

DISSENSION IN THE IONIAN ISLANDS:
COLONEL CHARLES JAMES NAPIER AND THE COMMISSIONERS
(1819-1833)

The question of dissension between Colonel Charles James Napier and the Lords High Commissioners of the Ionian Islands, Sir Thomas Maitland and Sir Frederick Adam, originates with and partly concerns the Greek Revolution (1821-1828). From 1819, there are signs of Napier's philhellenic sentiments and Sir Thomas's anti-philhellenism. This conflict is more fully exploited when Sir Frederick succeeds Sir Thomas as Lord High Commissioner in 1824. The conflict arising over the Greek Revolution is, however, only one aspect of several in the dissension that extended beyond 1828.

While serving as Inspecting Field-Officer of the Ionian Militia (1819-1822), Colonel Napier made four visits to the Court of Ali Pasha of Jannina¹. Ali Pasha, an Albanian satrap, was plotting a rebellion against Sultan Mahmud II, and requested Napier's military advice and assistance. Napier encouraged the intriguing pasha, and suggested an advance of £1,000,000 to recruit Greek *Klephts* and form an ordnance corps². In fact, Napier viewed the pasha's scheme as an opportunity to expel every Ottoman Turk from Greece. English help in this plot, reasoned Napier, was mandatory, or else the Greeks might look to Russia for military assistance³.

Colonel Napier would receive minor opposition from Sir Thomas on the matter of Napier's philhellenism. Sir Thomas, like many others, regarded

1. Cf. *Convention . . . des Sept Iles Ioniennes*, Vienna, 5 November 1815, pp. 1-10; Gaston Levy, *De la Condition des Iles Ioniennes*, Paris, Arthur Rosseau, 1901, pp. 26-70; E. Driault and M. Lheritier, *Histoire Diplomatique de la Grèce*, 5 vols, Paris, Universitaire de France, 1925, I, pp. 56-71; and Douglas Dakin, *British and American Philhellenes during the Greek War of Independence, 1821-1833*, Thessaloniki, Institute for Balkan Studies, 1955, p. 17.

2. Cf. William Francis Patrick Napier, *The Life and Opinions of General Sir Charles James Napier*, 4 vols, London, John Murray, 1857, I, pp. 360-67. Cf. also Theodore Kolokotronis, *The Klepht and The Warrior*, trans. by Mrs. Edmonds, London, T. Fisher Unwin, 1892, pp. 120-126; and John Makriyannis, *Memoirs*, trans. by H. A. Lidderdale, London, Oxford University Press, 1966, pp. 74-75, 136.

3. The Russians had precipitated the Greek rebellion of 1770. Cf. Richard Clogg, «Aspects of the Movement for Greek Independence», in *The Struggle for Greek Independence*, edited by Richard Clogg, London, MacMillan, 1973, p. 25. Napier also feared Russian designs upon Ottoman territory. Cf. Charles James Napier, *War in Greece*, London, James Ridgway, 1821, p. 9.

Philhellenes as misguided romantics who were «fresh from college, and full of classic imaginings». The image of Greeks as virtuous patriots was, to Sir Thomas, utter hyperbole¹. Likewise, the Ionian Greeks thought even less of Sir Thomas. Even his first biographer, Walter Frewen Lord, described Sir Thomas as «dirty and coarse, rude in manner and violent in temper». «No one more uncongenial to the Ionians», wrote Lord, «could have been found»².

Along with this unpleasantness, Sir Thomas had grown increasingly unpopular with his subordinates. The cession of Parga (1817-1819), a mainland dependency of the Septinsular Republic, had only resulted in the alienation of the Ionian Greeks and the complaints of the military. Sir Thomas himself expressed the opinion that the cession of Parga was unfortunate, though a necessary *quid pro quo* agreement: for the accession of Parga, the Porte would recognise *de facto* British suzerainty over the Septinsular Republic. Ali Pasha appeared as the main culprit in the accession when he objected to the method of transfer by the Resident, Lieutenant-Colonel C. P. de Bosset³. Sir Thomas dismissed de Bosset, and the Resident at Zante, Sir Frederick Adam, completed the evacuation of Parga. De Bosset sued Sir Thomas for compensation and was awarded £100 damages (King's Bench: 15 July 1821)⁴. Despite the obvious guilt of Ali Pasha in this affair, Sir Thomas did not escape unscathed from the Parga dilemma⁵.

