

THE DEVELOPMENT OF
MODERN EUROPE

VOLUME II

ROBINSON AND BEARD

Ex Libris



PROFESSOR J. S. WILL



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

THE DEVELOPMENT OF MODERN EUROPE

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE
STUDY OF CURRENT HISTORY

BY

JAMES HARVEY ROBINSON

PROFESSOR OF HISTORY IN COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

AND

CHARLES A. BEARD

ADJUNCT PROFESSOR OF POLITICS IN COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

VOLUME II

GINN & COMPANY

BOSTON · NEW YORK · CHICAGO · LONDON

ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL

COPYRIGHT, 1908, BY

JAMES HARVEY ROBINSON AND CHARLES A. BEARD

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

69.10



D
209
R63
1907
V. 2

980499

The Athenaeum Press
GINN & COMPANY · PROPRIETORS · BOSTON · U.S.A.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
XVII. EUROPE AFTER THE CONGRESS OF VIENNA	
49. The Restoration in France and the Revolution of 1830	1
50. Establishment of the Kingdom of Belgium	11
51. Formation of the German Confederation	12
52. Restoration in Spain and Italy	17
53. The Spanish-American Colonies and the Revolution of 1820	21
XVIII. THE INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION	
54. Invention of Machinery for Spinning and Weaving	30
55. The Steam Engine	39
56. The Factory System	44
XIX. REVOLUTION OF 1848 IN FRANCE	
57. Unpopularity of Louis Philippe's Government	53
58. The Second French Republic	57
59. Louis Napoleon and the Second French Empire	66
XX. REVOLUTION OF 1848, — AUSTRIA, GERMANY, ITALY	
60. The Fall of Metternich	72
61. Failure of the Revolution in Bohemia and Hungary	80
62. Austria regains her Power in Italy	84
63. Outcome of the Revolution of 1848 in Germany	86
XXI. THE UNIFICATION OF ITALY	
64. Cavour and Italian Unity	90
65. The Kingdom of Italy since 1861	99
XXII. FORMATION OF THE GERMAN EMPIRE AND THE AUSTRO-HUNGARIAN UNION	
66. Prussia assumes the Leadership in Germany	109
67. War of 1866 and the Formation of the North German Federation	115
68. The Franco-Prussian War and the Foundation of the German Empire	118
69. Austria-Hungary since 1866	123

CHAPTER	PAGE
XXIII. THE GERMAN EMPIRE	
70. The German Constitution	130
71. The Kulturkampf	134
72. Bismarck and State Socialism	137
73. Germany's Policy of Protection and Colonization .	142
74. Reign of William II.	145
XXIV. FRANCE UNDER THE THIRD REPUBLIC	
75. Establishment of the Third French Republic . .	151
76. The Third French Republic since 1875: The Drey- fus affair	161
77. The Separation of Church and State	166
78. Political Parties in France	172
79. Expansion of France	175
XXV. POLITICAL REFORMS IN ENGLAND	
80. Parliamentary Reform	181
81. The English Cabinet	193
82. Reform of Local Government in England . . .	198
XXVI. SOCIAL REFORMS IN ENGLAND	
83. Freedom of Discussion and Religious Toleration .	201
84. Humanitarian Legislation	206
85. Free Trade	213
86. Educational Reform	218
87. The Irish Question	220
XXVII. THE BRITISH EMPIRE IN THE NINETEENTH CEN- TURY	
88. The Extension of British Dominion in India . .	233
89. The Dominion of Canada	242
90. The Australasian Colonies	246
91. Growth of the British Empire in Africa . . .	251
92. Imperial Federation	257
XXVIII. THE RUSSIAN EMPIRE IN THE NINETEENTH CEN- TURY	
93. The Reigns of Alexander I and Nicholas I . .	261
94. The Freeing of the Serfs and the Growth of the Spirit of Revolution	270
95. The Industrial Revolution in Russia	280
96. The Struggle for Liberty under Nicholas II . .	283

Contents

V

CHAPTER	PAGE
XXIX. TURKEY AND THE EASTERN QUESTION	
97. The Greek War of Independence	303
98. The Crimean War	307
99. Revolts in the Balkan Peninsula	309
100. The Independent Balkan States	315
XXX. THE EXPANSION OF EUROPE IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY	
101. The Growth of International Trade and Competition: Imperialism	318
102. Relations of Europe with China	331
103. How Japan became a World Power	338
104. War between Japan and China and its Results	343
105. The Boxer Rising. The Russo-Japanese War	346
106. Occupation of Africa by the European Powers	353
107. Influences favoring Universal Peace	367
XXXI. SOME OF THE GREAT PROBLEMS OF TO-DAY	
108. The Responsibilities of Modern Government	373
109. The War on Poverty	386
110. Progress and Effects of Natural Science	405
APPENDIX I, LIST OF RULERS	423
APPENDIX II, LIST OF BOOKS	429
INDEX	435

LIST OF MAPS

		PAGE
23	Distribution of the Races in Austria-Hungary	74-75
24	Italy in 1859	90-91
25	The Unification of Italy	98-99
26	Sketch Map of the Zollverein	111
27	Sketch Map of Prussia's Annexations in 1866	117
28	Austria-Hungary	124-125
29	The German Empire since 1871	130-131
30	The British Empire	234-235
31	Australia	246-247
32	The Western Portion of the Russian Empire	262-263
33	Southeastern Europe	306-307
34	European Advance in Asia	332-333
35	The Far East To-day	338-339
36	Africa	356-357
37	Europe To-day	376-377

ILLUSTRATIONS

VII	Distaff and Spindle	32
VIII	Warp and Weft	33
IX	Spinning Jenny	35
X	Sir Richard Arkwright (full page)	36
XI	Newcomen's Steam Engine, 1704	41
XII	James Watt (full page)	42
XIII	Form of Watt's Engine in 1784	42
XIV	English Caricature of Louis Napoleon (1848)	65
XV	Count Cavour (full page)	92
XVI	Pope Pius IX (full page)	100
XVII	Bismarck (full page)	136
XVIII	Caricature, Dismissing the Pilot	146
XIX	Li Hung Chang (full page)	346
XX	Karl Marx (full page)	396
XXI	Charles Darwin (full page)	410

THE DEVELOPMENT OF
MODERN EUROPE

VOLUME II

EUROPE SINCE THE CONGRESS OF VIENNA

THE DEVELOPMENT OF MODERN EUROPE

CHAPTER XVII

EUROPE AFTER THE CONGRESS OF VIENNA

THE RESTORATION IN FRANCE AND THE REVOLUTION OF 1830

49. When, in 1792, the Austrian and Prussian armies had advanced toward Paris with the object of freeing Louis XVI from the restrictions placed upon him by the National Assembly, the French, roused to fury, had deposed and executed a ruler who was convicted of plotting with foreign powers to maintain his authority. In 1814 the allies placed on the throne the brother of Louis XVI, a veteran emigré, who had openly derided the Revolution and had been intriguing with other European powers for nearly twenty years to gain the French crown. Yet there was no demonstration of anger on the part of the nation, no organized opposition to the new king. The French were still monarchical at heart and had quietly submitted to the rule of Napoleon, which was no less despotic than that of Louis XIV.

The French do not oppose the restoration of the Bourbons in 1814

There was, however, no danger that Louis XVIII would undo the great work of the Revolution and of Napoleon. He was no fanatic like his younger brother, the count of Artois. In his youth he had delighted in Voltaire and the writings of the philosophers; he had little sympathy for the Church party, and six years' residence in England had given him some notion of liberal institutions. His sixty years, his corpulence, his gout,

Louis XVIII is not tempted to undo the work of Napoleon and the Revolution

and a saving sense of humor prevented him from undertaking any wild schemes of reaction which might be suggested to him by the emigrant nobles, who now returned to France in great numbers. Even if he had been far more inclined to absolutism than he was, he could hardly have been tempted to alter the administration which Napoleon had devised with a view of securing control of everything and everybody. The prefects and subprefects, the codes, the Church as organized under the Concordat of 1801, the Legion of Honor, the highly centralized University, even the new nobility which Napoleon had created, were all retained with little or no change.

The Constitutional Charter granted to France by Louis XVIII, June, 1814

The *Constitutional Charter* which he issued in June, 1814, was indeed a much more liberal form of government than that which Napoleon had permitted the French to enjoy. It is true that it shocked the sensibilities of the liberals by declaring that the whole authority in France resided not in the people, but in the person of the king. The constitution was therefore not an expression of the wishes of the nation, but was *granted* to his subjects by the king of his own free will "in view of the expectations of enlightened Europe." Nevertheless the king bound himself by a solemn oath to observe the limitations on his power which it prescribed.

Resemblance of the Charter to the English constitution

In the organization of the government the Charter suggests in some ways the English constitution. The power of making laws was vested in the king and a parliament consisting of two chambers, a house of peers chosen by the king, and a chamber of deputies elected by the wealthier citizens. The king alone could propose laws, but the chambers were empowered to petition the sovereign to lay before them any specific measure which they thought desirable. Provision was made for the annual assembling of the chambers, and they were given the right to impeach the royal ministers. Limited as this legislature was, it nevertheless possessed a greater control over taxation and lawmaking than any which had existed under Napoleon's rule.

In addition to establishing representative government, the Charter guaranteed almost all the great principles of reform laid down in the first Declaration of the Rights of Man. It proclaimed that all men were equal before the law and equally eligible to offices in the government and the army; taxation was to be apportioned according to the wealth of each citizen; personal and religious liberty was assured, although the Roman Catholic faith was to be the religion of the State; freedom of the press was guaranteed, but subject to such laws as might be passed for the purpose of checking the abuses of that freedom.

Some of the "Rights of Man" guaranteed by the charter

In view of what France had suffered it might have been supposed that the moderation of the restored monarch and his enlightened measures would have pacified the distracted kingdom; but the granting of a constitution could not bring back that quiet submission to the royal will that had existed in the days of Louis XV. The interest of the people in public questions had been aroused by the Revolution, and quite naturally they differed among themselves on current issues, such as the amount of power the king should really be permitted to exercise, the extension of the right to vote to the poorer classes, the authority of the clergy, the position of the ancient nobility, and the like. In this way political parties developed.

The origin of parties

The reactionary group, known as the ultra-royalists, was composed largely of emigrant nobles and clergy, who believed that their personal and sacred rights had been outraged by the revolutionists. They therefore wished to undo the work of the past twenty-five years and to restore the old régime in its entirety. They clamored for greater power for the clergy, for the restriction of the liberal press, for the king's absolute control over his ministers, and for the restoration of the property that they had lost during the Revolution. This party, though small in numbers, was composed of zealots whose bitterness had waxed strong through long nursing abroad and, with the king's brother, the count of Artois, at their head, they constituted an active and influential minority.

The ultra-royalists led by the count of Artois

The moderate royalists

The most valuable and effective support for the king, however, came from a more moderate group of royalists who had learned something during the last quarter of a century. They knew that the age of Louis XVI and Marie Antoinette could not return, and consequently they urged the faithful observance of the Charter and sought, on the one hand, to induce the reactionary nobility and clergy to accept the results of the Revolution and, on the other hand, to reconcile the people to the restored monarchy. These moderates did not propose, however, to weaken the power of the king in any way by allowing the chamber of deputies to control the ministers, as the House of Commons did in England, or by extending the franchise. The two royalist parties — extreme and moderate — doubtless made up the greater portion of the nation; at all events, they carried the election of 1815 by a large majority.

The liberals

A third party was composed of liberals who, though loyal to the king, did not regard the Charter as containing the last word on French liberties. They favored a reduction of the amount of property which a man was required to own in order to vote, and they maintained that the king should be guided by ministers responsible to the chambers.

The irreconcilables

The Bonapartists

Finally there was a large group of persons who were irreconcilable enemies of the Bourbons and everything savoring of Bourbonism. Among them were the Bonapartists, soldiers of Napoleon, who remembered the glories of Austerlitz and Wagram and were angered by the prestige suddenly given to hundreds of Frenchmen who had borne arms against their country, but who now crowded around the king to receive offices, rewards, and honors.¹ While Napoleon lived they longed for his return, and after his death in 1821, they placed their hopes upon his youthful son,² "Napoleon II," as they called him.

¹ See *Readings*, sect. 49.

² The son of Napoleon and Maria Louisa, born in 1811, to whom his father gave the title King of Rome, was taken to Vienna after Napoleon's overthrow, and given the title of Duke of Reichstadt. He lived at his grandfather's court until his death in 1832, and is the hero of Rostand's popular drama, *L'Aiglon* (The Eaglet).

On the other hand, there were the republicans, who detested Bonapartism no less than Bourbonism and longed to see a restoration of the republic of 1792. In 1824 they formed a secret society for the purpose of overthrowing the monarchy, declaring that might was not right, and that the nation was entitled to choose its own ruler, whereas Louis XVIII had been foisted on the French people by the armed powers of Europe.

The republicans

As long as Louis XVIII lived, the party loyal to him grew stronger. Though a thorough believer in divine right, he was determined not to endanger his crown by arbitrary measures which would increase the numbers in the opposing parties, and at the time of his death in 1824 the restored Bourbon line seemed to have triumphed completely over its enemies. Had his brother, who succeeded him as Charles X, been equally wise he, too, might have retained the throne until his death. But he frankly declared that he would rather chop wood than be king on the same terms as the king of England. He had already shown his real character by the zeal with which he labored for the ultra-royalist cause during his brother's reign, and had received the name of "King of the Emigrés." The high office to which he was called meant to him merely an opportunity to restore the crown, the nobles, and the clergy to the rights and powers which they had enjoyed before the Revolution.

Views of Charles X (1824-1830)

An old-fashioned law was passed in 1826, providing a penalty of death for offenders guilty of profaning the sacred vessels in a church or of insulting the Host. Though this law was not enforced and was principally designed to show that the State was a defender of the Church, it aroused great bitterness. A bishop was made Grand Master of the University and teachers were subjected to the oversight of the clergy. Monastic corporations were still prohibited by law,¹ but thousands of monks had flocked back to France and the Jesuits were

Charles X's measures in favor of the clergy

¹ See above, Vol. I, pp. 243-244 and note.

especially active under the favor and encouragement of the king. A royal edict restoring rigid supervision of the press was designed to stifle opposition to the new measures. The duke of Wellington declared that "Charles X is setting up a government by priests, through priests, and for priests."

The nobles partially indemnified for the loss of their lands during the Revolution

Seeing the clergy rapidly regaining their former prestige, the nobles who had suffered losses during the Revolution set about recovering their estates. But these had long been broken up and sold, often in very small parcels, so that a restoration of the ancient family domains would have displaced enough peasants and landlords to constitute a formidable political party. Under these circumstances they had to content themselves with forcing through a measure appropriating a thousand million francs as indemnity for their losses.

Elections show dissatisfaction with Charles X's government

As might have been anticipated, these measures aroused violent antagonism. At the elections of 1827 the opposition party, composed of the various discontented elements, was victorious; but this ominous warning was not heeded by the king. Charles X confided the direction of the government to ultra-royalist ministers and prorogued the chambers for remonstrating. This only served to strengthen popular resistance, and the elections of 1830 resulted in a decided addition to the number of deputies opposed to the king's policy.

The July ordinances, July 25, 1830

Before this newly elected parliament met, Charles determined upon a bold stroke. Acting under a provision of the Charter which empowered him to make regulations for the security of the realm, he and his ministers issued a series of ordinances infringing the freedom of the press and the political rights of the chambers and of the voters. The first ordinance suspended the liberty of the press and provided that no newspaper or journal should be published without the government's authorization. Other ordinances reduced the number of voters by making the payment of a land tax a qualification, thus excluding merchants and manufacturers; revived the clause of the Charter confining the initiation of laws to the

king, — a provision which had been neglected in practice ; and dissolved the newly elected chamber before a single session had been held. These ordinances practically destroyed the last vestiges of constitutional government and left the French people without any guarantee against absolutism.

The day following the promulgation of these ordinances, July 26, 1830, the Paris journalists published the following protest, which became the signal for open resistance to the king: "Since the government has violated the law, we are under no obligation to obey it; we shall endeavor to publish our papers without asking permission of the censors. The government has this day lost the character of legality which gave it the right to demand obedience. For our part we shall resist it; it is for France to judge how far her resistance shall extend." The Paris deputies in the parliament also declared that the king's ordinances were illegal and calculated to throw the whole state into confusion.

The protests
of the
journalists

Protests, however, do not make a revolution. The journalists could print resolutions easier than carry them out, and the ensuing revolt which brought about the overthrow of Charles X was not their work but that of the fearless though small republican party which faithfully cherished the traditions of 1792, but had been regarded as insignificant by the government. On July 27 they began tearing up the paving stones for barricades, behind which they could defend themselves in the narrow streets against the police and soldiers. The king, who was at his country residence at St. Cloud, regarded the insurrection as a mere street fight which the troops could easily put down, and played whist in the evening according to his custom.

The Republi-
cans start an
insurrection
in Paris,
July 27

But on July 29 the entire city of Paris was in the hands of the insurgents. The king, now realizing the seriousness of the situation, opened negotiations with the deputies and promised to repeal the obnoxious ordinances. It was, however, too late for concessions; a faction of wealthy bankers and business men was busily engaged in an intrigue to place upon the throne

A new candi-
date for the
throne
appears

Louis Philippe, a prince of the royal house, who had long been known as a believer in the more moderate principles of the Revolution.

Career of
Louis
Philippe

Louis Philippe was the son of that duke of Orleans who had supported the popular cause in the early days of the first revolution and had finally been executed as a "suspect" during the Reign of Terror. The son had been identified with the Jacobins and had fought in the army of the republic at Valmy and Jemappes. He was later exiled, but did not join the ranks of the allies against France because he could not get the officer's commission which he desired. He then visited America and on his return to England became reconciled with Louis XVIII. When he returned to France after the restoration he did not, however, join the reactionary party, but sought popular favor by professing democratic opinions, affecting the airs of a plain citizen, entertaining bankers and financiers at his home in Paris, and sending his children to ordinary schools instead of employing private tutors. He was therefore the logical candidate of those who wished to preserve the monarchy and yet establish the middle class in power in place of the nobles and clergy.

Charles X
abdicates;
Louis
Philippe
appointed
lieutenant
general

As the first step toward making Louis Philippe king, the deputies in Paris appointed him lieutenant general of the realm. Charles X, despairing of his ability to retain the crown for himself, abdicated in favor of his grandson, the duke of Bordeaux. He then charged Louis Philippe with the task of proclaiming the young duke as King Henry V, and fled with his family to England. Though this arrangement might very well have met the approval of the nation at large, Louis Philippe was not inclined to execute the order of Charles X. On the contrary, he began to seek the favor of the republicans who had done the actual fighting and had already formed a provisional government with the aged Lafayette at its head.

This committee occupied the City Hall and was surrounded by the insurgents who supported it. Louis Philippe forced his way through the throng and, in a conference with Lafayette,

won him over to his cause by fair promises. The two men then went out on a balcony and Lafayette embraced his companion before the crowd as a sign of their good understanding, while the duke on his part showed his sympathy for liberal doctrines by waving the tricolored flag,—the banner of the Revolution, which had not been unfurled in Paris since the last days of Napoleon. The hopes of the republicans who had borne the brunt of the Revolution were now at an end, for they realized that they formed too small a party to prevent Louis Philippe's accession to the throne.

THE BOURBON KINGS

Henry II' (the first of the Bourbon line, died 1610)

Louis XIII (d. 1643)

Louis XIV (d. 1715)

Philip, duke of Orleans (d. 1701)

Louis XV (d. 1774)

Philip the Regent (d. 1722)

great-grandson of Louis XIV

Louis (d. 1752)

Louis the Dauphin (d. 1765)

Louis Philippe (d. 1785)

Louis XVI
(d. 1793)

Louis XVIII
(d. 1824)
count of Provence

Charles X
(deposed 1830)
count of Artois

Philippe
(Egalité)
(d. 1793)

Louis XVII (d. 1795)

Louis
Philippe I
(deposed
1848)

Louis
duke of
Angoulême
(d. 1844)

Charles
duke of
Berri
(d. 1820)

Duke of
Orleans
(d. 1842)

(Duke of
Bordeaux
later count
of Chambord)
"Henry V"
(d. 1883)

Count
of Paris
(d. 1894)

Louis Philippe, as lieutenant general, convoked the Chamber of Deputies on August 3 and announced the abdication of Charles X, carefully omitting any allusion to the fact that the dethroned king had indicated his grandson as his successor.

The Chamber of Deputies calls Louis Philippe to the throne

Four days later the Chamber of Deputies passed a resolution — which was ratified by the Chamber of Peers — calling Louis Philippe to the throne as King of the French; he accepted their invitation, declaring that “he could not resist the call of his country.”

The Charter
is revised

The deposition of Charles X and the accession of Louis Philippe did not seem to require the convocation of a constitutional convention to draft a new constitution. So the parliament undertook to make the necessary changes in the existing Charter which Louis XVIII had granted, and required the new king to accept it before his coronation. The preamble of the Charter was suppressed because it wounded “national dignity in appearing to *grant* to Frenchmen the rights which essentially belonged to them.” The clause under which the July ordinances were issued was altered so that the king had no power to suspend the laws. Freedom of the press and the responsibility of the ministers to the Legislative Assembly were expressly proclaimed. Lastly, the provision establishing the Roman Catholic religion as the religion of the state was stricken out.

The slight
results of the
revolution

In reality, however, the revolution of 1830 made few innovations. One king had been exchanged for another who professed more liberal views, but the government was no more democratic than before. The right to vote was still limited to the few wealthy taxpayers, and government by clergy and nobility had given place to government by bankers, speculators, manufacturers, and merchants. The bishops were excluded from the Chamber of Peers, as were also many nobles, because they would not take the oath of allegiance to the new sovereign. While no change was made in the Church as settled under the Concordat of 1801, the influence of the clergy in politics was greatly reduced. The tricolored flag of the Revolution was adopted as the national flag, instead of the white banner of the Bourbons, but France was still a monarchy, and the labors of the republicans in organizing the insurrection had gone for naught.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE KINGDOM OF BELGIUM

50. The revolution of 1830 in France was the signal for an outbreak in the former Austrian Netherlands, where many grievances had developed since the Congress of Vienna united the region with the Dutch Netherlands under the rule of William of Orange. In the first place, the inhabitants of his southern provinces were dissatisfied with William's government. He had granted a constitution to his entire kingdom on the model of the French Charter, but many people objected to his making the ministers responsible to himself instead of to the parliament, and also to the restricted suffrage which excluded all but the richest men from the right to vote. Although the southern provinces had over a million more inhabitants than the Dutch portion of the kingdom, they had only an equal number of representatives. Moreover the Dutch monopolized most of the offices and conducted the government in their own interests.

Grievance of the Belgians against the Dutch government

There were religious difficulties, too. The southern provinces were Catholic, the northern, mainly Protestant. The king was a Protestant, and took advantage of his position to convert Catholics to his own faith; he instituted Protestant inspectors for Catholic schools and founded a college of philosophy at Louvain, where all candidates for the priesthood were compelled to study.

Religious dissensions arise between Protestants and Catholics

Louis Philippe had been seated on his throne only a few days when the agitation over these grievances broke out into open revolt at Brussels. The revolution spread; a provisional government was set up; and on October 4, 1830, it declared: "The province of Belgium, detached from Holland by force, shall constitute an independent state." The declaration was soon followed by the meeting of a congress to establish a permanent form of government. This assembly drew up a constitution based on the idea of the sovereignty of the people, and decided that the head of the new government should be a

The independent kingdom of Belgium is established

king constrained by oath to observe the laws adopted by the people. The Belgians were therefore very much in the same position as the English in 1688 when they made William of Orange their king on their own terms. They finally chose as their sovereign Leopold of Coburg, and in July, 1831, he was crowned king of the new state.¹

FORMATION OF THE GERMAN CONFEDERATION

Three chief results of Napoleon's influence in Germany

1. Disappearance of most of the little states

2. Advantageous position of Prussia

51. The chief effects of the Napoleonic occupation of Germany were three in number. First, the consolidation of territory that followed the cession of the left bank of the Rhine to France had, as has been explained, done away with the ecclesiastical states, the territories of the knights, and most of the free towns. Only thirty-eight German states, including four free towns, were left when the Congress of Vienna took up the question of forming a confederation to replace the defunct Holy Roman Empire.

Secondly, the external and internal conditions of Prussia had been so changed as to open the way for it to replace Austria as the controlling power in Germany. A great part of the Slavic possessions gained in the last two partitions of Poland had been lost, but as an indemnity Prussia had received half of the kingdom of Saxony, in the very center of Germany,

¹ Inasmuch as the Belgian revolution undid a part of the Vienna settlement, it formed the subject of long negotiations among the powers, which did not come to an end until 1837. The constitution which the Belgians drew up for themselves in 1831, with some modifications, is the basis of their government to-day, and Leopold II, the son of their first king, Leopold I, is now their sovereign. The principal problems of the little realm have been the contest for nonsectarian education, the extension of the suffrage, and the growth of socialism. The loss of Belgium made no important change in the government of the Netherlands. In 1848 King William II was forced to grant his subjects a new and enlightened constitution in place of the charter which he had issued some thirty years before. On the death of William III in 1890 his daughter, Wilhelmina, came to the throne, and as the grand duchy of Luxemburg was hereditary only in the male line it passed to a relative of the deceased king, the duke of Nassau. See Seignobos, *Political History of Europe since 1814*, pp. 238-255, and the *Statesman's Year-Book* (1907), pp. 752-773, 1227-1264.

and also the Rhine provinces, where the people were thoroughly imbued with the revolutionary doctrines that had prevailed in France. Prussia now embraced all the various types of people included in the German nation and was comparatively free from the presence of non-German races. In this respect it offered a marked contrast to the heterogeneous and mongrel population of its great rival, Austria.

The internal changes in Prussia were no less remarkable. The reforms carried out after Jena by the distinguished minister Stein and his successor, Hardenberg, had done for Prussia somewhat the same service that the first National Assembly had done for France. The abolition of the feudal social castes and the liberation of the serfs made the economic development of the country possible. The reorganization of the whole military system prepared the way for Prussia's great victories in 1866 and 1870, which led to the formation of a new German Empire under her headship.

Thirdly, the agitations of the Napoleonic period had aroused the national spirit.¹ The appeal to the people to aid in the freeing of their country from foreign oppression, and the idea of their participation in a government based upon a written constitution, had produced widespread discontent with the old absolute monarchy.

3. Demand for constitutional government

When the form of union for the German states came up for discussion at the Congress of Vienna, two different plans were advocated. Prussia's representatives submitted a scheme for a firm union like that of the United States, in which the central government should control the individual states in all matters of general interest. This idea was successfully opposed by Metternich, supported by the other German rulers. Austria realized that her possessions, as a whole, could never be included in any real German union, for even in the western portion of her territory there were many Slavs, while in Hungary and the southern provinces there were practically no

The German Confederation of 1815

¹ See above, Vol. I, pp. 355-357.

Germans at all. On the other hand, she felt that she might be the leader in a very loose union in which all the members should be left practically independent. Her ideal of a union of sovereign princes under her own headship was almost completely realized in the constitution adopted.

The German Confederation a union of rulers and free towns

The confederation was not a union of the various *countries* involved, but of "The Sovereign Princes and Free Towns of Germany," including the emperor of Austria and the king of Prussia for such of their possessions as were formerly included in the German Empire; the king of Denmark for Holstein; and the king of the Netherlands for the grand duchy of Luxemburg. The union thus included two sovereigns who were out-and-out foreigners, and, on the other hand, did not include all the possessions of its two most important members.¹

The insignificance of the diet at Frankfort

The assembly of the confederation was a diet which met at Frankfort. It was composed (as was perfectly logical), not of representatives of the people, but of plenipotentiaries of the rulers who were members of the confederation. The diet had very slight powers, for it could not interfere in the domestic affairs of the states, and the delegates who composed it could not vote as they pleased, since they had to obey the instructions of the rulers who appointed them, and refer all important questions to their respective sovereigns. So powerless and so dilatory was this assembly that it became the laughing-stock of Europe.

Weakness of the German union

The members of the confederation reserved to themselves the right of forming alliances of all kinds, but pledged themselves to make no agreement prejudicial to the safety of the union or of any of its members, and not to make war upon any member of the confederation on any pretense whatsoever. The constitution could not be amended without the approval

¹ Observe the boundary of the German Confederation as indicated on the map, Vol. I, pp. 352-353. Important portions of the German constitution of 1815 are given in the *Readings*, sect. 51.

of *all* the governments concerned. In spite of its obvious weaknesses, the confederation of 1815 lasted for half a century, until Prussia finally expelled Austria from the union by arms, and began the formation of the present German federation.

The liberal and progressive party in Germany was sadly disappointed by the failure of the Congress of Vienna to weld Germany into a really national state. They were troubled, too, by the delay of the king of Prussia in granting the constitution that he had promised to his subjects. Other indications were not wanting that the German princes were not yet ready to give up their former despotic power and adopt the principles of the French Revolution advocated by the liberals. The "League of Virtue" which had been formed after the disastrous battle of Jena to arouse and keep alive the zeal of the nation for expelling the invader, began to be reënforced, about 1815, by student associations organized by those who had returned to their studies after the war of independence. The students denounced the reactionary party in their meetings, and drank to the freedom of Germany.

Political associations of German students

On October 18, 1817, they held a celebration in the Wartburg to commemorate both Luther's revolt and the anniversary of the battle of Leipzig. Speeches were made in honor of the brave who had fallen in the war of independence, and of the grand duke of Weimar, who was the first of the North German princes to give his people a constitution. The day closed with the burning of certain reactionary pamphlets.

