Czar would indeed be warranted in showing no quarter to stipendiary soldiers recruited from the powers who were ostensibly in amity with him. All other objections to the proposed measure have been ably urged; but the one I now point out has not, to my knowledge, been suggested."*<sup>xxx</sup>

There was at this time great public concern about the conditions in which the troops engaged in the Crimean campaign lived and served, and Roebuck, a Member of Parliament, proposed a motion, hostile to the government, 'for a select committee to inquire into the condition of the army before Sebastopol, and into the conduct of those departments of the government whose duty it has been to minister to the wants of the army.' The motion was carried over to allow time for thought on the subject, and during that interval a leading member of the government, Lord John Russell resigned. The motion was then carried by 305 votes to 148 and the government collapsed leading to a new ministry

being formed. Thomas Mulock, no doubt as with many other persons, had set views on the subject of the committee and wrote to C. S. Lefevre, the speaker of the House of Commons:

“Sir,

*Before Mr. Roebuck’s successful motion shall be fully carried out, it might be well for some influential member to warn the House of the constitutional consequences of **such** a committee as the country is menaced with. It would be, in effect, a **government nominated by the House of Commons**, which must inevitably, over-ride the authority of **any** minister appointed by the crown.*

*There is, indeed, an evil precedent for such a course. The long parliament, by a succession of votes appointed committees which supplanted the function of the government, and Charles 1st ceased to be the King of England **de facto**.*

*I am quite certain that the true and proper course of proceeding was to move an address to the Crown, embodying the just and reasonable desires of the Commons of England in this crisis of national disappointment. But in agreeing to a committee for the purpose proposed, the crown seems to be so wholly overlooked that it appears questionable whether we are still living under a Monarchy.”*

Stoke-u-Trent, January 31<sup>st</sup> 1855.

Days later Mulock, still concerned as to the condition of the troops in the Crimea, was writing to the editor of the *Freeman’s Journal*, a letter that was then reproduced in the *Staffordshire Advertiser*:

“PAST DESTITUTION IN IRELAND WITH THE PRESENT DESTITUTION IN OUR CRIMEAN CAMP”

“At the time of the famine in Ireland, the difficulty which absorbed almost all others was that of getting food. In the ports were ships laden with meal and clothes; in the towns were stores of food in warehouses, and money in the bank; but all over the rural districts there were whole families dying in their desolate cabins, and men gasping their lives away in ditches, and children found, by mere accident, among the tall grass, dead or dying.” (Leading article in the *Daily News*, January 23<sup>rd</sup>.)

“The above extract ushers in a series of pungent comments on the misery and mortality which have so terribly thinned the ranks of the noble army whose wretched remnant now withers on the rocky heights that overhang Sebastopol. But the writer, able and zealous though he be, cannot have had the opportunities which my sorrowful experience supplies, serving to show the painful exactness of the analogy between the ministerial mismanagement of the relief formerly intended for Ireland, and of those vast resources meant to provide for the extension of our expeditionary force in the Crimea.

*During the frightful famine, and the consequent disease and death which desolated Ireland seven years ago, it fell to my lot to visit several of the most dreadfully distressed districts; and my frequent and copious communications to your patriotic journal were, perhaps of some little service in informing the public mind as to the almost incredible extent of the national calamity. Immense, though not immoderate, funds were voted by parliament to meet, if possible, the deplorable destitution occasioned by the potato failure – and yet, with money, food, and an enormous organisation of well paid officials, the peasant population of Ireland (suddenly) converted into famine stricken multitudes) died in thousands upon thousands in the very sight and sound of plentiful supply. Wherefore this fatal frustration of liberally devised succour? I allege now, as I boldly maintained then, that no man gifted with presiding power of mind, and armed with adequate authority, was entrusted with the awful responsibility of arresting the ravages of famine in the sister island. Sir John Burgoyne (now in another sad sphere of ineffective exertion) was sent over as relief commissioner, and, as people idly imagined, with full powers to exercise his great task. No assumption could be more groundless. Within one week after his arrival in Dublin Castle I drew out from the Commissioner himself that he had no power. He came over, he said, to carry out a system of instructions framed at a Treasury desk in Whitehall – that no discretion was left to him, and consequently that he could exercise none. I saw at once that Ireland’s hope was gone – that she was cheated with a semblance of philanthropic authority at the seat of starvation, while the real regulators of ruin were treasury clerks in luxurious London!*

*My conclusions proved calamitously sound. Wherever I pursued my agonising pilgrimage through the distressed districts I found incompetent officials turning public bounty into private jobbery – no foresight to plan relief – no willingness to receive timely suggestion – no use even made of resources actually at hand, and available for the perishing peasantry.*



When I pointed out some scene of extraordinary suffering to Lord Besborough, to Mr. Labouchere, to Mr. Redington, or Sir John Burgoyne, it occasionally happened that a Dublin official was despatched (with his hire of three guineas a day) "to make inquiries." The result of his enquiries was a 'report,' conned over at the Castle and then transmitted to the great treasury oracle, C. Trevelyan, for final perusal and cognition. By the time this last named functionary had made up his mind to do something, nothing remained to be done in the doomed quarter – for the poor sufferers were all dead! It was in vain that I exposed the rank folly of this process. "Send, if you will" I said, "intelligent inquirers to ascertain the extent of alleged famine and disease; but, for humanity's sake, give them some power to relieve instantly and on the spot, the wretched beings whose misery brooks no delay. But my reclamations were fruitless – for the Irish government was then, as now, composed of officials at once powerless and irresponsible – men who mistake bustle for business, and who are ever treading the inveterate circle of mere routine. Corrupt parliamentary patronage – it may be added, lies at the root of this vile official system – for real qualifications for office are never named as the just grounds for parliamentary solicitation. The member asks simply for **a place** whereas the public good requires a fitting man to fill it.