1. Cf. Walter Frewen Lord, *Sir Thomas Maitland*, New York, Longman, Green and Co., 1896, p. 217.

2. W. F. Lord, *The Lost Possessions of England*, London, Richard Bentley, 1896, p. 286.

3. There was some parliamentary opposition to the Parga cession. Cf. Great Britain, *Hansard's Parliamentary Debates*, 1st ser., Vol. XL (1819), 806-820. The entire population of Parga (3,000) emigrated to the Ionian Isles during the cession period. Cf. John Baggally, *Ali Pasha and Great Britain*, Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1938, pp. 68-69; Alphonse de Beauchamp, *The Life of Ali Pasha of Jannina*, 2nd ed., London, S. & R. Bentley, 1830, pp. 265-268; Rev. Thomas Smart Hughes, *Travels in Greece and Albania*, 2nd ed., 2 vols, London, Colburn and Bentley, 1830, II, pp. 281-328; and Thomas Gordon, *History of the Greek Revolution*, 2 vols, London, T. Cadwell, 1832, I, pp. 75-89.

4. Cf. Charles P. de Bosset, *Parga and the Ionian Islands*, London, John Warren, 1821, pp. 379-505. De Bosset's correspondence for Parga is found in Public Records Office (London) / Colonial Office 136 (Ionian Islands) / 18. [Hereafter PRO/CO 136]. Other papers relating to Parga are contained in PRO/CO 136/15. Cf. also C. Willis Dixon, *The Colonial Administrations of Sir Thomas Maitland*, New York, Augustus Kelley, 1969, p. 211.

5. The Parga Affair aroused the suspicions of John Capodistria. Sir Thomas resented Capodistria's presence on Corfu and finally persuaded him to embark for St. Petersburg. Cf. C. M. Woodhouse, *Capodistria*, Oxford, University Press, 1973, pp. 200-205; P. K. Grimsted, *The Foreign Ministers of Alexander I*, Los Angeles, University of California

Napier's appointment as Resident at Cephalonia (12 March 1822) would come at a rather unfortunate time. Sir Thomas's opinion of the Greek Revolution (6 March 1821) had further soured. The Lord High Commissioner complained of attacks upon Ionian shipping, massacres of Turkish prisoners, and the temporary arrest of the Vice-Consul for Patras. In fact, complained Sir Thomas, the mainland Greek insurrectionists acted «in the most Lawless and piratical manner»¹. In response to the hostilities on the mainland, Sir Thomas disarmed the population on Corfu, Paxo and Ithaca².

In 1823, Lord Byron visited Cephalonia, and although he did not initially form a favourable impression of Napier, Byron did recognise Napier as an able soldier. In a letter to the London Greek Committee, Byron said of Napier that «a better or a braver man is not easily found». «He is», wrote Byron, «our man to lead a regular force, or to organise a national one for the Greeks. Ask the army! ask anyone!»³ By January 1824, Byron had persuaded Colonel Napier to sail for London for an interview with the Greek Committee⁴.

When Napier arrived in London, he encountered official opposition. Under the statutes of the Foreign Enlistment Act, no British subject could join the forces of a foreign state, and Lords Canning (Foreign Minister) and Bathurst (Colonial Minister) could not be persuaded to waive the statute for Napier⁵. To justify his position, Napier wrote to Lord Bathurst, stating: «if . . . your lordship's colleagues doubt my conduct, or wish for my place

Press, 1969, pp. 230-238, 245-246; and W. P. Kaldis, *John Capodistria and the Modern Greek State*, Madison, Wis., State Historical Society, 1963, pp. 10-11.

1. Maitland to Bathurst, Corfu, 28 February 1822, PRO/CO 136/20. Cf. also Philip James Green, *Sketches of the War in Greece*, London, Thomas Hurstand, 1827, pp.vii-viii.

2. Maitland to Bathurst, Corfu, 1 March 1822, PRO/CO 136/20.

3. Byron to Greek Committee, Cephalonia, 10 December 1823. Quoted in William Napier Bruce, *Life of General Sir Charles Napier*, London, John Murray, 1885, pp. 94-95.