The Wartburg celebration, 1817

This innocent burst of enthusiasm excited great apprehension in the minds of the conservative statesmen of Europe, of whom Metternich was, of course, the leader. The murder by Sand, a fanatical student, of a journalist, Kotzebue, who was supposed to have influenced the Tsar to desert his former liberal policy, cast further discredit upon the liberal party. It also gave Metternich an opportunity to emphasize the terrible results which he anticipated would come from the students' associations, liberal governments, and the freedom of the press.

The murder of Kotzebue

The "Carlsbad Resolutions," 1819

The extreme phase in the progress of reaction in Germany was reached when, with this murder as an excuse, Metternich called together the representatives of the larger states of the confederation at Carlsbad in August, 1819. Here a series of resolutions were drawn up with the aim of checking the free expression of opinions hostile to existing institutions, and of discovering and bringing to justice the revolutionists who were supposed to exist in dangerous numbers. These "Carlsbad Resolutions" were laid before the diet of the confederation by Austria and adopted, though not without protest.

They provided that there should be a special official in each university to watch the professors. Should any of them be found "abusing their legitimate influence over the youthful mind and propagating harmful doctrines hostile to the public order or subversive of the existing governmental institutions," the offenders were to lose their positions. The General Students' Union, which was suspected of being too revolutionary, was to be suppressed. Moreover no newspaper, magazine, or pamphlet was to go to press without the previous approval of government officials, who were to determine whether it contained anything tending to foster discontent with the government. Lastly, a special commission was appointed to investigate the revolutionary conspiracies which Metternich and his sympathizers supposed to exist throughout Germany.¹

The attack upon the freedom of the press, and especially the interference with the liberty of teaching in the great institutions of learning which were already becoming the home of the highest scholarship in the world, scandalized all the progressive spirits in Germany. Yet no successful protest was raised, and Germany as a whole acquiesced for a generation in Metternich's system of discouraging reform of all kinds.

The southern German states receive constitutions, 1818-1820

Nevertheless important progress was made in southern Germany. As early as 1818 the king of Bavaria granted his people a constitution in which he stated their rights and

¹ See *Readings*, sect. 51.

admitted them to a share in the government by establishing a parliament. His example was followed within two years by the rulers of Baden, Württemberg, and Hesse. Another change for the better was the gradual formation of a customs union, which permitted goods to be sent freely from one German state to another without the payment of duties at each boundary line. This yielded some of the advantages of a political union. This economic confederation, of which Prussia was the head and from which Austria was excluded, was a harbinger of the future German Empire.¹

Formation of a customs union — *Zollverein* — with Prussia at its head

RESTORATION IN SPAIN AND ITALY

52. The restoration in Spain was more violent and thoroughgoing than in any other country involved in the revolutionary conflicts. Napoleon's efforts to keep his brother Joseph on the Spanish throne had led to a war which had continued to bring misery and demoralization upon the country until the autumn of 1812, when Wellington drove the invaders beyond the Pyrenees. During this entire period the Spanish people steadily resisted French dominion and maintained the semblance of an independent government in the form of a *Junta*, or improvised assembly, which was loyal to the Bourbon, Ferdinand VII, one of the most despicable of modern princes.² However, it was impossible for the Junta to maintain intact the system which had existed prior to the Revolution. In the disorder, press censorship was relaxed, Spanish officers and soldiers came into contact with Frenchmen and Englishmen, and political questions were discussed in Spain as never before. Napoleon himself had struck a severe blow at the old régime, as has already been noted, by abolishing the feudal dues and the internal customs lines, reducing convents to one third their former number, suppressing the Inquisition, and establishing freedom of industry.

State of Spain under Joseph Bonaparte

¹ See below, pp. 109 *sqq.*

² See above, Vol. I, p. 329 and note.

Spanish patriots frame the constitution of 1812

It was under these conditions that the Spanish people, deprived of their legitimate sovereign, undertook to frame a constitution of their own. The Junta in 1809 summoned the Cortes, or national parliament, which met in the autumn of the following year and adopted, in 1812, a constitution on the model of the French constitution of 1791. Knowing the devotion of the people to the monarchy, it did not abolish the kingly power, but proclaimed the sovereignty of the nation and reduced royal authority to a shadow by requiring that it be exercised through a ministry. The legislature was to consist of a single chamber to be elected biennially by universal suffrage. While declaring Catholicism to be the only religion of the nation, the constitution abolished press censorship, feudal obligations, and the privileges of the nobility.

Ferdinand VII abolishes the constitution

When Ferdinand VII (who had spent the previous six years in France surrounded by Napoleon's guards) was, in 1814, restored to power by the strength of English arms, he repudiated entirely this liberal government. He declared that the Cortes which had drawn up this instrument had usurped his rights by imposing on his people "an anarchical and seditious constitution based on the democratic principles of the French Revolution." He accordingly annulled it and proclaimed those who continued to support it guilty of high treason and worthy of death. With the old absolute government, he restored the Inquisition, feudal privileges, and the religious orders. The Jesuits returned, the press was strictly censored, free speech repressed, monastic property returned to the former owners, and the liberals were imprisoned in large numbers, or executed.

Italy only "a geographical expression" after 1815

The Congress of Vienna left Italy, as Metternich observed, merely "a geographical expression"; it had no political unity whatever. Lombardy and Venetia, in the northern part, were in the hands of Austria, while Parma, Modena, and Tuscany belonged to members of the Austrian family. In the south the considerable kingdom of Naples was ruled over by a branch of the Spanish Bourbons. In the center, cutting the peninsula

in twain, were the Papal States, which extended north to the Po. The presence of Austria, and the apparent impossibility of inducing the Pope to submit to any government but his own, seemed to preclude all hope of making Italy into a true nation. Yet fifty years later the kingdom of Italy, as it now appears on the map of Europe, came into existence through the final exclusion of Austria from the peninsula and the conquest of the States of the Church by Victor Emmanuel.

Although Napoleon had governed Italy despotically he had introduced many important reforms. The vestiges of the feudal régime had vanished at his approach; he had established political equality and an orderly administration, and had forwarded public improvements. Moreover he had held out the hope of a united Italy, from which the foreign powers who had plagued and distracted her for centuries should be banished. But his unscrupulous use of Italy to advance his personal ambitions disappointed those who at first had received him with enthusiasm, and they came to look for his downfall as eagerly as did the nobility and the dispossessed clergy, whose hopes were centered in Austria. It became clear to the more thoughtful Italians that Italy must look to herself and her own resources if she were ever to become an independent European state.

Reforms introduced in Italy during the Napoleonic occupation

The king of Sardinia, Victor Emmanuel I, entered his capital of Turin on May 20, 1814, amid great rejoicing, but immediately proceeded to destroy with a stroke of his pen all the reforms which the Revolution had accomplished in Piedmont during his absence. He gave back to the nobility their ancient feudal rights and jurisdictions, and reinstated them in their former military commands; he restored to the clergy their property, their courts, and their press censorship. The penalty of death for profaning the sacrament was revived; religious freedom abolished; the university placed under clerical supervision; and books savoring of liberal philosophy locked up in the libraries. So bitter was the hatred of revolutionary principles

Abolition of reforms in Piedmont

that a botanical garden at Turin was destroyed because it had been planted by the French; and the municipal council was able to save a bridge which the French had built only by erecting a church near by.

The clergy
return to
power in the
Papal States

The same reactionary policy was adopted in the States of the Church, where, in 1814, an edict was issued which abolished French legislation and restored the old order. In the zeal to destroy the work of the French, root and branch, vaccination and street lighting at Rome were abolished as revolutionary innovations. The government which had been placed in the hands of laymen was again turned over to the ecclesiastics. The Inquisition was reintroduced and over two thousand monasteries and convents reëstablished.

The restora-
tion in
Naples

The restoration in the kingdom of Naples was not so thorough as in other parts of Italy. French law was retained; the nobles were not reinvested with their feudal rights; the number of bishoprics and convents remained reduced; and the Church was given back only that part of its former property which had not been sold. The king, however, refused to drive along a street that Murat had laid out, and stopped the Pompeian excavations which French scientists had been carrying on.

The Austrian
possessions
in Italy

In Lombardy and Venetia, where Austrian sovereignty was established, the reforms instituted during the Napoleonic Period were practically nullified. In order securely to fasten their government on these provinces, the Austrians instituted a public and secret police system which constantly interfered with individual liberty in the most arbitrary fashion; moreover the courts and the administration were largely in the hands of the hated "Germans." Although the Austrian sovereign did not restore the ancient feudal exactions of the nobility, he introduced customs duties which were regarded by his Italian subjects as quite as galling.

Austrian
influence in
Italy

In addition to his Lombardo-Venetian kingdom in the northern part of Italy, the Austrian emperor enjoyed a protectorate over Modena; by treaty the duke of Tuscany practically

surrendered his duchy to him ; Maria Louisa of Parma turned the administration of her domain over to his officers ; and Ferdinand of Naples was bound to him in a defensive and offensive alliance. In short only Sardinia and the Papal States retained their freedom from " German " domination.

Though dismembered and subjected to a foreign yoke, the Italy of 1815 was not the Italy which Napoleon had found when he first entered it at the head of the French army in 1796. Despite the restoration, traces of the Revolution were everywhere apparent, not only in law and government but, above all, in the minds of men. National aspirations had been awakened which the Austrian police could not stamp out ; Italians, high and low, came to know and appreciate French reforms at first hand, though they might loathe the memory of Napoleon as a conqueror and a tyrant.

The work of the French not entirely undone

THE SPANISH-AMERICAN COLONIES AND THE REVOLUTION OF 1820

53. The very thoroughness with which Metternich's ideas were carried out in the Mediterranean states led to renewed attempts on the part of the liberals to abolish despotism. It was not, therefore, in Germany or France, as the allies had feared, but in Spain and then in Italy, that the spirit of revolution was first to reawaken.

Spain itself was, of course, but a small part of the vast Spanish empire, which included Mexico (and the regions to the northwest later acquired by the United States), Central America, and large portions of South America, besides her island possessions. The Spanish colonies had from the first been the victims of the selfish commercial policy of the mother country, which forced them to carry on all their trade with one or two favored Spanish ports. That enlightened despot, Charles III, had somewhat reduced the restrictions upon trade by permitting free intercourse between the colonies

The Spanish colonies in North and South America begin to dream of independence

and all the Spanish ports; as a result, the commerce of the Spanish dependencies increased nearly sevenfold from 1778 to 1788. The advantages of greater freedom and the success of the North American colonies in throwing off the yoke of England both served to suggest ideas of independence; these suddenly developed into downright revolt when the news reached the colonies that Napoleon had placed his brother on the Spanish throne and proposed to control the Spanish commerce in his own interests.

Revolt of
the Spanish
colonies,
1810-1825

Beginning in 1810, the colonies of Mexico, New Granada (now Colombia), Venezuela, Peru, Buenos Ayres, and Chile, while they still professed to be loyal to Ferdinand VII, took their government into their own hands, drove out the former Spanish agents, and finally rejected Spanish rule altogether. At first the revolt was put down with great cruelty, but in 1817, under the leadership of Bolivar, Venezuela won its independence, and during the following five years the Spaniards lost New Granada, Peru, Ecuador, Chile, Mexico, and lastly (1825) Upper Peru, which was renamed Bolivia after its liberator.

England
opposes re-
conquest of
the Spanish
colonies

Ever since his restoration Ferdinand VII had been sending thousands of men to die of fever and wounds in the vain attempt to subdue the insurgents. He had called upon the other powers to help him, on the ground that his colonies were guilty of the revolutionary crimes which it was to the interest of all the allied monarchs to aid in suppressing. He was disappointed however. England did not wish to lose the profitable trade which had grown up with the South American ports since they were freed from the restrictions of the mother country. The Tsar expressed his sympathy for Ferdinand, but gave him no further aid than to sell him a fleet of unseaworthy vessels.

Restora-
tion of the
constitution
of 1812 in
Spain, 1820

At last (January, 1820), the soldiers who were waiting in Cadiz to be sent to America, well aware of the sufferings of the regiments which had preceded them, were easily aroused to revolt by two adventurous officers who had become disgusted

with Ferdinand's tyranny and incapacity. The revolutionists proclaimed the restoration of the constitution of 1812, which Ferdinand had abolished on his return. Their call was answered by the liberals in the larger towns, including Madrid, where a mob surrounded the palace (March 9), and forced the king to take the oath to the constitution. The people also broke into the prison of the reëstablished Inquisition, and destroyed the instruments of torture that they found there. But Ferdinand had no idea of keeping his oath, and simply bent before what he believed to be a passing storm.

News of the Spanish revolt spread quickly throughout Italy, where the spirit of insurrection had been at work among the secret societies which had everywhere been organized. These societies assumed strange names, practiced mysterious rites, and plotted darkly in the name of Italian liberty and independence. By far the most noted of them was that of the Carbonari, i.e. charcoal burners. Its objects were personal liberty, constitutional government, and national independence and unity; these it undertook to promote by agitation, conspiracy, and, if necessary, revolution.

News of
Spanish rev-
olution
reaches Italy

The Italian agitators had a superstitious respect for a constitution; they appear to have regarded it not so much as a form of government to be carefully adapted to the needs of a particular country and time, as a species of talisman which would bring liberty and prosperity to its happy possessor. So when the Neapolitans heard that the king of Spain had been forced by an insurrection to accept a constitution, they made the first attempt on the part of the Italian people to gain constitutional liberty by compelling their king (July, 1820) to agree to accept this same Spanish constitution of 1812.¹ However, at the same time that he was invoking the vengeance of God upon his own head should he violate his oath of fidelity,

A constitu-
tion pro-
claimed in
Naples

¹ Even in the New World men did honor to this famous constitution, for in St. Augustine, Florida (which was not transferred to the United States until 1819), a monument still stands in the Plaza de la Constitución, erected to commemorate its adoption in 1812.

the king of Naples was casting about for foreign assistance to suppress the revolution and enable him to return to his former ways.

Metternich regards revolution as a terrible disease

He had not long to wait. The alert Metternich invited Russia, Prussia, France, and England to unite, in order to check the development of "revolt and crime." He declared that the liberal movement would prove "not less tyrannical and fearful" in its results than that against which the allies had earlier combined. "Revolution" appeared to him and his conservative sympathizers as a fearful disease that not only destroyed those whom it attacked directly, but spread contagion wherever it appeared. Therefore, prompt and severe measures of quarantine, and even of violent extirpation, were justified, in view of the necessity of stamping out the devastating plague. In addition to his detestation of revolution, Metternich entertained an especial contempt for the Neapolitans. He exclaimed on hearing the news of the revolt, "A semi-barbarous people, of absolute ignorance and boundless credulity, hot-blooded as the Africans, a people that can neither read nor write, whose last word is the dagger—such a people offers fine material for constitutional principles!"

The powers at Troppau declare against revolution

Under these circumstances a congress of the powers was called at Troppau in October, 1820, to consider the European situation. England and France refused to participate formally on the ground that the revolutions were domestic concerns and did not justify international intervention. Austria, Russia, and Prussia, however, drew up a protocol in which they declared the indisputable right of the powers to take common measures of safety against states in which government was overthrown by rebellion.

The Laibach conference and Austrian intervention in Italy

Another conference was called at Laibach in January, 1821, for the purpose of taking practical measures to restore absolutism in southern Italy. To this conference King Ferdinand of Naples was summoned. After taking renewed oaths to maintain the constitution which he had granted his people,

he started northward, but on the way to Laibach he repudiated his promises to his subjects, and at the conference heartily concurred in the plan to send an Austrian army to Naples to abolish the noxious constitution. In March this decision was carried out with no considerable resistance on the part of the Neapolitan revolutionists, who were thoroughly disorganized. The leaders of the revolt were executed, imprisoned, or exiled, and the king freed from the embarrassments of the constitution.

While the Austrian forces were moving southward toward Naples an insurrection broke out in Piedmont. The Italian patriots there planned to combine with the discontented subjects of Austria in Lombardy and free their country by attacking the rear of the Austrian army. There were, however, plenty of Austrian troops in Venetia to suppress this movement promptly. All hopes for reform in Italy now seemed at an end.

An insurrection in Piedmont fails

Meanwhile the revolution in Spain had developed into a civil war. Ferdinand VII was supported in his opposition to reform by the clergy and other friends of the old system. The representatives of the great powers, Russia, Austria, Prussia, France, and England, met at Verona in 1822 to discuss their common interests and decide what should be done about Spain. The Tsar was eager to send an army into Spain to aid Ferdinand to rid himself of the obnoxious constitution which had been forced upon him, but France made it clear that she would not permit a Russian army to cross her territory. England refused to interfere in any way; so finally it was left to Louis XVIII, urged on by the clerical and ultra-royalist party, to send an army across the Pyrenees "with the purpose of maintaining a descendant of Henry IV on the throne of Spain." This interference in the affairs of a neighboring nation which was struggling for constitutional government disgusted the French liberals, who saw that France, in intervening in favor of Ferdinand VII, was doing just what Prussia and Austria had attempted in 1792 in the interests of Louis XVI. But, unlike

The Congress of Verona, 1822

France aids Ferdinand VII to suppress reform, 1823-1825

the duke of Brunswick, the French commander easily defeated the revolutionists and placed Ferdinand in a position to stamp out his enemies in such a ferocious and bloodthirsty manner that his French allies were heartily ashamed of him.

Question of
the revolted
Spanish
colonies

While France was helping to restore absolutism in Spain the Spanish colonies, as we have seen, were rapidly winning their independence, encouraged by the United States and England. At the Congress of Verona all the powers except England were anxious to discuss a plan by which they might aid Spain to get the better of her rebellious colonies, since it was the fixed purpose of the allies to suppress "rebellion in whatever place and under whatever form it might show itself."

The Monroe
doctrine

The threats of Metternich and his friends led President Monroe, in his message to Congress, December, 1823, to call attention to the dangers of intervention as practiced by the European alliance of great powers, and clearly stated what has since become famous as the "Monroe Doctrine," namely, "We owe it therefore to candor and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and these powers to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety. With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European power we have not interfered and shall not interfere. But with the governments who have declared their independence and have maintained it, and whose independence we have on great consideration and on just principles acknowledged, we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them or controlling in any other manner their destiny, by any European power, in any other light than a manifestation of an unfriendly disposition towards the United States."

England
recognizes
independence
of some
Spanish
colonies

About the same time the English foreign secretary, Canning, informed the French ambassador in London that any attempt to bring the Spanish colonies again under their former submission to Spain would prove unsuccessful, and that while

England would remain neutral in the troubles between the mother country and her American dominions, the intervention of a third party would constitute a cause for action on the part of the English government. Toward the close of 1824 England recognized the independence of Buenos Ayres, Mexico, and Colombia and paid no heed to the remonstrance of the continental powers that such an action "tended to encourage the revolutionary spirit which it had been found so difficult to restrain in Europe."

A word may be said here of Spain's little neighbor Portugal. Portugal
It will be remembered that when Napoleon dispatched his troops thither in 1807 the royal family fled across the Atlantic to their colony of Brazil. After the expulsion of the French by the English, the government was placed in the hands of an English general, Beresford, who ruled so despotically that he stirred up a revolt in 1820, at the time when the insurrection in Spain was in progress. The insurgents demanded the return of the royal family from Brazil and the granting of a constitution. The king, John VI, accordingly set sail for Portugal, leaving his elder son, Pedro, to represent him in Brazil.¹

King John died shortly after his return, and Pedro, yielding his rights to his daughter, Maria da Gloria, granted the Portuguese a charter in 1826. Pedro's brother, Miguel, then started a civil war to gain the throne for himself, but after several years of discord he was driven out of the kingdom in 1834.²

¹ In 1822 Pedro proclaimed the independence of Brazil and took the title of Emperor. In 1831 he abdicated in favor of his son, who retained the crown until he was deposed by the revolution of 1889, which established the United States of Brazil as a republic.

² Queen Maria retained the throne for twenty years in spite of no less than half a dozen revolutions. She married Ferdinand, a prince of Coburg-Gotha, and thus founded a new line of Portuguese rulers, the Braganza-Coburg, whose third representative in the person of her grandson, Carlos I, now occupies the throne of Portugal. The government of Portugal, still based on the charter of 1826 with subsequent modifications, provides for a chamber of peers and a house of deputies chosen by popular vote. Of her ancient colonial dominion Portugal still retains Goa in India, Macao in China, Portuguese Timor in Ambeno, Pulo Cambing in the Malay Archipelago, the Cape Verde islands, the Islands of St. Thomé and Principe, Guinea, Angola, and Portuguese East Africa in Africa.

Metternich's
international
police system
fails

It will have become apparent that Metternich's international police system, designed to prevent innovation and revolution, was for all practical purposes a failure. The action of Great Britain and the United States had weakened it. The struggle of the Greek revolutionists against Turkey for independence,¹ which finally involved Russia in a war with the Sultan and ended in victory for the Greeks, demonstrated that even Russia would not hesitate to aid and abet revolution if she could thereby advance her own interests. The climax was reached in 1830 by the revolution in France described above, which deposed the older Bourbon line and established a liberal government, thus violating the fundamental principles for which Metternich had fought with so much determination. In fact the Holy Alliance, as such, never accomplished any great work, and it went to pieces as much through its own inherent weakness as through the growth of revolutionary spirit.

REFERENCES

The Restoration in France : *Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. IX, chap. xviii, pp. 559-571 ; PHILLIPS, *European History, 1815-1899*, pp. 22-36 ; ANDREWS, *The Historical Development of Modern Europe*, Vol. I, pp. 134-157 ; FYFFE, *History of Modern Europe*, pp. 375-380 ; SEIGNOBOS, *Political History of Europe since 1815*, pp. 103-121.

The Revolution of 1830 in France : *Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. X, chap. iii, pp. 71-103 ; PHILLIPS, pp. 168-185 ; FYFFE, pp. 603-621 ; ANDREWS, Vol. I, pp. 157-179.

The Revolution of 1830 in Belgium : *Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. X, chap. xvi, pp. 517-544 ; FYFFE, pp. 620-624 ; SEIGNOBOS, pp. 229-238 ; PHILLIPS, pp. 186-198.

The German Confederation and Metternich's Policy : PHILLIPS, chap. iii, pp. 37-56 ; SEIGNOBOS, chap. xii, pp. 374-386 ; ANDREWS, Vol. I, chap. vi, pp. 229-241 ; *Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. X, chap. xi, pp. 340-382.

¹ See below, sect. 97.

Reestablishment of Absolutism in Italy: *Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. X, chap. iv, pp. 104-130; ANDREWS, Vol. I, chap. v, pp. 180-228; SEIGNOBOS, pp. 326-333.

The Restoration and Revolution in Spain: *Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. X, chap. vii, pp. 205-233; FYFFE, pp. 478-485; SEIGNOBOS, pp. 286-295.

The Spanish American Colonies: *Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. X, chaps. viii, ix, pp. 244-309.

Metternich and the European Congresses: *Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. X, chap. i, pp. 1-39; PHILLIPS, pp. 57-134; SEIGNOBOS, pp. 747-762.

CHAPTER XVIII

THE INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION

INVENTION OF MACHINERY FOR SPINNING AND WEAVING

The Industrial Revolution due to mechanical inventions

54. In the preceding chapters we have reviewed the startling changes and reforms introduced by the leaders of the French Revolution and by Napoleon Bonaparte, the reconstruction of Europe at the Congress of Vienna, and finally the chief modifications of these arrangements which occurred during the following generation. These were mainly the work of statesmen, warriors, and diplomats, — who have certainly done their part in making Europe what it is to-day. But a still more fundamental revolution than that which has been described had begun in England before the meeting of the Estates General. The chief actors in this never stirred an assembly by their fiery denunciation of abuses, or led an army to victory, or conducted a clever diplomatic negotiation. On the contrary, their attention was concentrated upon the homely operations of everyday life, — the house-wife drawing out her thread with distaff or spinning wheel, the slow work of the weaver at his primitive loom, the miner struggling against the water which threatened to flood his mine. They busied themselves perseveringly with wheels, cylinders, bands, and rollers, patiently combining and recombining them, until, after many discouragements, they made discoveries destined to alter the habits, ideas, and prospects of the great mass of the people far more profoundly than all the edicts of the National Assembly and all the conquests of Napoleon taken together.

The Greeks and Romans, notwithstanding their refined civilization, had shown slight aptitude for mechanical invention,

and little had been added to their stock of human appliances before the opening of the eighteenth century.¹ In the time of Louis XIV, when inventors were already becoming somewhat numerous, especially in England, the people of western Europe for the most part continued to till their fields, weave their cloth, and saw and plane their boards by hand, much as the ancient Egyptians had done. Merchandise was still transported in slow, lumbering carts, and letters were as long in passing from London to Rome as in the reign of Constantine. Could a peasant, a smith, or a weaver of the age of Cæsar Augustus have visited France or England eighteen hundred years later, he would have recognized the familiar flail, forge, and hand loom of his own day.

Few new inventions added to the old stock before the eighteenth century

Suddenly, however, a series of ingenious devices were invented, which in a few generations eclipsed the achievements of ages and revolutionized every branch of industry. These serve to explain the world in which we live, with its busy cities, its gigantic factories filled with complicated machinery, its commerce and vast fortunes, its trades unions and labor parties, its bewildering variety of plans for bettering the lot of the great mass of the people. The story of the substitution for the distaff of the marvelous spinning machine with its swiftly flying fingers, of the development of the locomotive and the ocean steamer which bind together the uttermost parts of the earth, of the perfecting press, producing a hundred thousand newspapers an hour, of the marvels of the telegraph and the telephone, — this story of mechanical invention is in no way inferior in fascination and importance to the more familiar history of kings, parliaments, wars, treaties, and constitutions.

Importance of the history of mechanical inventions

¹ Roger Bacon, in the thirteenth century (see Vol. I, p. 15 and note), firmly believed that the lot of mankind could be greatly improved by mechanical inventions. In his century spectacles first began to be used, and in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries gunpowder was introduced, the printing press invented, and a method discovered by which iron could be not merely softened, but melted so that it could be cast.

The revolution in manufacture during the past two centuries may perhaps be best illustrated by the improvements in the methods of spinning and weaving wool and cotton, which are so important to our welfare and comfort. The main operations had remained essentially the same from the time when men first began to substitute coarse woven garments for the skins of animals, down to the eighteenth century.

Primitive spinning with the distaff and spindle

The wool was first "carded," that is, cleaned and straightened out by means of "cards," or wooden combs some five inches long. The next step was to twist it into thread, fine or coarse as the quality of the cloth demanded.

This was accomplished by means of the distaff and spindle, — two very simple implements which may be seen in almost any historical museum, or even in actual use in out-of-the-way places of Europe. The spinner held under her arm a bunch of carded wool fixed to the distaff; then with her fingers she drew out and twisted a few inches of the fiber, and attached it to a hook, or notch, in the end of


a short stick called the spindle, which she permitted to swing down freely,

whirling like a top as it went.

She fed out the fiber gradually,

and when three or four feet were properly twisted she would un-

hook the end of the thread from



Distaff and Spindle

the top of the spindle and wind the thread on the lower part of it. She would then begin a new length at the point where the finished thread merged into the loose fiber on her distaff.

The spinning wheel


Compared with this slow method, the spinning wheel of our great-grandmothers was a wonderful contrivance; but the process was still very much the same. The wool was fixed on a distaff, a little of it was drawn out to make a beginning and

attached to a small spindle driven by a wheel worked by a treadle. As the lengths of thread were spun they were wound on a bobbin. This one-thread wheel appears to have been in general use in England in the days of Queen Elizabeth, though the distaff was still employed by women in the fields or on the way to market where the wheel was not available. As late as 1757 an English poet wrote :

And many yet adhere
To the ancient distaff at the bosom fixed,
Casting the whirling spindle as they walk.
At home, or in the sheep fold, or the mart,
Alike the work proceeds.

If one examines a bit of cloth, whether it be the finest silk Weaving
or the coarsest burlap, he will find that it is made up of

threads running length-
wise, known as the warp,
and shorter threads called
the weft, running in and
out across the warp and
at right angles to it.
Weaving had from time
immemorial been carried
on by means of a very
simple loom constructed



Warp and Weft

as follows: Two rollers were fixed horizontally, some four or five feet apart, in a frame, and the threads of the warp, laid close together, were wound on one of the rollers. The loose ends were then attached to the second roller, fixed in the frame near the stool where the weaver sat. The cross thread, or weft, was then wound on a stick called the shuttle, which, in the seventeenth-century loom, was simply a notched piece of wood. This primitive shuttle required two men to work it, one to start it on one side, and another to pull it out and start it back again from the other side.

The primi
tive loom

Method of interlacing the threads of the warp and those of the weft

Now in order to interlace the threads of the weft with those of the warp, the long threads composing the warp were attached alternately to two wooden bars, i.e. every other thread was attached to one of the bars, and the remaining threads to the other bar. This enabled the weaver to raise the alternate threads by lifting one of the bars; then the shuttle would be thrown across; he would then lower this set of threads and raise the other, and the shuttle would be thrown back. In this way the first thread of the weft went over the first thread of the warp, under the second, and so on. The next thread of the weft went under the first thread of the warp, over the second, and so on, thus producing the fabric. There was a simple device for pushing the threads of the weft close together as the work progressed.