Like cases, like effect, just as English resources were rendered useless for relief, so have they been made equally unavailing in our Crimean camp. The lesson taught is this – to effect a desirable object, choice must be made of a competent chief – civil or military, as the case may be – give him all the power that his position demands, and invest him thereby with a responsibility which he cannot possibly shift from his shoulders – as all office holders now do.

Thomas Mulock. 23<sup>rd</sup> January 1855.<sup>xxi</sup>

Yet more comments came from Mulock's pen, and he found opportunity to offer his views on the political plight of the Duke of Newcastle-under-Lyme, in his position as Minister of War, a copy of the letter Mulock sent to the Duke, receiving a polite reply:

*"PAINFUL AND ANOMALOUS POSITION OF THE DUKE OF NEWCASTLE, AS NOMINAL HEAD OF THE WAR DEPARTMENT:*

*"The views which I endeavoured to express, in comparing "Past destitution in Ireland with the present destitution in our Crimean Camp" have been abundantly borne out by the recent disclosures in parliament, revealing the utter inadequacy of the powers granted to the luckless Duke of Newcastle when the post of war minister was assigned to him. It does not appear that any definite allocation of duties was marked out to his grace, and it is now plain that the Duke was disabled from exercising any efficient control over the various public departments connected with the proper prosecution of the war. He had no real authority at the war office, at the ordnance office, at the admiralty (for transport services), at the commissariat department, or, lastly, over that iniquitously mismanaged thing styled the medical department! What an inventory of nullities to inaugurate the advent of a new secretary-ship of state.*

*The Duke of Newcastle, actuated (as I firmly believe) by honest zeal for the public service, unfortunately accepted the office in question, confiding, I have no doubt, in the cordial cooperation of the different departments through which he trusted to fulfil his great task. But here he erred again. The public departments in England are rotten to the very core; glutted with supine and selfish functionaries; official responsibility is lost in a **maze** of plausible routine. The grand object is to evade irksome labour, and thus positive duties are shamefully postponed, or left wholly unperformed.*

*The Duke of Newcastle worked early and late, issued orders stringently and seasonably, **but those orders were not obeyed**; nor was the Duke possessed of power to enforce obedience. And why was he not? Because the prime minister himself was only the 'nominal head' of the government – a mere nose of wax, to give countenance to a coalition ministry.*

*Respecting and pitying the Duke of Newcastle, I ventured to make known my thoughts to him, and I subscribe his Grace's answer, which is, I think, creditable to his judgement and good feeling."*

The Duke of Newcastle-under-Lyme (un-deterred by the recent painful precedent concerning Prince Albert) had replied:

Portman Square, 3<sup>rd</sup> February 1855.

Sir,

Accept my thanks for your very kind and sympathising letter. It is most gratifying to receive such testimonies as yours to my humble efforts to perform my duty to my country.

I am, your faithful servant,  
Newcastle.<sup>xxxii</sup>

Concern for world affairs remained an important consideration for Mulock and sometime in 1854 he published a twelve page pamphlet *'The War Destined to Convulse the World'* in which he included several of the letters reproduced here concerning the Crimean conflict. This publication appears to have run to two editions, whether that bespeaks popularity or there were essential revisions in the second edition, I do not know<sup>xxxiii</sup>.

Next Mulock was citing his past association with the parish of Stoke-u-Trent when complaining to the Poor Law Board in London with regard to procedures adopted by the local Board of Guardians:

*THE POOR LAW AND THE POOR LAW GUARDIANS OF STOKE-UPON-TRENT.*

*To the Right Honourable M. T. Baines.*

*Sir, A long residence in this parish in former years, and a sojournment here during the last eight months, warrant me in submitting some remarks relative to the state of the poor which may prove useful at the present crisis of parochial pressure.*

*The depression of trade has thrown multitudes out of employment, who, in order to relieve their great necessity, apply for out-of-door allowances in money or food, and the guardians of the union are, in fact, endeavouring to nullify the law, and the general order of December 31<sup>st</sup> 1844, springing out of that law, by granting relief of this sort to able-bodied persons. If this violation of the law be sanctioned great numbers will soon be on the lists for out-of-door relief and there will necessarily be an enormous increase of poor rate. That augmented rate will in every instance fall heavily on the poorer class of ratepayers, who will soon be crushed into paupers themselves.*

*The proceedings of the Board of Guardians must be checked at once, or great evils will inevitably ensue. Under similar circumstances of destitution on the part of able-bodied persons in Ireland in 1847-48 several Boards of Guardians contumaciously resisted the orders of the Poor Law Commissioners, who very wisely and properly availed themselves of their discretionary authority to **dissolve such insubordinate boards**, and to appoint paid guardians to carry out the law. I was in Ireland when this course produced the best results. Not a moment should be lost in dissolving the board of guardians for Stoke union; for the precedent here would be most perilous, if the present refractory system shall be tolerated. A vast population in a comparatively small area will soon become dangerous if vigour and decision be not exerted.*

*The real alleviation of the great distress of the local poor (which I deeply deplore) would be found in liberal subscriptions to relieve families reluctant to enter the poor-house, and the opulent employers who think it expedient to diminish the number of their hands should be the first to contribute largely. But so long as the poor law is presently on the statute book, it should be enforced by the proper authorities instead of being openly resisted by the board of guardians, as is now the case at Stoke-u-Trent.*

*P.S. It should be borne in mind that the poor house is capable of containing 800 inmates, and the latest official return only gives a number of 470.*

A remarkably prompt return of post reply appears to have given little attention to Mulock's complaint:

Poor Law Board, Whitehall.  
19<sup>th</sup> February 1855.