4. W. Napier, *Life*, I, pp. 335-338. Byron also advised Napier to restrain any signs of crusading, because the Colonel's «ardour appeared to mislead his judgment». Quoted in George Finlay, *A History of Greece*, ed. by H.F. Trozer, 7 vols, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1877, VI, p. 325. Byron spent four months on Cephalonia, while Sir Frederick officiated for Sir Thomas. Sir Frederick pressed Napier for information on Byron: «Let me know what Lord Byron's instructions are —and what he is about». Adam to Napier, Corfu, 11 September 1823, PRO/CO 136/1309. Napier did not respond and Sir Frederick sent another despatch: «You don't tell me a word of Lord Byron or what his intentions are». Adam to Napier, Corfu, 12 October 1823, PRO/CO 136/1309. Again, Napier did not respond.

5. Napier had written: «Neutrality does not bother me». Quoted in W. Napier, *Life*, I, pp. 374-375. The Rt. Hon. Robert Peel stated that «it was perfectly fair that his majesty should have the power of preventing the enlistment of British officers in the service of foreign states . . .» Great Britain, *Hansard's Parliamentary Debates*, 2nd ser., Vol. XIII (1825), 1475.

to give a better man . . . let them use their acknowledged power to employ men they think best calculated for the King's service»¹. In 1824, Napier faced a dilemma: resign his commission and citizenship in order to fight for Greece, or refrain from such activity. By 1825, however, the course was determined: the bondholders of the Greek Committee, despite Byron's recommendation, refused Napier's services². Napier was naturally disappointed, but he went on to write a new tract: *Greece in 1824* (London, James Ridgway, 1824)³.

Colonel Napier received little opposition from Sir Thomas, since the Lord High Commissioner was often too concerned with the administration of Malta and the reforming of the Septinsular Republic's archaic institutions. W. F. Lord comments that Sir Thomas was not uneasy with Napier's interest in the Greek Revolution, and that Napier «was at liberty to ruin himself for the Greeks, if he chose»⁴.

Despite Sir Thomas's casual attitude, the outward signs of Colonel Napier's dissent became conspicuous to a contemporary observer. Early in 1823, Julius van Millingen (Lord Byron's physician) remarked that of all the British administrators in the Ionian Islands, only Colonel Napier refused to participate in the «rancour and animosity» shown to the Greeks⁵. Van Millingen, however, failed to mention that Sir Thomas had proclaimed the neutrality of the Ionian Islands soon after the initiation of the Greek Revolution. According to Sir Thomas, all Residents were not to receive any Greek corsairs, nor to engage in the insurrection⁶. This was Sir Thomas' method to assure the Ottoman Turks that the British in the Ionian Isles would not

1. Quoted in W. Napier, *Life*, I, pp. 342-343; and William F. Butler, *Sir Charles Napier*, London, MacMillan, 1890, p. 69.

2. Napier appeared as the best hope for the Greek Committee. Cf. Napier, *War in Greece*, pp. 12-30; and Dakin, *Philhellenes*, p. 113.

3. Cf. W. Napier, *Life*, I, p. 340.

4. Lord, *Maitland*, passim. Napier, a nephew of Charles James Fox, had been appointed as Resident as a conciliatory measure with regard to Capodistria. Cf. Dakin, *Philhellenes*, pp. 46-48; and Woodhouse, *Capodistria*, p. 145.

5. Julius van Millingen, *Memoirs of the Affairs of Greece*, London, John Rodwell, 1831, pp. 38-39. Sir Thomas made both favourable and unfavourable impressions. Accounts which applauded Sir Thomas were: H.W. Williams, *Travels in Italy, Greece, and the Ionian Islands*, 2 vols, Edinburgh, Archibald Constable, 1820, II, p. 156; William Parry, *The Last Days of Lord Byron*, London, Knight and Lacey, 1825, pp. 35-36; and George Waddington, *A Visit to Greece in 1823 and 1824*, London, John Murray, 1825, p. 206. A rather critical account is Henry Lytton Bulwer, *An Autumn in Greece*, London, Ebers, 1826, p. 52.

6. Maitland to Goulburn, Corfu, 25 October 1821, PRO/CO 136/20. Cf. also Proclamation, Malta, 29 October 1821, no. 432, 40e, in PRO/CO 136/20; and *Malta Government Gazette*, 29 May and 27 June 1821, in PRO/CO 136/20.

involve themselves in the mainland hostilities¹.