Kay, of Bury, invents the "fly-shuttle," 1738


Early in the eighteenth century a number of English workmen were busy trying to improve the implements for making cloth and finally, in 1738, John Kay, of Bury in Lancashire, invented a contrivance which enabled a weaver, without any assistant, to drive the shuttle back and forth, even through a wide strip, by means of a handle placed conveniently in front of his stool. By this invention one weaver could now do the work of two, and consequently the demand for woolen and cotton thread to be worked into cloth rapidly increased; indeed, the weavers could now work much faster than the spinners who supplied them with yarn and thread, and it became imperative to discover some quicker method of spinning.

Hargreaves and the spinning jenny, about 1767

The Society for the Encouragement of Arts and Manufactures offered in 1761 two prizes for improvements in the spinning wheel. Their hopes were abundantly fulfilled by the ingenuity of a Blackburn weaver and carpenter, James Hargreaves, who about 1767 contrived a novel spinning machine known as the jenny (probably named after his daughter), which drove eight spindles¹ instead of one and enabled a child

¹ Hargreaves later increased the number of spindles to sixteen and finally, before his death, he succeeded in raising the number to eighty.

to do the work of eight or ten spinners using the old-fashioned wheel. The machine was a very simple one, — a rectangular frame mounted on four legs. At one end were the spindles, standing in a row and revolved by a wheel. In front of them was a frame, moving back and forth, through which the threads gathered from the prepared cotton, or “rovings,”¹ were drawn,



Spinning Jenny

and attached to the ends of the spindles. The frame was then drawn back, stretching out four or five feet of the rovings, when the spindles rapidly revolved, twisting the fibers into firm threads. By a little device the twisted threads were then loosened from the top of the spindles, dropped down, and wound about the base of the spindles as the frame moved back towards them. Before his death in 1778, Hargreaves

¹ In preparing cotton for weaving it was drawn out into loose rolls about the size of a large candle wick, known as “rovings.” These rovings were wound on bobbins, and then spun into thread. The old-fashioned spinner was sometimes forced to spin his thread two or three times in order to draw it out to the necessary fineness.

had the satisfaction of seeing some twenty thousand of his jennies in operation.

Arkwright introduces a method of spinning by means of rollers, 1768

Many workmen were busy with projects for improving the machinery used in spinning, but it was reserved for a barber of Preston, Richard Arkwright, to establish the first great factories filled with power-driven machines. He is accused of having stolen the inventions which he patented, and there seems to be much truth in the charges; at all events a genius for turning other men's ideas to practical account on a large scale. In 1768 he patented a device which consisted essentially of two pairs of rollers placed a little distance apart. When the rovings were fed between these, the second pair, by reason of its higher speed, drew out the cotton or wool into thread, which was wound on bobbins as it passed from the rollers.

Arkwright, the father of the factory system

Arkwright took out many other patents for improvements in textile machinery and established a number of factories, run at first by water power and later by steam. He was a shrewd, hard-headed business man and accumulated a fortune of two and a half million dollars, an achievement which would have been impossible so long as the old hand machinery was used. He is therefore known as the father of the factory system.

Crompton devises the spinning mule, 1779

Arkwright's device had one serious drawback. While it would spin threads for warp or coarse fabrics, it would not twist the fiber tightly enough to make the finer threads. This defect was remedied in 1779 by Crompton, who made a happy combination of Hargreave's spinning jenny and Arkwright's roller machine, which was named the "mule." The system of rollers was used to reduce the rovings, while the movable frames and spindles were used to stretch and twist the thread. This invention quickly supplanted other machines and gave a great impetus to the cotton trade, although Crompton, like so many inventors, enriched others rather than himself by his brilliant achievement.



SIR RICHARD ARKWRIGHT



With these machines as a basis improvements were constantly made until, before the end of the eighteenth century, two hundred spindles were operated on a single mule. The spinning machine of to-day, the combination of many hundred separate patents, has a thousand spindles, each revolving at an almost incredible speed, drawing, twisting, and winding automatically, and requiring the attention of only one or two boys to mend broken threads.

Modern
spinning

It was now necessary that improvements in weaving should overtake those in spinning, for the spinners could furnish yarn and thread more rapidly than the weavers could work it up into cloth. In 1784 a clergyman of Kent, Dr. Cartwright, took the first steps in the construction of a loom, all the operations of which could be performed mechanically by revolving a single wheel. Happening to meet some gentlemen from Manchester who were talking about Arkwright's extraordinary invention, he suggested that some one should try to contrive a loom which could be run by water or steam power, but his listeners unanimously agreed that the thing was impossible. Nevertheless three years later (1787) he patented a new and workable power loom.¹ While hand weaving still held its own for a quarter of a century, it afforded a more and more precarious existence for the workmen who tried to compete with Cartwright's new machine. In 1813 there were already twenty-four hundred power looms in England, and a quarter of a century later the number had increased to more than one hundred thousand.

Cartwright's
power loom,
1787

Other machines for cheapening the production of cloth were gradually invented; for example, a new device for printing calico. This cheap cotton fabric came originally from India, and derives its name from Calicut, whence it was first imported into England. Its brilliant color and its cheapness made it very popular. The Huguenots, who appear to have introduced the calico industry into England shortly after the revocation of the

New methods
of printing
calico

¹ Cartwright's loom was too complicated to be explained here.

Edict of Nantes, colored the white cloth by means of blocks which were inked and then stamped on the goods by hand. In 1783 this slow method was superseded by the use of rollers upon which the designs were cut, one roller being devoted to each color used. The cloth was run between the rollers at a very high rate of speed, so that one man could turn out as much calico in a day as two hundred persons could do with the old hand blocks.

Bleaching

About the same time it was discovered that it was possible to bleach cloth by using acid instead of relying principally upon the light of the sun. In this way a process which formerly had required several months was reduced to a few days.

Whitney's
cotton gin,
1792

With all these contrivances for spinning and weaving, nothing had been done to facilitate removing the seed from raw cotton. In the southern states of America, where most of the cotton was produced, it still took an old colored woman nearly a whole day to clean one pound of raw, green seed cotton, while the best of workers could prepare only five or six pounds a day. Eli Whitney, a young Yankee who was studying law in the South, recognized the difficulties with which the planters had to deal and, having a genius for mechanics, he set to work to make a cotton cleaner. In 1792 he announced the success of his efforts, and when his "gin," as it was called, was perfected, one man by its aid could clean upwards of a thousand pounds a day.

Astonishing
increase of
production
due to the
new machin-
ery

The effect of these inventions in increasing the amount of cloth which was manufactured was astonishing. In 1764 England imported only about four million pounds of cotton. In 1841 she used nearly five hundred million pounds annually. At the close of the Napoleonic wars, Robert Owen, a distinguished manufacturer and philanthropist, declared that his two thousand workmen at New Lanarck could do as much work with the new machinery which had been invented during the previous forty years as all the operatives in Scotland could do without it.

THE STEAM ENGINE

55. In order that inventions should further develop and become widely useful, two things were necessary: In the first place, there must be a sufficiently strong material available out of which to construct the machinery, and for this purpose iron and steel have, with few exceptions, proved the most satisfactory. In the second place, some adequate power had to be found to propel the machinery, which is ordinarily too heavy to be run by hand or foot. Of course windmills were common, and waterfalls and running streams had long been used to turn water wheels, but these forces were too restricted and uncertain to suffice for the rapid development of machinery which resulted from the beginnings we have described. Consequently while Hargreaves, Arkwright, and Crompton were successfully solving the problem of new methods of spinning and weaving, other inventors were endeavoring to supply the material for making the machinery and to discover an adequate power to run it.

Iron and power necessary for the development of machinery

Iron and steel had, of course, been used for hundreds and even thousands of years for tools, weapons, and armor; and the expansive power of steam was known before the opening of the Christian era, but had not been put to any useful purpose. So, although the eighteenth-century inventors could base their new devices upon older discoveries, they were forced to find some means for greatly cheapening the production of iron and steel, and for applying steam to everyday uses.

Expansive power of steam observed by the ancients

If one examines a modern steam engine, he will find the principal parts very simple. In the first place, there are the furnace and boiler for generating steam. The boiler is filled about two thirds full of water, which is heated by the furnace. In the second place, there is the engine proper, which consists of a hollow cylinder, a piston, a crank, and a fly wheel. The piston rod has a head which fits snugly in the cylinder, and as the steam is automatically turned first into one end of the

Principle of the steam engine

cylinder and then into the other, it forces the piston back and forth. The end of the piston rod which projects from the cylinder is attached to an arm, which is jointed in such a way as to drive a wheel.¹

Newcomen's
steam engine,
1704

No single genius contributed all the parts that go to make up the steam engine, simple as they may seem. Huyghens, a Dutchman, who lived in the latter part of the seventeenth century, appears to have been the first to suggest that a piston could be moved up and down in a cylinder by the explosion of gas or gunpowder.² A little later an Englishman, Newcomen, profiting by the discoveries of earlier inventors, devised a workable steam engine which could be used for pumping. The figure given on the opposite page will explain its design. The steam generated in the boiler *d*, by fire in the furnace *n*, was turned into the cylinder *a*, and pushed the piston head *s* up to the top of the cylinder. The steam was then turned off, cold water injected from the reservoir *g* into the steam to condense it, and the pressure of the air on the piston head drove it down to the bottom of the cylinder again. The motion of the piston up and down worked the beam *i*, connected with the rod *k*, which raised and lowered in turn the sucker of the pump. This device contains all the essential elements of the steam engine except the appliance for turning a wheel.


James Watt
(1736-1819)
invents the
modern form
of the steam
engine

Newcomen's engine, crude and imperfect as it was, prepared the way for the inventions of James Watt, to whom we largely owe the practical and economical steam engine, which has for more than a century been the main source of power used in our factories, and has proved equally suitable for propelling

¹ There are several important accessories which should be noted: a steam gauge for registering the pressure of the steam in the boiler, a water gauge indicating the amount of water in it, and a pump to keep up the supply of water as it is transformed into steam. Above the stationary engine are the revolving iron balls, which automatically regulate the amount of steam admitted to the cylinder, and thus preserve a uniform speed for the engine.

² This idea has in recent times been ingeniously applied so that gas engines are used for a great variety of purposes, such, for instance, as driving automobiles and boats, and pumping water.


ships and railroad trains. Watt showed very early in life a fondness for mathematics and mechanics. When a young man he obtained an appointment in the University of Glasgow as maker of mathematical instruments, and it was while he held



Newcomen's Steam Engine, 1704

this position that, as he was engaged (during the winter of 1763-1764) in repairing a model of Newcomen's engine, he was first struck with the great waste caused by the necessity of cooling the cylinder after every upward stroke, in order to condense the steam and permit the piston head to fall back. In 1768 Watt, who was himself a poor man, went into

partnership with Matthew Bolton, of Birmingham, who was able to supply the necessary funds to carry on his experiments. The following year (1769) Watt took out his first patent, which is described as a project for "diminishing the waste of steam



Form of Watt's Engine in 1784

and heat in steam engines," and from that time until his death in 1819 he continued to work on this problem.

Principle of
Watt's steam
engine

His great achievements may be summarized briefly. Instead of leaving one end of the cylinder open, as Newcomen had done, in order that the pressure of the air might push down the piston head, Watt closed both ends and introduced a



JAMES WATT

clever system of valves which admitted the steam automatically first into one end of the cylinder and then into the other, thus moving the piston up and down. He invented the revolving balls, or "governor,"¹ to control the speed of the engine, thus making it entirely automatic and insuring the regularity of its motion. Taking up the projects of other inventors, he devised a simple arrangement of a rod and crank by which he made it possible to drive a wheel that could be connected by a belt with machinery for spinning. In 1785 steam was first used to run spinning machines in a factory at Papplewick in Nottinghamshire. Arkwright adopted it in 1790, and by the end of the century steam engines were as common as wind and water mills.

These inventions reacted powerfully on the iron industry which had hitherto been relatively insignificant. The importance of this metal can scarcely be overestimated. Its qualities of durability, malleability, and strength, and the manifold uses to which it can be adapted make it the very foundation of all mechanical industry. Though it had been in use for ages before the day of Arkwright and Watt, it was still worked up in the crudest fashion. A huge pair of bellows, operated by hand or water power, was used to supply the blast required to melt the metal for casting; charcoal made from wood was used for fuel in the smelting furnace; and the metal was hammered out either by hand or by heavy iron blocks fixed on the ends of levers worked up and down by horse or water power.

When the manufacturers of the new spinning machines began to demand more and better iron, the smiths at their forges turned their attention to the improvement of their crude tools. About 1750 the process of smelting by coal became available, and at once led to a rapid development of the industry. Ten years later the bellows were supplanted by Smeaton's cylinder blowing apparatus, and in 1790 the advantage of a steady and continuous blast was secured by the

Older method
of working
iron

Smelting
with coal;
new methods
of working
and handling
iron

¹ In the accompanying illustration the governor (Q) is not shown in position.

adoption of steam as a motor force. About the same time a great improvement was made in the machinery for handling heavy castings, and in the methods for changing cast, or brittle, iron into wrought, or malleable, iron.¹

THE FACTORY SYSTEM

The "domestic" system of industry

56. Having seen how machinery was introduced into England in the latter part of the eighteenth century and how steam came to be utilized as a motive power, we have now to consider the important results of these inventions in changing the conditions under which people lived and worked. Up to this time, the term "manufacture" still meant, as it did in the original Latin (*manu facere*), "to make by hand." Artisans carried on a trade with their own tools in their own homes or in small shops, as the cobbler does to-day. Instead of working with hundreds of others in great factories and being entirely dependent upon his wages, the artisan, in England at least, was often able to give some attention to a small garden plot, from which he derived a part of his support. This "domestic system," as it is called, is graphically described by the journalist, Defoe, as he observed it in Yorkshire during a journey through England in 1724-1726.

Defoe's description of Yorkshire artisans about 1725

"The land was divided into small enclosures of from two acres to six or seven acres each, seldom more, every three or four pieces having a house belonging to them; hardly a house standing out of speaking distance from another. We could see at every house a tenter and on almost every tenter a piece of cloth, or kersie, or shalloon. At every considerable house there was a manufactory. Every clothier keeps one horse at least to carry his manufactures to market, and every one generally keeps a cow or two, or more, for his family. By this means

¹ Grooved rolling for working out the semimolten mass was introduced in 1783; hot air was substituted for cold in the blast in 1828; and in 1842 Nasmyth patented the steam hammer, which he had invented some years before.

the small pieces of enclosed land about each house are occupied, for they scarce sow corn [i.e. grain] enough to feed their poultry. The houses are full of lusty fellows, some at their dye vat, some at their looms, others dressing the cloth; the women and children carding or spinning, all being employed from the youngest to the eldest."

As the Industrial Revolution progressed, these hand workers found themselves unable to compete with the swift and tireless machines. Manufacturing on a small scale with the simple old tools and appliances became increasingly unprofitable. The workers had to leave their cottages and spend their days in great factories established by capitalists who had enough money to erect the huge buildings, and install in them the elaborate and costly machinery and the engines to run it. As an English writer has concisely put it, "The typical unit of production is no longer a single family or group of persons working with a few cheap, simple tools upon small quantities of raw material, but a compact and closely organized mass of labor composed of hundreds or thousands of individuals co-operating with large quantities of expensive and intricate machinery through which passes a continuous and mighty volume of raw material on its way to the consuming public."

Principle of the "factory system"

One of the principal results of the factory system is that it makes possible a minute division of labor. Instead of giving his time and thought to the whole process, each worker concentrates his attention upon a single stage of it, and by repeating a simple set of motions over and over again acquires wonderful dexterity. At the same time the period of necessary apprenticeship is shortened, because each separate task is comparatively simple. Moreover the invention of new machinery is increased, because the very subdivision of the process into simple steps often suggests some way of substituting mechanical action for that of the human hand.

Chief results of the introduction of machinery

1. Division of labor

An example of the greatly increased output rendered possible by the use of machinery and the division of labor is given

2. Examples of the increased production of goods by machinery

by the distinguished Scotch economist, Adam Smith, whose great work, *The Wealth of Nations*, appeared in 1776. Speaking of the manufacture of a pin in his own time, Adam Smith says: "To make the head requires two or three distinct operations; to put it on is a peculiar business, to whiten the pin is another. It is even a trade by itself to put them into the paper, and the important business of making a pin is, in this manner, divided into about eighteen distinct operations." By this division, he adds, ten persons can make upwards of forty-eight thousand pins in a day. This was when machinery was in its infancy. A recent writer reports that an English machine now makes one hundred and eighty pins a minute, cutting the wire, flattening the heads, sharpening the points, and dropping the pin into its proper place. In a single factory which he visited seven million pins were made in a day, and three men were all that were required to manage the mechanism.

Printing

Another example of modern mechanical work is found in printing. For several centuries after Gutenberg printed his first book, the type was set by hand, inked by hand, each sheet of paper was laid by hand upon the type and then printed by means of a press operated by a hand lever. Nowadays our newspapers, in the great cities at least, are printed almost altogether by machinery, from the setting up of the type until they are dropped, complete, and counted out by hundreds, at the bottom of a rotary press. The paper is fed into the press from a great roll and is printed on both sides and folded at the rate of five hundred or more newspapers a minute.

3. Growth of great manufacturing towns

Before the coming of machinery industry was not concentrated in a few great cities, but was scattered more or less evenly over the country in the hands of small masters, or independent workmen, who combined manufacturing with agriculture on a small scale. For example, the metal workers of West Bromwich and the cutlers of Sheffield (already famous in Chaucer's

day) lived in cottages with small plots of land around them, and in dull seasons, or to change their occupation, engaged in gardening. The factory system put an end to all this. The workmen now had to live near their work; long rows of houses, without gardens or even grass plots, were hastily built around the factory buildings, and thus the ugly tenement districts of our cities came into existence.

This great revolution in the methods of manufacturing produced also a sharp distinction between two classes of men involved. There were, on the one hand, the capitalists who owned the buildings and all the mechanism, and, on the other, the workmen whom they hired to operate the machines. Previous to the eighteenth century, those who owned large estates had been, on the whole, the most important class in political and social life. But, alongside of the landed aristocracy, a powerful mercantile class had arisen, whose wealth, gained by commerce and trade, gave them influence in the affairs of the nation. With the improvements in machinery there was added the new class of modern capitalists, who amassed fortunes by establishing great manufacturing industries.¹

The workingman necessarily became dependent upon the few who were rich enough to set up factories. He could no longer earn a livelihood in the old way by conducting a small shop to suit himself. The capitalist owned and controlled the necessary machinery, and so long as there were plenty of workmen seeking employment in order to earn their daily bread, the owner could fix a low wage and long hours. While an individual employee of special ability might himself become a capitalist, the ordinary workman would have to remain a workman. The question of the proportion of the product which should go to the workers, and that which may properly be taken by the capitalist, or manager, who makes a successful

4. Appearance of a capitalist class

5. The workman becomes dependent upon the capitalist

Problem of Labor vs. Capital

¹ The industrial capitalist began to appear even before the days of Arkwright and Watt, since there were employers earlier, who in some cases collected ten, twenty, or more looms in a town and employed workmen who had no tools of their own, thus creating something like the later factory system.

business possible, lies at the basis of the great problem of capital and labor. This matter, especially the solution advocated by the socialists, will be discussed later.¹

6. Women and children in the factories

The destruction of the domestic system of industry had also a revolutionary effect upon the work and the lives of women and children. In all except the heaviest of the mechanical industries, such as iron working or ship building, the introduction of simple machines tended greatly to increase the number of women and children employed compared with the men. For example, in the textile industry in England during the fifty years from 1841 to 1891, the number of males employed increased fifty-three per cent, and the number of females two hundred and twenty-one per cent. Before the invention of the steam engine, when the simple machines were worked by hand, children could be employed only in some of the minor processes, such as preparing the cotton for spinning. But in the modern factory, labor is largely confined to watching machines, piecing broken threads, and working levers, so that both women and children can be utilized as effectively as men, and much more cheaply.

The Industrial Revolution relieves some women of their former duties

Doubtless the women were by no means idle under the old system of domestic industry, but their tasks were varied and performed at home, whereas under the new system they must flock to the factory at the call of the whistle, and labor monotonously at a speed set by the foreman. This led to many grave abuses which, as we shall see, the State has been called upon to remedy by factory legislation, which has served to save the women and children from some of the worst hardships, although a great deal still remains to be done. On the other hand, thousands of women belonging to the more fortunate classes have been relieved of many of the duties which devolved upon the housewife in the eighteenth century when many things were made at home which can now be better and more cheaply produced on a large scale.

¹ See sect. 109.

Before the Industrial Revolution there had been no sudden change in the life and habits of the people, since the same tools had been used in the same way, often by the same family, from generation to generation. When invention began change began, and it seems likely to become more and more rapid, since new and better ways of doing things are discovered daily. Old methods give way to new ones, and the workman of to-day may successively engage in a considerable variety of occupations during his life as industries rise, are transformed, and decline under the stress of competition and invention. This serves to shake the workingman out of the old routine, encourages him to move from place to place as circumstances dictate, and so widens his experience and broadens his mind. He has also learned to combine with his fellows into national unions, and even international congresses of workmen are held to consider their common interests.

7. Broadening effects of mechanical progress on the workingman

To these changes still another may be added, i.e. the expansion of commerce. In spite of the development of trade before the eighteenth century, a great part of the goods produced were destined to be consumed in the neighborhood, whereas, after the invention of machinery, it became customary to manufacture goods which might be sold in any part of the world; so that one would find the products of Manchester or Birmingham in Hongkong, Melbourne, or Bulawayo. According to official estimates, the exports of England, which amounted to less than fourteen million pounds sterling in 1783, exceeded twenty-nine millions thirteen years later.

8. Expansion of commerce

Although England had been the first to develop the modern industrial system, it was, of course, impossible for her to prevent the gradual introduction of the new inventions on the Continent. Napoleon, in his effort to ruin England's commerce by excluding her from the European markets, was led to foster and protect French industries. He encouraged a society for the promotion of national industry, and called to the direction of the internal affairs of France, Chaptal, a manufacturer,

France begins after Napoleon's downfall to follow England's example

inventor, and active administrator, who organized an exposition at Paris as early as 1801, and invited manufacturers to send their products for exhibition. Nevertheless, it can hardly be said that the Industrial Revolution began on the Continent until after Napoleon's fall. It is true that steam engines from the works of Bolton and Watt in Birmingham had long been used for pumping water, but not until the year in which Napoleon suffered his terrible reverse in Russia was a small engine of ten horse power set up in a cotton factory at Mülhausen in Alsace. The backward state of French industry was due to the lack of capital and operatives, for Napoleon's military enterprises drained the country of millions of francs and drafted hundreds of thousands of men into his armies who might otherwise have proved industrious and efficient workmen.

Develop-
ment of in-
dustry in
France be-
tween 1815
and 1848

After the final establishment of peace in 1815 French industry rapidly underwent the revolution that had been accomplished in England half a century before. By 1847 there were in France nearly five thousand steam engines with a capacity of sixty thousand horse power. The consumption of raw cotton was multiplied fivefold in thirty years, and in 1847 there were over one hundred thousand spinning machines with three and a half million spindles at work. Cotton thread, which sold for nearly fifteen francs a kilogram when Louis XVIII came to the throne, fell to three francs by 1850.

It was during this period that the iron industry was revolutionized by the use of coal instead of wood for smelting. About 1825 there was a general reëquipment of French iron works with cylinder blast apparatus and improved machinery for casting and handling heavy bars. In 1841 the steam hammer was introduced at the great Creusot works.¹ But perhaps the best test of the development of industry in France is the number of patents issued. In spite of the efforts of Napoleon and the prizes offered by the government and industrial

¹ Schneider, the proprietor of the great iron works at Creusot, got the idea from Nasmyth, the English inventor, while on a visit to England in 1840.

societies, the number issued was not over one hundred a year during the Empire. Under the Restoration it increased rapidly and in 1834 reached five hundred. Ten years later it was nearly fifteen hundred, and after the patent law reform of 1844 it immediately rose to two thousand annually.

The change in the methods of production had a marked effect on the development of the towns and on the growth of an industrial class as distinguished from the peasantry. Between the years 1836 and 1846 the population of France increased by about two millions, and the towns of over two thousand inhabitants absorbed the entire increment, that is, the country population remained stationary, while the manufacturing towns drew to themselves about two millions, mostly belonging to the working class. Paris alone had three hundred and forty-two thousand working people of both sexes in 1847, and other cities, such as Lyons, Marseilles, Lille, Bordeaux, and Toulouse, had their great factories and whole quarters peopled by the factory laborers.

After the July revolution of 1830 the workingmen began to form unions, in spite of the fact that the law forbade all associations designed to force employers to pay higher wages. While it is true that employers were likewise forbidden to form associations to control wages or prices, they could more readily conceal their agreements on account of their small numbers.

Notwithstanding the law and the frequent prosecutions for its violation, the workingmen continued to organize in order to enforce their demands for higher wages. For example, in 1833 there was a general strike among the carpenters, who demanded four francs a day and attempted to coerce those who were willing to continue at the old wages. When the leaders were arrested they were warned that only prisons and poverty awaited trade unionists; nevertheless strikes, disorders, and arrests seem to have continued, for among the unions brought before the courts in the year 1843-1844 were

Growth of
French man-
ufacturing
towns

Labor unions
in France

Strikes

Hostility of
Louis
Philippe's
government
to the labor
unions

the weavers of Bernay and Rennes ; the hat makers of Lyons ; the carpenters of Bourges ; the lightermen, masons, trench diggers, carpenters, and leather dressers of Paris. In addition to punishing workmen for forming unions and quitting work in a body, the government refused to listen to their demands for legislation to protect women and children in the factories. Discontented with their lot, they continued to meet in secret clubs, where they listened to socialist schemes for bettering their condition and planned the overthrow of Louis Philippe's government.

REFERENCES

Introduction of Machinery into Textile and Iron Industries: HOBSON, *Evolution of Modern Capitalism*, chap. iii ; CHEYNEY, *Industrial and Social History of England*, pp. 203-212.

Ancient and Mediæval Experiments with Steam: THURSTON, *A History of the Growth of the Steam Engine*, pp. 1-19.

Steam Engines before Watt's Inventions: THURSTON, pp. 19-78.

James Watt and the Development of the Modern Engine: THURSTON, pp. 79-143.

The Organization of Industry before Machinery: HOBSON, chap. ii ; CHEYNEY, pp. 220-232.

The Organization of Industry after Machinery: HOBSON, chap. iv ; CHEYNEY, pp. 232-239.

Development of the Industrial Town: HOBSON, chap. xiii.

Employment of Women in Industry: HOBSON, chap. xii ; SAMUELSON, *The Civilization of Our Day*, pp. 182-195.

CHAPTER XIX

REVOLUTION OF 1848 IN FRANCE

UNPOPULARITY OF LOUIS PHILIPPE'S GOVERNMENT

57. The revolution of 1830 gave the final blow in France to the divine right of kings. The sovereignty of the people was proclaimed in the revised Charter which Louis Philippe accepted from the parliament. He added to the former title, — “King of the French by the Grace of God,” — the significant phrase “and the Will of the Nation.” The white flag, the old banner of the Bourbons and the symbol of absolutism, was replaced by the tricolor, the flag of the Revolution. But in spite of these externals, only a small fraction of the nation had any part in the new government. The two hundred and nineteen deputies from whom Louis Philippe accepted his crown represented only about eighty thousand voters out of a population of thirty million ; and the revised election law under the new Charter, which reduced the voting age from forty to thirty years and the property qualification by one third, still excluded the majority of Frenchmen from political life. In short, both the republicans and the old reactionary aristocracy had been forced to give way before the wealthy middle class, — the *bourgeoisie*.

Louis
Philippe,
the bourgeois
king

The king himself announced that his policy would be the golden mean between conservatism and liberalism. He was himself an excellent *bourgeois* ; he lived without the pomp of royalty and was fond of going shopping, almost unattended, carrying his green umbrella under his arm. He was cautious and not inclined to risk any innovations ; grasping and avaricious, he regarded his kingdom as a kind of business enterprise which interested him mainly for the sake of the profits to be derived from it. As time wore on he grew more and more

Character of
Louis
Philippe

conservative, and his reign of eighteen years was a period of political stagnation.

The legiti-
mists

The so-called "July monarchy" was therefore stoutly opposed by two types of extremists, — the adherents of the older Bourbon line, or "legitimists," as they were called, and the republicans. As for the former, the flight of Charles X from his kingdom had not deprived them of all hope of again coming into power, for Charles had left a grandson whom, under the title of Henry V, they regarded as their lawful king. This party was numerically small; it was mainly recruited from the nobility and the clergy, and found its chief supporters among the peasants of the Vendée, where traditional faithfulness to the royal family was still the rule. The legitimists were not, however, given to violent measures, such as throwing up barricades and seizing public buildings, and Louis Philippe did not feel his throne greatly endangered by them.

The republi-
cans

It was an altogether different matter with the republicans, who cherished the memories of 1793 and continued to threaten France with another violent revolution. This party carried on its work mainly through secret societies, similar to the Carbonari in Italy, which spread rapidly in the new manufacturing towns. The most powerful of these organizations was the "Society of the Rights of Man," which was divided into lodges of twenty members each. Remembering the ease with which they had overturned the throne in 1830, the republicans made several futile attempts to organize insurrections, which were easily put down, however, by Louis Philippe's troops.