*Sir, I am directed by the Poor Law Board to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 18<sup>th</sup> instant and to thank you for the observations which you have therein submitted to them on the subject of the relief of the poor at Stoke-u-Trent.*

I am sir, your obedient servant, Courtney, Secretary.<sup>xxxiv</sup>

Correspondence between the Duke of Sutherland and Mulock appears to have continued – at least from Mulock who had written to the Duke on the 15<sup>th</sup> March, continuing to express indignation. The Duke's agents considered the letter and debated the best response and James Lock having received Mulock's letter from the Duke - who had wondered if no answer would be for the best – offered his view:

Friday night, 16<sup>th</sup> March, 1855.

“I scratched with a pencil and Edward has written fair what I think the Duke better say to Mr. Mulock. Edward as far as he has seen the correspondence agrees with me – Mr. Mulock in his note which I now return appears to me to accept your explanation. I therefore think it unnecessary for you again to repeat what you have said before and as he makes no fresh attack it is uncalled for – but if you think otherwise your note is very temperate and I think cannot do any harm unless it opens the correspondence with you again which Mr. Mulock does not propose.”

The note read:

“I have recently received your note of the 15<sup>th</sup> instant and I feel it would ill become me to offer any opinion on the course you may think proper to adopt in re-publishing your work on the Western Highlands.

I can only repeat the belief which I formerly expressed to you, that there has been no intentional misrepresentation on the part of anyone connected with me as to your sentiments.”<sup>xxxv</sup>

The Duke’s agents having between them considered the appropriate response, James Lock now submitted the conclusions to the Duke:

17<sup>th</sup> March 1855.

“My Dear Lord,

I return Mr. Mulock’s letter.

It is conceived in terms towards your Grace as everyone knows as deserved and the tone is in all way moderate and conciliatory. I am inclined therefore to think it would be better if your Grace acknowledged the receipt of it expressing that you could offer no opinion on the course he might think right to follow in re-publishing his work on the Western Highlands and would you have any objection to add that you beg to respect the belief that there was no intention on the part of any connected with you to misrepresent his sentiments.

I need hardly add that I had no knowledge of .....connection with any newspaper publication.

In making the last suggestion it had occurred to me that it might lead to correspondence and therefore had better be avoided. I have, on that account, put my pen through it.

James Lock.<sup>xxxvi</sup>

The subject of the Mellard estate and Mulock’s late wife’s inheritance - of which he had long supposed himself cheated – still rankled in his mind and having received advice relating to a bill of costs, Mulock now wrote to Hyde, one of the trustees:

*North Staffordshire Hotel, Stoke-on-Trent,  
April 12<sup>th</sup> 1854.*

*Dear Sir,*

*It was not until this day that I received a written avowal from Messrs. Keary and Shepherd that their bill of costs, connected with the Mellard estate have not been taxed. I am, therefore, in a position as grantor of the trust under which Mr. Bull and yourself acted to call you both to account, and I resolve to do so under the 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> Victoria, cap 35. And I shall do more. As Mr. Bull, Mr. T. Harding and yourself have treated me with discourtesy, as a convenient cover for injustice, I will publish a short statement of the case, in which the antecedents of all the parties (not forgetting Mr. Bull’s Plaster-of-Paris achievements) shall figure clearly and conspicuously.*

*I am sorry for your sake, as I had a real regard for you, but you have drawn the disagreeableness upon yourself.*

*Yours truly,  
Thomas Mulock.*

*P.S. The result of my communication with the Bishop of Lichfield will be the early return of the Reverend J. W. Tomlinson to his proper position in Stoke.*<sup>xxxvii</sup>

Mulock, it seems, was once again in need of money and circumstances may have temporarily affected his judgement, which might account for the aggressiveness of his next publications.

Pape quotes a letter that Mulock sent to Louis Napoleon, who having overcome many difficulties was by now universally recognised as the ruling French monarch:

*To His Majesty the Emperor of the French:*

Newcastle, Staffordshire.  
12<sup>th</sup> April 1855.

Sire,  
*I was the first public writer in this country who espoused the cause of the Prince President, at an epoch when the French Republic was menaced with anarchy. It was, moreover, my willing duty to be one of the first, even in France, to proclaim your just pretensions to the Imperial Diadem. You have not justified your mission so as to benefit mankind. Instead of cultivating the arts of peace you have, in conjunction with England, involved Europe in an unjust and unnecessary war. I therefore plainly announce to your Imperial Majesty that your career of prosperity will speedily terminate, that your alliances will produce sinister results, and that your throne will totter amidst convulsions which no political prudence or armed force can possibly avert or overcome. I have the honour to be,*

*Your Majesty's faithful servant,*  
*Thomas Mulock.*<sup>xxxviii</sup>

Varying his subject Mulock then attacked what he considered to be the lethargy or ineptitude of officials at Newcastle-U-Lyme in failing to deal competently with a social problem:

*"THE POOL DAM, NEWCASTLE (U-LYME):*

*Sir, Among the objects and subjects which have engaged my attention during a somewhat protracted stay in this neighbourhood, I have not overlooked the continued existence of what may be fitly styled the monster nuisance of Newcastle – namely, the aggregate of filth dangerous to the public health still un-removed from the Pool Dam. Upon inquiry I find that all the zeal of the Commissioners has proved abortive, in consequence of the faulty mode of proceeding towards the party or parties bound by law to abate this mischievous nuisance. Negotiation seems to have been resorted to, instead of adhering to the severe simplicity enjoined by the statute. On referring to the act 11/12<sup>th</sup> Victoria cap 63 s 58, it will at once be seen that the proper course to serve a notice upon the proprietor or occupier of the pool dam, "requiring him within a time to be specified in such notice," to effect the removal of the nuisance complained of. If such notice is not complied with, the local Board of Health is empowered, and indeed enjoined, to execute such works as shall be necessary for the complete abatement of the nuisance in question, and the party neglecting the said notice "in a summary manner."*