Colonel Napier's real nemesis proved to be Sir Frederick Adam. As Maitland's successor², Sir Frederick (1824-1832) inherited the problems of Ionian administration; not a very attractive post. Meanwhile, the Greek insurgents were gaining success and infringements upon Ionian neutrality were frequent.

Sir Frederick had a long and distinguished career as a soldier; however, like his predecessor, Sir Frederick had experienced a legal dispute in the past. This incident occurred during the Napoleonic Wars, when Thomas Moore (a merchant) claimed personal and commercial loss against Sir Frederick in Alicante, Spain. Moore won the suit on the point of personal assault, but lost on the matter of commercial compensation³.

Also like his predecessor, Sir Frederick possessed no philhellenic sentiments. According to Sir Frederick's biographer, all British colonial administrators, diplomats and military officers in the Near East preferred the Ottomans and despised the Greeks. «The spirit of Philhellenism», wrote Alfred von Reumont, «has been only shared by independent noblemen, poets, and men addicted to classical studies»⁴. Sir Frederick was aware of these anti-Hellenic currents and could not change matters, even if he had such inclinations. In a speech to the Ionian Assembly, Sir Frederick condemned the mainland Greeks for perpetrating violations of Ionian neutrality (also British neutrality) and obstructing the commerce of the Seven Isles. Sir Frederick

1. For Ionian volunteers in the Revolution, cf. Domna N. Dontas, *The Last Phase of the War of Independence in Western Greece*, Thessaloniki, Institute for Balkan Studies, 1966, p. 19; C. W. Crawley, *The Question of Greek Independence*, Cambridge, University Press, 1930, p. 21; and Douglas Dakin, *British Intelligence of Events in Greece, 1824-1827*, Athens, Myrtides, 1959, pp. 5-15, 69-71.

2. Napier may have felt discouraged when Sir Frederick was appointed Lord High Commissioner. (Perhaps Napier coveted the post himself!) With his discouragement, Napier foreshadowed his eventual recall. In an account of his civil works projects on Cephalonia, Napier wrote that his purpose in writing was to describe and enlighten, so that «should any circumstance remove unexpectedly from the government of Cefalonia, my successors may pursue the same course . . .» Charles James Napier, *Memoir on the Roads of Cefalonia*, London, James Ridgway, 1825, p. iii. Colonel Napier went on to write that Sir Frederick showed «great activity, united with a thorough knowledge of the resources and wants of all the islands . . .» *Ibid.*, p. 47.

3. An appeal by Moore failed, and Sir Frederick was forced to pay £500 in personal damages. Cf. *Moore vs Adam: Proceedings in a Case tried in the Court of King's Bench, December 21, 1815*, London, R. and S. Kirby, 1816, pp. 24-44, 99-216. Cf. also Bulwer, *Autumn*, p. 114.

4. Alfred von Reumont, *Sir Frederick Adam: A Sketch of Modern Times*, London, by the Author, Lincoln's Inn, 1855, p. 41.

criticised the Ionian legislators for their cautious manner concerning such incidents and threatened all Greeks with the intervention of the Royal Navy¹.

Despite his threats, however, Sir Frederick tried to halt the mainland hostilities. During the siege of Missolonghi (April 1826), Sir Frederick attempted to mediate a truce between the Ottoman and Greek forces, but Ibrahim Pasha refused to accept Sir Frederick's offer and the Greeks followed suit². One month later, Sir Frederick held a conversation with John Capodistria. In response to Capodistria's enquires about Ionian neutrality and the frequent Ottoman violations, Sir Frederick stated: «I am bound by strict neutrality». Capodistria retorted: «What about Nelson at Copenhagen?»³. Such experiences produced disillusionment, and Sir Frederick did not forget these incidents⁴.

Ionian neutrality, first declared by Sir Thomas, was reasserted by Sir Frederick. The Treaty of London (6 July 1827) defined British, French and Russian policy towards the Greek Revolution by imposing a truce —with force, if necessary— upon the Greeks and Ottomans⁵. Intransigence and ambiguous instructions on the part of both the three powers and the Porte resulted in the naval battle at Navarino (20 October 1827), thus placing Ionian neutrality in an embarrassing light⁶. In a dispatch to Napier, Sir Frederick reaffirmed Ionian neutrality and ordered Napier to deny clearance to all Ionian ships that intended to embark for Ottoman ports in the Morea⁷.

