Missing or lost, last Sunday night,
A Waterloo coin, wheron was trac’d
Th’ inscription, ‘Courage!’ in letters bright,
Though a little by rust of years defac’d.

The metal thereof is rough and hard,
And (tis thought of late) mix’d up with brass;
But it bears the stamp of Fame’s award,
And through all Posterity’s hands will pass.

How it was lost God only knows,
But certain City thieves they say,
Broke in on the owner’s evening doze,
And filch’d this ‘gift of gods’ away!!

In light of Jeffrey Vail’s assessment that the Irish poet Thomas Moore “shaped international perceptions of an entire culture for a generation,” one would expect Moore’s response to the Battle of Waterloo to
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have carried significant weight. Curiously, however, such a response seems to be absent in his oeuvre. With the exception of a handful of scattered references, the unassumingly titled “Advertisement” (1803) that serves as epigraph of the present essay is his most notable explicit engagement with this landmark event in European history. It is, by all standards, a markedly muted response. The central conceit of this six-stanza poem, the search for a lost coin, is all too banal for an event that many of his contemporaries saw as heralding a new era. Just as critics of Beethoven’s music point to the “Rage Over a Lost Penny” (“Die Wut über den verlorenen Groschen, ausgetobt in einer Caprice,” op. 129) as the banausic counterpart to his more transcendent compositions, so Moore’s humorous poem stands in stark contrast to the overwhelming or even sublime feelings articulated in the poems of Lord Byron and William Wordsworth, as well as the more sentimental and serious spirit captured by Walter Scott and Robert Southey. Even as Moore’s poem recognizes the importance of the Battle of Waterloo, it reduces its significance to a memorial coin, which is not only debased and defaced, but missing or lost as well—hardly a cenotaph. As such, the tone of this little caprice is one of belatedness; it is a reflection on the legacy of the Battle of Waterloo, rather than the Battle itself.

Moore may have skirted the Battle of Waterloo in his writings, but he did write two popular poems about the diplomatic aftermath of this military event: The Fudge Family in Paris (1818) and Tom Crib’s Memorial to Congress (1819). These two satires examine how in the months and years following Waterloo many disputes between European nations were resolved at a number of diplomatic summits, among which the Congress of Vienna was the first and the most important. Even if sabers occasionally rattled, after Waterloo the Powers settled their affairs at these gatherings through negotiation rather than military prowess, thus ushering in a period


3. The diptychs “Before the Battle” and “After the Battle” in Moore’s Irish Melodies (1808–1834) might present a more serious reflection (Poetical Works, 192–93). However, given the Irish poems alongside of which it appeared, and given the fact that it “has no historical footnotes or references that would locate this military defeat of freedom in the distant past, Moore tacitly invites his readers and hearers to interpret this as a song about the Uprising of 1798, and it is certainly hard not to” (Vail, “Thomas Moore: After the Battle,” 312).


5. The title of Moore’s Fables for the Holy Alliance (1823) suggests that these poems have a diplomatic undertone as well. However, this is only the case for the first fable, “The Dissolution of the Holy Alliance”; the core of the collection focuses on national concerns. See Moore, Poetical Works, 493–505.
of European peace that would last until the Crimean War in the 1850s. This article posits that this new system fired Moore's imagination for two reasons. On the one hand, he recognized that the Congress of Vienna may have seemed a restoration of the ancien régime (which it to a certain extent certainly was), but in fact it also marked the beginning of a wholly new way of conducting foreign policy. On the other hand, his experience of life in Ireland—a part of the British Isles that was more prone to rebellion than the metropolis—meant that Moore was aware of a contradiction in foreign policy: while on an international level these decades were relatively peaceful, on a domestic level they were marked by upheaval and revolution.

Since the Treaty of Utrecht (1713), thinking about international relations had been dominated by a particular interpretation of the idea of a balance of power. This was essentially a bellicist interpretation, resting on the notion, most famously encapsulated by Thomas Hobbes, that the state of nature is essentially one of war: as long as one military bloc was kept from becoming powerful enough to dominate all others, then there would be no chance of conflicts escalating into war. This idea did not disappear after the Congress of Vienna. Carl von Clausewitz, writing in the wake of the Napoleonic wars, unpacks it in chapter six of book six in On War (Vom Kriege, 1832), but summarizes its implications more famously in the aphorism that "war is merely the continuation of policy by other means."  