The govern-
ment takes
measures to
suppress the
republican
party

In addition to their other efforts to destroy the monarchy, the republicans published a number of papers which attacked the government and even ventured to make sport of the king. The administration therefore determined to suppress entirely this revolutionary party. A law was passed forbidding the formation of any association whatever which had not previously submitted its rules and by-laws to government officials for approval, and members as well as leaders of unauthorized

societies were made liable to severe penalties. Exceptional measures were also taken against the press, including a censorship of drawings and caricatures. It was made a crime to attack the institution of private property or the established government, or to incite the people to revolt. The most violent paper, *The Tribune*, was prosecuted one hundred and eleven times; its editor was condemned to prison on twenty different occasions, and fines aggregating 157,000 francs were imposed upon him. By these vigorous methods the republicans, as a political party, were reduced for the time being to insignificance.

Meanwhile there was growing up in the large industrial cities a socialistic party, which no mere change of rulers or extension of the suffrage would satisfy. Its members had seen the republic, the empire, and the Bourbon monarchy come and go, and constitutions made and unmade, leaving the poverty of the peasants and workingmen unalleviated. On the other hand, they had seen the nobles deprived of their privileges and the clergy of their property, and it was only natural that bold thinkers among them should demand that the triumphant middle class, who owed their wealth to commerce and the new machinery, should in turn be divested of some of their riches and privileges in the interest of the working classes.

Denunciations of private property and of the unequal distribution of wealth had been heard during the first French Revolution and even earlier, but they had attracted little attention. Babœuf (1760-1797) had declared in the days of the Terror that a *political* revolution left the condition of the people practically unchanged. "When I see the poor without the clothing and shoes which they themselves are engaged in making, and contemplate the small minority who do not work and yet want for nothing, I am convinced that government is still the old conspiracy of the few against the many, only it has taken a new form." His proposal to transfer all property to the State and so administer it that every one should be assured employment, speedily found adherents, and a society was formed

The socialists

Babœuf advocates a socialistic system during the Reign of Terror

to usher in the new order. The organization was soon suppressed and Babœuf himself executed ; but his writings were widely circulated, and after the July revolution in 1830 some of his old followers began to renew their agitation against private property.

Aims of the
various
socialistic
groups

In addition to the followers of Babœuf there were other writers and agitators, who all advocated more or less complete abolition of private property, although they disagreed fundamentally as to the methods to be employed in order to achieve their ends. The general aims of these various groups were set forth in a manifesto of 1832 as follows : " We have in view not so much a political change as a social reformation. The extension of political rights, electoral reform, universal suffrage, may all be excellent things, but simply as means to an end. Our object is the equal division of the burdens and benefits of society, the complete establishment of the reign of equality."

Louis
Blanc's
*Organiza-
tion of
Labor*, 1839

The work of formulating a practical program for these contentious factions was undertaken by Louis Blanc, whose volume on *The Organization of Labor*, published in 1839, gave definiteness to the vague aspirations of the reformers. Blanc proclaimed the right of all men to employment and the duty of the State to provide it. He proposed that the government should furnish the capital to found national workshops which should be managed by the workmen, who were to divide the profits of the industry among themselves, thus abolishing the employing class altogether. The "organization of labor" became the battle cry of the labor leaders ; it was heard even in the Chamber of Deputies, for as early as 1840 Arago declared in that body that the organization of labor was necessary in order to put an end to the miseries of the working classes. A journal called *Reform* was founded by Louis Blanc, and the agitation in favor of a social revolution was actively carried on, especially among the workingmen. Nevertheless there was no well-organized party ready to enter the political field or to work for a definite aim ; there were plenty of theories and agitators, but discipline and leadership were wanting.

The political power at this time was really in the hands of two groups of statesmen, one headed by Thiers, and the other by Guizot, both famous as historians and men of letters. Thiers wished to have a constitution like that of England, where, as he was wont to say, "the king reigns but does not rule." Guizot wished the king to exercise real power; he did not want the throne to become an "empty armchair," and regarded further change in the constitution as undesirable. He resisted all compromise with republicans and radicals and labored to strengthen the monarchy as established and to conciliate the powers of Europe, who looked askance at revolutionary France. In 1840 he became prime minister, and he and the king together ruled France for eight years.

Views of
Thiers and
Guizot

In order to keep up the pretense of government by parliamentary majority, Guizot resorted to a regular system of corruption which recalls the practices of Walpole. Owing to the centralized administration established by Napoleon, all of the government officials throughout France—the mayors, prefects, and subprefects—were appointed and dismissed by him, and he could thus use them to coerce the voters. Though personally honorable, Guizot placed the government on a thoroughly corrupt basis and then attempted to stifle protest by police measures and the prosecution of newspaper editors. Having made himself master of the kingdom, he steadily refused to undertake any legislation for the benefit of the working classes and opposed all efforts to extend the suffrage, maintaining that there were not more than one hundred thousand persons in all France "capable of voting with good judgment and independence."

Corrupt and
conservative
policy of
Guizot

THE SECOND FRENCH REPUBLIC

58. Thiers and the other politicians who were opposed to Guizot devised a plan of holding banquets where, over their cigars and wine, the enemies of the unpopular minister could

Political ban-
quets, Feb-
ruary, 1848

denounce his policy and dwell on the great things they would do if they were in power. Invitations had been issued to one of these banquets to be held in Paris on February 22, 1848. The government, however, intervened and forbade the guests to assemble. After some hesitation they decided to obey, but a crowd of workmen and republicans gathered in the neighborhood of the banquet hall and before long there was trouble between them and the police. As the excitement increased the national guard was summoned, but the soldiers sympathized with the people and joined in their cry for reform. Barricades were built and gunsmiths' shops ransacked for arms.

Fall of
Guizot

The king was now thoroughly frightened and agreed to the formation of a new ministry. The next day (February 23) Guizot tendered his resignation in the Chamber of Deputies and Louis Philippe called to office the politicians of the opposition. But it was too late. He and Guizot had calmly ignored the vast mass of the nation, and in the next few days they were to learn what intense hatred their irresponsible rule had engendered.

The Febru-
ary revolu-
tion in Paris

What seemed to be the happy ending of a popular demonstration was really the beginning of a revolution. The politicians were satisfied with getting rid of Guizot, but the leaders in the street disturbances wanted far more than a change in the ministry. During the evening of the twenty-third they made an attack upon the Foreign Office, where the unpopular minister resided; thereupon the soldiers on guard fired upon and killed several of the rioters. This roused the anger of the populace to fever heat; the bodies of the victims were placed on a cart and carried through the boulevards in a weird torchlight procession. Before the dawn of February 24 the eastern part of the city was covered with barricades. In the narrow winding streets a cart or two and a heap of cobblestones formed an effective fortification, while the tall houses on either side enabled a few defenders to check a considerable body of soldiers.

With a disloyal national guard and an insufficient police force the entire city was soon in the hands of the insurgents, and Louis Philippe in despair abdicated in favor of his grandson, the count of Paris. The Chamber of Deputies was powerless to check the rising tide of revolution. Both the republicans and the labor party seized the occasion to institute provisional governments; but they soon saw the necessity of uniting their forces in order to oppose the supporters of the monarchy. Determined, at any rate, to have no more royalty, they proclaimed a republic on the afternoon of the twenty-fourth, subject to the ratification of the people in a national assembly to be summoned immediately.

Abdication
of Louis
Philippe,
February 24,
1848

A republic
proclaimed

In spite of the momentary victory, the success of the provisional government was by no means assured. It was divided against itself, for it consisted of two factions whose aims were really entirely different. The moderate republicans were quite satisfied with merely abolishing the monarchy, whereas the workingmen, whose active coöperation had put the revolutionists in power, had set their hearts on introducing the whole scheme advocated by Louis Blanc. Thus by a peculiar combination of circumstances the radical leaders of the working classes, though a mere minority, were able to force upon the provisional government measures for which the people of France were not prepared.

How the
labor party
was able to
control the
provisional
government

On the day after the proclamation of the republic the radicals compelled the government to assume the obligation of guaranteeing employment to all citizens and to recognize the right of workingmen to form unions,—a right which had hitherto been denied them. A decree soon followed ordering the establishment of national workshops and charging the minister of public works with carrying the plan into execution. This measure was accepted by the majority of the provisional government in order to avoid a division in their ranks, which at that moment might have led to a renewal of disorder in Paris.

Decrees in
favor of the
laboring
classes

A labor commission established at the Luxembourg

As a further concession to the labor element the provisional government declared that it was necessary without delay to assure to the people the legitimate fruits of their labor, and established in the Luxembourg palace a committee charged with the special task of looking after the interests of the working classes. This was really a shrewd move on the part of the opponents of the "socialists," for it sent them away from the City Hall to waste their time in making fine speeches and expounding theories for the execution of which no money had been appropriated.

The labor parliament assembles in the hall hitherto occupied by the House of Peers

The Luxembourg committee, headed by Louis Blanc and a leader of the workingmen named Albert, began its sessions on March 1, and at once proceeded to organize a labor parliament composed of delegates from each craft. This was opened on March 10 with a speech by the eloquent Blanc. He declared that as he beheld the workmen assembled in the Hall of the Peers, hitherto the sanctuary of privilege, in which so many laws directed against them had been made, he felt an emotion which he could with difficulty repress. "On these same seats," he exclaimed, "once glittering with embroidered coats, what do I see now? Garments threadbare with honorable toil, some perhaps bearing the marks of recent conflict."

Slight results

The labor parliament, however, accomplished very little. It temporarily persuaded the provisional government to reduce the working hours from eleven to ten in Paris, and from twelve to eleven in the country, and to abolish the payment of wages in goods instead of money.

Louis Blanc's coöperative workshops not fairly tried

As the government had furnished them with no capital, Louis Blanc and his supporters were powerless to carry out their plan for coöperative workshops, which they regarded as the most vital of all their reforms. Only some exceptional circumstances permitted even a partial trial of their theories. As the government needed clothing for the soldiers and saddles for the cavalrymen, some associations of tailors, saddlers, and spinners were formed to supply this demand.

Although fairly successful as long as they lasted, they furnished no real test of Blanc's doctrines, because they were engaged on special work for which there was an assured demand rather than in regular trades dependent upon the general market.

The provisional government had, it is true, ordered the establishment of national workshops and issued a decree guaranteeing employment to all, but with very different motives from those of the labor committee. Louis Blanc and his followers sought to organize the various trades into permanent, self-supporting coöperative industries, financed in the beginning by the State, but managed by the workingmen themselves. The provisional government, on the contrary, merely desired to allay the restlessness of the unemployed by fair promises. It opened relief works accordingly, which offered more or less useless occupation to the idle men who thronged to Paris. The minister of public works was a determined opponent of Louis Blanc and the socialists. He made no attempt to assign the workmen to their proper trades or to establish factories. He merely organized into brigades those who applied for work, and set them to digging ditches and building forts at a uniform wage of two francs a day.

This crude temporary expedient was put into operation March 1, and in fifteen days six thousand men had enrolled in the government employ. In April the number reached a hundred thousand, and several million francs were being expended to pay these labor gangs. The plan, however, realized the original object of the government, — it kept the idle busy and prevented disorder until the conservative classes could regain their usual ascendancy.

On May 4 the provisional government gave way to a National Assembly elected by practically universal manhood suffrage, which was called upon to draft a new republican constitution for the country. The majority of the deputies were moderate republicans who were bitterly opposed to all socialistic

The national workshops a mere temporary expedient unworthy the name

The National Assembly exhibits no sympathy for socialism

tendencies. The rural districts which had taken no part in the Revolution could now make themselves felt, and it was clear enough that the representatives of the peasants did not sympathize in any way with the projects and demands of the Paris workingmen.

The National Assembly determines to close the national workshops

Before it could proceed to consider seriously the form of the new constitution the National Assembly was forced to take decisive measures in regard to the "national workshops," to which crowds continued to flock, draining the treasury to pay for their useless labor. When Louis Blanc proposed in the assembly that a minister of labor should be created to deal with the situation, he was met with the cry of, "No, no socialism for us." In vain did he urge that the sudden discharge of so many idle men would mean bloodshed, and perhaps revolution, unless some provision were made for their employment. The assembly decided on closing the "workshops," and ordered the men either to join the army or leave the city.

The terrible "June days" of 1848

The people at once set up the cry of "bread or lead," and the most terrible street fighting that Paris had ever witnessed ensued. The streets of the districts inhabited by the working classes were again torn up for barricades, and from Friday, June 23, until the following Monday a desperate conflict raged. The assembly, fearing the triumph of the labor party, invested General Cavaignac with dictatorial power to crush the revolt. Victory was inevitably on the side of the government troops, who were well disciplined and well equipped, while the insurgents fought irregularly and were half-starved. In its hour of triumph the government's retaliation was most unjustifiably severe; about four thousand citizens were transported without trial, thirty-two newspapers were suppressed, and the leading writers among the radicals imprisoned. Order was restored, but the carnage of the "June days" left a heritage of undying hatred between the workingmen and the capitalists of Paris.

After this "solution" of the labor problem the assembly turned with more freedom to the work of drawing up a constitution. In spite of a strong royalist minority, the assembly had declared itself in favor of a republic on the very first day of meeting. It revived the motto of "Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity," and urged all Frenchmen to forget their former dissensions and "to constitute henceforth but a single family."

The constitution of the second French Republic completed, November, 1848

After six months of debate a new constitution was promulgated. It proclaimed the sovereignty of the people and guaranteed religious freedom and liberty of the press. The government was vested in a single chamber of seven hundred and fifty members elected by popular vote, and a president to be chosen, also by popular vote, for a term of four years. The only trace of the violent labor agitation was embodied in a clause of the preamble, which declared that the republic, within the limit of its resources, was bound to assure the maintenance of indigent citizens by furnishing them with work or aiding those unable to work.

After the establishment of the constitution, interest centered in the first presidential election, held on December 10, 1848. Three leading candidates entered the contest, Ledru-Rollin, representing the labor party, General Cavaignac, who had so ruthlessly suppressed the June insurrection, and Louis Napoleon, a nephew of Napoleon I.

The candidates for the presidency

The last of these candidates had up to this time led a varied and interesting life. He was born in Paris while his father, Louis Napoleon, was king of Holland, and the great emperor had stood as his godfather at his baptism. After his uncle's downfall, when he was six years old, he was expelled from France with his mother, who wandered about with him for some time, and then settled down in Augsburg, where his education was begun in a German school. Later they moved to the shores of Lake Constance, where the young Louis began a special study of the French Revolution under a Swiss tutor. His mother continually impressed upon his youthful mind

Checked career of Louis Napoleon


the fact that one who bore the great name of Bonaparte was destined to accomplish something in the world, and he came firmly to believe that it was his mission to reestablish the Napoleonic dynasty on the throne of France.

After the death of Napoleon I's son in 1832¹ he put himself forward as the direct claimant to the imperial crown, and four years later he attempted to provoke a military uprising at Strassburg, designed to put him on the throne of France. This proved a miserable failure, and only the clemency of Louis Philippe saved him from being punished as a traitor. He then settled in England, where he published in 1839 a volume on *Napoleonic Ideas*, in which he represented Napoleon as the servant of the principles of the Revolution, his empire as the guardian of the rights of the people, and his fondest desire, the progress of democracy. In short, he created a fictitious Napoleon who hoped and labored only for the good of the people, and who was overthrown by tyrants.

This volume proved very opportune, for the next year the remains of the emperor were brought back to France from the lonely island of St. Helena and entombed with great pomp on the banks of the Seine. It seemed to Louis Napoleon that the time was ripe for another attempt to win the coveted crown. He landed with a few companions at Boulogne, bringing with him a tame eagle as an emblem of the empire. This second

Louis Napoleon's work on *Napoleonic Ideas*

¹ Chief members of the Napoleonic House.



* See above, p. 4, note.



The caricaturist represents Louis Napoleon fallen upon evil times. But as he sits in his London lodgings despondent over his past failures to make himself master of France, his pet eagle alights upon the bust of his famous uncle, Napoleon I, and prophesies a great future for his nephew.

English Caricature of Louis Napoleon (1848)

enterprise, like the first, proved a fiasco, and this time Louis Napoleon was shut up in the fortress at Ham, from which, in 1846, he escaped to England to await the good fortune to which he still firmly believed himself destined.

Louis Napoleon returns to France in 1848

The insurrection in 1848 offered just the opportunity he desired, and four days after the proclamation of the republic he announced his presence in Paris to the provisional government, pledged himself to support it, and declared that he had no other ambition than that of serving his country. Shortly afterward he was elected a member of the National Assembly and soon found favor with the populace.

He conciliates the favor of all classes and is elected president of the French Republic

He had for years professed himself a democrat and proclaimed his belief in the sovereignty of the people. He had written several essays in which he had expressed sympathy with the working classes and he was known to have interested himself in the projects of Louis Blanc. He now offered himself as a candidate for the presidency and issued a campaign manifesto, as adroitly worded as many of his famous uncle's proclamations, in which he promised the working classes special laws for their benefit; but, on the other hand, he distinctly repudiated all socialistic schemes and reassured the middle classes by guaranteeing order and the security of property. He did not forget the soldiers, to whom he recalled the glories of the empire and offered an assured existence in return for their long and faithful services to their country. This time his plans worked admirably, for he was elected president by an overwhelming majority of five and a half million votes to less than one and a half millions cast for the two other candidates combined.

LOUIS NAPOLEON AND THE SECOND FRENCH EMPIRE

How the republicans fell into disrepute

59. It soon became clear that the man whom the French had put at the head of their second republic was bent on making himself emperor. His first step was to destroy the

republican party itself ; this was the more easily done because the peasantry and shopkeepers had been turned against it by the hard times and the disorders of 1848. As a result of their discontent almost two thirds of the deputies elected in 1849 were monarchists, so that the president's plans coincided with the sentiments of the assembly. The newspapers of the republicans were closely watched and their public meetings prohibited. A new electoral law was then passed on May 31, 1850, which was cleverly arranged to exclude from the suffrage nearly three million workingmen, — the class most interested in maintaining the republic.

President Napoleon now began to work for a revision of the constitution that would extend his term of office from four to ten years. He selected his ministers from among his personal friends, courted the favor of the army and the government officials, and by journeys through the country sought to arouse the enthusiasm of the people for the restoration of the empire. Nevertheless his proposition to revise the constitution was defeated in the assembly, whereupon he endeavored to gain popularity by declaring that he had never sympathized with the electoral law of May 31, restricting the suffrage, and demanded its repeal.

As the Assembly refused to coöperate in his plans he finally determined to risk a *coup d'état* which he had been meditating for some time. After a social function held in his palace on the evening of December 1, 1851, he gathered about him a few of his most trusted advisers and confided his designs to them. One of his supporters, whom he charged with the publication of a series of decrees, immediately repaired with an armed force to the government printing office and compelled the workmen to print the required proclamations. Another confidential agent was instructed to see that a number of the president's chief opponents in the Assembly were arrested and imprisoned before sunrise. A third was intrusted with the task of preventing any trouble in the army. When

How Louis Napoleon began to work toward reëstablishing the empire

Coup d'état of December 1-2, 1851

the morning of December 2 — the anniversary of the glorious victory of Austerlitz — broke, the walls of Paris were placarded with copies of a decree issued by the president, dissolving the Assembly, reëstablishing universal suffrage, and ordering a new election.

The president appeals to the people

This decree was accompanied by an appeal to the people, in which the president declared that the assembly had become the "center of conspiracies where weapons of civil war were being forged," and added that it was his duty to "preserve the republic and save the country." He stated that he no longer desired an office which he was powerless to use for good. He appealed, consequently, to the people, and proposed certain fundamental constitutional changes, including an increase in the president's term of office to ten years and the establishment of a ministry responsible to the president alone. (Like his distinguished uncle, he was willing to allow everybody to vote if he could retain the right of initiating all laws himself through his council of state.)

And is given dictatorial power by a plebiscitum

Finally he submitted to the people of France the following proposition: "The French people desire the maintenance of the authority of Louis Napoleon Bonaparte and delegate to him the necessary powers in order to make a constitution on the basis announced in his proclamation of December 2." Every Frenchman twenty-one years of age was permitted to vote "yes" or "no" on this proposition, and the result was officially estimated at 7,740,000 for the measure and 646,000 against it. The *coup d'état* was thus approved by the people, and what may be called the constitutional absolutism of the first Napoleon was again introduced into France.

Peaceful character of the revolution of December, 1851

Save for a little bloodshed in Paris on December 4, this revolution was accomplished very quietly. About a hundred thousand opponents of Napoleon throughout the country, including the leaders of the opposition in the assembly, — Thiers, Cavaignac, and Changarnier, — were arrested, and nearly ten thousand were deported, but the people at large accepted the

situation without protest. As Victor Hugo said : "Workingmen read the appeal and went quietly to work. Perhaps one in a hundred took the trouble to say : 'The law of May 31, abolished? — that is good. Universal suffrage again restored? — that is fine. The reactionary majority driven out? — excellent! Thiers imprisoned? — splendid! Changarnier collared? — Hurrah!'" In short the workingmen merely rejoiced in the overthrow of the politicians who had waged war on them in the bloody June days of 1848.

The president was now master of France. He appointed officers, initiated laws, declared war, made peace, and in fact himself constituted the real power in the government. Though already an emperor in reality he was not satisfied until he secured the title, and it was evident that the country was ready for the fulfillment of his hopes, for wherever he went he was greeted with cries of "Long live the Emperor." Part of this public sentiment was doubtless inspired by the president's officials, but the name of Napoleon awakened glorious memories and there was a genuine desire throughout France to see the empire reëstablished.

Reëstablishment of the empire, November, 1852

Toward the close of 1852 Louis Napoleon, in a speech at Bordeaux, at last openly announced his belief that France was ready for the abolition of the second republic. The final step was easy, for the constitution which he had devised after the *coup d'état* of 1851 empowered the senate to regulate everything that had not been provided for by the constitution, and furthermore to propose constitutional amendments. Now, since the members of the senate were chosen by Louis Napoleon himself they readily agreed to pass a decree making him Napoleon III, emperor of the French. This decree was submitted to popular vote (November, 1852) and ratified by an overwhelming majority. The dream of Louis Napoleon's life was at last realized, — the Napoleonic dynasty was restored.

For almost ten years his government was a thinly veiled despotism. Though the imperial constitution confirmed the

Despotic
character of
Napoleon
III's govern-
ment

great principles of the Revolution, a decree abolishing the liberty of the press was immediately issued. No periodical or newspaper treating of political or social economy could be published without previous authorization on the part of the government. Papers of such character published abroad could not be circulated without the consent of the government, and lithographs, engravings, and prints could not be exposed for sale without the approval of the police authorities. Moreover the government officers could suppress journals at will. Napoleon III had promised liberty of instruction, but he compelled the teachers in the university to take an oath of allegiance to himself. Instruction in history and philosophy was discouraged, and the university professors were ordered to shave their mustaches "in order to remove from their appearance, as well as from their manners, the last vestiges of anarchy."

Though the forms of a democratic government were maintained, the will of the emperor was really supreme. While all citizens could vote, the government took care to secure the election of its own candidates for parliament. The representatives of the people met every year in Paris, but they could introduce no bills, for that was reserved to the emperor's council of state, and their debates were rarely open to the public when anything of interest was under consideration.¹

Prosperity of
France under
the second
empire, 1852-
1870

Notwithstanding this autocratic régime, the country was prosperous and the people generally contented. If the emperor was a despot, he endeavored — and with no little success — to be an enlightened one. Benevolent institutions increased in number. Railway construction was rapidly pushed forward, and great trunk lines which had been begun under Louis Philippe were completed. The city of Paris was improved and beautified ;

¹ After ten years of this personal rule the emperor had aroused so much opposition that he was compelled to moderate the laws against the press and political meetings, and in 1870 he consented to a revision of the constitution demanded by the liberals. This reform changed the senate from an imperial council into a second legislative chamber and made ministers responsible to the national parliament.

the narrow streets were widened and broad avenues laid out. The great exposition of 1855 testified to the industrial and scientific advance of France; and if little of all this progress is to be attributed to the emperor's initiative, it nevertheless remains a fact that it was accomplished under his rule. If it had not been for a series of foreign events which weakened his prestige at home, Napoleon III might have remained securely on his throne until his death.

REFERENCES

The Character of Louis Philippe's Government: SEIGNOBOS, *Political History of Europe since 1814*, pp. 132-136; FYFFE, *History of Modern Europe*, pp. 699-703; ANDREWS, *Historical Development of Modern Europe*, Vol. I, pp. 276-314; *Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. X, chap. xv, pp. 475-490; MÜLLER, *Political History of Recent Times*, pp. 182-186.

Growth of the Republican and Labor Parties: SEIGNOBOS, pp. 136-142; ANDREWS, Vol. I, pp. 315-319; *Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. X, chap. xv, pp. 490-493.

The Guizot Ministry and Development of Opposition: SEIGNOBOS, pp. 145-152; ANDREWS, Vol. I, pp. 320-336.

The February Revolution: SEIGNOBOS, pp. 155-159; FYFFE, pp. 703-706; ANDREWS, Vol. I, pp. 336-345; MÜLLER, pp. 186-192.

The Labor Party and Its Overthrow: SEIGNOBOS, pp. 159-164; FYFFE, pp. 729-734; ANDREWS, Vol. I, pp. 345-358; MÜLLER, pp. 192-197.

The Second Republic and Louis Napoleon: SEIGNOBOS, pp. 164-170; FYFFE, pp. 734-737, 810-823; ANDREWS, Vol. II, pp. 7-41; MÜLLER, pp. 197-202.

The Empire of Napoleon III: SEIGNOBOS, pp. 170-184; ANDREWS, Vol. II, pp. 146-188.

CHAPTER XX

REVOLUTION OF 1848, — AUSTRIA, GERMANY, ITALY

THE FALL OF METTERNICH

The issues of the revolution of 1848 broader than those of the first French Revolution

60. When Metternich heard of the February revolution in France all his old fears were revived. "Europe finds herself to-day," he declared, "in the presence of a second 1793." Great changes had, however, taken place during the fifty-five years which had elapsed since France first offered to aid other nations to free themselves from their "tyrants" and throw off the trammels of feudalism. In 1848 the principles proclaimed in the Declaration of the Rights of Man were accepted by the liberal parties which had come into existence in every state of Europe, and which were actively engaged in promoting the cause of popular government, a free press, equality of all before the law, and the abolition of the vestiges of the feudal system. Moreover the national spirit which had awakened during the Napoleonic Period¹ was at work, and served more than anything else to excite opposition to the existing order. Lastly, the Industrial Revolution was quickening the thought and rousing the aspirations of the great mass of the population. Those who lived by the labor of their hands and were employed in the new industries which were rapidly developing now had their spokesmen, especially in France, and claimed the right to vote and to mold the laws to meet their particular interests. So in 1848 the rights of nations and of the laborer were added to the rights of man, which had constituted the main issue in 1793.

In nearly every European country the liberals were encouraged by the successful February revolution in Paris to undertake

¹ See above, Vol. I, pp. 355-599.

to win, by violence if necessary, the reforms which they had so long been advocating. In England a body of workingmen, known as "Chartists,"¹ made a desperate though futile effort to wring from Parliament the right to vote. A liberal ministry in Belgium was forced to reduce the amount of property which voters were required to possess, so that larger numbers of the people could participate in elections. The king of the Netherlands, in order to allay the discontent in his realm, agreed to a new and more democratic form of government. The Swiss, who had just passed through a civil conflict, swept away the constitution which had been adopted in 1814, and drew up a new one.² The chief agitations of 1848, — if we except that in France, described in the preceding chapter, — occurred, however, in Germany, Italy, and the Austrian dominions,³ and it seems best to consider first the disturbances in Vienna, where Metternich had for forty years been doing his best to prevent any hint of change.

The agitation of 1848 general throughout western Europe

¹ The Chartist movement will be considered later. See sect. 80.

² The settlement of 1815 in Switzerland, like that in Germany, Italy, and other European countries, met with opposition from the liberals. It had left the internal government of each canton in the hands of a small minority of the wealthy classes, and had modeled the diet on that of Germany, making it merely a congress of ambassadors with slight powers. Agitation for a revision of this system was begun immediately after its establishment, but it was opposed especially by the Catholics, who were in a slight minority and feared that a stronger central government would be used by the Protestants to restrict their rights. In 1841 the government of Aargau precipitated a civil conflict by suppressing the monasteries within its jurisdiction. Although the Swiss constitution guaranteed the monasteries in their rights, the federal government refused to interfere with the domestic concerns of Aargau. Thereupon the Catholic cantons, under the leadership of Lucerne, Uri, and Zug, formed a Catholic alliance, or *Sonderbund*, which defied the entire democratic and nationalist party. After some skirmishes which scarcely deserve the name of war, this party of disunion was suppressed, and in 1848 a new federal constitution drawn up. Instead of a diet of ambassadors it provided for a senate representing the states, and for deputies elected by the people at large on the plan of the government of the United States. This constitution was revised in 1874, when still larger powers were given to the federal government. For the initiative and "referendum," see below, p. 378. For further details see Seignobos, *Political History of Europe since 1814*, pp. 256-285.

³ Spain escaped a revolution in 1848, largely owing to the strong measures of General Narvaez, who just then enjoyed dictatorial powers.