*By strictly following out the wise provision of the Act of Parliament, instead of dangling after parties not made conscious of their amenability to the law, the local board will properly discharge their duty – vexatious delays will be put an end to – and the statute book will no longer remain a dead letter with reference to the care taken by the legislature to avert accumulation of perilous filth, which might poisonously augment the evil of an epidemic in the town of Newcastle.*<sup>xxxix</sup>

By now Mulock's address was given as Stafford as from the 1<sup>st</sup> of May, 1855, he had been taken into custody over debts incurred at the hotel (he seemingly refused to pay the bill because of poor service and other failings on the part of the hotel management) and was in custody in Stafford Gaol. In the index of correspondence to the Hatherton Letters there is a brief entry against Mulock's name:

"Mr. Mulock: Editor of a newspaper. He passed more than a year in the Stafford Gaol sooner than pay a disputed hotel bill at Stoke-upon-Trent. He was father of Mrs. Craik, the author of 'John Halifax, Gentleman,' etc."<sup>xl</sup>

This comment is undated and may have been written by a person without first-hand knowledge of matters who was relying on hearsay. But in a letter from the gaol (see below), written to his daughter, Mulock gives the first date of this imprisonment as the 1<sup>st</sup> May, 1855. Many who have written concerning Mulock, or speculated on his whereabouts at different times, have believed or asserted him to have been held in the Stafford Asylum and there will be those who, if they read this account, will firmly believe that he should have been!

As a civil prisoner Mulock was not under the same constraints as those imprisoned for criminal offences – however dubious the moral distinction should have been; now with time on his hands and little to distract him from pursuing his thoughts, Mulock allowed his eye to wander over many subjects; an incident in Ireland having aroused indignation, even fury, amongst members of the Protestant faith - when a Protestant bible was burnt at the instigation of a Roman Catholic priest, leading to the trial of the persons involved - the national newspaper coverage of proceedings, led Mulock to pen observations on the matter in another letter to the local newspaper:

*“THE BIBLE BURNING AT KINGSTOWN:*

*“Sir, Now that the verdict of a Dublin jury has acquitted one of the parties charged with the above-mentioned crime, it appears to me to be desirable to offer, through the press, some observations which may serve to account for the failure of the crown prosecution instituted against the so-called Redemptionist father, Vladimir Petcherine. I feel myself qualified to tender this explanation from my knowledge of the Roman Catholic tenets and discipline; from my perfect acquaintance with the practical operation of the Roman Catholic religion in Ireland; and from my personal experience of the almost satanic sway exercised over the mind and actions of the Roman Catholic population by their clergy, who desecrate the name and office of priesthood!*

*Perusing carefully and impartially the whole of the evidence on behalf of the prosecution (and no rebutting evidence was offered) as reported in the well-known organ of the **soi-disant** priests, the **Freeman’s Journal**, it seems impossible that any unbiased reader should entertain a shadow of a doubt as to the proved guiltiness of Petcherine. He was the head and front of the entire proceeding; and that the Holy Scriptures were wheeled from his lodgings, flung among heaps of alleged “immoral publications” and consumed in flames kindled by order of the rabid Redemptionist, are facts irrefragably established by several credible witnesses.*

*How, then, can we account for the astounding verdict of acquittal? I boldly reply, from the vague generality of all the indictments preferred against the traverser. Teeming with zeal for laws which he is professionally bound to uphold, the Attorney General, following the orthodox dictum of Westminster Hall, that “Christianity is part and parcel of the law of the land,” laboured to show that the offence with which Petcherine was charged was an open blasphemous onslaught against the Christian religion. **So** in truth and essence it really was; but not provable in the eye and ear of the law itself, for the actual allegation which ought to have been urged was the profane burning of the authorised version of the Scriptures. Had the prosecution been strictly confined to this single charge, a conviction must inevitably have taken place; but the Attorney General and judge Crampton wandered into drift-less declamation about the Rhomish Testament, the Douay Bible and other versions of Roman Catholic compilation, which of course were not in the wheelbarrow or in the bonfire, and the case fell to the ground from the over-astuteness of perverse lawyerdome!*

*The attorney general omitted to avow to the jury that Rome denounces in her **Index Expurgatorious** our Authorised Version as an heretical book; that to possess it is a crime cognisable by the Inquisition; and that it would be burnt **by authority** in the Papal States in Tuscany or in Spain. The very existence as well as policy of Rome requires this, for our truthful version of the Scriptures overthrows the whole fabric and uproots the false foundation of guileful and pernicious Popery, the infidel sacrifice of the mass, penance, purgatory, the confessional, and other religious frauds, - and the crowning anti-Christian abomination recently dogmatised by Pio Nono, viz. the blasphemous assertion of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary. All these horrible lies and deceptions are at once annihilated by the sacred certainties contained in our Authorised Version of the Scriptures. Rome knows this, and therefore Rome interdicts – finally prohibits – **our** Bible. The Irish Romanist clergy being the devoted slaves of the Papacy in all matters of doctrine and pseudo-priestly superstition – (indeed they never kick, except when rebuked for being political incendiaries, which many of them are) – the result of their subjection to the Romish See is, **inter alia**, a fierce desire and determination to prevent our Bible from reaching their blinded flocks; and if it should be found among them, father This or father That would deem it a work exaltedly meritorious to order a private **auto da fe** of the sacred volume! And such is the abject slavery of the people to their arrogant priests that no Roman Catholic would dare to disobey the sacrilegious command. Every Irish priest would do stealthily what Petcherine had the hardihood to perpetrate publicly and with defiant effrontery, and wide and universal will now be “bible-burnings” in every parish in Ireland. Never since the olden time of Popish supremacy in these realms was Popery so rampant in the persons of the audacious priesthood as at this day; and I may add, from personal knowledge, that the pride, pretensions, and monstrous assumption of the Roman Catholic priests in Ireland exceeds all that I ever witnessed in Continental States, where the Roman Catholic form of religion is paramount.*