Prior to Clausewitz, Enlightenment thinkers such as Jean-Jacques Rousseau and Immanuel Kant had sought to refute Hobbes’s conclusions, and instead advanced a notion of perpetual peace. This pacifist ideal was one of the constitutive principles behind the creation of the Holy Alliance, which was a multilateral compact that aimed to replace the hegemonic idea of a balance of power with what Stella Ghervas has called a balance of negotiation. Although the mystical and authoritarian overtones of the Holy Alliance initially stopped the British from joining this collective, the British did take an active part. This mechanism has become known as the Congress System, “a cycle of regular, multilateral conferences that took place between 1815 and 1822 in a number of European cities.”


into its true light, and giving to the great powers the efficiency and almost the simplicity of a single state.”

Beatrice de Graaf has recently suggested that popular sentiment had cleared the ground for this endeavor. Literary intellectuals, in particular, fostered a longing for peace, tranquility, and order, emotions that they “translated into political metaphors.” Poems and novels were, in her view, of a piece with other commemorative events such as mass gatherings, troop inspections, and memorial days, which all served to instill a reasonable desire for peace. Walter Scott, for instance, who was a close friend of Castlereagh, spent a considerable amount of time conversing with him in Paris in 1815. This led the essayist Charles Lamb to joke that he had tricked a friend into believing that Castlereagh was the author of *Waverley* (1814), thus prompting much mirth among London’s liberal elite. This joke has in fact two layers. At first sight it seems to derive its force from the outlandish suggestion that Castlereagh would have been capable of such a feat of the imagination; Castlereagh was often portrayed as an intellectual nobody, and Moore lampooned him as a “malaprop Cicero,” even though he had in fact read widely in Enlightenment authors. At the same time, this anecdote suggests continuity between Castlereagh’s ideas and Scott’s art—that *Waverley* was a vehicle for Castlereagh’s policy. It is this second layer to which de Graaf wants to draw our attention. The plot of *Waverley*, she argues, helps us “understand the notion of the balance of power as an emotional metaphor” rather than “a reactionary political idea.”

Edward Waverley is torn between his love for the quiet and demure Rose and the passionate Flora; his love for the former wins out, which mirrors his abandonment of the Scottish rebellion, but also echoes a more general yearning for stability and security. It is on this level that de Graaf sees the novel as contributing to a “process of conference diplomacy that bestowed new meaning and legitimacy (of a procedural, substantial and perceived kind) onto the balance of power reasoning.” A poem such as Scott’s “The Field of Waterloo” (1815) participates in this discourse, as its concluding stanza illustrates:


Yet, 'mid the confidence of just renown,
Renown dear-bought, but dearest thus acquired,
Write, Britain, write the moral lesson down:
'Tis not alone the heart with valour fired,
The discipline so dreaded and admired,
In many a field of bloody conquest known;
—Such may by fame be lured, by gold be hired—
'Tis constancy in the good cause alone,
Best justifies the meed thy valiant sons have won.15

The way in which other poets and novelists might have contributed to
this discourse falls outside the scope of de Graaf's argument. Given that
Thomas Moore was often seen as a counterweight to Scott, as an 1827 cari-
cature of the two of them sitting in a pair of scales illustrates, it is worth
considering his works in this context.16 Scott's sparring partner in writing
the stanza above was not Moore, of course, but Lord Byron. His decision
to use the Spenserian stanza, building up to the decidedly unexciting call
for "constancy," was part of a wider response to Child Harold's Pilgrimage
(1812-1818), in which Byron had revitalized the stanza to very different ef-
fect.17 In the third canto of this work (1816), Byron famously refuses to
celebrate the Allied victory on the field of "fateful Waterloo," not deign-
ing even to mention the Duke of Wellington and casting Napoleon
Buonaparte as a tragic hero.18 Curiously, the narrator of Byron's poem does
not dwell on the way in which this "king-making victory"19 was ratified at
the Congress of Vienna, with the exception of stanza ninety-seven in the
fourth canto (1818):

But France got drunk with blood to vomit crime,
And fate have her Saturnalia been
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To Freedom's cause, in every age and clime;
Because the deadly days which we have seen,
And vile Ambition, that built up between
Man and his hopes an adamantine wall,
And the base pageant last upon the scene,
Are grown the pretext for the eternal thrall
Which nips life's tree, and dooms man's worst—his second fall. 20