Ionian neutrality was a major concern of Sir Frederick; however, this

1. Adam to Ionian Assembly, Corfu, March 1825, PRO/CO 136/28; Adam to Horton, Corfu, 15 April 1824, PRO/CO 136/26; and Adam to Strangford, Corfu, 5 August 1822, PRO/CO 136/20.

2. Cf. Finlay, *Greece*, VI, pp. 388-389.

3. Quoted in C. W. Crawley, *John Capodistria: Some Unpublished Documents*, Thessaloniki, Institute for Balkan Studies, 1970, p. 81.

4. Sir Frederick later refused Capodistria's request to visit his family on Corfu (February 1828). Cf. Woodhouse, *Capodistria*, pp. 334, 342.

5. For the Anglo-Russian Protocol (4 April 1826), cf. M. S. Anderson, *The Great Powers and the Near East, 1774-1923*, New York, St. Martin's Press, 1970, pp. 32-33; and M. S. Anderson, *The Eastern Question, 1774-1923*, New York, St. Martin's Press, 1968, pp. 66-67.

6. Sir Frederick was the first to congratulate Admiral Codrington on the victory, but he refused to seize any Ottoman held islands. Cf. C. M. Woodhouse, *The Battle of Navarino*, London, Dufour, 1965, pp. 72-141, 154; and Georges Douin, *Navarin*, Cairo, L'Institut d'Archeologie Orientale, 1927, pp. 88, 192-193, 283-312. Just previous to Navarino, Napier wrote «Memorandum on Military Operations in the Morea against Ibrahim Pasha in 1826», in Finlay, *Greece*, VII, pp. 340-342.

7. Circular no. 113, Corfu, 5 May 1828, PRO/CO 136/1274. Cf. also Circular no. 107, Corfu, 4 April 1828 and Letter of 23 November 1828, both in PRO/CO 136/1274.

concern only generated more responsibility for the Island Residents. Within the Greek Provisional government were some former Cephaloniotēs, and Sir Frederick requested Napier to procure information on these *heterochtons*. Furthermore, Napier was instructed to secure these facts (there were nine questions) «without any publicity or direct application»¹. Napier had experience in clandestine missions; however, by 1829 —with the conclusion of the Greek Revolution— Napier was more concerned with road construction, rather than obtaining information about former Cephaloniotēs.

Once again, Colonel Napier's dissent and his military ability was noticeable to a contemporary observer. In January, 1828, the American philhellene, Colonel Jonathan Peckham Miller, docked at Cephalonia and was quarantined by Napier. After the normal twenty-five days isolation, Miller met Napier (February 21) and later remarked that Napier «appeared to be a man of good sense and much discernment . . .»². Eleven days later, Miller read Napier's *War in Greece* and *Greece in 1824*, thus stating that «it is to be regretted that a man like Col. Napier should not have sufficient encouragement . . . to . . . assume the chief command in Greece, which has heretofore been held by ignorant Palikars or conceited coxcombs ever since the commencement of the revolution»³. Perhaps Napier's dissent was now transformed, as interpreted by Colonel Miller, into frustration.

With the passing of Napier's dissent on the Greek Revolution, the dissension between Sir Frederick and Colonel Napier occurred over the domestic administration of Cephalonia⁴. Colonel Napier was entrusted with road construction on Cephalonia, and apart from the natural obstacles, the main difficulty was forcing the Cephaloniotēs to assist in the construction. Napier instituted the dreaded *corvée* thus remarking that no one, except paupers,

1. Adam to Napier, Corfu, 26 July 1829, Private and Confidential, PRO/CO 136/1275. Cf. Letters of 2 June 1829 and 21 January 1830 in PRO/CO 136/1275.

2. J. P. Miller, *The Condition of Greece in 1827 and 1828*, New York, J. and J. Harper, 1828, p. 183. Cf. Bulwer, *Autumn*, p. 49.

3. *Ibid.*, pp. 186-187. Colonel Miller also met Sir Frederick who left no impression upon the American philhellene. *Ibid.*, p. 189. Cf. also Myrtle Cline, *American Attitude toward the Greek War of Independence, 1821-1828*, Atlanta, Higgins-McArthur, 1930, pp. 19-208; and Stephen Larrabee, *Hellas Observed*, New York, Columbia University Press, 1957, pp. 6-52.