*P.S. The second acquittal has necessarily followed.* ”<sup>xli</sup>

It must be said that by and large many of Mulock's letters did not trigger published response, but on this occasion there was a reply, from an address in Liverpool, that at once went to the very root and heart of religious difference, but perhaps also revealing the correspondent's – and no doubt that of many Irishmen – deep rooted hostility to the English domination of Ireland, as distinct from the general Protestant break away from the Catholic Church:

“Sir,

Your correspondent, Mr. Mulock, seems to be very angry that an English judge and Dublin jury failed to convict father Petcherine. Were Mr. Mulock on the jury he would, no doubt, have gulped the *sworn promise to do justice*, and found the accused guilty. We have had plenty of such “justice in Ireland;” it is time it were altered, and such bigots as Mr. Mulock restrained from tramping on the laws, and oppressing priests and people.

The clergy of Ireland most undoubtedly possess an influence over their flocks that is *bitterly galling* to partisans of an *alien* church, thrust upon the country *by Act of Parliament*. It is a holy and useful influence (not as Mr. Mulock describes it, a ‘satanic one’), which negatives and makes useless the efforts of *Protestantism* to tempt or coerce the people from their ancient faith to become members of an establishment kept together only by Acts of Parliament and the immense property it plunders the people of.

Mr. Mulock calls the doctrine of the Catholic Church “horrible lies and deceptions,” and adds, “That if the priests permitted the Protestant Bible to be read universally by their flocks, it would uproot Catholicism.” But he is in error; it should be *trusted as well as read*, and he will wait some time ere the population of Ireland rely on a Protestant Bible in preference to their own. *Many read* the works of Tom Paine; fortunately for Christianity, *few believe* in his writings. Would not any good Christian prevent their circulation among the masses? And why should a clergyman permit an erroneous version of the scriptures to take the place of the true one? Does Mr. Mulock suppose the word of God *can be changed by Act of Parliament*, or that his denouncing the only true church can make her less holy or less catholic than she has ever been?

I know Ireland probably *as well*, and Catholicism *better* than he does, and for his own sake, I hope he may learn to know them both better. He may then have the good fortune to follow in the steps of those *eminent* men who have lately left “the church established by law” for that established by God; who promised that church that he would be with it all days, even to the consummation of the world, and who authorised its ministers to teach his name to those of all ages present and to come. It will take many Mulocks to undo his work, for long after the upstart Church of England has followed the many other heresies that attacked the ancient Church of God, it will yet remain and fulfil its mission, and do the work of its founder.

James Brown.

Scotland Road, Liverpool.<sup>xlii</sup>

(Vladimir Petcherine had converted to the Roman Church having first been a minister in the Eastern Orthodox Church. Amongst those who had left the Protestant Church in this general period was Cardinal Newman.)

In March 1856, another of Mulock's letter, this time containing comments on the death of John Sadleir, was published in the *Staffordshire Advertiser*. Over the next few years other letters of Mulock's on a variety of subjects, also appeared and it seems that Mulock was settled in the Stafford area. John Sadlier was a noted politician and wealthy banker, who committed suicide at Hampstead Heath, London, following the collapse of The Tipperary Bank, of which he was the principal; it had emerged that Sadlier had been defrauding the public. According to Mulock, Sadleir had at one time viewed him as a possible associate in a scheme concerning Irish landed property:

*‘The Late John Sadleir,’*

*‘The recent awful catastrophe on Hampstead Heath, following so fast upon other revealed enormities of different kinds, ought to have the effect of arousing the public mind to a sense of the important truth “the love of money is the root of all evil;” for is it not clear as the noon-day that the insatiable desire for gain is the moving spring of countless atrocities? One wretch poisons others, another wretch poisons himself, but still the latent cause is the same – “he that maketh haste to be rich shall not be innocent.” In the olden time the love of lucre manifested itself in the miser's hoard, the rich man's strongbox or the poor man's hidden gold and silver in the rafted nook or the secreted stocking. But in our disordered days covetousness takes a much more formidable shape and a far more destructive scope, for it is arrayed in the enticing garb of SPECULATION. The man who formerly would have worn a threadbare coat, starved himself, or famished his family – the Elweses or Daniel Dancers – that race of skinflints is almost extinct. The covetous man of our time is of a more satanic stamp, for he aims to enrich himself by sordid schemes which may eventuate in the ruin of multitudes. He is a concocter of swindling railway or mining projects, or a stock exchange*

trafficker in the shares of public companies – for all companies carried on **without proper profit** are emphatically bubble concerns. Our **man of money** is a rapacious seeker after gain throughout the whole realm of fraud – void of all fear of God, and all compassion for his fellow creatures; and **such** a man was John Sadleir! When his multiform villainies could no longer be cloaked, he writes dying letters to acknowledge his guilt, and to avow that he falls by his own hand rather than witness the calamities which his cupidity must occasion to thousands. But it must be borne in mind that had he lived, the certain penal consequence of his crimes would have been transportation for life. One painfully instructive passage in Sadleir's letters is his saddening reference to the fatal exchange he made of quiet industry in Ireland for the perilous allurements of that modern Babylon, of which, after the lapse of a century, doctor Johnson's description is so pungently true:

*"London, the needy villain's general home,  
The common sewer of Paris and of Rome"*

There Sadleir found a field for the uttermost stretch of dishonest speculation; and speculation, be it deeply noted, **under colour of laws**. Sadleir was a solicitor, and employed solicitors, and all his nefarious projects carried with them a certain air of professional **prestige** and legal protection, which solves the secret of his long impunity. No class of persons, except unscrupulous lawyers, could possibly perpetrate such frauds as Sadleir devised and executed. Curiously enough, Sadleir wrote to me, dated from the 'Albany, London,' a letter which reached me at Inverness, where I was residing in 1850. He informed me that he had read with pleasure my published letters to Lord Clarendon on the 'Disenthralment of Incurably Involved Irish Estates,' and drew my attention to a plan for profitable re-sale. I replied to him that in suggesting what afterwards led to the Incumbered Estates Commission, I never contemplated a constant trafficking transfer of estates, which would convert Ireland into a vast auction arena. My wish was to see insolvent ownership exchanged for prosperous and permanent proprietorship. I never heard from him again. <sup>xliii</sup>

Mulock's daughter, Dinah, whose early venture into verse was noticed earlier, had, while caring for her mother in the final years of that lady's life, continued with her ambition in authorship; numerous of her works had been published, although not always identified by her name, when in the spring of 1856 came the novel that brought almost instant recognition, 'John Halifax, Gentleman' the story of an orphan lad who rose from rags to riches. This as time progressed may well have gained Thomas Mulock reflected glory and there can be little doubt that he was quietly proud of her achievement. Later this year, in writing to his daughter, Mulock said that he had borrowed a copy of her novel - that belonged to the Countess of Dartmouth - from Major Fulford, to whom it had been loaned - and was quick to point out an inaccuracy relating to Napoleon Bonaparte, but complimented her on the novel's literary merit.<sup>xliv</sup> Mulock was at this time in contact with Dinah from whom he had received a letter and a postal order (presumably towards the necessities of life in a debtor's gaol) assuring her that any letter addressed to him at 'Stafford' would be sure to reach him, a possible indication that the Mulock family in general did not seek to draw attention to the fact that Thomas was in prison, perhaps preferring the alternative of the asylum. In replying to Dinah, Mulock referred to her impending travels and implied that his contact with the prison governor, Major Fulford, was by letter but that at present Fulford was visiting his mother near Exeter but would have to be back at the prison soon to arrange Palmer's removal to Newgate. Mulock also mentioned his son, Benjamin, expected to return from the Crimea where he had been serving with the Land Transport Corps. Finally, "*my captivity's anniversary is this day – I do not regret an hour of its duration.*"<sup>xlv</sup>

The execution of William Palmer at Stafford in 1856, was an event that Mulock could not allow to pass without contribution and, in verse, he contrived to attack the three churches, Protestant, Catholic and Methodist:

*The Three Churches - or heart's ease for murderers.*

*Judge and Jury assembled. The trial proceeds,  
Of Palmer accused of a poisoner's deeds!  
He splutters a speech full of fustian and lies.  
Canny Campbell<sup>xlvi</sup> sums up and on strychnine relies!  
The Jury quite vexed with a trial so slow  
Agree. To the gallows that Campbell must go!  
And though his own County too vile was to try him  
To a Staffordshire tree a home hangman must tie him.  
The law thus pronounced and the halter be fixed  
The Church with the State must be finally mixed!  
'Confess' cries the Chaplain 'that Cook's poor intestines  
With strychnine were soaked lest the verdict that destines*

*Your neck to the noose be impeached by the people  
Clear Jury and Judge - 'tis a voice from the steeple's  
Confess brother Palmer! With Sacrament crammed  
The Church will receive you - then die and be damned!*

*Dissenters, like Churchmen, can poison a wife  
So Dove, though Wesleyan, must forfeit his life  
What a Methodist hanged! tis shocking and sad  
To the body of Saints! So the murderer's mad!  
And scores of sham Parsons rush forward to swear  
That Dove was a maniac under their care!  
Though never till now did the secret escape them  
(Such liars are ripe for the Devil to take them!)  
But Gray is inflexible - yields to no hell sect!  
Believes not that Dove was defective in intellect  
And despite of the cheating philanthropists slang  
'Tis decreed that mad Dove must infallibly hang.  
Ho! Presto! A change! He's Wesleyan once more!  
A sound-minded hypocrite - false to the core!  
The Scriptures he wrests - as old Wesley had taught him  
Affirms that his God to foul murder hath brought him!  
Other means having failed - 'twas to save his poor soul  
That he poisoned his wife by celestial control!!  
This blasphemy fits - to the scaffold he wends  
Conscience scared by the lies of his Methodist friends.  
Mother Church! Ancient Rome! has her murderers too  
To be shrived by her Clergy with ritual due  
'Confess' bawls the Priest 'to the Church, that's to me,  
And from all your transgressions I'll soon set you free  
The Virgin shall save you - No Christ do you want  
In Immaculate Mary's Salvation we vaunt!  
When you're hanged - out of flames purgational we'll snatch you  
If you've money for Masses - if not Satan catch you!*

1. Your blood be upon your own head.  
(Chaplain Goodacre's valedictory solace to William Palmer.)
2. Ordinary means God had used but they failed. He has therefore used extraordinary means  
and adopted this plan to save me. Vide Dove's letter  
to the Manchester philanthropist Mr. J. Wright, who, by the way, must be an  
egregious simpleton.
3. The worship of Mary 'born without sin' being new, the dogmatic religion of all Roman Catholics their Church  
has consequently renounced even her fraudulent semblance of Christianity - and puts forth a naked form of  
Antichrist.  
(1- 3 Mulock's Illustrative notes.)<sup>xlvi</sup>