Extraordi-
nary mixture
of peoples
under Aus-
trian rule

But before proceeding it will be necessary to consider more carefully than we have hitherto done the singular composition of the realms of the House of Hapsburg. The regions west of Vienna, extending to Switzerland and Bavaria, were inhabited chiefly by Germans. To the south, in the provinces of Carniola, Styria, Carinthia, Goerz, Gradiska, and Istria, there were many Slavs, and to the north, in Bohemia and Moravia, were the Czechs, interspersed among twice their number of Germans. On the borders of Russia dwelt the Poles, whose territories the emperor had received at the partition of their kingdom, and the Ruthenians who had once been subjects of the Sultan of Turkey. The inhabitants of the kingdom of Hungary included, besides the Magyars, or Hungarians proper, who dwelt in the vast plains of the Danube valley, Roumanians in the south and east, and the independence-loving Croats (Croatians) in the south and west. Beyond the Alps was the Lombardo-Venetian kingdom inhabited by Italians. Among this mass of people of different tongues and traditions, the most important were the Germans of Austria, the Czechs of Bohemia, the Magyars of Hungary, and the Italians in Lombardy and Venetia.

The govern-
ment of
Austria


In the provinces of the Austrian Empire, Ferdinand I ruled personally through ministers whom he appointed and dismissed. Laws were made, taxes levied, and revenues spent without consulting the people. Newspapers, books, theaters, and teachers were under close police surveillance to prevent the introduction of any new ideas. Travel abroad was restricted by a decree which required every citizen leaving the realm to have a government passport. Scholars were therefore largely cut off from the thought of western Europe, and Metternich boasted that the scientific spirit had been kept out of even the universities. The nobles still enjoyed their ancient authority over their serfs, including the right to mete out justice to them in the manorial courts, to prevent their leaving the villages without permission, and to exact from them the old feudal services. The clergy were as powerful as they had been

Distribution of Races in AUSTRIA-HUNGARY

Scale of Miles.
0 50 100 150

REFERENCE

- Germans
- Czechs
- Slovaks
- Ruthenians
- Poles
- Magyars
- Sorbo Croats
- Slovenes
- Romanians
- Italians and Ladins



before the French Revolution, and non-Catholics were excluded entirely from government offices.

The only vestige of popular government was to be found in the diets of the provinces, and among them only that of Bohemia was formidable enough to hamper in any way the officials dispatched from Vienna. The Bohemians had never ceased to remember that theirs was once an independent kingdom¹ with a glorious past, and, as in other races, a strong spirit of nationalism awakened among them at the opening of the nineteenth century. Napoleon had appealed to that spirit in 1809 when he sought to prevent their aiding Austria against him. "Your union with Austria," he urged, "has been your misfortune. Your blood has been shed for her in distant lands, and your dearest interests have been sacrificed continually to those of the hereditary provinces. You form the finest portion of her empire, and you are treated as a mere province to be used as an instrument of passions to which you are strangers. You have national customs and a national language; you pride yourself on your ancient and illustrious origin. Assume once more your position as a nation. Choose a king for yourselves, who shall reign for you alone, who shall dwell in your midst and be surrounded by your citizens and your soldiers." This stirring appeal failed to arouse the Bohemians at the time, but native poets and writers soon began to recall the independence of the past and to sing the praises of the Bohemian nation, and the Czech language, which had been supplanted among the educated classes by the German tongue, was revived.

The kingdom of Bohemia and its national aspirations

In the kingdom of Hungary the government was under the control of the proud and tyrannical Magyar nobles, who still enjoyed their old feudal privileges and excluded their dependents from all participation in public affairs. There was a diet, or parliament, composed of an upper house of nobles, and a lower house of representatives chosen by the smaller landlords.

Hungary controlled by the Magyar nobles

¹ The Bohemian diet had freely chosen Ferdinand I of Austria as their ruler after the death of their king, Louis, at the battle of Mohács in 1526.

Although the Magyars, or Hungarians proper,¹ constituted less than one half of the population, they held their neighbors, the Croats, Roumanians, and Slovaks in contempt, and denied them all national rights.

Demands for
reform in
Hungary

While Hungary enjoyed a considerable degree of independence, there were two important groups of malcontents. On the one hand, there were the ardent Magyar patriots, who demanded that their diet should meet at Pesth instead of at the German town of Pressburg (not far from Vienna), and that the emperor should choose Hungarian advisers who should be responsible to the diet. On the other hand, there were the enlightened liberals, whose programme included : the admission of the public to the discussions in the diet ; a parliamentary journal in which the debates should be published in full ; triennial elections, and regular yearly meetings of the diet ; increase of the representatives chosen by the towns ; equal taxation of all classes ; the abolition of the forced labor required of the peasant, and all other vestiges of serfdom.

Opposition
from Vienna

For many years there had been warnings of impending changes in Hungary. In 1832 speakers in the diet began to substitute their own native tongue for the barbarous Latin which had for centuries been used as the official language. The reformers complained that their king spent too much of his time in his German capital and requested him to recognize the importance of Hungary by more frequent visits to their country. The government at Vienna replied to these reasonable suggestions by insisting on the continued use of Latin instead of Magyar, which the emperor's ministers would scarce have understood. The publication of reform speeches was forbidden, and a prominent Hungarian leader, Kossuth, was imprisoned for circulating them in manuscript. Undaunted by this punishment, however, Kossuth, on his release, established

Kossuth
(1802-1894)

¹ The Hungarians — who belong to a very different race from the Slavic peoples and speak the Magyar tongue — invaded the Danube valley in the year 895, and wedged themselves in between the Slavic Russians and Poles on the north and the Slavic Croats, Slovaks, and Servians on the south.

a newspaper at Pesth and began to advocate radical reforms in the Hungarian government itself, as well as greater freedom from Austrian interference. With fiery zeal he wrote and spoke on the abolition of feudal privileges, the introduction of trial by jury, revision of the barbarous criminal law, and similar questions which had long agitated the rest of Europe.

The Italians in Lombardo-Venetia were no less dissatisfied than the Hungarians. The Austrian government there was in the hands of police officials and judges who arrested and imprisoned freely all advocates of Italian rights. Tariffs were so arranged as to enrich the emperor's treasury and check Italian industries in favor of those of Austria. The forts were garrisoned with Austrian troops which the government employed to suppress any violent demonstrations.

Causes of
discontent in
Lombardo-
Venetia

The ground was therefore thoroughly prepared for the seeds of insurrection when the overthrow of Louis Philippe encouraged the opponents of Metternich in Germany, Austria, Hungary, and Italy to hope that they could destroy his system at once and forever. On March 13, 1848, a number of students proceeded to the assembly hall in Vienna where the local diet was in session, and, supported by the crowd that quickly gathered, invaded the building. Outside the mob continued to increase, barricades were built, street fighting began, and shouts of "Down with Metternich" penetrated the imperial palace. The aged minister, convinced that it was no longer possible to check the rising torrent of revolution, tendered his resignation. He fled from Austria and found refuge in England, where he was heartily welcomed by his old friend, the duke of Wellington, who was himself occupied with a threatened uprising in London. After the flight of Metternich a new ministry was formed, which began to draft a constitution.

March revo-
lution in
Vienna

Fall of
Metternich

Two days after the uprising in Vienna the Hungarian diet at Pressburg, by a unanimous vote, dispatched a delegation to the emperor demanding a responsible ministry, freedom of the

Reform
measures in
Hungary

press, trial by jury, and a national educational system. The Hungarian representatives were received in Vienna with tremendous cheering, and the emperor acceded to most of their demands. Thereupon the Hungarian diet, under the influence of the zealous patriot, Kossuth, swept away the old offices through which the emperor had ruled in Hungary, and established its own ministries of finance, war, and foreign affairs, — a first step toward independence. It also emancipated the peasants without providing compensation to the landlords, leaving that as a “debt of honor” to be paid in the future. The king, owing to the insurrection in Vienna, was in no position to reject even these revolutionary measures.

Revolution
in Prague

His troubles were, moreover, not yet at an end, for on March 15 the patriotic Czechs in the city of Prague held a mass meeting at which a petition for civil liberty, racial equality, and the abolition of serfdom was drawn up. Solemn mass was then said, and a delegation bearing the petition left by special train for Vienna amid the cheers of the crowd and the waving of Czech flags. The Bohemian representatives, like those from Hungary, were received in the capital with enthusiasm. The emperor addressed them, to their great joy, in their own language, and approved most of their proposals. It will be observed that so far neither in Hungary nor in Bohemia had the patriots showed any desire to throw off their allegiance to their Austrian ruler.

Revolution
throughout
Italy, March,
1848

In Italy, however, the Austrian rule was thoroughly hated. Immediately on hearing the news of Metternich's fall the Milanese expelled the imperial troops from their city, and the Austrians were soon forced to evacuate a great part of Lombardy.¹

¹ The revolutionists in Italy had not waited for the February revolution in Paris, or the fall of Metternich, to begin a movement for reform. In September, 1847, a little uprising had taken place in Sicily which resulted in the death of several champions of Italian unity and constitutional government. Disorder was renewed in both Sicily and Naples four months later, and in January, 1848, Ferdinand II, king of the Two Sicilies, granted his Neapolitan subjects a constitution, and in February another to the people of Sicily. Trouble was meanwhile brewing in Milan, and the presence of Austrian troops alone postponed the outbreak.

The Venetians followed the lead of Milan and set up once more their ancient republic which Napoleon had suppressed. The Milanese, anticipating a struggle, appealed to Charles Albert, king of Sardinia, for aid. By the middle of March a great part of Italy was in revolt, and constitutions had been granted by the rulers in Naples, Rome, Tuscany, and Piedmont. The king of Sardinia was forced by public opinion to assume the leadership in the attempt to expel the interloping Austria and ultimately perhaps to found some sort of an Italian union which would satisfy the national aspirations of the Italian people. Pope Pius IX, who was just beginning his long and celebrated pontificate of more than thirty years, and even the Bourbon king of Naples, were induced to consent to the arming of troops in the cause of Italian freedom, and thus Italy began her first war for independence.

The crisis in Vienna and the war in Italy now made it impossible for Austria to continue to exercise the control over the German states which she had enjoyed for more than thirty years. Consequently there were almost simultaneous risings in Baden, Würtemberg, Bavaria, and Saxony. The news of the February revolution in Paris caused great excitement also in Berlin, where deputations were sent to the king asking him to grant Prussia a constitution. On March 18 a crowd before the royal palace came into serious collision with the police; some street fighting ensued, and barricades were constructed after the Paris fashion in the districts in which the working people lived. Frederick William IV, hoping to avoid more disorder and bloodshed, promised to summon an assembly to draft the desired constitution.

Now that Metternich was overthrown there was some hope of reorganizing the weak German confederation and forming a new and firm union which would at last make a real nation of the Germans. Indeed, before the rising in Vienna, a self-appointed committee of liberals had called together an assembly to which several hundred delegates from the diets of the

The Prussians demand a constitution

A National Assembly convoked at Frankfort to draw up a new constitution for Germany, May, 1848

various German states came on March 30. At their instigation the diet of the confederation convoked a national assembly made up of representatives chosen by popular vote in all the states. This met at Frankfort, May 18, 1848, amid high hopes, and proceeded to take up the difficult question of drafting a constitution which should please at once the German princes and their liberal-minded subjects.

FAILURE OF THE REVOLUTION IN BOHEMIA AND HUNGARY .

Bright outlook for reform in March, 1848

61. By the end of March, 1848, the prospects of reform seemed bright indeed. Hungary and Bohemia had been granted the local rights which they had so long desired; a committee in Vienna was busy drawing up a constitution for the Austrian provinces; Lombardy and Venetia had declared their independence; four other Italian states had obtained their longed-for constitutions; a Prussian convention to reform the government had been promised; and lastly, a great National Assembly was about to be convened at Frankfort to prepare a constitution for a united Germany.

How the radicals, by their want of coöperation and their extreme demands, aided the conservatives to regain their power

The reformers who had gained these seeming victories had, however, only just reached the most difficult part of their task. They were opposed by two parties, who abhorred each other, but who effectually, if unconsciously, combined to frustrate the plans of the moderates. These were, first, the conservatives, represented by the rulers and nobles, who were naturally reluctant to see popular constitutions established; and secondly, the radicals of various degrees, from those who only wanted universal suffrage, to the socialists, who wished to overturn the whole existing economic system in favor of the working classes. The discontent of the latter was not without some justification, for everywhere it had been their demonstrations that had frightened the rulers into concessions, and now those who had risen to power by their aid showed little

disposition to heed their demands. For example, the ministers who drafted the new Austrian constitution put such restrictions on the right to vote for members of the lower house as to exclude the workingmen altogether. As in France, so also in the other countries, the revolutionists were divided among themselves, and this division enabled the reactionary rulers and their supporters to recover from the extraordinary humiliations which they had suffered during the various uprisings in March.

The first notable victory for the reaction was in Bohemia, where race rivalry proved favorable to the reëstablishment of the emperor's former influence. The Czechs hated the Germans, while the Germans, on their part, feared that they would be oppressed if the Czechs were given a free hand. They therefore opposed the plan of making Bohemia practically independent of the government at Vienna, for it was to German Vienna that they were wont to look for protection against the enterprises of their Czechish fellow-countrymen. The German element also wanted to send delegates to the Frankfort Convention and were very anxious that Bohemia should not be excluded from the reorganized German confederation, to which they quite naturally desired to belong in the future as in the past.

Divergent views of the Czechs and Germans in Bohemia

The Czechs, on the other hand, determined to offset the movement toward German consolidation by a Pan-Slavic congress which should bring together the various Slavic peoples comprised in the Austrian Empire. To this assembly, which met at Prague early in June, 1848, came representatives of the Czechs, Moravians, and Ruthenians in the north, and the Servians and Croatians in the south. Unfortunately the several Slavonic languages differ from one another quite as much as English, Swedish, Dutch, and German, and after trying French as a common tongue, the delegates had to fall back upon German, which was the only language with which they were all familiar.

The Pan-Slavic congress forced to carry on its debates in German

Windischgrätz puts an end to the Bohemian revolution, June 18, 1848

The congress accomplished nothing beyond fraternal declamations, and was about to dissolve on June 12, when some of the more radical students and workingmen began singing Bohemian songs and denouncing General Windischgrätz, a Bohemian nobleman in command of the troops in Prague, who was especially hated on account of his aristocratic bearing and sentiments. (He was reputed to have said, "No one below the rank of baron should be considered a human being.") A street fight broke out between the crowd and his soldiers, which was followed by an attack on his residence. On June 17 he retaliated by bombarding the town, which caught fire. The next day he entered the flaming streets, proclaimed martial law, and announced that the revolution in Bohemia was at an end. This was Austria's first real victory over her rebellious subjects.

Windischgrätz bombards and takes Vienna, October 31, 1848

In Vienna affairs were going from bad to worse. The promised constitution had been issued on April 25, but it proved to be far too conservative to meet the demands of the people and only served to increase the general dissatisfaction and uneasiness. Frightened by the growing disorder, the incompetent emperor fled to Innsbruck (May 18). A provisional government was set up and an assembly called to draft a new constitution, but nothing was accomplished. Meantime the turmoil increased; the minister of war was brutally murdered for ordering troops to march against the Hungarians who were fighting for independence, and for a time there was almost a reign of terror in the capital. The emperor's government was helpless, and finally Windischgrätz announced his intention of marching on Vienna and, with the emperor's approval, putting an end to revolution there as he had done in Prague. The Viennese attempted to defend the city and were supported by a Hungarian army which marched to their aid, but all in vain. After a cruel bombardment Windischgrätz entered the capital on October 31, and once within the walls, he showed little mercy on the people.

A reactionary ministry was soon formed, and a new Metternich discovered in the person of Schwartzemberg, who forced the weak Ferdinand to abdicate, December 2, in favor of his youthful nephew, Francis Joseph, who still (1907) sits on the Austrian throne.

Francis Joseph becomes emperor of Austria

It will be remembered that after the fall of Metternich the emperor had not been in a position to refuse the demands of the Hungarians, and that they had succeeded in gaining practical independence for their kingdom. The new Hungarian government forbade its officials to receive orders from Vienna and instituted a Hungarian army and a national currency. But the spirit of independence had also been awakened in the other races which the Magyars had so long dominated. The Slavs in Hungary, southern Austria, and the neighboring Turkish Empire had long meditated on the possibility of a united Slavic kingdom in the south, and when the Magyars attempted to force their language on the Croats, one of the Slav leaders hurled back at them: "You Magyars are only an island in an ocean of Slavs. Take heed that the waves do not rise and overwhelm you."

Dissension between the Magyars and Slavs

The Croats and Servians were, on the whole, friendly to the Vienna government, which was quick to take advantage of their antagonism to Hungarian rule. In March, 1848, a few days after the Hungarian delegation had been dismissed with fair promises, the emperor appointed as governor in Croatia, Colonel Jellachich, who was known to be a bitter enemy of everything Magyar. As soon as he was installed in office he drove the Magyar officials out of Croatia, convoked a Croatian diet, and actively championed Austrian unity against Magyar separatism. While the emperor publicly repudiated the action of the Croatian governor he secretly encouraged him, and on September 11, 1848, Jellachich, with the support of the Austrian ministry, led an army of Servians and Croats into Hungary.

Rôle of Jellachich

Kossuth now adopted an attitude of uncompromising hostility toward the Austrian government and denounced its duplicity. The emperor also threw off the mask and, in a manifesto on

Austria, with
Russia's aid,
crushes the
Hungarian
rebellion,
August, 1849

October 3, declared the Hungarian parliament dissolved and its acts void. In December Windischgrätz, the conqueror of Prague and Vienna, crossed into Hungary at the head of an army, and on January 5 entered Pesth. The war seemed for a time at an end, but the Hungarians rallied in a mighty national uprising against the Austrians, and on April 19, 1849, they declared their complete and eternal separation from the Vienna government. They might have succeeded in maintaining their independence had not the Tsar, Nicholas I, placed his forces at the disposal of Francis Joseph. Attacked by an army of a hundred and fifty thousand Russians, who marched in from the east, the Hungarians were compelled, by the middle of August, to give up the contest. Austria took terrible vengeance upon the rebels. Thousands were shot, hanged, or imprisoned, and many, including Kossuth, fled to the United States or elsewhere. The ancient kingdom of Hungary seemed about to be reduced to the state of an insignificant Austrian province, but, as we shall see, within less than twenty years she was able to secure the coveted independence.

AUSTRIA REGAINS HER POWER IN ITALY

Defeat of
the Italians
under Charles
Albert of
Sardinia,
July, 1848

62. Austria was no less successful in reëstablishing her power in Italy than in Hungary. The Italians had been unable to drive out the Austrian army which, under the indomitable general, Radetzky, had taken refuge in the so-called Quadrilateral, in the neighborhood of Mantua, where it was protected by four great fortresses. Charles Albert of Sardinia found himself, with the exception of a few volunteers, almost unsupported by the other Italian states. The best ally of Austria was the absence of united action upon the part of the Italians and the jealousy and indifference that they showed as soon as war had actually begun. Pius IX decided that his mission was one of peace, and that he could not afford to join in a war against Austria, the staunchest friend of the Roman Church. The king

of Naples easily found a pretext for recalling the troops that public opinion had compelled him to send to the aid of the king of Sardinia. Charles Albert was defeated at Custoza, July 25, and compelled to sign a truce with Austria and to withdraw his forces from Lombardy.

The Italian republicans, who imputed to Charles Albert merely personal motives in his efforts to free Italy, now attempted to carry out their own program. Florence followed the example of Venice and proclaimed itself a republic. At Rome the liberal and enlightened Rossi, whom the Pope had placed at the head of affairs, was assassinated in November just as he was ready to promulgate his reforms. Pius IX fled from the city and put himself under the protection of the king of Naples. A constitutional assembly was then convoked by the revolutionists, and in February, 1849, under the influence of Mazzini, it declared the temporal power of the Pope abolished, and proclaimed the Roman Republic.

Policy of the Italian republicans

While these local insurrections were weakening the already distracted Italy, the truce between Piedmont and Austria expired, and in March, 1849, Charles Albert renewed the war which had been discontinued after the disaster at Custoza. The campaign lasted but five days and closed with his crushing and definitive defeat at Novara (March 23), which put an end to the hopes of Italian liberty for the time being. Charles Albert abdicated in favor of his son, Victor Emmanuel II, who was destined before many years to exchange the title of King of Sardinia for that of King of Italy.

Austria defeats the king of Sardinia at Novara, March, 1849

Accession of Victor Emmanuel II as king of Sardinia

After bringing the king of Sardinia to terms, Austria pushed southward, reestablishing the old order as she went. The ephemeral Italian republics were unable to offer any effectual resistance. The former rulers were restored in Rome,¹ Tuscany, and Venice, and the new constitutions were swept away from

Austria reestablishes the former conditions in Italy, except in Piedmont

¹ In order to secure the support of the clergy and the conservative party in France, Louis Napoleon, president of the new French republic, had dispatched troops to the Pope's assistance.

one end of the peninsula to the other, except in Piedmont, the most important part of the king of Sardinia's realms. There Victor Emmanuel not only maintained the representative government introduced by his father, but, by summoning to his councils d'Azeglio and others known throughout Italy for their liberal sentiments, he prepared to lead Italy once more against her foreign oppressors.

OUTCOME OF THE REVOLUTION OF 1848 IN GERMANY

Question of
the extent
of the pro-
posed Ger-
man union

63. In Germany, as elsewhere, Austria profited by the dissensions among her opponents. On May 18, 1848, the National Assembly, consisting of nearly six hundred representatives of the German people, had met at Frankfort. It immediately began the consideration of a new constitution that should satisfy the popular longings for a great free German state, to be governed by and for the people. But what were to be the confines of this new German state? The confederation of 1815 did not include all the German inhabitants of Prussia, and did include the heterogeneous western possessions of Austria, — Bohemia and Moravia, for example, where many of the people were Slavs. There was no hesitation in deciding that all the Prussian territories should be admitted to the new union. As it appeared impossible to leave out Austria altogether, the Assembly agreed to include those parts of her territory which had belonged to the confederation formed in 1815. This decision rendered the task of founding a real German state practically impossible; for the new union was to include two great European powers which might at any moment become rivals, since Prussia would hardly consent to be led forever by Austria. So heterogeneous a union could only continue to be, as it had been, a loose confederation of practically independent princes.

Impossibility
of a German
state which
should in-
clude both
Austria and
Prussia

The improbability that the Assembly at Frankfort would succeed in its undertaking was greatly increased by its unwise

conduct. Instead of proceeding immediately to frame a new form of government, it devoted several months to the formulation of the general rights of the German citizen. This gave a fine opportunity to the theorists, of whom there were many in the Assembly, to ventilate their views, and by the time that the constitution itself came up for discussion, Austria had begun to regain her influence and was ready to lead the conservative forces once more. She could rely upon the support of the rulers of southern Germany, for they were well satisfied with the old confederation and the independence that it gave them.

The Assembly at Frankfurt gives Austria time to recover

In spite of her partiality for the old union, Austria could not prevent the Assembly from completing its new constitution. This provided that there should be an hereditary emperor at the head of the government, and that exalted office was tendered to the king of Prussia. Frederick William IV had been alienated from the liberal cause, which he had at first espoused, by the insurrection in Berlin. He was, moreover, timid and conservative at heart; he hated revolution and doubted whether the National Assembly had any right to confer the imperial title. He also greatly respected Austria, and felt that a war with her, which was likely to ensue if he accepted the crown, would not only be dangerous to Prussia, since Francis Joseph could rely upon the assistance of the Tsar, but dishonorable as well in Austria's present embarrassment. So he refused the imperial title and announced his rejection of the new constitution (April, 1849).

The Assembly asks the king of Prussia to become emperor of Germany

Frederick William IV refuses the imperial crown

This decision rendered the year's work of the National Assembly fruitless, and its members gradually dispersed, with the exception of the radicals, who made a last desperate effort to found a republic. Austria now insisted upon the reëstablishment of the old diet, and nearly came to war with Prussia over the policy to be pursued. Hostilities were only averted by the ignominious submission of Prussia to the demands of Schwartzemberg in 1850, when Austria had once more, in spite

The National Assembly disperses and the old diet is restored

Decline of
Austrian
influence
after 1851

of the greatest obstacles, established the system of Metternich. But this victory was of short duration, and it was her last. Five years later the encroachments of Russia in Turkey brought on the Crimean War.¹ In this war Austria observed an inglorious neutrality; she thereby sacrificed much of her prestige with both Russia and the western powers and encouraged renewed attempts to free both Italy and Germany from her control.

Prussia
granted a
constitution
by Frederick
William IV
(January,
1850)

Amid the meager results of the revolution of 1848 there was one gain of great significance for the future of Germany; Prussia emerged from the turmoil of the period with a written constitution which established a legislative assembly and admitted a portion of the people to a share in the government. As we have seen, the news of the revolution in France caused great excitement in Berlin, and the king, fearing a continuance of violence, promised to convoke an assembly to formulate a constitution. This convention met at Berlin in May of the same year and, amid prolonged debates, advocated many radical measures which displeased the king. It proposed to abolish the nobility and to strike from the royal title the phrase "King by the Grace of God." Meanwhile there was disorder in the quarters occupied by the working class, and on June 14 a mob stormed the arsenal. This situation frightened the king and he withdrew to Potsdam. He then ordered the assembly to adjourn to Brandenburg, and on its refusal, he dissolved it in spite of its protests. After getting rid of the popular assembly, the king, in 1849, submitted a constitution of his own to a more tractable convention of carefully selected subjects. This document, which was promulgated in January, 1850, remains, with some minor changes, the constitution of Prussia to-day.

The Prussian
constitution
disappoints
the liberals

It proved, however, a great disappointment to the liberals, who had hoped for a really democratic form of government. It contains forty articles enumerating the rights of Prussians, but makes no provision for enforcing them. It provides for a

¹ See below, pp. 307 *seqq.*

ministry, but makes it responsible to the king rather than to the diet. The latter comprises a house of lords (*Herrenhaus*), — consisting of princes, nobles, life peers selected by the king, representatives of the universities, and burgomasters of the large towns, — and a house of deputies (*Abgeordnetenhaus*).

All men over twenty-five years of age may vote for the electors, who in turn select the deputies to the lower house, but the constitution carefully arranges to give the rich a predominating influence in the election. Those who stand first on the tax list, and pay together one third of the total taxes, are permitted to choose one third of the electors. The second third on the list also choose a third of the electors, and finally, the great mass of the poorer people, whose small contributions to the treasury make up the remaining third of the revenue, are entitled to cast their votes for the remaining third of the electors assigned to the district. It may happen, therefore, that a single wealthy man, if he pay a third of the taxes, has as much influence in sending representatives from the district to Berlin as the whole number of working people combined.

System of voting which gives a predominating influence to the rich

REFERENCES

The Austrian Empire on the Eve of the Revolution of 1848: SEIGNOBOS, *Political History of Europe since 1814*, pp. 401-412.

The March Revolution in Austria: SEIGNOBOS, pp. 412-419; PHILLIPS, *European History, 1815-1899*, pp. 273-281; ANDREWS, *Historical Development of Modern Europe*, Vol. I, pp. 363-373.

Prussia and the Revolution of 1848: SEIGNOBOS, pp. 424-451; PHILLIPS, pp. 282-284; ANDREWS, Vol. I, pp. 379-384.

Revolution and Restoration in Italy: SEIGNOBOS, pp. 335-346; ANDREWS, Vol. I, pp. 384-395.

The Frankfort Assembly and German Unity: SEIGNOBOS, pp. 391-399; ANDREWS, Vol. I, pp. 418-448.

General View of the March Revolution in Europe: FYFFE, *History of Modern Europe*, pp. 707-728; PHILLIPS, pp. 273-292.

Reaction after the Revolution of 1848: FYFFE, pp. 738-823; PHILLIPS, pp. 293-331.

CHAPTER XXI

THE UNIFICATION OF ITALY

CAVOUR AND ITALIAN UNITY

Italy in 1850

64. The efforts of the Italian liberals to expel Austria from the peninsula and establish constitutional governments in the various Italian states had failed, and after the battle of Novara it seemed as if the former political conditions were to be restored. The king of Naples broke all the promises which he had made to his subjects, revoked the constitution which he had granted, and imprisoned, exiled, or in some cases executed the revolutionists. The Pope, with the assistance of France, Austria, Naples, and Spain, was able to destroy the Roman Republic which had been set up, and place the government again in the hands of the ecclesiastics. In northern Italy Austria was once more in control, and she found faithful adherents in the rulers of Modena, Parma, and Tuscany, who looked to her for continued support. The leading spirits of the revolution who had escaped prison or death fled to foreign countries to await a more auspicious opportunity to secure their ends, for they did not surrender the hope that Austria would some time be driven from their country, and all the Italian states brought together into a federation, or perhaps united into a single monarchy or republic.

Divergent
views of those
intent on uni-
fying Italy


However, those who, since the fall of Napoleon I, had been interested in promoting Italian independence and liberty differed from one another as to the best way in which to make Italy a nation. There were the republicans, who became more and more disgusted with monarchy and believed that nothing could be accomplished until the various rulers should give way to a great democratic republic, which should recall the ancient



ITALY.
in 1859
 (before the
 Austro-Sardinian War)

0 50 100
 Scale of Miles

8 W. - N. ENG., BUFFALO 10 12 Longitude East 14 from Greenwich 16



glories of Rome; others were confident that an enlightened Pope could form an Italian federation, of which he should be the head; lastly, there was a practical party, whose adherents placed their hopes in the king of Sardinia, who seemed to them to be the natural leader in the emancipation of Italy. Little as the revolution of 1848 had accomplished, it had at least given Sardinia a young and energetic king and a new constitution.

Among the republican leaders the most conspicuous was the delicately organized and highly endowed Giuseppe Mazzini. Born in 1805, he had, as he tells us, become a republican from hearing his father discuss the achievements of the French Revolution, and had read eagerly the old French newspapers which he found hidden behind the medical books in his father's library. He joined the secret society of the Carbonari, and in 1830 was caught by the police and imprisoned in the fortress of Savona, west of Genoa. Here he arranged a secret code, which enabled him to keep in communication with the revolutionists.