4. In 1827, Sir Frederick ordered Napier to reduce the expenditure concerning Cephalonian administration. In the last paragraph of the despatch, Sir Frederick wrote: «I expect on your part not only the fullest participation in my views, but that you will understand I expect your information will be given on the principle of the most entire and unreserved candour, and that your Statement will be upon honour one between Man and Man, never thinking of providing for the individual . . .» Adam to Napier, Corfu, 11 December 1827, PRO/CO 136/1273.

were exempt: «nobles, priests, peasants, all work or pay according to their means»¹. According to Napier, the price of labour and food was so extraordinary, that the *corvée* was equally distributed among all classes of Cephalonian society. Napier estimated that if the *corvée* were rigorously enforced, the road construction would only require four years labour; however, he lamented, this was not always so, and no less than eight years would likely be required².

Eventually, Sir Frederick's disapproval of Napier's methods reached Cephalonia. Napier's use of the *corvée*, which affected all Cephaloniotes, angered the nobility and they complained to Sir Frederick about Napier's methods. A memo to Napier was despatched, directing the Resident to ease his expectations and to delay the rate of road construction³. To Napier, such instructions were repugnant: why should he postpone progress to appease an indulgent population —especially that of the Cephaloniote nobility? Colonel Napier, after all, was chosen for his firmness in dealing with arrogant and intriguing opportunists; the Ionian nobility was infamous for its duplicity⁴. Sir Frederick instructed Napier to ease the *corvée* system and proceed with road construction on a «modest scale»⁵.

Sir Frederick felt that Napier's methods, especially the *corvée*, alienated all classes of Cephaloniote society. «There is nothing more galling to the peasantry», wrote Sir Frederick, «than the forced labour . . . not only because it is of itself the most irksome of all obligations but also from the impossibility of the pressure falling in fair proportion upon the several Classes . . .». The Lord High Commissioner continued with: «There is nothing more vexatious to the Landholders than the Road Contribution because they are obliged to declare to the municipality their Incomes, and because they consider contributions as a land Tax . . . and lastly because it is a direct one»⁶. Napier's system, where all either worked or paid rates, was not —according to Sir Frederick—bureaucratically expedient; too many complaints from the Cephaloniotes had been received at Corfu, thus reflecting upon Sir Frederick's administration. Sir Frederick suggested moderation in road construction, and a relaxation of the *corvée* amendments⁷. Moderation and relaxation, however, were not inherent characteristics for Colonel Charles James Napier.

1. Napier, *Memoir*, p. 26.

2. *Ibid.*

3. Rudsdell to Napier, Corfu, 28 December 1829, PRO/CO 136/1275.

4. Cf. Lord, *Maitland*, p. 238.

5. Rudsdell to Napier, Corfu, 28 December 1829, PRO/CO 136/1275.

6. Adam to Napier, Corfu, 28 December 1829, PRO/CO 136/1275.

7. *Ibid.* Cf. Napier, *Memoir*, p. 26.

To increase the dissension, Napier was finally ordered to gather statistics and to report on the expenditure of administering Cephallonia¹. As illustrated in his earlier tracts and memoirs, Napier was very thorough in gathering statistics; however, in 1829, Napier was rather slow in executing Sir Frederick's orders. A dispatch was sent to Napier, reminding him of earlier orders and stating that the «public Service has been much impeded in consequence of the delay in their transmission»². Napier, concerned with personal problems and the conclusion of the Revolution, gave little thought to any delays and prepared to embark for England³.

Since his wife was considerably ill, Napier accompanied her on a ship for England (February 1830). Napier's first stop was Corfu where Sir Frederick told the Colonel: «Good bye, Napier. Stay as long as you please, but remember that the longer you stay the worse for us»⁴. With Napier's absence, however, Sir Frederick underwent a radical change of sentiment. Road construction on Cephallonia was ordered to halt, and four months later, — after a religious disturbance — Sir Frederick seized Napier's public papers and filed seventy charges with the Colonial Office against Napier⁵.