In another letter to his daughter, Mulock referred to Palmer's execution "*....he walked beneath my window to execution<sup>xlvi</sup> - I of course closed my shutters to avoid the sight - a more impenitent malefactor never left this world..... I am not ashamed of being here, as I am not a criminal - I am only poor - but poverty is a greater crime in English eyes than poisoning - I never received a thousandth part of the sympathy that Palmer has been shewn since his conviction, during all my experience of England and her people - but the world loveth its own - whereas I belong to Christ.*"<sup>xlvi</sup>

In another letter to Dinah (Mulock addressed her as Maria), Mulock throws more light upon the prison scene stating that amongst those suffering confinement through debt was "*an excellent photographic artist who never ceased importuning me until I sat and I resolved to send you the result. I trust it will reach you uninjured. People find abundant fault with my head but most critics commend my hands so I have managed to put them forward.*" In a postscript to the same letter Mulock adds, "*My old Shepherd's plaid is a gift from a zealous Scotch patriot who valued*



*my efforts in behalf of the oppressed Highland peasantry. By the way that trashy writer, Mrs. B. Stowe has (under the lying tutelage of Lord Shaftesbury and the late Mr. Lock) libelled me in her 'Funny Memories,' the got up and impudently false chapter on 'Sutherland.' I never could get through 'Uncle Tom's Cabin' which is false religion grafted upon extravagant fiction.*"<sup>l</sup>

From another letter written to his daughter, Mulock referred to the prison governor's kindness in consequence of which Mulock was able to see the *Times* every day, "*...indeed the major drops in on me most days and consults me on knotty points. He will call on you in the course of a few days.*" Some weeks later Mulock received an unexpected visit from his son, Benjamin, who was home from the Crimea, "*Ben came in upon me so unexpectedly that I hardly rallied into self-composure during his stay, but I was delighted to see him. All he said was marked with sound sense drifting occasionally into a sly quiet drollery, which I always relish. I see the hustle of Balaclava operates on his mind so as to make him perforce a strenuous seeker for stimulating employment.*"<sup>li</sup>

Now, for whatever reason, the Duke of Sutherland wanted his agent, Jackson, to send all the letters that Mulock had written in respect of the 'retraction' of 1853, to George Lock, now an agent. This letter confirms that Mulock had shifted his residence from Stoke to Stafford being in gaol for debt:

Dunrobin, Golspie,  
22<sup>nd</sup> September 1856.

To George Lock,

I send you by the Duke's desire all the letters from Mr. Mulock relating to his retraction or alteration of opinion. That of October 27<sup>th</sup> 1853 is the original letter and with it is the cutting from the *Inverness Advertiser* with the editor's remarks. Mrs. Stowe's book was published, I think in July, 1854, and the letter of August 15<sup>th</sup> is the first which indicates any notion on Mr. Mulock's part that he has been misunderstood. I have put in the order of dates a letter to the Duke from Mr. Mulock marked Private, dated June 9<sup>th</sup> 1854 before Mrs. Stowe's book appeared, from which you will see that others as well as Mr. Lock considered him to have withdrawn his charges, as he is charged with 'perfidy to the Highland Cause' in consequence of these letters in question. There are many other letters of his, but as they do not relate to this I do not send them unless you desire it. You will find some letters from Mr. Crewe, the bookseller at Newcastle, showing when he used to communicate with the *Staffordshire Advertiser*, which show the same inconsistency on the subject of his own letters, which however, do seem to strongly characterised by Mrs. Stowe. The letter of March 15<sup>th</sup> 1855 is the last letter I have, but I remember that almost immediately after this he got into Stafford gaol for debt. While there he wrote to the Duke not asking for money but saying that his only means of existence were from his new edition of the work on the Highlands. The Duke contented himself with saying he would take some copies of it when it came out but sent him nothing then, nor I think since. Altogether there were three or four letters from Stafford gaol, and in one of them he said he should again attack Mr. Lock. These letters were written during your father's illness and he of course did not see them, nor was Mr. Mulock at all aware of his state of health, when he talked of a fresh attack. His new edition has I believe never appeared.

I am sir,

Your obedient servant,

Thomas Jackson<sup>lii</sup>

The letters were duly forwarded to the Duke:

September 25<sup>th</sup> 1856.

My Dear Lord,

I beg to return the packets containing Mr. Mulock's letters which your Grace was so kind as to send me.

His letter of the 27<sup>th</sup> October 1853 being that which he complains has been misconstrued, seems to have been carefully written in no ambiguous a way as to enable him ..... either by claiming credit with your Grace for complete vindication (?) or by falling back on his previous opinion, in case that course should seem likely and the most advantageous.

It is clear that the letter admitted of the first construction, for such was the view taken by of it by the authors of the Editorial remarks both of the Scotch and English newspapers in which it appear, remarks written with the letter lying before them. My father, in writing to Lord Shaftesbury spoke of it from memory, and it is not surprising that he fell into the same mistake as to its precise meaning.

The whole of these letters shew Mr. Mulock to be a very bad fellow – precisely of the sort who in the newspapers, seek to make grievances, and to set themselves up as teachers of what should and should not be done.