As one of Byron's closest friends and later his biographer, it is not surprising that Thomas Moore expands on the ideas in this stanza. Even so, his misgivings about the Congress of Vienna are not a perfect copy of Byron's outright denunciation. Moore's position is a complex one, partly because of his Irish background, as I suggested, but also because he is willing to use the language of the new security culture even as he makes it the subject of critique. His poems are diplomatic not just in the sense that their subject is peace rather than war, which is significant in itself, but also in the sense that they negotiate between different perspectives. As such, Moore's poems occupy a middle ground within writing about Waterloo: they may be profitably situated between, on the one hand, Scott's effusions and the European policy that these subtended, and, on the other, Byron's polemical productions and the turn away from his home nation.

The Irish perspective from which Moore interpreted the Congress of Vienna is quite apparent in The Fudge Family in Paris. This satire in verse consists of letters written by four different characters: Phil Fudge, one of Castlereagh's former secret agents in Ireland, now operating on a European level; his daughter Biddy, who is hunting for a husband; his son Bob, who is obsessed with the culinary delights of Paris; and their tutor Phelim Connor, who seems to harbor revolutionary principles and whose censored voice critics often take to be Moore's own (Moore had, after all, sympathized with the 1798 Rebellion). 21 Biddy Fudge writes in anapestic tetrameter (with an iambic substitution of the first foot), a meter with comic overtones, which suits her sense of the theatrical; so too does Bob Fudge, though with much more irregularity, probably occasioned by his all too

21. Ronan Kelly, Bard of Erin: The Life of Thomas Moore (Dublin: Penguin Ireland, 2008), 47–66. In the years leading up to the Irish rebellion, Viscount Castlereagh was instrumental in arresting several leaders of the United Irishmen. When the rebellion broke out, in 1798, he was appointed acting chief secretary, in which capacity he introduced severe security measures, including torture, even though he frequently displayed leniency and fairness. After the rebellion had been put down, he oversaw the passing of the Act of Union, which resolved a number of issues, but which would eventually prove to be a new source of discontent.
frequent wining and dining. In his correspondence with Castlereagh and other friends, Phil Fudge writes in chatty iambic tetrameters, which convey intimacy and confidence. Phelim Connor, finally, couches his anger and resentment in stately iambic pentameters.

The letters of Phelim Connor reprise the liberal critique of the efforts of Wellington and Castlereagh that we find in the works of, among others, Byron and Percy Shelley. Phelim Connor seems to repeat Byron's lament on the Austrian annexation of Venice in the following extract:

Pure Austria too—whose hist'ry nought repeats
But broken leagues and subsidiz'd defeats;
Whose faith, as Prince, extinguish'd Venice shows,
Whose faith, as man, a widow's daughter knows?22

However, Connor also takes aim at Castlereagh's Irishness. Addressing Europe, Moore's character writes that

'twas an Irish head, an Irish heart,
Made thee the fall'n and tarnish'd thing thou art;
That, as the Centaur gave th'infected vest
In which he died, to rack his conqueror's breast,
We sent thee C——GH:—as heaps of dead
Have slain their slayers by the pest they spread,
So hath our land breath'd out—thy fame to dim,
Thy strength to waste, and rot thee, soul and limb—
Her worst infections all condens'd in him!23

Suggesting that Irish policy has infected Europe with a deadly disease, passages such as these irked Castlereagh. Moore and Castlereagh did not know one another personally, but they did have mutual connections, such as the Anglo-Irish diplomat Percy Smythe, Lord Strangeford, from whom Moore learnt that Castlereagh did not mind "the humorous & laughing things," but that the verses of the tutor were "quite another sort of thing" and "in very bad taste indeed." Moore took this as a compliment: "This I can easily believe."24 Connor even reverses the traditional allegory of the relation between Ireland and England as that of wife and husband.25 Because this Irish

23. Moore, Fudge, 33.
25. Ina Ferris, The Romantic National Tale and the Question of Ireland (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002); Mary Jean Corbett, Allegories of Union in Irish and English Writ-
authoritarian politician has trampled on the English ideal of liberty, England is ravished by Ireland:

And thou, oh England—who, though once as shy
As cloister'd maids, of shame or perfidy,
Art now broke in, and, thanks to C——gh,
In all that's worst and falsest lead'st the way! 26