Sir Frederick only pressed charges and recalled Napier when the Resident was in England⁶. The Lord High Commissioner reduced the number of charges to nineteen which were, at the time, kept secret⁷. Colonel Napier had no cognizance of the charges, and instead, wrote to Sir Frederick — upon the Lord High Commissioner's arrival in London — asking him to clarify matters, especially those which occurred on Cephallonia. Sir Frederick's response was quick, but not conciliatory. Lieutenant Rudsdell, Sir Frederick's secretary, replied that the Lord High Commissioner did not feel obligated to account for his conduct on Cephallonia: what occurred there was Sir Frederick's concern⁸. Napier next wrote to Lord Goderich, Secretary of State for War and Colonies (1830-1833), where Napier expressed his displeasure at Sir Frederick's actions.

1. Circular no. 137, 21 September 1829 and Circular no. 141, 9 January 1830, both in PRO/CO 136/1275.

2. Rudsdell to Napier, Corfu, 8 February 1830, PRO/CO 136/1275.

3. Napier's civil works projects were continued by others: Cf. Report of W. Worsley, in PRO/CO 136/1275.

4. Quoted in W. Napier, *Life*, I, p. 428.

5. *Ibid.* Cf. Bruce, *Napier*, p. 108.

6. Rudsdell to Napier, Corfu, 20 December 1830, PRO/CO 136/1276.

7. Charles James Napier, *The Colonies: Treating of their Value Generally - Of the Ionian Islands in Particular*, London, Thomas and William Boone, 1833, pp. 397-414.

8. Napier to Adam, London, 20 September 1831, and Rudsdell to Napier, London, 28 September 1831, in Napier, *Colonies*, pp. 383-384.

«I am», wrote Napier, «an old colonel in the service. I filled one of the highest offices in the Ionian Islands for many years; an office which I . . . had been ordered to assume by Sir Thomas Maitland». Napier then stated that his recall was punishment «unjustly inflicted, not only in my absence and without being heard in my own defence, but without my having the most distant idea of what I was accused, by whom I was accused, or that I was accused at all!» Napier concluded by demanding to be reinstated to his former post at Cephalonia¹. In the meantime, Sir Frederick was received by King William IV and this prompted Napier to address further letters to Lord Goderich (9 and 11 December 1831), both of which failed to generate any interest².

Napier's next resort was to publish his grievances, which he did in the study: *The Colonies: Treating of their Value Generally — Of the Ionian Islands in Particular* (London, Thomas and William Boone, 1833). Without actually knowing the specific charges brought against him, Napier surmised the offences. Among other charges, specific offences included: insubordination, sedition, arbitrary conduct and administration, disrupting morale, incompetence, aiding clandestine agents, and abusing the Orthodox clergy. Napier's justification to these charges were all punctilious: insubordination was frustration at having no chance to explain his actions; sedition was only a verbal disapproval of King William's accession; arbitrary conduct was the only effective method of administration in Cephalonia; disruptive morale was already inherent in the Cephalonians; the charge of incompetence was a falsehood; there were no clandestine agents —all were administrative personnel; and the Orthodox clergy were within the limits of the *corvée*— they paid rather than worked³. Napier's rebuttal to Sir Frederick's charges were the expected answers; however, both the charges and answers (in fact, recriminations) were far from precise. That Napier was guilty of insubordination is quite correct, but the verity of the other charges and Napier's justification are far more difficult to ascertain.

Apart from the charges, Colonel Napier placed some emphasis on a speech that Sir Frederick delivered on Cephalonia. According to Napier, this speech included some of Sir Frederick's charges, as well as some criticisms that Sir Frederick used against Napier. In his book: *The Colonies . . .*, Napier conveniently excluded a copy of this speech —if such a speech exist-

1. Napier to Goderich, London, 30 September 1831. *Ibid.*, p. 385 ff.

2. *Ibid.*, pp. 387-388. Napier had visited the Colonial Office on 11 December 1831, but was not received by Lord Goderich. Cf. also Letter of 4 July 1832. *Ibid.*, p. 454.

3. *Ibid.*, pp. 397-414.

ed!— and substituted a second speech which Sir Frederick delivered to the Cephalonioties in the autumn of 1830. In this particular speech, Sir Frederick only alluded to Colonel Napier in the concluding paragraph:

«I have the highest esteem and affection for Colonel Napier, and have the honour of being a friend of his; and perhaps my feelings of friendship have induced me to think too favourably of some of his measures, but I certainly feel, and every one must see, that if the good which he has rendered to Cephallonia was put in the balance against the evils, the good would indefinitely, most indefinitely, over-balance them»¹.