Mazzini,
1805-1872

Becoming disgusted with the inefficiency and the silly mystery of the Carbonari, Mazzini planned a new association, which he called "Young Italy." This aimed to bring about the regeneration of Italy through the education of young men in lofty republican principles. Mazzini had no confidence in princes or in foreign aid. "We are of the people, and will treat with the people. They will understand us," he said. He believed that every nation was destined by the laws of God and humanity to form a community of free and equal brothers, and that true sovereignty resided essentially in the people. He urged that all the Italians should be brought together into a single republic, for he feared that any form of federation would leave the country too weak to resist the constant interference of neighboring nations. Mazzini was not a man to organize a successful revolution, but he inspired the young Italians with almost religious enthusiasm for the cause of Italy's liberation. His writings, which were widely read,

"Young
Italy"

created a feeling of loyalty to a common country among the patriots who were scattered throughout the various Italian states.

Gioberti advocates union under the Pope

The priest and theologian Gioberti, while he dreamed of a new Italy, placed his hopes, not in a republic in which the common man should have a voice in the conduct of the government, but in a federation of princes under that most ancient of all Italian princes, the bishop of Rome.¹ And when Pius IX, upon his accession in 1846, immediately began to consult the interests and wishes of his people by admitting laymen to his councils and tribunals, subjecting priests to taxation, granting greater liberty to the press, and even protesting against Austrian encroachments, there seemed to be some ground for the belief that the Pope might take the lead in the regeneration of Italy. But he soon grew suspicious of the liberals, and the revolution at Rome and his temporary exile from the city in 1848 completely alienated him from the popular movement.

Pius IX at first adopts a liberal policy

Progressive government of Victor Emmanuel

The future, however, belonged neither to the republicans nor to the papal party, but to those who looked to the king of Sardinia to bring about the salvation of Italy. Only under his leadership was there any prospect of ousting Austria, and until that was done no independent union could possibly be formed. Practical men therefore began to turn to the young Victor Emmanuel, whose devotion to the cause of freedom in the war with Austria in 1848, and whose frank acceptance of the principles of constitutional government, distinguished him from all the other rulers of Italy. His father, Charles Albert,

¹ Some notion of the fervid eloquence and vague ideas of Gioberti may be gained from the following: "Let the nations then turn their eyes to Italy, their ancient and loving mother, who will be the source of their regeneration. Italy is the organ of the supreme reason, . . . the fountain, rule, and guardian of reason and eloquence everywhere; for there resides the Head that rules, the Arm that moves, the Tongue that commands, and the Heart that animates Christianity at large. . . . As Rome is the seat of Christian wisdom, Piedmont is to-day the principal fortress of Italian military strength. Seated on the slopes of the Alps as a wedge between Austria and France, and as a guard to the peninsula of which it is the vestibule and peristyle, it is destined to watch from its mountains, and crush in its ravines every foreign aggressor."



COUNT CAVOUR

had granted Piedmont a constitution in 1848, which provided for a parliament with two houses and a responsible ministry. This constitution (which was later to become that of a united Italy) Victor Emmanuel maintained in spite of Austria's demands that he suppress it.

Though not a man of great brilliance or energy, Victor Emmanuel was possessed of good judgment and no little administrative capacity. He was wise enough to call to his aid one of the most distinguished of modern statesmen, Camille Benso, better known as the count of Cavour, who had long been an advocate both of constitutional government and of Italian unity. Cavour, who was born in 1810, had given much attention to the improvement of agriculture and to the study of political economy. In pursuance of these interests he had visited France and then spent some time on an English estate studying agricultural methods. He visited the factories, inspected the latest machinery, studied the operation of the English poor laws and prison reforms, and became in the process a warm admirer of the English system of government.

Upon his return to Piedmont Cavour had begun immediately to advocate those reforms which alone could secure the unity and independence of Italy. He proposed a great network of railways, radiating from the city of Rome and binding together the entire peninsula. He founded a newspaper called *The Resurrection*, for the purpose of furthering the cause of independence and reform. Although an object of hatred to the conservatives, he gained a large following among the liberal-minded. He was not discouraged by the outcome of the conflict with Austria in 1848 and became a member of the chamber of representatives under the new constitution. In 1852 he was selected by the king as prime minister and now found himself at last in a position to carry out his convictions.

Sardinia was a rather insignificant kingdom when compared with the more important countries of Europe. It had a population of less than five millions and consisted of four distinct

Count
Cavour,
1810-1861

Cavour be-
gins to
advocate
radical re-
forms in
Piedmont
and Italy

Cavour prime
minister, 1852

The kingdom of Sardinia composed of four quite different regions

regions which were more or less hostile to one another. The heart of the kingdom was Piedmont, an agricultural district inhabited by a haughty aristocracy and a mass of ignorant peasantry, who spoke a peculiar Italian dialect and were regarded by the remainder of Italy as a half-foreign people. To the northwest of Piedmont lay Savoy, consisting mainly of a lofty Alpine range, the valleys of which were inhabited by French-speaking peasants who were thoroughly under the control of the clergy and nobility and would feel no natural interest in Italian unity, or even in the reform of the kingdom of Sardinia to which they seemed hardly to belong. Lying along the shores of the Mediterranean were the former possessions of the republic of Genoa, whose people had never become reconciled to their annexation to Piedmont in 1815. And lastly, far away in the Mediterranean lay the island of Sardinia, a barren region in a backward state of civilization.

How the king and Cavour sought to strengthen the kingdom of Sardinia

The task, therefore, which confronted Victor Emmanuel was a complicated one. He must endeavor to bind together the various parts of his own kingdom, and encourage the growth of a commercial and industrial class, in order to balance the conservatism of the nobility and clergy, while at the same time he sought to strengthen his army for the inevitable war against Austria. He and his minister, Cavour, determined to raise the kingdom to a position of importance in European affairs. They encouraged trade by concluding favorable commercial treaties, reduced the number of monasteries, steadily promoted the construction of railways, increased the army, and improved its discipline.

Cavour's foreign policy

Yet Cavour did not sympathize with those enthusiasts who hoped that Italy would achieve unity without foreign aid. He knew that it was impossible to disregard the other powers of Europe, who had so long interfered freely in Italian affairs. He early declared, "Whether we like it or not, our destinies depend upon France; we must be her partner in the great game which will be played sooner or later in Europe."

An opportunity soon offered itself for Sardinia to become the ally of France. The Crimean War¹ had broken out in 1854 between England and France on the one side, and Russia on the other, and in 1855 Cavour signed an offensive and defensive alliance with France and sent troops to her aid in the Crimea. This gave him an opportunity to take part in the European congress which met in Paris in 1856 to conclude a peace. There he warned the powers that Austrian control in northern Italy was a menace to the peace of Europe and succeeded in enlisting the interest of Napoleon III in Italian affairs; — it will be remembered that in his younger days the French emperor had sympathized with the Carbonari, and he had a number of Italian relatives who besought his aid in forwarding the cause of Italian unity.

Sardinia
joins France
in the
Crimean War

There were other reasons, too, why Napoleon was ready to consider intervention in Italy. Like his distinguished uncle, he was after all only a usurper. He knew that he could not rely upon mere tradition, but must maintain his popularity by deeds that should redound to the glory of France. A war with Austria for the liberation of the Italians, who like the French were a Latin race, would be popular, especially if France could thereby add a bit of territory to her realms and perhaps become the protector of the proposed Italian confederation. A conference was arranged between Napoleon and Cavour. Just what agreement was reached we do not know, but Napoleon no doubt engaged to come to the aid of the king of Sardinia, should the latter find a pretense for going to war with Austria. Should they together succeed in expelling Austria from northern Italy, the king of Sardinia was to reward France by ceding to her Savoy and Nice, which belonged to her geographically and racially.

Position and
policy of
Napoleon III

By April, 1859, Victor Emmanuel had managed to involve himself in a war with Austria. The French army promptly joined forces with the Piedmontese, defeated the Austrians at

Victories
of Victor
Emmanuel
and Napo-
leon III over
Austria

¹ See below, pp. 307 *sq.*

Magenta, and on June 8 Napoleon III and Victor Emmanuel entered Milan amid the rejoicings of the people. The Austrians managed the campaign very badly and were again defeated at Solferino (June 24).

Napoleon III
unexpectedly
consents to
a truce

Suddenly Europe was astonished to hear that a truce had been concluded and that the preliminaries of a peace had been arranged which left Venetia in Austria's hands, in spite of Napoleon III's boast that he would free Italy to the Adriatic. The French emperor was shocked, however, by the horrors of a real battlefield; he believed, moreover, that it would require three hundred thousand soldiers to drive the Austrians from their strongly fortified Quadrilateral, and he could not draw further upon the resources of France. Lastly he had begun to fear that, in view of the growing enthusiasm which was showing itself throughout the peninsula for Piedmont, there was danger that it might succeed in forming a national kingdom so strong as to need no French protector. By leaving Venetia in the possession of Austria and agreeing that Piedmont should only be increased by the incorporation of Lombardy and the little duchies of Parma and Modena, Napoleon III hoped to prevent the consolidation of Italy from proceeding too far. He had, however, precipitated changes which he was powerless to check. Italy was now ready to fuse into a single state.

Parma,
Modena,
Tuscany, and
the Romagna
request to be
annexed to
the kingdom
of Sardinia
(August-
September,
1859)

When war had broken out between Austria and Sardinia, the liberals in the duchies of Parma, Modena, Tuscany, and the Romagna (that portion of the papal possessions which lay farthest from Rome) had formed provisional governments with a view of supporting Sardinia. During the months of August and September, 1859, the people in the three duchies declared in favor of the permanent expulsion of their respective rulers and for annexation to the kingdom of Sardinia. An assembly in the Romagna repudiated the temporal rule of the Pope and also expressed the wish to be joined to Sardinia. The customs lines were thereupon abolished between these several countries; they adopted the Sardinian constitution,

and placed their postal service under the control of Sardinian officials.

The king of Naples stubbornly refused either to form any kind of an alliance with the king of Sardinia or to grant his people a constitution. Garibaldi thereupon determined to bring him to terms and prepare the way for the union of southern Italy and Sicily with the expanding Sardinia. This bold sailor, warrior, and ardent revolutionist had long been following an adventurous career as a champion of republican liberty. He was born in Nice in 1807; while still a youth he joined Mazzini's "Young Italy" and later took an active part in all the revolutionary risings in Italy. As a sailor he visited various parts of the world and became interested in the political struggles in South America, where he spent ten years fighting in the interests of the people, as he believed. After the fall of the Roman Republic which he helped to establish in 1848, he went to the United States, where for a year or so he associated himself with an honest Florentine candle maker on Staten Island; but he was back in Italy in time to lead a band of faithful followers against Austria in the war of 1859.

Garibaldi,
1807-1882

After the premature conclusion of the war he determined to carry on the work of unifying Italy on his own responsibility, and accordingly set sail from Genoa for Sicily in May, 1860, with a band of a thousand "Red Shirts," as his followers were called from their rough costume. He gained an easy victory over the few troops that the king of the Two Sicilies was able to send against him, and made himself dictator of the island in the name of Victor Emmanuel. He then crossed over to the mainland, and after a slight skirmish he was received in Naples with enthusiasm on September 6.

Garibaldi
makes him-
self dictator
of Sicily
and Naples
(May-Sep-
tember, 1860)

While Garibaldi's conquest of the kingdom of the Two Sicilies in the name of Victor Emmanuel was by no means distasteful to Cavour, he was very apprehensive lest the policy of the radical republicans whom Garibaldi represented should lead Napoleon and Catholic Europe to interfere in the interests

The Sar-
dinian army
invades the
Papal States,
September,
1860

of the Pope, whose territories Garibaldi proposed next to occupy. He therefore determined to intervene at this point, and dispatched an army into the Papal States with a view of getting control of the situation (September 11). The Pope's forces, which were composed of Austrians, Irish, Belgians, and French, under a French commander, made only a feeble stand and were quickly dispersed. Nevertheless Victor Emmanuel did not send his army to Rome itself, since it was too clear that Napoleon III, in view of the strong Catholic sentiment in France, could not possibly permit the occupation of the Pope's capital. The French emperor agreed, however, to Sardinia's annexation of the Marches and Umbria, that is, all of the papal possessions except the Eternal City and the region immediately surrounding it.

The Marches and Umbria annexed to Sardinia

The kingdom of the Two Sicilies votes to be united to Sardinia, October, 1860

When the Sardinian army moved on into the kingdom of the Two Sicilies it easily overcame the slight resistance which the young king, Francis II, could offer. Victor Emmanuel and Garibaldi met in Naples, and on November 7, 1860, held a memorable conference. The king of Sardinia refused to grant the request of the revolutionist leader that he be made his representative in southern Italy. Garibaldi thereupon resigned his dictatorship and, refusing all honors and gifts, retired to his house and garden on the island of Caprera. A vote had already been taken, and the people of southern Italy had expressed their desire to have the kingdom of the Two Sicilies added to that of Victor Emmanuel.

The first Italian parliament proclaims Victor Emmanuel II King of Italy

In February, 1861, the first Italian parliament was opened at Turin. Its first act was to proclaim Victor Emmanuel King of Italy. Yet the joy of the Italians over the realization of their hopes of unity and national independence was tempered by the fact that Austria still held Venice, one of the most important and famous of the Italian provinces, while the city of Rome and the neighboring district, which especially recalled Italy's former greatness, were not yet included in the new kingdom.



ITALY
1861-1866

SCALE OF ENGLISH MILES
0 50 100 150 200

8° Longitude East from 12° Greenwich 16° 20°



ITALY
1866-1870

SCALE OF ENGLISH MILES
0 50 100 150 200

8° Longitude East from 12° Greenwich 16° 20°



THE KINGDOM OF ITALY SINCE 1861

65. The fact that Italian unification was not complete did not cause the patriots to lose hope. In a debate in the very first parliament held in the new kingdom of Italy, Cavour directed the thoughts and energies of the nation to the recovery of the "Eternal City and the Queen of the Adriatic." "Opportunity," he said, "matured by time, will open our way to Venice. In the meantime we think of Rome. . . . To go to Rome is for the Italians not merely a right, — it is an inexorable necessity."

Question of Venetia and Rome

Meanwhile Pius IX stoutly resisted the pretensions of the newly established kingdom and entered a formal protest when the Italian Parliament proclaimed Victor Emmanuel King of Italy. He declared that the ruler of Sardinia had forgotten every religious principle, despised every right, trampled every law under foot, and deprived the head of the Church of the most flourishing portions of his legitimate possessions. He therefore excommunicated the king and his ministers and declared the new constitution to be a creation of revolution, which was a thing to be struck down like a mad dog wherever it showed itself. Any temptation, however, that the Italians may have felt to add Rome to the kingdom of Italy was discouraged by the intervention of Napoleon III, who, at the instigation of the French Catholics, sent a French garrison to Rome with a view of protecting the Pope from attack. On the other hand, Napoleon sought to placate the Italians by advising the emperor of Austria to cede Venetia to the new kingdom; but Francis Joseph not unnaturally refused his assent to a proposition which he regarded as dishonorable.

Attitude of the Pope toward the new Italian kingdom

Help, however, soon came from an unexpected quarter. In the early months of 1866 Prussia and Austria were on the eve of war, and in order to gain the support of Italy, Prussia concluded a treaty with Victor Emmanuel in April of that year. When the war came in July the Italians as well as the

How Venetia was added to the kingdom of Italy, 1866

Prussians attacked Austria. The Italians were worsted in the battle of Custoza, but the Prussians more than made up for this defeat by their memorable victory at Sadowa. Thereupon Austria consented to cede Venetia to Napoleon III, with the understanding that he should transfer it to Italy. The efforts of the Italians to wrest Trent and Trieste from Austria failed, however, for their fleet was defeated, and they were forced to content themselves with Venetia, which they owed rather to the victories of others than to their own.

Rome occupied by the king of Italy, 1870

Four years later, when war broke out between France and Prussia, Napoleon III was forced to withdraw the French garrison from Rome, and Victor Emmanuel, having nothing further to fear from French intervention, dispatched an ultimatum to Pius IX demanding that he make terms with the kingdom of Italy. The Pope refused, whereupon the Italian troops blew open the gates of the city and, without further violence, took possession of Rome, while the Pope withdrew to the Vatican and proclaimed himself the prisoner of the Italian government. The inhabitants, however, welcomed the invaders and, by a vote of one hundred and thirty thousand to fifteen hundred, Rome and the remaining portions of the Papal States were formally annexed to the kingdom of Italy in January, 1871.

Rome becomes the capital of the kingdom of Italy, 1871

Italy was at last free and united from the Alps to the sea, and, as King Victor Emmanuel said at the opening of the parliament of 1871, "It only remains to make our country great and happy." The capital was transferred from Florence to Rome in 1871, and the king made his solemn entry into the city, announcing to the people, "We are at Rome and we shall remain here."

The Italian constitution

The constitution which had been drawn up for Sardinia in 1848 was adopted in succession by all the former Italian states. The king governs through a ministry responsible to a chamber of deputies elected by the people. Like the English monarch, he has the power to veto measures, but never exercises



POPE PIUS IX



it, and, as a rule, takes no active part in the business of government, which he leaves to his ministers. He makes his influence felt, however, in the selection of his cabinet and in foreign affairs. Besides the Chamber of Deputies, there is a Senate, composed of the princes of the royal family and an indefinite number of men, of at least forty years of age, whom the king appoints for life from among those persons who have distinguished themselves in the State, the Church, the army, the navy, or in letters and science. The real power is vested in the Chamber of Deputies which, like the English House of Commons, really controls the appointment of ministers, determines the policy of the cabinet, and formulates all important laws.

It was a difficult problem to determine the relations which should exist between the new government and the head of the Christian Church, who for a thousand years had regarded the city of Rome as his capital. By a law of May, 1871, the Pope was declared to enjoy perfect freedom in all his spiritual functions, and his person was made sacred and inviolable like that of the king. He was to continue to enjoy the honors and dignity of a sovereign prince, and to send and receive diplomatic agents like any other sovereign. Within the trifling domain which was left to him, — the Vatican and Lateran palaces, Castel Gondolfo and the gardens attached to them, — he may live as an independent ruler, since no officer of the Italian government is permitted to enter these precincts on any business of State. In order to indemnify him decently for the loss of his possessions, the Italian government assigned him something over six hundred thousand dollars a year from the State treasury. The Pope, however, has not only always refused to accept this sum, but he persistently declines, down to the present day, to recognize the Italian government, and continues to consider himself the prisoner of a usurping power.

Position of
the Pope

The wars and disasters which had preceded the unification of Italy had left the country in serious financial straits. The

Improve-
ment of the
finances and
extension of
the suffrage

deficit and the question of properly organizing an army suitable to the new kingdom, which had now become a European power, occupied the main attention of the parliament for several years. By 1881 the treasury could show a favorable balance instead of a heavy deficit, and in the next year a law was passed greatly extending the suffrage. According to the original charter of Sardinia, which had been adopted as the constitution of the kingdom of Italy, the suffrage was limited to men over twenty-five years of age, who paid at least eight dollars a year in direct taxes. Under this restriction there were only about six hundred thousand voters. The law of 1882 reduced the age limit to twenty-one years, cut down the tax qualification by one half, and made some other changes; these modifications increased the number of voters to over two millions. The suffrage was still further extended by the law of 1895, but even now less than one third of the adult males enjoy the right to vote.

Italy becomes
a European
power

Italy could hardly have avoided assuming the responsibilities of a great European power, even if she had wished to do so. The desertion of the cause of Italian unity by Napoleon III had left bitter memories, and the Italians were justified in suspecting that France regarded with disfavor the establishment of a powerful and independent government on her confines. Italian hostility to France was aggravated by a clashing of interests in northern Africa. The Italians were anxious to obtain control in Tunis and thereby recall the days when their Roman ancestors had conquered Carthage. They attempted to gain special concessions from the Bey of Tunis, but their efforts were frustrated by the French, who occupied the province and established a protectorate there.

These designs led the Italian government to embark on the expensive policy of rapidly increasing its army and navy. Modern warships were constructed, the principle of universal military service was introduced, and the army reorganized on the Prussian model. This nearly doubled the military expenses

and served to produce a deficit which amounted in 1887 to \$83,000,000.

In 1882 the government concluded the famous triple alliance with Germany and Austria-Hungary in which the powers guaranteed one another in the possession of their recently acquired territories. Alsace-Lorraine was assured to Germany, Bosnia and Herzegovina to Austria-Hungary, and Rome to Italy.¹

The triple alliance, 1882

Disappointed in their hopes of securing a foothold in northern Africa, the Italians turned their attention to Abyssinia, near the outlet of the Red Sea. An army of occupation was dispatched thither in 1887, and after some fifteen years of intermittent warfare, treaties, negotiations, and massacres of the Italian troops by the natives, the Italians were able to make themselves masters of an area about twice the size of the state of Pennsylvania, inhabited by half a million of nomad peoples. The new colony received the name of Eritrea. The coast region south from Cape Guardafui to British East Africa and the equator was also made an Italian protectorate, known as Italian Somaliland. This has an area of about one hundred thousand square miles, and a population, almost entirely native, of four hundred thousand. Neither of these colonial enterprises has proved profitable to Italy. It has cost much to secure them, and, owing to their tropical climate, only a few thousand Italians, including the army of occupation, have settled there.

Italy's colonial policy in Abyssinia

Eritrea

Italian Somaliland

It is clear that the old ideals of Cavour and King Victor Emmanuel have been left far behind. The heavy burden of taxation which the Italians have had to bear, in order to play the part of a European power and pay for the very expensive luxury of colonization, have roused deep discontent among the peasants and workingmen. The patriotic feelings which had nerved the people to heroic service in behalf of unity and independence gave way later to a spirit of selfishness in the

Political parties in Italy

¹ This triple alliance was renewed in 1902.

various provinces, the interests of which were by no means identical, for the conditions in Naples were essentially different from those in Venetia or Piedmont. The republicans who still clung to the ideas of Mazzini and Garibaldi continued to oppose the monarchy, while the ideals of socialism, as elsewhere in Europe, appealed strongly to the workingmen. Lastly there were the defenders of the Pope's political power, who were among the bitterest enemies of the new government.

Ministry of
Crispi,
1887-1896

During most of the period from 1887 to 1896 Crispi was prime minister and exercised, with the support of the middle classes, a power bordering upon that of a dictator. He opposed with energy and success the real or supposed enemies of the monarchy, whether republicans, socialists, adherents of the papal party, French, or Abyssinians. He dissolved the socialistic and republican societies, and scandalized the Church by permitting the erection at Rome of a monument to Giordano Bruno, a philosopher and scientist who had been burned as a heretic in the sixteenth century. Crispi lost his power in 1896 in consequence of the disastrous defeat of the Italian troops in Abyssinia, for which he was held responsible.

Chief public
questions in
Italy to-day

It would be unprofitable to follow the rise and fall of Italian ministries since Crispi's retirement. Instead of two great parties, such as exist in England and in the United States, there are numerous factions in the Italian parliament, which are constantly combining and recombining, for in no other way can a majority be obtained for any specific measure. The real interest of Italian affairs lies in the solution of the great national questions of reduction of taxation, disarmament, management of the state railways, improvements in the educational system, colonial policies, troubles between capital and labor; these remain to be faced year after year by each cabinet that comes into power.

Progress of
Italy

Notwithstanding the seeming instability of the Italian government, the kingdom has made remarkable progress during the last generation. Italy is rapidly becoming an industrial

state, and to-day more than one third of its population is engaged in industrial and commercial pursuits. Silk, cotton, and woolen mills export large quantities of goods to foreign markets. Cars and locomotives are produced at Milan and Turin for the railways, which are now for the most part owned and managed by the government. In the ten years from 1890 to 1900 the tonnage of ships entering and clearing Italian seaports was tripled. Though Italy has no city as yet of over a million inhabitants, Rome, Milan, and Naples have passed the half million mark, and are rapidly growing.

Many laws have been passed for the improvement of the public schools, in the hope of diminishing the illiteracy which is a reproach to the kingdom. In districts where there are elementary schools children are compelled to attend them from the age of six to twelve. In 1904 three thousand additional school buildings were ordered to be erected, and the illiterate recruits entering the army were required to obtain an elementary education. The republicans and socialists are not satisfied, however, with the amount of money voted for education; they admit that there has been a steady reduction in the number of persons over twenty years of age who are unable to read and write,—from 73 per cent in 1862, to 52 per cent in 1901,—but they contend that it is a disgrace for the nation to spend eighty millions of dollars a year on the army and navy, and less than one sixth that amount for the schools.¹

Italy has suffered more from strikes and riots than her neighbors; this is doubtless partly attributable to the fact that the sources of discontent are particularly obvious. In proportion to its wealth, the Italian nation has the largest debt and the heaviest taxation of any country in Europe. There are the land tax, the income tax, the house tax, the inheritance tax, the

Improvements in education

Burden of taxation

¹ In 1901, 28 per cent of the population of northern Italy over six years of age could not read or write, and in southern Italy, from whence a large proportion of the American immigrants come, 70 per cent were illiterate.

stamp tax, the excise, the customs duties, in addition to the government monopolies of tobacco, lotteries, salt, and quinine. These are so distributed that the most burdensome of them fall on the workingmen and the peasants, who receive very low wages,¹ so that it is estimated that the poor pay over one half of the revenue of the government.

The heaviest taxes are imposed on the necessities of life, such as grain and salt; and in times of scarcity this has been a source of serious bread riots in the towns. As for the salt, the government in 1900 was charging eight dollars for a quintal (two hundred and twenty pounds) of salt, which cost it only thirty cents. An Italian economist estimated in 1898 that the family of a Florentine workingman was forced to pay in local and national taxes no less than one fourth of its income, whereas in England the government demanded less than one twentieth of the earnings of a workman in a similar position.

Assassina-
tion of King
Humbert

Victor Emmanuel died in 1878. His son and successor, Humbert I, although personally courageous and faithful to the constitution, was not the man to undertake the reforms necessary to relieve the prevailing discontent. He was not the controlling factor in the government either for or against reform; nevertheless the anarchists marked him as one of their victims, and on July 29, 1900, he was assassinated while distributing prizes at a great public meeting in Monza. He was succeeded by his son, Victor Emmanuel III, who has continued the general policy of his father.

Emigration
from Italy

The discontent continues, and if emigration can be taken as in any sense a measure of it, the year after the assassination of Humbert was a period of exceptional distress. In 1888 Italy lost by emigration one hundred and nineteen thousand subjects; this had increased by 1900 to three hundred and fifty-two thousand, and in 1901 to over half a million. Italy had never come into possession of any of those new territories which

¹ The average annual income in Italy is forty dollars per head, as compared with one hundred and fifty-five dollars in Great Britain.

her sons, Columbus, Cabot, and Verrazano had laid claim to in the name of other European nations, and her recent acquisitions in Africa were entirely uninviting to her discontented peasants and workingmen. Those who leave Italy, therefore, go to foreign lands, — some twenty thousand annually to Brazil, fifty thousand to Argentina, Uruguay, and Paraguay; while hundreds of thousands settle in the United States.¹

This enormous emigration does not appear to relieve the discontent. The workingmen in the towns and the peasants in the country are organized into powerful unions and listen with favor to the principles advocated by the socialists. In 1897 the socialists entered the election as a distinct party and have made steady progress since that day, polling over three hundred thousand votes in 1904. They have been able to elect over thirty members out of the five hundred and seven which constitute the Chamber of Deputies, and with their working allies, the republicans and radicals, they constitute an influential minority. Socialism

In 1905 the strength of the socialists became so alarming that Pope Pius X instructed faithful Catholics to aid in the struggle against socialism by taking part in the elections, from which they had hitherto been admonished by the Church to abstain. Indeed it seems not impossible that the Pope may forget his grievance against the Italian State in his anxiety to combat the common enemy. Others, on the contrary, have reached the conclusion that the socialist party is an effective instrument for arousing the more conservative people to undertake important reforms. As the prime minister, Giolitti, recently said, the socialists owe their entire influence to the miserable state of the workingman, and constitute the only party that consistently occupies itself with the condition of the people.

¹ It must not be overlooked, however, that large numbers of these, after accumulating a small capital, return to Italy. An Italian statistician estimated that the permanent emigration in 1903 was only two hundred and thirty thousand out of five hundred and seven thousand who left Italy.

REFERENCES

Mazzini and Young Italy: ANDREWS, *Historical Development of Modern Europe*, Vol. I, pp. 205-213; STILLMAN, *The Union of Italy, 1815-1895*, pp. 44-48.

Piedmont and Cavour: ANDREWS, Vol. II, pp. 91-114; SEIGNOBOS, *Political History of Europe since 1814*, pp. 346-351; STILLMAN, pp. 242-280; CESARESCO, *Cavour* (Foreign Statesmen Series); FYFFE, *History of Modern Europe*, pp. 866-876.

Napoleon III and the Italian War: ANDREWS, Vol. II, pp. 115-129; SEIGNOBOS, pp. 792-796; PHILLIPS, *European History, 1815-1899*, pp. 361-375; STILLMAN, pp. 281-297; FYFFE, pp. 876-884.

Establishment of Italian Unity: ANDREWS, Vol. II, pp. 130-145, 391-405; SEIGNOBOS, pp. 351-359; PHILLIPS, pp. 375-389; STILLMAN, pp. 297-358; FYFFE, pp. 886-908.