Behind these sentiments lies the curious fact that the British participation in the Congress of Vienna was dominated by two Irish aristocrats, Wellington and Castlereagh. English liberals even used this as part of their rhetorical strategy. In the prologue to the Anglo-Irish writer Charles Maturin’s tragedy Bertram, for instance, John Hobhouse, one of Byron’s friends and better known as Lord Brougham, ironically praises Ireland for having produced Wellington:

Nor yet let British candour mock the toil
That rear’d the laurel on our sister soil;
That soil to Fancy’s gay luxuriance kind,
That soil which teems with each aspiring mind,
Rich in the fruits of glory’s ripening sun—
Nurse of the brave—the land of WELLINGTON. 27

These lines should be read ironically: the soil of Ireland was not exactly “teeming with each aspiring mind,” nor was Ireland, oppressed through colonial policies and famine, rich in the “fruits of glory’s ripening sun.” Statements such as Hobhouse’s put Irish nationalists such as Moore and his character in a double bind, however. Irish nationalists’ denunciation of the Congress was mingled with a sense of guilt, partly created by English liberals, that the British contribution to the Congress was a particularly Irish one. Moore’s poem can be read as an expression of this conundrum. Indeed, since the Irish had lost their status as a nation with the Act of Union, literature provided one of the few channels through which it could be expressed. Phelim Connor’s letters are thus as much concerned with the negative consequences of British foreign policy for small European states like Venice as with the perception that this policy was in a certain sense “Irish.” More generally, Phelim Connor’s words reveal a tension between the voices of liberalism and nationalism. Moore even suggests that the creation
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of this tension may in fact have been a deliberate strategy on the part of the statesmen at the Congress, who traded European peace for domestic strife.

The other parts of Moore’s poem present this paradox in more subtle ways. The Fudge family is, after all, a family of turncoats. In one of his own letters, Phil Fudge responds to his brother’s concern that his record is not clean: in 1791, the year of the French Revolution, he published a book called Down with Kings and he played “some few seditious tricks” in ’95 and ’96.28 Still, he says, “His Lordship likes me all the better.”29 His early views may have been abandoned, but they sometimes filter through. For instance, Phil Fudge describes Castlereagh’s reputation in Ireland with an ambiguous compliment:

Mid all the tributes to thy fame,
There’s one thou shouldst be chiefly pleas’d at—
That Ireland gives her snuff thy name,
And C—–GH’s the thing now sneez’d at.30

Bob Fudge’s letters, too, alert the reader to the fact that the peace created by the Congress was not mirrored on the home front. If his father’s letters are colored with diplomatic jargon, Bob’s are marked by the language of cuisine and fashion. Yet, Bob Fudge’s letters are not as innocuous as they seem. Not only do these letters provide a narrative elaboration of the common perception that the statesmen at the Congress of Vienna were carving up Europe, their talk of friand and bon-bons also reminds the reader of Byron’s charge that “fatal have her Saturnalia been / To Freedom’s cause, in every age and clime.” This darker subtext regularly shimmers through, as in the beginning of Bob Fudge’s first letter, with a particularly outrageous pun: “Talk of England—her fam’d Magna Charta, I swear, is / A humbug, a flim, to the Carte at old Very’s.”31 More relevant and subtle are Bob Fudge’s frequent allusions to executions:

I rise—put on neck-cloth—stiff, tight, as can be—
For a lad who goes into the world, Dick, like me,
Should have his neck tied up, you know—there’s no doubt of it—
Almost as tight as some lads who go out of it.32

Statements such as these only heighten the reader’s sense of Bob Fudge’s obtuseness. It is clearly bad taste, within the story-world of the poem, to al-

28. Moore, Fudge, 52.
29. Moore, Fudge, 52.
31. Moore, Fudge, 20. Located in the Palais-Royal, Very was one of the finest restaurants in Paris. It was one of the favorite haunts of Honoré de Balzac. In 1869, it was absorbed by Le Grand Véfour, which is still in business.
32. Moore, Fudge, 23.
lude to hanging in a post-revolutionary France, where the guillotine had become an institution. Bob puts a different spin on this further down in this letter, in his description of French fashion, which he dislikes:

The collar sticks out from the neck such a space,
That you'd swear 'twas the plan of this head-lopping nation,
To leave there behind them a snug little place
For the head to drop into, on decapitation.33