As indicated above, there was very little in Sir Frederick's speech that was either harmful or derogatory to Colonel Napier. According to Napier, Sir Frederick delivered an earlier speech on Cephallonia, but this speech is not extant, while the second speech is rather unharmed. It appears also that Sir Frederick pressed his formal charges against Napier when both men were in England, and perhaps the damaging speech which Sir Frederick is alleged to have delivered really took place in London. In spite of the speculation, Colonel Napier made very little effort to relate the events in a concise manner. Napier could only write that «Multiplied mediocrity had beaten individual genius»².

The question of fault in the dissension between Colonel Napier and the Lords High Commissioners has been related by biographers and historians; however, their pronouncements cannot be fully related here³. It should be noted that Colonel Napier himself considered Sir Thomas as an able soldier

1. No. 57, «Report of Sir F. Adam's second Address, delivered in the Autumn of 1830, to the Cephallonian Gentlemen». *Ibid.*, p. 573.

2. Quoted in Butler, *Napier*, p. 74. The years 1828 to 1832 were a burden for Sir Frederick and he soon resigned after Capodistria's assassination. Cf. von Reumont, *Adam*, pp. 41-44; and John A. Petropoulos, *Politics and Statecraft in the Kingdom of Greece, 1833-1843*, Princeton, University Press, 1968, pp. 107-150.

3. On the dissension, cf. W. Napier, *Life*, I, pp. 424-436; Bruce, *Napier*, p. 108; Butler, *Napier*, p. 74; T. R. E. Holmes, *Sir Charles Napier*, Cambridge, University Press, 1925, p. 20; R. Lawrence, *Charles Napier: Friend and Fighter, 1782-1853*, London, John Murray, 1952, p. 66; and Priscilla Napier, *The Sword Dance*, London, Michael Joseph, 1971, pp. 369-370. Cf. also Dora d'Istria, «Les Iles Ioniennes sous la domination de Venise et sous le protectorat britannique», *Revue des deux mondes* XVI (15 July 1858), 408-411; Stefanos Xenos, *East and West*, London, Trübner and Co., 1865, p. 27; An Ionian, *The Ionian Islands: What They Have Lost and Suffered . . .*, London, James Ridgway, 1851, pp. 46-47; and Anon., *The Ionian Islands Under British Protection*, London, James Ridgway, 1851, pp. 136-137.

and a strong administrator¹, whereas Napier labelled Sir Frederick as an imitator and a mediocre administrator². In the survey of pronouncements, Viscount Kirkwall has suggested that Colonel Napier was ill-suited for a post that demanded submission to authority;³ however, such reasoning is merely sympathetic.

Instead, the conclusions reached by Professor Dakin and William St. Clair are, though cynical, far more observant. Although both scholars have overlooked the dissension, they have interpreted Napier's moves as a deliberate attempt to ingratiate himself with the Greek insurgents. As a soldier and a veteran of the Napoleonic Wars, Napier was accustomed to sanguinary commands, and he viewed the Revolution as a chance to gain both glory and destiny⁴. Napier's plans were, however, too calculated and selfish: his persistent efforts to obtain a command failed where many philhellenes with lesser abilities and romantic inspirations succeeded. In his disillusionment, Napier neglected his civil responsibilities and interpreted his superiors' orders with rancour and fears of a threat to his Residency on Cephalonia⁵.

1. Napier wrote that Sir Thomas «was a rock; a rock on which you might be saved, or dashed to pieces; but always a rock», Napier, *Colonies*, p. ix.

2. Napier speculated that Sir Frederick, had he possessed any wit, would have suited the ladies of the Court of King Charles II! Napier, *ibid.*, pp. 70-77.

3. Cf. George William Hamilton Fitzmaurice (Viscount Kirkwall), *Four Years in the Ionian Islands*, 2 vols, London, Chapman and Hall, 1864, I, pp. 114-117.

4. Dakin, *Philhellenes*, p. 116. «Greece was fortunate to escape him». William St. Clair, *That Greece Might Still Be Free*, London, Oxford University Press, 1972, pp. 302-303.

5. Colonel Napier acquired his glory in the Scinde campaigns. Cf. W. Napier, *Life*, II-IV, *passim*; and Byron Farwell, *Queen Victoria's Little Wars*, New York, Harper and Row, 1972, pp. 23-36.