Development of the Italian Kingdom: ANDREWS, Vol. II, pp. 405-414; SEIGNOBOS, pp. 359-372; STILLMAN, pp. 359-393.

The Government of Italy: LOWELL, *Governments and Parties in Continental Europe*, Vol. I, pp. 146-231.

CHAPTER XXII

FORMATION OF THE GERMAN EMPIRE AND THE AUSTRO-HUNGARIAN UNION

PRUSSIA ASSUMES THE LEADERSHIP IN GERMANY

66. The failure of the liberals to bring about the unity of Germany at the congress at Frankfort in 1848 was largely due to the tenacity with which the numerous German rulers clung to their sovereignty and independence. No fond aspirations for national union formulated by an assembly of lawyers and professors could destroy the spirit of state sovereignty. However, industry and commerce were silently but surely welding the German people into a nation. In 1835 the first railway line had been built, and the era of steam transportation inaugurated; a network of telegraph lines quickly brought the separate states into close and constant touch with one another; and the growth of machine industry compelled them to seek wider markets beyond their borders. A solid foundation for unity was thus laid by steam, electricity, and machinery, and the development of common interests.

Industrial
Revolution
in Germany

Statesmen as well as leaders in commerce and industry began shortly after the settlement of 1815 to realize the disastrous effects of the existing division of Germany into numerous independent countries. Each of the thirty-eight states had its own customs line, which cut it off from its German neighbors as well as from foreigners. How this hampered trade can be readily seen by examining the map of Germany at that time. The duchy of Anhalt was almost completely surrounded by the territory of Prussia; the grand duchy of Oldenburg lay like a great wedge driven into the kingdom of Hanover, having its only outlet on the North Sea; the grand duchy of

Commercial
disadvan-
tages of the
division of
Germany into
practically
independent
states

Hesse was broken in twain by a narrow strip of the electorate of Hesse; and the important kingdom of Würtemberg was surrounded by Baden and Bavaria. Had one traveled in a straight line from Fulda to Altenburg, a distance of some one hundred and twenty-five English miles, he would on the way have crossed thirty-four boundary lines and have been in the dominions of nine sovereign and independent monarchs. A merchants' association complained to the diet of the Confederation in 1819 that in order to trade from Hamburg to Austria, or from Berlin to Switzerland, one had to cross ten states, study ten different customs systems, and pay ten tariff charges. They called attention to the fact that a French merchant, on the contrary, could trade from the Rhine to the Pyrenees, and from Holland to Italy, without being troubled by a single collector of duties.


The customs
union
(*Zollverein*)

The first step toward remedying these evils was taken by Prussian ministers, who swept away the customs lines which separated the different parts of the kingdom, and introduced uniform rates. Having improved their own system, these ministers opened negotiations with those neighboring states which were entirely or partially surrounded by Prussian territory. The independent state of Schwarzburg-Sondershausen was forced to turn over its customs administration to Prussia in 1819, and other minor states soon yielded to the same pressure. In January, 1834, a *Zollverein*, or tariff union, was formed, which was composed of seventeen states with a combined population of twenty-three millions. Goods were allowed to pass freely from one of these states to another, while the entire group was protected against all outsiders by a common tariff frontier. Austria, after some hesitation, decided not to join this union, but other German states were from time to time compelled by their own interests to do so. The marvelous effect of this tariff union was celebrated by a popular writer in some verses, in which he declared that matches, fennel, lampreys, cows, cheese, madder, paper, ham, and boots had served to bind

together German hearts more effectively than all the political ties which had been formed at the Congress of Vienna. This commercial unity was the forerunner of political union.

As the center of this commercial reorganization of Germany, Prussia gathered strength for the coming conflict with her great rival, Austria, and with the accession of William I in 1858,¹ a new era dawned for Prussia. A practical and vigorous man was now at the helm, whose chief aim was to expel Austria from the

Accession of William I, 1858 (1861)



The Zollverein

German Confederation, and out of the remaining states to construct a firm union under the leadership of Prussia, which would then take her place among the most powerful nations of Europe. He saw that war must come sooner or later, and therefore made it his first business to develop the military resources of his realms.

¹ He ruled until 1861 as regent for his brother, Frederick William IV, who had become incapacitated by disease.

The strengthening of the Prussian army

The German army, which owes much of its fame to the reforms of William I, is so extraordinary a feature of Europe to-day that its organization merits attention. Fifty years before, the necessity of expelling Napoleon had led Scharnhorst to revolutionize the military strength of the kingdom by making military service a universal obligation for all healthy male citizens, who were to be trained in the standing army in all the essentials of discipline, and then retired to the reserve, ready for service at need. The first thing that William I did was to increase the annual levy from forty to sixty thousand men, and to see that all the soldiers remained in active service three years. They then passed into the reserve, according to the existing law, where for two years more they remained ready at any time to take up arms should it be necessary. William wished to increase the term of service in the reserve to four years. In this way the State would claim seven of the years of early manhood and have an effective army of four hundred thousand, which would permit it to dispense with the service of those who were approaching middle life. The lower house of the Prussian parliament refused, however, to make the necessary appropriations for thus increasing the strength of the army.

Bismarck and his struggle with the Prussian parliament

The king proceeded, nevertheless, with his plan, and in 1862 called to his side the most commanding figure among the statesmen of modern times, Otto von Bismarck. The new minister conceived a scheme for humiliating Austria and exalting Prussia, which he carried out with startling precision. He could not, however, reveal it to the lower chamber; he would, indeed, scarcely hint its nature to the king himself. In defiance of the lower house and of the newspapers, he carried on the strengthening of the army without formal appropriations, on the theory that the constitution had made no provision in case of a deadlock between the upper and lower house, and that consequently the king, in such a case, might exercise his former absolute power. In one of his first speeches in Parliament he

said with brutal frankness, "The great questions of the time are to be decided not by speeches and votes of majorities, but by blood and iron." For a time it seemed as if Prussia was returning to a pure despotism, for there was assuredly no more fundamental provision of the constitution than the right of the people to control the granting of the taxes. Yet Bismarck was eventually fully exonerated by public opinion, and it was generally agreed in Germany that the end had amply justified the means.

Prussia now had a military force that appeared to justify the hope of victory should she undertake a war with her old rival. In order to bring about the expulsion of Austria from the Confederation, Bismarck took advantage of a knotty problem that had been troubling Germany, known as the Schleswig-Holstein affair. The provinces of Schleswig and Holstein, although inhabited largely by Germans, had for centuries belonged to the king of Denmark. They had been allowed, however, to retain their provincial assemblies and were not considered a part of Denmark any more than Hanover had been a part of Great Britain.

The Schleswig-Holstein affair

In 1847, when the growing idea of nationality was about to express itself in the revolution of 1848, the king of Denmark proclaimed that he was going to incorporate these provinces into the Danish kingdom in spite of the large proportion of Germans in the population. This aroused great indignation throughout Germany, especially as Holstein was a member of the Confederation, and Frederick William IV attempted by force of arms to prevent this absorption of the provinces. The controversy over their relation to Denmark continued, however, and finally, in 1863, Schleswig was definitely united with the Danish kingdom.

"From this time the history of Germany is the history of the profound and audacious statecraft and of the overmastering will of Bismarck; the nation, except through its valor on the battlefield, ceases to influence the shaping of its own fortunes.

Bismarck's audacious plan for the expulsion of Austria from Germany

What the German people desired in 1864 was that Schleswig-Holstein should be attached, under a ruler of its own, to the German Federation as it then existed ; what Bismarck intended was that Schleswig-Holstein, itself incorporated more or less directly with Prussia, should be made the means of the destruction of the existing federal system, and of the expulsion of Austria from Germany. . . . The German people desired one course of action ; Bismarck had determined on something totally different ; with matchless resolution and skill he bore down all the opposition of people and of the [European] courts, and forced a reluctant nation to the goal which he himself had chosen for it.”¹

Character of
Bismarck

Bismarck was forty-seven years old when, in 1862, he was called to the presidency of the Prussian cabinet, and he had already won a reputation as a shrewd diplomat and an ardent champion of the Prussian monarchy. He was an aristocrat of the aristocrats, — a pure type of the conservative landed proprietor of the old régime in Germany. He entertained a profound and sincere contempt for all the revolutionary and liberal ideas that had come into the world since the age of Frederick the Great ; he had refused to join in a vote of thanks to the Prussian king when he promised his subjects a constitution in 1848, and he laughed at the liberals who tried to establish German unity at the Frankfort congress. In short, his policy was akin to that of the benevolent despots of the eighteenth century ; Germany was to be united not by the will and the coöperation of the German people, but only by the aggrandizement of Prussia and the exaltation of the Prussian king. He was, moreover, a staunch believer in divine Providence, and declared that “ Each State that wishes to secure its own permanence, or even if it merely desires to prove its right to existence, must act upon religious principles. The words ‘ By the grace of God,’ which Christian rulers add to their names, are for me no mere empty sound. On the contrary, I recognize in them the

¹ Fyffe, *History of Modern Europe*, pp. 936-937.

confession that princes desire to wield the scepter with which God has invested them according to his will." Firmly believing in the destiny of the German nation, justifying the means by the end, and frankly disregarding the humanitarian and democratic aspirations of the liberals, Bismarck nevertheless proved himself just the leader needed to weld the nation by the heat and violence of war.

WAR OF 1866 AND THE FORMATION OF THE NORTH GERMAN FEDERATION

67. Bismarck's first step was to invite Austria to coöperate with Prussia in settling the Schleswig-Holstein difficulty. As Denmark refused to make any concessions, the two powers declared war, defeated the Danish army, and forced the king of Denmark to cede Schleswig-Holstein to the rulers of Prussia and Austria jointly (October, 1864).¹ They were to make such disposition of the provinces as they saw fit. There was now no trouble in picking a quarrel with Austria. Bismarck proposed a plan by which the duchies should be left nominally independent but which would bring them virtually under Prussian control. This plan was of course indignantly rejected by Austria, so it was arranged that, pending an adjustment, Austria should govern Holstein, and Prussia, Schleswig.

The working out of Bismarck's plan

Bismarck now obtained the secret assurance of Napoleon III that he would not interfere if Prussia and Italy should go to war with Austria. In April, 1866, Italy agreed that, should the king of Prussia take up arms during the following three months with the aim of reforming the German union, it too

Prussia declares the German Confederation dissolved, June, 1866

¹ After the war with Austria and Prussia, the king of Denmark, sadly in want of money, was compelled in 1866 to conciliate the taxpayers by reëstablishing the constitution which had been drawn up in 1849 and set aside during the reaction that followed. This constitution, which is in force to-day, provides for an upper house composed of senators, part of whom are chosen by the king and part by indirect election, and a lower house of representatives chosen by the people. The ministry is responsible to the legislature. See Seignobos, *Political History of Europe since 1814*, pp. 566-577, and the *Statesman's Year-Book* (1907), pp. 857-871.

would immediately declare war on Austria, with the hope, of course, of obtaining Venice.¹ The relations between Austria and Prussia grew more and more strained, until finally in June, 1866, Austria induced the diet to call out the forces of the Confederation for the purpose of making war on Prussia. Prussia's representative in the diet declared that this act put an end to the existing union. He accordingly submitted Prussia's scheme for the reformation of Germany and withdrew from the diet.

War declared
between
Austria and
Prussia

On June 14 war was declared between Austria and Prussia. With the exception of Mecklenburg and the small states of the north, all Germany sided with Austria against Prussia. Bismarck immediately demanded of the rulers of the larger North German states — Hanover, Saxony, and Hesse-Cassel — that they stop their warlike preparations and agree to accept Prussia's plan of reform. On their refusal, Prussian troops immediately occupied these territories and war actually began.

Prussia wins
the battle of
Sadowa,
July 3, 1866

So admirable was the organization of the Prussian army that, in spite of the suspicion and even hatred which the liberal party in Prussia entertained for the despotic Bismarck, all resistance on the part of the states of the north was promptly prevented; Austria was miserably defeated on July 3 in the decisive battle of Königgrätz, or Sadowa, and within three weeks after the breaking off of diplomatic relations the war was practically over. Austria's influence was at an end, and Prussia had won the right to dictate to the rest of Germany.

The North
German
Federation


Prussia was aware that the larger states south of the river Main were not ripe for the union that she desired. She therefore organized a so-called North German Federation, which included all the states north of the Main. Prussia had seized the opportunity considerably to increase her own boundaries and round out her territory by annexing such of the North German states, with the exception of Saxony, as had opposed her in the war. Hanover, Hesse-Cassel, Nassau, and the free

¹ See above, p. 99.

city of Frankfort, along with the duchies of Schleswig and Holstein, all became Prussian.

Prussia, thus enlarged, summoned the lesser states about her to confer upon a constitution that should accomplish four ends. First, it must give to all the people of the territory included in the new union, regardless of the particular state in which they lived, a voice in the government. A popular assembly satisfied

Requirements of
the proposed
constitution



Prussia's Annexations in 1866

this demand. Secondly, the predominating position of Prussia must be secured, but at the same time, thirdly, the self-respect of the other monarchs whose lands were included must not be sacrificed. In order to accomplish this double purpose the king of Prussia was made "president" of the federation but not its sovereign. The chief governing body was the Federal Council (*Bundesrath*). In this each ruler, however small his state, and each of the three free towns—Hamburg, Bremen, and Lübeck—had at least one vote; thus it was arranged

that the other rulers should not become *subjects* of the king of Prussia. The real sovereign of the North German Federation was not the king of Prussia, but "all of the united governments." The votes were distributed as in the old diet, so that Prussia, with the votes of the states that she annexed in 1866, enjoyed seventeen votes out of forty-three. Lastly, the constitution was so arranged that when the time came for the southern states — Bavaria, Württemberg, Baden, and South Hesse — to join the union, it would be adapted to the needs of the widened empire. The union was a true federation like that of the United States, although its organization violated many of the rules which were observed in the formation of the American union. It was inevitable that a union spontaneously developed from a group of sovereign *monarchies*, with their traditions of absolutism, would be very different from one in which the members, like the states of the American union, had previously been governed by republican institutions.

THE FRANCO-PRUSSIAN WAR AND THE FOUNDATION OF THE GERMAN EMPIRE

Foreign
policy of
Napoleon III

68. No one was more chagrined by the abrupt termination of the war of 1866 and the victory of Prussia than Napoleon III. He had hoped that both combatants might be weakened by a long struggle, and that in the end he might have an opportunity to arbitrate, and incidentally to gain something for France, as had happened after the Italian war. His disappointment was the more keen because he was troubled at home by the demands of the liberals for reform, and had recently suffered a loss of prestige among his people by the failure of a design for getting a foothold in Mexico.¹ Napoleon was further chagrined by his failure to secure the grand duchy of

¹ This Mexican episode is one of the most curious incidents in the checkered career of Napoleon III. He desired to see the Latin peoples of the western world develop into strong nations to offset the preponderance of the Anglo-Saxons in North America, and furthermore, like his uncle, he cherished imperial designs

Luxemburg, which its sovereign, the king of Holland, would have sold to him if it had not been for the intervention of Prussia. In other diplomatic negotiations also it was believed that Napoleon had been outwitted by Bismarck, and a war fever developed both in France and Germany, which was fostered by the sensational press of Paris and Berlin. Frenchmen began to talk about "avenging Sadowa," and the Prussians to threaten their "hereditary enemy" with summary treatment for past wrongs.

In the midst of this irritation, a pretext for war was afforded by the question of the Spanish throne then vacant as the result of the expulsion of Queen Isabella in 1868. She had succeeded to the crown as a child, on the death of her father, Ferdinand VII, in 1833, and, notwithstanding the attempts of her uncle, Don Carlos, to secure the crown, which he claimed could not legally descend to a woman,¹ she had succeeded in retaining her position, through many dictatorships, revolutions, and palace

Question of
the succession
to the throne
of Spain

outside of the confines of Europe. What appeared to him to be an excellent opportunity to build up a Latin empire under his protection was afforded by disorders in Mexico. In the summer of 1861, at the opening of the great Civil War in America, the republic of Mexico suspended payments on its debts. England, France, and Spain made a joint demonstration against Mexico in favor of their subjects who held Mexican bonds. Napoleon then entered into negotiations with some Mexicans who wanted to overthrow the republic, and he offered to support the establishment of an empire if they would choose as their ruler Archduke Maximilian, brother of the Austrian emperor, to which they agreed. Little realizing how few of the Mexican people wanted him for their ruler, Maximilian landed in his new realm in 1864, strongly supported by French troops. As soon as the Civil War in the United States was brought to a close, the American government protested, in the name of the Monroe Doctrine, against foreign intervention in Mexican affairs, and as Napoleon III was in no position to wage war with so formidable a power, he withdrew his soldiers and advised Maximilian to abdicate and return to Europe. The new emperor, however, refused to leave Mexico, and shortly afterward he was captured and shot (June, 1867). The whole affair cost France a great deal of money and the lives of many soldiers, and discredited Napoleon's ability as a statesman.

¹ According to the old Bourbon family law, the heir to the throne after the death of Ferdinand VII, who had no son, was his brother Don Carlos. The excluded brother found support among the clergy, the mountaineers of northern Spain, the army, and the cities of Castile, and from 1833 to 1840 they waged a civil war against the young queen who, being a *mère* child, was in the care of her mother, Christina. The party of the queen, *Christinos*, as they were called, were at last victorious over the Carlists, but the latter party was not completely broken up until after the reestablishment of the Bourbon line in 1874.

intrigues, until 1868, when all her discontented subjects — liberals who wanted a constitution with responsible ministry, democrats who wanted universal suffrage, and republicans who wanted to overthrow the monarchy altogether — united in an insurrection which forced Isabella to flee to France.

After the flight of the queen a national Cortes was summoned to determine upon a form of government, and as the majority of the assembly believed that Spain was not yet ready for a republic, they voted in favor of establishing a monarchy, but drew up at the same time the most liberal constitution that Spain had ever had. After long deliberations they finally tendered the crown to Leopold of Hohenzollern, a very distant relative of William I of Prussia. This greatly excited the journalists of Paris, who loudly protested that this was only an indirect way of bringing Spain under the influence of Prussia. The French minister of foreign affairs declared that the candidacy was an attempt to reestablish the empire of Charles V. This belief was entirely unfounded, for, in spite of the apprehensions of the French, the mass of the Spanish people were more anxious to see the restoration of the Bourbon line in the person of Alfonso, the son of Queen Isabella, than they were to have as their ruler Leopold of Hohenzollern, or Amadeus (the son of the king of Italy), who was finally induced in 1870 to accept the crown.¹

¹ Amadeus was an enlightened prince, and endeavored to rule according to the wishes of his new subjects, but he found himself opposed by the Carlists, who supported a grandson of Don Carlos as their candidate; by the clergy, who opposed the new constitution because it granted religious liberty; and by the moderate royalists, who favored placing Isabella's son Alfonso on the throne. After little more than two years' experience, Amadeus laid down his crown, and the revolutionists proclaimed a republic (February 12, 1873) which lasted only about a year. At last, in 1875, the crown was given to Isabella's son, who took the title of Alfonso XII, and after a short civil war with the Carlists a new constitution was drawn up in 1876 providing for a parliament of two houses — a senate composed of grandees, appointed dignitaries, and elected persons, and a lower house of representatives chosen by popular suffrage. (By the electoral law of 1890 all male Spaniards twenty-five years of age are entitled to vote.) This is the present constitution of Spain. Alfonso XII died in 1885, and was succeeded by the present king, Alfonso XIII, who was born a few months after his father's death.

But the war parties in France and Prussia were looking for a pretext for a conflict, and consequently the candidacy of Prince Leopold was given an exaggerated importance. In June, 1870, with the consent of the king of Prussia, he accepted the proffered crown; but when the French government protested he withdrew his acceptance, also with the approbation of the Prussian king. The affair now seemed to be closed, but the French ministry was not satisfied with the outcome and demanded that the king of Prussia should pledge himself that the candidacy should never be renewed. This William refused to do, and Bismarck, with gleeful malice, so edited the account given to the German newspapers of the refusal as to make it appear that the French ambassador had insulted King William, and had been rebuffed. This excited the "jingo" in both countries to a state of frenzy, and although the war party in France was a small minority, France nevertheless declared war against Prussia on July 19, 1870.

The French minister proclaimed that he entered the conflict with a "light heart," but it was not long before he realized the folly of the headlong plunge. The hostility which the South German states had hitherto shown toward Prussia had encouraged Napoleon III to believe that so soon as the French troops should gain their first victory, Bavaria, Würtemberg, and Baden would join him. But that first victory was never won. War had no sooner been declared than the Germans laid all jealousy aside and ranged themselves as a nation against a national assailant. The French army, moreover, was neither well equipped nor well commanded. The Germans hastened across the Rhine and within a few days were driving the French before them. In a series of bloody encounters about Metz, one of the French armies was defeated and finally shut up within the fortifications of the town. Seven weeks had not elapsed after the beginning of the war before the Germans had captured a second French army and made a prisoner of the emperor himself in the great battle of Sedan, September 1, 1870.

Attitude of France toward candidacy of Leopold of Hohenzollern

France declares war on Prussia, July 19, 1870

Disastrous opening of the war for France

Siege of Paris
and close of
Franco-
Prussian
War

The Germans then surrounded and laid siege to Paris. Napoleon III had been completely discredited by the disasters about Metz and Sedan, and consequently the empire was abolished and France for the third time was declared a republic.¹ In spite of the energy which the new government showed in arousing the nation against the invaders, prolonged resistance was impossible. The capital surrendered on January 28, 1871, and an armistice was concluded.

Cession of
Alsace and
Lorraine to
Germany

In arranging the treaty of peace Bismarck deeply humiliated France by requiring the cession of two French provinces which had formerly belonged to Germany, — Alsace and north-eastern Lorraine.² In this way France was cut off from the Rhine, and the crest of the Vosges Mountains was established as its boundary. The Germans further exacted an enormous indemnity for the unjustifiable attack which the French had made upon them. This was fixed at five billion francs, and German troops were to occupy France till it was paid. The French people made pathetic sacrifices to hasten the payment of this indemnity, in order that the country might be freed from the presence of the hated Germans. The bitter feeling of the French for the Germans dates from this war, and the longing for revenge has by no means disappeared. For many years after the war a statue in Paris, representing the lost city of Strassburg, was draped in mourning.

Proclamation
of the Ger-
man Empire,
January 1,
1871

The attack of France upon Prussia in 1870, instead of hindering the development of Germany, as Napoleon III had hoped it would, only served to consummate the work of 1866. The South German states, — Bavaria, Würtemberg, Baden, and South

¹ See below, p. 151.

² Alsace had, with certain reservations, — especially as regarded Strassburg and the other free towns, — been ceded to the French king by the treaty of Westphalia at the close of the Thirty Years' War. Louis XIV disregarded the reservations and seized Strassburg and the other towns (1681), thus annexing the whole region to France. The duchy of Lorraine had fallen to France in 1766, upon the death of its last duke. It had previously been regarded as a part of the Holy Roman Empire. In 1871 less than a third of the original duchy of Lorraine, together with the fortified city of Metz, was ceded back to Germany.

Hesse, — having sent their troops to fight side by side with the Prussian forces, consented after their common victory over France to join the North German Federation. By a series of treaties it was agreed, among other things, that the name “North German Federation” should give way to that of “German Empire,” and that the king of Prussia, as president of the union, should be given the title of German Emperor. Surrounded by German princes, William, king of Prussia, and president of the North German Federation, was proclaimed German Emperor in the former palace of the French kings at Versailles, January 18, 1871. The long conflict for unity was now at an end; it only remained for Germany to assert its place among the great nations of the world.

AUSTRIA-HUNGARY SINCE 1866

69. The defeat at Sadowa and the formation of the North German Federation had served to cut off Austria from Germany altogether, and she was left to solve as best she might the problems of adjusting her relations with Hungary, reconciling the claims of the various races within her borders, and meeting the demands of the liberals for constitutional government and reforms in general.

Problems facing Austria in 1866

An attempt had been made in 1861 to unite all the possessions of Francis Joseph into a single great empire with its parliament at Vienna, but the Hungarians obstinately refused to take part in the deliberations and, by encouraging the Bohemians, Poles, and Croats to withdraw, brought the plan to naught.

The Austro-Hungarian dual monarchy established in 1867

Soon after the defeat of Austria by Prussia in 1866 the relations between the Austrian Empire and the kingdom of Hungary were finally settled by a compromise (*Ausgleich*, as the Germans call it). Francis Joseph agreed to regard himself as ruling over two separate and practically independent states: (1) the Austrian Empire, which includes seventeen provinces, — Upper and Lower Austria, Bohemia, Moravia, Carinthia,

Carniola, and the rest; and (2) the kingdom of Hungary, including Croatia and Slavonia. While each of these had its own constitution and its own parliament, one at Vienna, and the other at Pesth, and managed its own affairs under the guidance of its own ministers, the two governments, in dealing with foreign nations, declaring war, and concluding treaties, were to appear as one state, to be called Austria-Hungary. They were to have a common army and navy and to be united commercially by using the same coins, weights, and measures, and agreeing upon a common tariff. Although this particular kind of union between two states was a new thing in Europe, it has so far proved a permanent one.

The government of the Austro-Hungarian dualism consists of a common sovereign, three ministries, and the *Delegations*

In order to manage the affairs common to the two states, their joint monarch appoints three ministers, — a minister of foreign affairs, a minister of war, and a minister of finance. These ministers are responsible to a curious kind of joint parliament, called the *Delegations*, one of which is chosen by the Austrian parliament, and the other by the Hungarian diet. These *Delegations* consist of sixty members each and hold their sessions alternately at Vienna and at Pesth, in order to avoid all jealousy. They sit as separate bodies, one carrying on its discussions in German and the other in Hungarian, and ordinarily communicate with each other in writing, except in cases of disagreement, when the two *Delegations* come together and vote as a single body, but without debate.

The Austrian constitution

While the relations were thus being adjusted between Austria and Hungary, the Austrian Empire itself was reorganized by five constitutional laws passed in 1867. The protests of the Poles, Slovenians, Bohemians, and Italians were unheeded, and all the provinces were made subject to the parliament at Vienna, which was to consist of a House of Lords and a Chamber of Deputies, the members of the latter to be selected by the diets of the seventeen provinces. The emperor promised to choose ministers who enjoyed the confidence of the parliament, to conciliate the various nationalities,







and to insure equal rights to all in the schools and in appointments to government offices.

In Hungary the liberal constitution of 1848 was revived. The king appoints the ministers but they are responsible to the diet, consisting of two houses. The Chamber of Magnates is an aristocratic body made up mainly of hereditary nobles. The members of the Chamber of Deputies, on the other hand, which, like the House of Commons in England, is the predominant body, are chosen by the people. Every man over twenty years of age who pays a small tax¹ is permitted to vote, and in the case of professional men even the tax requirement is waived.

The Hun-
garian
constitution

The problem of satisfying the various races, with their differing languages and their national aspirations, has been the most characteristic difficulty which both Austria and Hungary have had to face. There were in Austria in 1867, 7,100,000 Germans, 4,700,000 Czechs, 2,440,000 Poles (in Galicia), 2,580,000 Ruthenians (in eastern Galicia), 1,190,000 Slovenians (principally in Carniola), 520,000 Croats (in Dalmatia and Istria), 580,000 Italians (in Trieste and southern Tyrol), and 200,000 Roumanians (in Bukovina). The Germans held that the German town of Vienna, the old seat of the court, was the natural center of all the provinces, and that the German language, since it was spoken more generally than any other in the Austrian provinces and was widely used in scientific and literary works, should be given the preference everywhere by the government. The Czechs and Poles, on their part, longed for their old freedom and independence, wished to use their own language, and constantly permitted their dislike of the Germans to influence their policy in the parliament at Vienna.²

Continued
difficulties
due to the
mixture of
races

If each language were spoken by all the inhabitants in a particular province the difficulties would be lessened, but the

¹ This requirement, moderate as it seems to be, excludes about three fourths of the adult males and has given rise to serious agitation for reform.

² In the newspapers we read of the "Young" Czechs, who agree with the "Old" Czechs in working for Bohemian independence, but are more progressive than their fellow-representatives.

various races are hopelessly intermingled, especially the Czechs and the Germans in Bohemia. While the majority of the inhabitants of Austria belong to some branch of the Slavic race, the Czechs, Poles, Croats, Ruthenians, and Slovenians cannot understand one another's language. Consequently the Austrian government seemed forced to order that all commands to its soldiers be given in German, for if each were to be addressed in his native tongue disastrous confusion would result. But if a Slovenian kills an Italian, what language shall be employed in his trial? Where there are two or three different languages spoken in a single parish, shall there be a school for each, or shall the language of the majority prevail? Shall officials be required to speak the several languages or dialects used within their provinces? These and a hundred similar questions vex the Austrian parliament, cause ill feeling and party divisions, and hinder progress in general reform.

Power of the
Church re-
duced in
Austria, 1868

The two most noteworthy achievements in Austria during the past forty years have been perhaps the readjustment of the relations between Church and State, and the extension of the suffrage. Austria has always been specially faithful to the Catholic Church, and consented to maintain its ancient supremacy longer than any other European power. But after the settlement of 1867 the German liberal party forced through the parliament a series of laws which restricted the time-honored prerogatives of the Catholic clergy. Every individual was given the right to choose his own religion and to worship as he pleased. Government offices and positions in the schools were thrown open to all citizens, regardless of creed; the State, not the Church, was thereafter to manage the schools; civil marriage was instituted for those who did not wish to have a priest officiate at their marriages, as well as for those whom the priests refused to unite. The Pope vigorously condemned the constitutional laws of 1867, which had guaranteed complete religious liberty; the laws of 1868 he pronounced "abominable," and rejected them as null and void. Nevertheless the reforms

which Joseph II had striven to introduce before the French Revolution were at last secured.