The contrast between his own clothes, tailored to suit hanging, and the French, designed for beheading, reveals his Irish background: during the 1798 Irish Rebellion rebels were commonly hanged, as traitors, rather than beheaded. Bob Fudge need not worry, of course, since he clearly has no truck with sedition; but his imagery bespeaks a fear and anxiety that not all is well in the individual states of Europe. At various points in the poem, indeed, Moore hints at the perceived continuity between Castlereagh’s approach to international politics and his management of Ireland as Lord Lieutenant, which, even if Castlereagh’s intentions were more noble than posterity has been willing to acknowledge, did not leave a trace in the collective memory as particularly mild: Castlereagh was instrumental in the suppression of the 1798 Irish rebellion and in the creation of the United Kingdom, making Ireland one of the constituent dominions of Great Britain.34

So whereas in Childe Harold Byron uses his narrator to criticize the outcome of the Congress of Vienna, in The Fudge Family in Paris Moore ventriloquizes through characters. Connor is joined by three other protagonists; his voice is one in a quartet. Yet, these three characters are all foolish and funny, and stand in a striking contrast with Phelim Connor’s deadly seriousness. This raises questions: if they are caricatures, why should Connor be different? A closer look at the poem as a whole in fact reveals a more sophisticated appreciation of the condition of Europe after the Congress of Vienna than Phelim Connor’s outright denunciation would suggest.

For one, it is significant that Moore opts for the form of an epistolary novel, a genre with ideological connotations. Lynn Hunt has argued that the “advance of the human rights paradigm was partly mediated through the rise of popular epistolary novels that ‘helped spread the practices of autonomy and empathy’”: those emotions that, according to de Graaf, anticipated and strengthened the new security culture.35 Moore has no truck with such attempts, however, and parodies this Rousseauist use of the epis-
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tolary novel. The narratives of his four characters all revolve around one form of deceit or another. This is already announced in the epigraph, by Castiglione, on the title page: “Le Leggi della Maschera richiedono che una persona mascherata non sia salutata per nome da uno che la conosce malgrado il suo travestimento.” This epigraph is ostensibly a reflection on the identity of the editor of these letters, Thomas Brown the Younger, one of Moore’s alter egos. In the conclusion of the preface this “editor” even faults Moore for pretending to be Brown in a scabrous Greek couplet that can be read in two ways, phonetically (in English) or semantically (in ancient Greek). From its very opening, then, the novel questions the idea of honesty and sincerity that underlies the idea of human rights. It is also a central feature in the novel’s narrative.

The sentimental story of Biddy Fudge, for instance, culminates in her dalliance with a mysterious gentleman, one colonel Calicot, “a stickler of Boney’s” in whom she can “trace / Ulm, Austerlitz, Lodi, as plain in his face.” She is under the impression that he is the King of Prussia, traveling incognito, and casts herself as a protagonist in a sentimental narrative, which, on the basis of the following passage, may be read as a dig at Rousseau:

And how perfectly well he appear’d, DOLL, to know
All the life and adventures of JEAN JACQUES ROUSSEAU!—
’Twas ‘there,’ said he—not that his words I can state—
’Twas a gibb’rish that Cupid alone could translate;—
But ‘there,’ said he (pointing where, small and remote,
The dear Hermitage rose), ‘there his JULIE he wrote,—
‘Upon paper gilt-edg’d, without blot or erasure;
‘Then sanded it over with silver and azure,
‘And—oh, what will genius and fancy not do?—
‘Tied the leaves up with nonpareille blue!’
What a trait of Rousseau! what a crowd of emotions
From sand and blue ribbons are conjur’d up here!
Alas, that a man of such exquisite notions
Should send his poor brats to the Foundling, my dear! 38

Biddy Fudge seems to be bewildered by the contradiction between Rousseau’s “exquisite notions,” which we may read as including his advocacy of human rights, and the way in which he mistreated his children. Whether she is faking her bewilderment or not, the contradiction is cer-

36. [“The laws of the mask require that if one recognizes a masked person, in spite of his disguise, one does not greet him by name”: my translation; Moore, Fudge, title page.
37. Moore, Fudge, 131.
38. Moore, Fudge, 131–33.
tainly exposed, and heightened through the contrast in vocabulary in the last two lines: Rousseau’s "exquisite notions" are counterpointed by the blatantly unpoetic "poor brats." Importantly, Moore singles out the role of the emotions. The "crowd of emotions" that fiction is supposed to create (an association that Moore reinforces by skilfully rhyming this phrase with "exquisite notions") is here reduced to the effect of fancy paper. Biddy Fudge thus suggests that political writing derives its emotional force from its material context (here represented metonymically as the paper, the ink, the sanding) as much as from the ideas that it represents. As such, this passage criticizes the fact, adduced by de Graaf, that novels such as Scott’s were part of an attempt to bring sense and sensibility to the continent. In other words, Moore confirms the existence of such a discourse by making it the subject of parody.