I am, your Grace, most faithfully,  
George Lock.<sup>liii</sup>

- 
- <sup>i</sup> Liverpool Mercury, 10<sup>th</sup> January, 1854
- <sup>ii</sup> The Elgin and Morayshire Courier, 20<sup>th</sup> January, 1854. I quote from one newspaper; several other newspaper sources could easily be appended
- <sup>iii</sup> See above.
- <sup>iv</sup> Lloyds Weekly London Newspaper, 15<sup>th</sup> January, 1854
- <sup>v</sup> Nottinghamshire Guardian, 12<sup>th</sup> January, 1854
- <sup>vi</sup> Dublin Evening Mail, 13<sup>th</sup> January, 1854
- <sup>vii</sup> Dublin Evening Mail, 16<sup>th</sup> January, 1854
- <sup>viii</sup> Freeman's Journal, 18<sup>th</sup> January, 1864
- <sup>ix</sup> Dublin Evening Mail, 18<sup>th</sup> January, 1854
- <sup>x</sup> The Dublin Courier, 18<sup>th</sup> January, 1854; The Spectator.
- <sup>xi</sup> The Essex Standard, 18<sup>th</sup> January, 1854
- <sup>xii</sup> Dumfries and Galloway Standard, 18<sup>th</sup> January, 1854
- <sup>xiii</sup> The Fife Herald, 19<sup>th</sup> January, 1854
- <sup>xiv</sup> SRO/D593/K/1/3/42 Sutherland Collection In Letters January 1854
- <sup>xv</sup> Freeman's Journal, 21<sup>st</sup> January, 1854
- <sup>xvi</sup> Staffordshire Advertiser 15<sup>th</sup> April 1854.
- <sup>xvii</sup> Staffordshire Advertiser 22<sup>nd</sup> April 1854.
- <sup>xviii</sup> The Dublin Evening Mail, 17<sup>th</sup> February, 1854
- <sup>xix</sup> Staffordshire Advertiser 29<sup>th</sup> April 1854.
- <sup>xx</sup> SRO/D593/K/1/3/42 Sutherland Collection In Letters August 1854.
- <sup>xxi</sup> SRO/D593/K/1/3/42 Sutherland Collection In Letters August 1854
- <sup>xxii</sup> SRO/D593/K/1/3/42 Sutherland Collection In Letters August 1854.
- <sup>xxiii</sup> D593/K/1/5/80 f352 Sutherland Collection Out Letter Book July-Sept 1854.
- <sup>xxiv</sup> SRO/D593/K/1/3/42 Sutherland Collection In Letters September 1854
- <sup>xxv</sup> Staffordshire Advertiser 26<sup>th</sup> August 1854.
- <sup>xxvi</sup> Staffordshire Advertiser 2<sup>nd</sup> September 1854.
- <sup>xxvii</sup> A Lunatic Asylum.
- <sup>xxviii</sup> Staffordshire Advertiser
- <sup>xxix</sup> The Petition of Dr. Peithman, LLD., John Perceval, British Library.
- <sup>xxx</sup> Staffordshire Advertiser 29<sup>th</sup> December 1854.
- <sup>xxxi</sup> Staffordshire Advertiser 10<sup>th</sup> February 1855.
- <sup>xxxii</sup> Staffordshire Advertiser 17<sup>th</sup> February 1855.
- <sup>xxxiii</sup> See Pape.
- <sup>xxxiv</sup> Staffordshire Advertiser 24<sup>th</sup> February 1855.
- <sup>xxxv</sup> SRO/D593/K/1/3/43 Sutherland Collection In Letters March 1855.
- <sup>xxxvi</sup> SRO/D593/1/3/82, folio 630 Sutherland Collection, Outgoing letter book Jan – Mar 1855
- <sup>xxxvii</sup> 'Old Newcastle' T. Pape;
- <sup>xxxviii</sup> 'Old Newcastle' T. Pape; the war was the Crimean.
- <sup>xxxix</sup> Staffordshire Advertiser 6<sup>th</sup> May 1855.
- <sup>xl</sup> SRO/D260/M/F/27/38, volume 1.
- <sup>xli</sup> Staffordshire Advertiser 15<sup>th</sup> December 1855.
- <sup>xlii</sup> Staffordshire Advertiser 29<sup>th</sup> December 1855.
- <sup>xliii</sup> Staffordshire Advertiser 1<sup>st</sup> March 1856. The couplet quoted is from Samuel Johnson's 'London, a Satire in the Imitation of Juvenal.'
- <sup>xliv</sup> See 'Dinah Mulock Craik,' by Sally Mitchell; Narrating Insanity in the letters of Thomas Mulock and Dinah Mulock Craik, by Karen Bourrier.
- <sup>xlvi</sup> I am obliged to Karen Bourrier for this information.
- <sup>xlvi</sup> The judge, Campbell, was the same man who had acted as counsel for Simpson and Wilson in 1829 and who Mulock had berated in his article!
- <sup>xlvi</sup> Staffordshire Advertiser, 16<sup>th</sup> August 1856
- <sup>xlvi</sup> While allowance must be made that there could be a temptation to colour the 'story' it was by no means improbable that it occurred as Mulock described. Prisoners under sentence of death were, at that time, held in the old 'Sheriff's' gaol building, as were those imprisoned for debt, though well separated. Palmer was brought from his cell at the rear of the building by way of the Crescent yard in a procession of officials with the prison bell tolling and taken to the gate lodge where he was hanged in the open in front of the prison in view of a vast assembly of people. Had Mulock's cell overlooked the route then he most probably would have seen the procession pass by. See Stafford Prison 1793-1916 A. J. Standley, WSL (unpublished).
- <sup>xlvi</sup> Another reference for which I am obliged to Karen Bourrier.
- <sup>li</sup> I am obliged to Karen Bourrier for this reference
- <sup>li</sup> I am obliged to Karen Bourrier for this reference
- <sup>lii</sup> D593/K/1/3/44 Sutherland Collection, In Letters September 1856.