The resolution of Biddy Fudge’s narrative drives this message home. In keeping with the novel’s general theme of masks and mistaken identities, her paramour, "The man, whom [she] fondly had fancied a King" turns out to be "but a low linen draper." The irony that tailors are a stock character in depictions of social revolutions is lost on her. Biddy Fudge’s main worry is that she will now be a social outcast:

Farewell—I shall do something desp’rate, I fear—
And, ah! if my fate ever reaches your ear,
One tear of compassion my DOLL will not grudge
To her poor—broken-hearted—young friend,

BIDDY FUDGE.  

Her postscript to this letter and the final lines of the poem undercut this conclusion, however, again illustrating that everything in the world of this story is a façade, and that the conventions of the epistolary novel are the subject of parody:

Nota bene—I’m sure you will hear, with delight,
That we’re going, all three, to see BRUNET to-night,
A laugh will revive me—and kind Mr Cox
(Do you know him?) has got us the Governor’s box.

Interestingly, her father seems to have been in the know and to have contented himself with letting this story play itself out: "Oh—Papa, all along, knew the secret, ‘tis clear—/ ’Twas a shopman he meant by a ‘Brandenburgh,’ dear!" She is, indeed, taken in by her father, who, so she
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think, is behaving like a typical Irish tourist—a figure that would become more visible in the course of the century.42 On their arrival, she writes,

Pa flies to the Row
(The first stage your tourists now usually go)
Settles all for his quarto—advertisements, praises—
Starts post from the door, with his tablets—French phrases—
‘Scott’s Visit,’ of course—in short, ev’ry thing he has
An author can want except words and ideas . . .43

The reference to Scott suggests that Phil Fudge is participating in the discourse of the security culture that led to and was continued by the Congress of Vienna. And here, unknowingly, Biddy Fudge comes closer to the truth about her father, who does in fact have “words and ideas.” On the first page of the book, the editor of the poem introduces Phil Fudge as “one of those gentlemen whose Secret Services in Ireland, under the mild ministry of my lord C—GH, have been so amply and gratefully remunerated” and who “has lately been induced to appear again in active life, and superintend the training of that Delatorian Cohort, which Lord S—DM—TH, in his wisdom and benevolence, has organized.”44 “Delatorian” is a nonce word, derived from the Latin for informer, and thus referring to the activities of spies. More precisely, Phil Fudge is a middleman between the “rats” and the spymaster. It is significant that Moore’s narrator introduces a concern with code language, since it resurfaces throughout this poem and Tom Crib’s Memorial, which both play with slang, jargon, and cant.

In his letters, Fudge sends Castlereagh dispatches in which he praises the clandestine means by which Castlereagh has restored the Bourbon monarchy in France. Castlereagh has sent Phil Fudge to France under the pretext of writing a piece of propaganda on the condition of Europe. In the following passage, for instance, Fudge praises the work of the Allied Council, led by the Duke of Wellington:

I must embark into the feature
On which this letter chiefly hinges;—
My Book, the Book that is to prove—
And will, so help ye Sprites above,
That sit on clouds, as grave as judges,
Watching the labours of the Fudges!—
Will prove that all the world, at present,
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Is in a state extremely pleasant:
That Europe—thanks to royal swords
And bay’nets, and the Duke commanding—
Enjoys a peace which, like the Lord’s,
Passeth all human understanding . . .

Fudge’s aside on bayonets and royal swords indicates that the peace achieved does in fact depend on military rule. Peppered with humor, Fudge’s language cannot be easily faulted: he can flatter his master and at the same time voice criticism. After his first letter, in which Fudge proceeds to sketch how the Congress has affected the make-up of European nations, he touches on various geopolitical subjects. One such issue is the problem caused by the practice of kowtowing in China, which Fudge proposes to resolve by sending actors, for “in diplomatic art, / The ‘volto sciolto’ [open countenance] [is] meritorious.” In keeping with the general theme of the book, the poem here highlights the notion that international relations are a matter of keeping up appearances. This message is reinforced by stylistic quirks in Fudge’s language. Fudge opens here with a mixed and disjointed image: “to embark into the feature on which this letter chiefly hinges” merges two different idioms, thus creating a strange, unsteady mixture. Castlereagh had, in fact, a notorious penchant for such images; in one of the appendices to Tom Crib’s Memorial, Moore similarly encourages Castlereagh to “Break promises, fast as your Lordship breaks metaphors.” As such, Fudge’s malapropisms are knowing.

Biddy Fudge, Phil Fudge, and Bob Fudge thus provide a distorted lens for the language of the security culture created by the Congress of Vienna. They are a concoction of sentimentalism, diplomacy, and appetite. At the same time, this palette is struck through with elements that suggest danger and subversion. Their surface texture serves to hide a deeper and more seductive reality. The poem’s structure is thus the opposite of Waverley’s; whereas Scott’s narrative moves from anxiety and fear to peace and tranquility, The Fudge Family begins with the latter while increasingly showing more glimpses of the former.

Moore did not include Tom Crib’s Memorial to Congress in his collected works, even though it is not without merit. In this text, Moore explores the post-Waterloo situation with a very different kind of writing from The Fudge Family’s. After a jeu d’esprit in which the anonymous author gives the summary of a forthcoming history of Pugilism from antiquity to the
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present day, the volume opens with the memorial itself, which is followed by five appendices: an account of the meeting that preceded this intervention, a translation of the fight between Entellus and Dares in the Aeneid, poems on the Congress by Thomas Brown, a lyric and two songs by the boxing champion Bob Gregson, and finally a ballad about Sir Hudson Lowe, Napoleon’s jailer. The central text in this collection takes the form of a letter written on behalf of the members of the “Pugilistic Fraternity” who, as the Preface informs the reader, feel that the “milling Powers of Europe,” who assembled at Aix-la-Chapelle, gained much from hearing the Society’s ideas. They are in favor of an order of things “when the Milling shall succeed to the Military system, and the Fancy will be the sole arbitress of the trifling disputes of mankind.” This poem applauds the Congress System, suggesting that it can be improved and refined by reducing it to a boxing match. One of the central similarities between boxing and diplomacy is their practitioners’ preference for jargon, “Flash” or “St. Giles’s Greek”:

As this expressive language was originally invented, and is still used, like the cipher of the diplomatists, for purposes of secrecy, and as a means of eluding the vigilance of a certain class of persons, called, flashè, Traps, or in common language Bow-street-Officers, it is subject of course to continual change, and is perpetually either altering the meaning of old words, or adding new ones, according as the great object, secrecy, renders it prudent to have recourse to such innovations. In this respect, also, it resembles the cryptography of kings and ambassadors, who by a continual change of cipher contrive to baffle the inquisitiveness of the enemy.

It is from this conceit that the succeeding poems derive their creative energy. The anonymous editor does help the non-initiate, however, by explaining the poem’s peculiar vocabulary in copious footnotes. Expressing a hope that “wars and rumbustions will cease” now that “Freedom [is] all gammon,” Tom Crib nevertheless warns that “something may happen to kick up a breeze.” He therefore proposes to the “great Swells, as some mode of settling the chat . . . / With which the tag-rag will have nothing to do . . . a Royal Set-to.” To illustrate what this would look like, he provides an imaginary account of how “the Balance of Power / Was settled” in a fight between Georgy the Porpus (the Prince Regent and future George IV) and

49. Moore, Crib, vii.
50. Moore, Crib, xxvi.
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52. Moore, Crib, 6.
Sandy the Bear (Tsar Alexander I of Russia). Initially the Prince has the upper hand, when they clinch and “Like cronies they hugg’d, and came smack to the ground; / Poor SANDY the undermost, smothered and spread / Like a German, tuck’d under his huge feather bed.”53 The Tsar extricates himself from under the King’s paunch, however, and regains the initiative, winning the contest with more dirty fighting.

In passing, Moore takes swipes at many of the principal figures at the Congress. One of these, mentioned in the first appendix (the account of the Great Pugilistic Meeting), illustrates the political reach that Moore’s poems had: “Bob’s eloquence / Lies much in C—NN—G’s line, ’tis said, / For, when Bob can’t afford us sense, He tips us poetry, instead.”54 George Canning was Castlereagh’s successor as Foreign Secretary. This succession was strictly pragmatic: both were Tories with an Anglo-Irish background who at times served in the same cabinet, but their personalities and politics were widely divergent. Whereas Castlereagh was a reactionary belonging to the aristocratic Ascendancy, Canning came from the middle classes and developed what would eventually emerge as a more “liberal” outlook. At one point, they even fought a duel, which Castlereagh won. Their style, too, differed: Castlereagh was notoriously dry and unimaginative, whereas Canning was a talented orator and poet, known for both the eloquence of his diplomatic missives and the wit of his literary parodies. Thus, even if Canning’s and Moore’s politics differed, Canning’s literary inclinations made him a more likable figure for Moore. The narrator of The Fudge Family in Paris, indeed, admonishes Canning to distance himself from Castlereagh with the following verses:

Says Clarinda, ‘though tears it must cost,
’It is time we should part my dear Sue;
‘For your character’s totally lost,
‘And I have not sufficient for two!’55

Canning may have been heartened by Moore’s poems and taken his cue from them. In 1826, as British Foreign Secretary, he sent a dispatch to the British Ambassador to the Netherlands in The Hague, Charles Bagot. Countering the Dutch minister Anton Reinhard Falck’s attempt to negotiate a new trade treaty, Canning announced his intention to impose new tariffs. Curiously, the dispatch was encrypted in a twofold fashion. Not only was it written in cipher, it also had recourse to the language and features of poetry:
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In matters of commerce the fault of the Dutch
Is giving too little and asking too much;
With equal advantage [sic] the French are content,
So we'll clap on Dutch bottoms a twenty percent.
Twenty percent,
Twenty percent,
Nous frapperons Falck with twenty percent.56

It would be easy to dismiss this anecdote as a rare instance of diplomatic
whimsy, but more is at stake. Canning is here giving political expression to
the emotions expressed by Moore, just as Castlereagh had previously been
influenced by Scott. Instead of a diplomatic practice tailored to suit a desire
for stability, Canning here showcases a diplomatic practice predicated on
wit and tact. Moore's satires, I would argue, prepared the way for this turn
in the history of British foreign policy, which would be more fully devel-
oped by yet another Irish peer, Lord Palmerston.

Moore's poems, then, address the legacy of the Battle of Waterloo by
imaginatively exploring the security culture created by the Congress of
Vienna. As such, his response to the Battle of Waterloo differs markedly
from that of many British contemporaries. From the jingoism in the later
Wordsworth to the vehement republicanism of Byron, British authors
tended to focus on what happened during the Battle. For Moore, however,
the Battle is akin to a debased coin that would soon be lost (which is pre-
scient, given that the First World War would come to obliterate the mem-
ory of this momentous event). In contrast, Moore is more interested in ac-
tual currency—in what happened after the Battle. His poetry derives its
creative energy from Waterloo's diplomatic ramifications, that is, from the
replacement of the balance of power by a balance of negotiation. Walter
Scott recognized as much and became a willing advocate of Castlereagh's
policies. Moore's stance was more skeptical. Not unlike one of his forgot-
ten contemporaries, the Irish poet Louisa Stuart Costello, his allegiances lie
somewhere in between Scott's and Byron's: in the words of Timothy
Ruppert, like Costello, Moore chose "to advance a pacifistic, internation-
alist vision that privileged contrariness to conformity," but worried about
the repercussions of such a vision on the domestic political scene.57 It was
Moore's investment in the Irish cause, as I have attempted to show, that
motivated his misgivings about Castlereagh; The Fudge Family in Paris be-
trays a fear that Castlereagh's European interventions would be a cover for
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the repressive policies that he had pursued in Ireland. Moore couches this fear in a parody of an epistolary novel in which different perspectives collide, thus providing the idea of negotiation as well as his misgivings about the way it was put into practice with a formal equivalent. Revolving around the conceit that the congress system is not at all unlike the practice of boxing, *Tom Crib's Memorial to Congress* expresses a similar anxiety. Most striking, perhaps, is the way in which Moore's poems play with puns and slang, thus suggesting that the post-Waterloo state of affairs gave poets the opportunity to be as crafty as spies. Not only does Moore portray the confusion of the post-Waterloo diplomatic system, through his virtuoso play with double-speak, he also stimulates the reader to experience this lack of understanding.
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