Austria, like the other European states, has been profoundly affected by the Industrial Revolution. The ever-increasing numbers of workingmen began to urge that the old system of voting, which permitted the richer classes to choose the members of the parliament, should be changed so as to allow the great mass of the people to send representatives to Vienna.¹ At last, in 1906, the suffrage was extended to all males over twenty-four years of age. The first election under the new law took place in May, 1907. The socialists gained over fifty seats, many of which they secured at the expense of the Czechs. But, on the other hand, the conservative clerical party also gained. It remains to be seen whether the various little parties formed on race issues will give way in time to those representing grave economic and social problems such as exist in the other European states.

Question of
the suffrage

The history of Hungary since 1867 has resembled that of Austria in some respects. The Magyars have, however, been more successful than the Germans in maintaining their supremacy. The population of Hungary proper in 1900 was about seventeen millions, of which the Magyars formed something over half. Croatia and Slavonia had together less than two and a half millions. In the lower house of the diet four hundred and thirteen deputies are chosen in Hungary, and only forty in Croatia and Slavonia.² Magyar is naturally the language chiefly used in the diet, and by government officials, and railway employees, and in the universities. The government encourages the migration of the people to the cities,

The Magyars
predominate
in Hungary

¹ The system adopted in 1867, according to which the local diets of the provinces elected the deputies, was later abolished, and the right to select the 425 deputies was put into the hands of four classes: the landowners were assigned 85 seats; the chambers of trade and commerce, 21; the towns, 118; the rural districts, 129. The adult males were permitted to choose the remaining 72.

² In 1900 there were in round numbers 9,000,000 Magyars, 2,000,000 each of Germans and Slovaks, 1,500,000 Croats, 1,000,000 Servians, and 400,000 Ruthenians.

especially to Budapest,¹ for it is the rapidly growing cities which are the strongholds of the Magyars, and the number of those who speak their language is steadily increasing.

Race discontent in Hungary

Croatia and Slavonia do not consider that they have their proper weight in the national parliament at Budapest. The Servians are discontented, and some of the extremists among them would like to have the region they inhabit annexed to the kingdom of Servia; while the Roumanians look longingly to the independent kingdom of Roumania, of which they feel they should form a part.

Hungary's attitude toward its union with Austria

As for the relations of Hungary with the Austrian half of the union, the Magyars are divided among themselves. Some of them accept the present arrangement as final, others demand that the whole system of common government be done away with, and that a merely *personal* union with the Austrian Empire be established. Both countries would then have the same king, but would otherwise pursue an entirely independent policy in their relations with foreign powers, and in the organization of their military forces. Indeed it appears to be one of the chief grievances in Hungary that the commands in the army are given in German. To offset Magyar influence the king agreed in 1904 to support a measure for introducing universal suffrage, which would greatly weaken the Magyar majority and give the Slavic elements more weight. Race antagonism occasionally gives rise to violent demonstrations in the diet. For example, in December, 1904, the Magyar deputies expressed their disapproval of an unpopular minister of Francis Joseph's by wrecking the furniture in the Chamber of Deputies and thus preventing the regular opening of the parliament.

Practical annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina

One matter of importance to the whole monarchy was the practical annexation in 1878 of two new provinces, Bosnia and Herzegovina. These had formed a part of the Turkish dominions, but the population, consisting mainly of Slavs akin to the

¹ Buda, which lies on the right bank of the Danube, was united to Pesth across the river in 1872.

Servians and Croats, aroused by the atrocities of Mohammedan rule, revolted against the Sultan. The Austrian emperor managed to secure from the Congress of Berlin which settled the Eastern question in 1878 permission to occupy the provinces and restore order in them. Hungary, however, opposed this on the ground that there were already Slavs enough in the Austro-Hungarian union. Nevertheless the emperor had his way; the minister of finance of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy continues to administer the two provinces, and there is little prospect that they will ever be returned to the Sultan, who is still, however, their nominal ruler.

REFERENCES

The Zollverein: SEIGNOBOS, *Political History of Europe since 1814*, pp. 451-454; ANDREWS, *Historical Development of Modern Europe*, Vol. I, pp. 252-257.

Bismarck and the Rise of Prussia: SEIGNOBOS, pp. 456-466; ANDREWS, Vol. II, pp. 189-213; PHILLIPS, *Modern History*, pp. 390-407; FYFFE, *History of Modern Europe*, pp. 909-920.

The Schleswig-Holstein Question and Dissolution of the Confederation: SEIGNOBOS, pp. 466-472; ANDREWS, Vol. II, pp. 213-252; PHILLIPS, pp. 407-448; FYFFE, pp. 934-963.

Formation of the North German Federation: SEIGNOBOS, pp. 472-481; ANDREWS, Vol. II, pp. 252-261.

The Establishment of the Empire: SEIGNOBOS, pp. 482-484; ANDREWS, Vol. II, pp. 261-277; PHILLIPS, pp. 449-485; FYFFE, pp. 968-1019.

Formation of Austria-Hungary: SEIGNOBOS, pp. 518-529; ANDREWS, Vol. II, pp. 278-296; LEGER, *History of Austro-Hungary*, pp. 572-588.

Political Development of Austria-Hungary: SEIGNOBOS, pp. 529-553; ANDREWS, Vol. II, pp. 415-435; LEGER, pp. 589-637.

The Government of Austria and Hungary: LOWELL, *Governments and Parties in Continental Europe*, Vol. II, pp. 70-179.

Spain after the Revolution of 1820: SEIGNOBOS, pp. 293-308.

The Spanish Revolution of 1868: SEIGNOBOS, pp. 308-315.

The Reestablishment of the Spanish Monarchy: SEIGNOBOS, pp. 315-325.

CHAPTER XXIII

THE GERMAN EMPIRE

THE GERMAN CONSTITUTION

The constitution of the German Empire

70. It will be remembered that the constitution of the North German Federation had been drawn up in 1866 with the hope that the southern states, Bavaria, Württemberg, Baden, and South Hesse, would later join the union ; consequently little change was necessary when the empire was established four years later. The title of German Emperor (*Deutscher Kaiser*) was bestowed on King William I of Prussia and his successors, but it did not carry with it any authority which he had not enjoyed as president of the North German Federation. In the empire, as in the federation, the sovereignty is not vested in the ruler, but in the *Bundesrath*, or Federal Council, which is made up of representatives of the twenty-two monarchs and the three free cities included in the union.¹ The emperor does not possess the right to veto laws passed by the imperial parliament, but nevertheless he exercises many of the powers which would naturally fall to a monarch. He appoints and dismisses the imperial chancellor, — the chief minister of the empire, — as well as other imperial officials. Though he cannot declare an offensive war without the consent of the Bundesrath, he commands the unconditional obedience of all German soldiers and sailors, and appoints the chief officers in the army and all those in the navy.²


The Bundesrath, or Federal Council

The Bundesrath, like the Senate of the United States, represents the various states of the union, but its members are not free to vote as individuals. On the contrary, the

¹ See above, pp. 117 *sq.*

² As king of Prussia the emperor controls seventeen votes in the Bundesrath, which would usually enable him to block measures which he disapproves.





THE GERMAN EMPIRE

since 1871

SCALE OF MILES



THURINGIAN STATES

- | | |
|------------------------------|---------------------------|
| 1. Schwarzburg-Sondershausen | 5. Saxe-Meiningen |
| 2. Saxe-Coburg-Gotha | 6. Schwarzburg-Rudolstadt |
| 3. Saxe-Weimar | 7. Reuss, Older Line |
| 4. Saxe-Altenburg | 8. Reuss, Junior Line |

delegates from each state must vote together, and according to instructions received from their respective governments on every question. Unlike the American system, the various states in the German union are not given equal representation in the Bundesrath; Prussia, which includes more than one half of the territory and population of the empire, sends seventeen delegates, Bavaria six, Saxony four, Württemberg four, Baden and Hesse three each, Mecklenburg-Schwerin and Brunswick two each, and all the others one each.¹

The democratic element in the government is the *Reichstag*, or House of Representatives, which was established at the instance of Bismarck, not because he believed in popular government, but because such a body was necessary in order to insure the loyalty of the people to the new union. The

The *Reichstag*, or House of Representatives

¹ COMPOSITION OF THE GERMAN EMPIRE

NAMES OF THE STATES	POPULATION IN DEC. 1, 1905 (IN ROUND NUMBERS)	NUMBER OF MEMBERS IN THE BUNDES- RATH	PRESENT NUM- BER OF REPR- ESENTATIVES IN THE REICHSTAG
Kingdom of Prussia	37,300,000	17	236
Kingdom of Bavaria	6,500,000	6	48
Kingdom of Saxony	4,500,000	4	23
Kingdom of Württemberg	2,300,000	4	17
Grandduchy of Baden	2,000,000	3	14
Grandduchy of Hesse	1,200,000	3	9
Grandduchy of Mecklenburg-Schwerin	625,000	2	6
Grandduchy of Saxe-Weimar	388,000	1	3
Grandduchy of Mecklenburg-Strelitz .	103,000	1	1
Grandduchy of Oldenburg	439,000	1	3
Duchy of Brunswick	486,000	2	3
Duchy of Saxe-Meiningen	269,000	1	2
Duchy of Saxe-Altenburg	207,000	1	1
Duchy of Saxe-Coburg-Gotha	242,000	1	2
Duchy of Anhalt	328,000	1	2
Principality of Schwarzburg-Sonders- hausen	85,000	1	1
Principality of Schwarzburg-Rudolstadt	97,000	1	1
Principality of Waldeck	59,000	1	1
Principality of Reuss, elder line	71,000	1	1
Principality of Reuss, junior line	145,000	1	1
Principality of Schaumburg-Lippe	45,000	1	1
Principality of Lippe	146,000	1	1
Free town of Lübeck	106,000	1	1
Free town of Bremen	263,000	1	1
Free town of Hamburg	875,000	1	3
Imperial territory of Alsace-Lorraine . .	1,800,000	-	15
	60,000,000	58	397

Reichstag consists of about four hundred members distributed among the various states according to their population. The constitution provides that every German citizen twenty-five years of age may vote for members of the Reichstag. The representatives are elected for a term of five years, but the house may at any time be dissolved by the emperor with the consent of the Bundesrath. Members of the Reichstag under a law of May, 1906, are now paid for their services.

The chan-
cellor

The chief minister of the empire is the chancellor, who is appointed by the Kaiser from among the Prussian delegates in the Bundesrath and may be dismissed by him at will without regard to the rise and fall of parties in the Reichstag. The chancellor is not bound by any resolutions or votes of the Reichstag; he is entirely at the command of the emperor from whom alone he derives his authority. He presides over the Bundesrath, appoints the federal officers in the name of the emperor, and supervises the discharge of their duties. The departments of the empire, such as the foreign office, post office, and department of the interior, are simple bureaus under the control of the chancellor, and their heads are not ministers in the English sense, or cabinet officers in the American sense. They are not colleagues of the chancellor, but are responsible to him, not to the Reichstag; consequently the fate of political parties does not affect their tenure of office.

No cabinet
system in the
German
Empire

In short, Germany has never introduced the cabinet system of government which prevails in other European countries. The Kaiser exercises, through the chancellor, and in view of his position as king of Prussia, a power unrivaled by any of the constitutional rulers of Europe; the general tone and policy of the government is determined by his personal views and character, and the Reichstag serves rather as a critic of, and a check on, the government than as the directing force.

When German unity was finally achieved in 1871 by the formation of the empire, the new nation was very much in the

position of the United States after the adoption of the constitution in 1789. A federation had been entered into by states bound together by ties of a common race and language, but its permanence was by no means assured. The various German rulers were zealous in safeguarding their dignity and their own particular rights, and they were not altogether pleased with the preëminence assumed by the king of Prussia. Each commonwealth had its own traditions as an independent state,¹ its own peculiar industrial interests, and its own particular form of government. Some were Protestant, others Catholic; in some agriculture predominated, in others, mining or manufacturing; some wanted protective tariffs for grain, others for textiles, and still others wanted no tariff at all. Realizing that the new union might not bear the continued strain of these disruptive tendencies, the imperial government undertook to establish stronger national ties through the introduction of uniform laws for the whole German people to supplant the diverse laws of the various commonwealths.

Necessity of uniform laws for the whole empire

The leadership in this nationalizing movement fell naturally to Bismarck, chancellor of the empire and president of the Prussian ministry. Fortunately for him, the constitution conferred on the imperial legislature wide powers in regulating matters which in the United States are reserved entirely to the states. The imperial parliament is authorized to regulate commerce and intercourse between the states and with foreign nations, to coin money, fix weights and measures, control the banking system, the railways, telegraph, and post office, besides other general powers. But, more than this, the federal government in Germany is empowered by the constitution to make uniform throughout the empire the criminal and civil law, the

Powers of the imperial government

¹ As a concession to the feelings of the previously sovereign states of southern Germany, the constitution assures them a few special rights. The most important of these is the special postal system which both Bavaria and Würtemberg are permitted to maintain. The result is that a stamp of the empire, if put on a letter to be mailed in Munich or Stuttgart, is as worthless as a French or English stamp would be.

organization of the courts, and judicial procedure, whereas in the United States each state defines crimes, regulates the form of contracts, and so forth. In one important matter the two constitutions agree, — the citizens of each state are entitled to the civil rights of the citizens of all the other states.

Imperial
legislation

The parliament at once set to work to carry into effect the important powers conferred upon it. In 1873 a uniform currency law was passed, and the bewildering variety of coins and paper notes of the separate states was replaced by a simple system of which the *mark* (about twenty-five cents) is the basis. The new coins bore on one side the effigy of the emperor, and on the other the arms of the empire, "to preach to the people the good news of unity." Two years later the Prussian bank was transformed into a federal bank, and a financial center for the empire was established at Berlin. In 1871 a uniform criminal code was introduced; in 1877 a law was passed regulating the organization of the courts, civil and criminal procedure, bankruptcy, and patents; and from 1874 to 1887 a commission was busy drafting the civil code which went into effect in 1900.

THE KULTURKAMPF¹

Attitude of
the ultramon-
tane party
toward the
new German
Empire

71. In his endeavor to strengthen the government in the empire and in Prussia, Bismarck came into collision with the ancient rival of the secular power, the Church. At the first imperial election in 1871 the Catholics returned sixty-three members to parliament, and the chancellor saw, or pretended to see, a conspiracy of clerical forces against the State. The Jesuits were charged with having stirred up France to attack Prussia, and although there was little or no evidence in support of this theory, Bismarck professed to believe in it. It was also alleged that the Pope and the Catholic bishops in eastern and

¹ It is said that Virchow, the famous scientist, suggested this name, commonly applied to the conflict between Bismarck and the Vatican. It may be translated "War in defense of civilization."

southern Germany had sought to prevent the establishment of the empire under the leadership of a Protestant king.

It was undoubtedly true that some Catholics held opinions which conflicted with the chancellor's views on the supremacy of the civil government. The decrees of the Vatican Council issued in 1870 definitely asserted that the secular government might not interfere with the Pope in his relations with the clergy or with lay Catholics. German bishops received with favor a work by a Jesuit author in which he affirmed the right of the Pope to suspend and alter the civil law, and even went so far as to say that "Peace and national unity are an unqualified good only for a people in possession of the true faith. If they have not the true faith, then national division is incomparably less an evil than persistence in religious error."

There was therefore a clear conflict, in theory at least, between the doctrines maintained by Catholics and the views of the chancellor on the supremacy of the civil government. The open contest, however, was precipitated by divisions among the Catholics themselves. The doctrine of papal infallibility ratified by the Vatican Council in 1870 had been rejected by some of the former adherents of the Roman faith, who now assumed the name of "Old Catholics" to distinguish themselves from the majority who accepted the Vatican decree. The bishops who remained faithful to the Pope demanded that Old Catholic teachers should be removed from their places in the universities and schools, on the ground that they had refused to obey the dictates of the Church. The Prussian government declined to accede to this demand, alleging as a reason the fact that the decree in question had never been ratified by the State.

The Catholics antagonized the government by their denunciations of its policy, and in 1872 a law was passed expelling the Jesuits and their affiliated orders from the German Empire. The following year the Redemptorists, the Lazarists, the Congregation of Priests of the Holy Ghost, and the Society of the

Question of
the "Old
Catholics"

Imperial
laws against
the Church


Sacred Heart were likewise suppressed. Civil marriage was made compulsory in 1876, and civil registration of births and burials was established. To repress criticism on the part of the clergy, it was made a punishable offense for them to utter in public or to print anything designed to discredit the government. The German ambassador was withdrawn from Rome, and Bismarck, recalling the famous controversy eight hundred years earlier between the German emperor, Henry IV, and the Pope, which had ended in Henry's going to Italy to seek the Pope's forgiveness, declared, "We will not go to Canossa."

The May
laws of 1873

In addition to his imperial anti-Catholic measures, Bismarck instituted a repressive policy in Prussia which, in spite of its Protestant ruler, had granted liberty to Catholics ever since the days of the Great Elector. In May, 1873, important measures were passed which bear the name of the "May laws." One of them provided that no priest might undertake his functions until he had passed through a German preparatory school, spent three years in a German university, and passed an examination in three other faculties besides that of theology. Hence no priest could officiate without a government certificate of his training in the government schools, which were decidedly anti-Catholic, and a bishop who appointed a priest not properly qualified was liable to a heavy fine.

Compromise
with the
Church

As might have been expected, these measures aroused powerful opposition. The Pope declared them contrary to the constitution of the Church, the clergy in general refused to obey them, and the Catholics, as a result of these laws, were welded into a strong political party which secured the election of ninety-one members to the Reichstag in 1874. Even the more conservative Protestants did not approve of the harsh policy toward the Catholics, and in spite of his proud boast that he would never come to terms with the Church, Bismarck was at length forced to yield. He was wise enough to see that the Catholics were really less dangerous adversaries of absolutism and militarism than the national liberals who wanted a



BISMARCK

ministry responsible to the Reichstag, or the rapidly growing socialist party which demanded radical reforms on behalf of the working classes. Pius IX died in 1878 and Leo XIII, in notifying the Kaiser of his elevation to the holy see, expressed his regret at the strained relations existing between Rome and Berlin. Bismarck made this an excuse for withdrawing the repressive laws, and the liberals said, "He has, after all, gone to Canossa." One after another all the measures directed against the clergy, excepting the civil-marriage law, were abolished, and at length cordial relations were again established with the Vatican. The Catholic political party — whose representatives in the Reichstag are called the Center — was not, however, broken up by the reversal of the government's policy, and the attempt to destroy the socialist party, which Bismarck was now free to make, proved no more successful.

BISMARCK AND STATE SOCIALISM

72. The socialist party had grown up in Germany practically within Bismarck's own time. In 1842 a German professor had declared that Germany had nothing to fear from that movement since the country had no distinct working class. But within less than a quarter of a century Germany, like England and France, underwent a radical industrial revolution. Large manufacturing towns sprang up; railways were built; the working classes inevitably combined to protect and advance their own interests; and all the problems of capital and labor were suddenly thrust upon the German people.

Beginnings
of socialism
in Germany

The socialist view of the labor problems and their solution had been elaborated by a German scholar, Karl Marx, before the revolution of 1848,¹ but it was not until nearly twenty years later that a party championing his doctrines entered German politics. Under the leadership of Lassalle, a radical

Karl Marx

Lassalle

¹ See below, pp. 393 *seq.*, for general development of socialism in Europe.

thinker and a brilliant orator, a General Workingmen's Association was formed at a labor congress in Leipzig in 1863. The purpose of this organization was to work for universal suffrage, in order that through their votes the workingmen might force the government to furnish capital for the foundation of workshops like those which Louis Blanc had sought to establish during the French Revolution of 1848. After more than a year's vigorous agitation Lassalle had, however, mustered less than five thousand members for his association, and he was thoroughly discouraged when he met his end in a duel over a love affair in 1864.

The social
democrats
organize in
1869

Notwithstanding the death of Lassalle, the campaign which he had begun continued to be prosecuted with greater vigor than before, although by no means all of the workingmen believed in his programme. Some of the more radical among them, under the influence of the teachings of Marx, founded at Eisenach, in 1869, a new association, which bore the name of the Social Democratic Labor Party of Germany. The two groups worked side by side until 1875 when, at a general labor congress held at Gotha, they combined and issued an important statement of the views and purposes of the party. In the elections of that year for the Reichstag the socialists polled three hundred and forty thousand votes and began to arouse the apprehension of the government, which was naturally suspicious of them. They not only advocated a fundamental social revolution but had opposed the continuance of the war with France after Napoleon III had been overthrown and the French republic established, on the ground that the burdens of war always fall most heavily upon the laboring classes. They had even expressed the hope that Germany might, like France, become a republic.

Bismarck
determines to
crush out
socialism,
1878

Bismarck resented the attitude of the socialists, and after two unsuccessful attempts upon the life of the emperor, which he ascribed without justification to socialist conspiracies, he had a law passed in 1878 designed to suppress socialistic

agitation altogether. It prohibited meetings, publications, and associations having for their purpose "the subversion of the social order" or the promotion of socialistic tendencies dangerous to the public peace, and authorized the government to proclaim martial law in any city threatened by labor disturbances. This repressive law remained in force for twelve years and completely disorganized the party as far as national politics were concerned. It failed, however, in accomplishing its full purpose, for the socialists continued to form local societies in spite of the precautions of the police, and to spread their doctrines by means of papers smuggled in principally from Switzerland. Their leaders declared that the law only made their agitation the more dangerous, and many even of their opponents championed its repeal.

While these attempts were being made to suppress the social democrats, there was growing up in Germany a new school of political economists who maintained that the government should adopt a number of the socialistic proposals for the benefit of the working classes in order to remove the causes of their discontent. The members of this new school, among whom Professors Wagner and Schmoller, both of the University of Berlin, were the most distinguished, repudiated the idea that there were any rules in economic affairs which could be applied at all times and under all conditions. They advocated so strongly the duty of the government to legislate on behalf of the working classes that the name "state socialists" was applied to them, although they were far from approving of the thorough-going measures desired by the regular socialists. The purpose of state socialism is defined by Schmoller as "the establishment of a friendly relationship among the different social classes, the removal or reduction of injustice, a nearer approach to fairness in the distribution of wealth, and social legislation promoting progress and the moral and material elevation of the lower and middle classes." To Wagner it seemed not only unchristian but inhuman to

Origin of
the "state
socialist"
party

regard labor merely as a commodity to be bought and sold in the market, and wages as its price.

The practical proposals of the state socialists were exceedingly numerous. They advocated providing steady employment for the working classes, reduction of the hours of labor, improvement of the sanitary and moral conditions in factories, restriction of the labor of women and children, and adequate precautions against accidents and sickness. They proposed to equalize the distribution of wealth by taxing those whose incomes were derived from rents, interest, or speculation, and favored government ownership of railways, canals, and all means of communication and transport, water and gas works, markets, and the business of banking and insurance.

Bismarck himself took a deep interest in the theories of the state socialists, and from 1878 to the close of his administration, he advocated a number of reforms for the benefit of the working people and carried out a few of them. In undertaking these measures he frankly admitted that he was only renewing the old Brandenburg policy of paternal interest in the welfare of the people and in increasing the power and prosperity of the State. As he once declared: "For me there has been but one compass, one pole star, by which I have steered: *Salus publica*. Since I entered public life I have often perhaps acted rashly and imprudently. But when I have had time for reflection I have always asked myself the question, What is most beneficial, most expedient, and desirable for the dynasty I serve (so long as I was concerned only with Prussia), and, nowadays, for the German nation? I have never been committed to any set of doctrines. All the systems . . . are of secondary importance to me." He accepted the capitalist system of industry and the division of society into rich and poor as a natural and permanent arrangement, but considered it the duty of the State to better the condition of the working people by special laws, as well as to encourage industry by protective tariffs.

Programme
of the state
socialists

Attitude of
Bismarck
toward social-
ism and the
working
classes

He looked upon certain reforms in favor of the working classes as the best means of undermining the influence of the socialists. His views on this subject are summed up as follows in a speech he delivered in 1884: "Give the workingman the right to work as long as he is healthy, assure him care when he is sick, and maintenance when he is old. Do not fear the sacrifice involved, or cry out at state socialism as soon as the words 'provision for old age' are uttered; — if the State will show a little more Christian solicitude for the workingman, then the socialists will sing their siren song in vain, and the workingmen will cease to throng to their banner as soon as they see that the government and the legislative bodies are earnestly concerned for their welfare."

In 1882 the government introduced two bills providing for accident and sickness insurance which were given their final form after two years of deliberation and did not go into effect until 1885. According to the provisions of the first law, employers are obliged to provide a fund to insure their employees against accidents. From this fund the workmen are compensated when partially or totally disabled, and in case of death provision is made for the family of the deceased. The sickness insurance law compels workingmen and women to insure themselves against sickness, but helps them to bear the burden by requiring the employer to pay a portion of the premium and to be responsible for carrying out the law.

These measures were supplemented in 1889, after the accession of the present Kaiser, by an old-age insurance law which compels every workman with an income under five hundred dollars a year to pay a certain proportion into a state fund which provides an annual pension for him after he has reached the age of seventy years. In case he is incapacitated earlier in life he may begin to draw the pension before he reaches that age. As in other forms of workingmen's insurance, the employers pay a portion of the premium, and the State also makes a regular contribution to every annuity paid.

State insurance in the interest of the working classes

Accident and sickness insurance

Insurance for the aged and incapacitated

These three measures constitute the main results of Bismarck's policy of aiding the workingman, for notwithstanding an early promise of the present emperor, no substantial addition has been made to imperial labor legislation since 1889. Moreover these measures have failed to accomplish the purpose which Bismarck particularly had at heart, — that of checking the socialist influence.

GERMANY'S POLICY OF PROTECTION AND COLONIZATION

Demand for
protection of
German
industries

73. Closely connected with Bismarck's paternal attitude toward the working classes was his policy of protecting German industries against foreign competition. The successful war with France, the establishment of the empire, and, above all, the payment of the French indemnity had created a great "boom" in Germany. New enterprises multiplied; in Prussia alone the number of joint-stock companies increased from 410 in 1870 to 2267 in 1874; wages rose rapidly and times were "good" until the inevitable reaction due to overspeculation set in. Prices and wages then began to fall, companies failed, and factories closed. The manufacturers then commenced to demand that they be protected from foreign competition, and the farmers that a duty be placed upon the grain that was being shipped into the country from the United States and Russia. It was urged that the German "infant" industries (of which we have heard so much in the United States) could not maintain themselves without aid when rival nations, especially England, were so much better equipped with machinery, experience, and natural resources.

Bismarck's
views of
protection

Bismarck, who had formerly seemed to favor free trade, declared in the Reichstag that he was convinced that it could never be universally adopted by the nations of the earth, as some economists hoped. Even England, he argued, could not continue her free-trade policy. "Both France and

America have completely forsaken free trade ; Austria, instead of reducing her protective duties, has increased them ; Russia has done the same. . . . Therefore no one can expect Germany to remain permanently the victim of its sincere belief in the theory of free trade. Hitherto we have thrown our doors wide open to foreign goods and so have made our country the dumping ground for all the overproduction of other countries. . . . Let us close the door and erect the somewhat higher barriers that are proposed, and let us see to it that we secure at any rate the German market for the German manufacturers."

Bismarck had another motive in advocating higher customs duties. He would thereby greatly increase the revenue of the empire, which had hitherto been largely dependent upon the contributions to the imperial treasury made by the individual states. The wisdom of his policy has since been amply demonstrated, for the empire now enjoys an independent income from customs duties amounting in 1906 to some two hundred million dollars, while it called on the states for contributions scarcely exceeding seventy million dollars.

Customs duties serve to strengthen the empire

It was under these circumstances that the imperial chancellor presented to the Reichstag in 1878 a programme of tariff revision embodying two main points: (1) protective duties designed to give German industries the advantage over foreign producers; (2) a reduction of duties on raw materials not produced within the empire. In the following year the Reichstag adopted the new tariff laws by a large majority and thus initiated a system under which Germany has become one of the greatest manufacturing countries in the world.

Germany establishes a protective system in 1879

German manufacturers were, however, not satisfied with securing preference over foreign competitors in their domestic trade ; they soon began to demand government aid in finding new markets abroad. Even before the establishment of the empire a Central Union for Commercial Geography and the Advancement of German Foreign Interests had been founded,

African colonization

and in 1878 an African Society was established for the purpose of carrying on explorations and educating public opinion in favor of colonial expansion. Numerous trading posts were built, especially along the western coast of Africa, and the agents at these centers began to urge the government not only to protect them but also to secure a firmer control over the natives and their trade by the seizure of territory. In spite of many misgivings about the ultimate value of distant colonies peopled by barbarous races, Bismarck was induced to take steps toward the acquisition of territory in Africa.

Togoland
and
Kamerun

He sent out Dr. Gustav Nachtigal in 1884 for the purpose of establishing German control at certain points along the western coast of Africa. The English Foreign Office was notified that this enterprise was designed merely to gather information for the German government on the state of commerce. Before the English government was aware of the real character of the expedition, the German agent had induced native chiefs to acknowledge a German protectorate over two large provinces, Togoland in Upper Guinea, a region about the size of the state of Indiana, and Kamerun, adjoining the French Congo, — in all an area of over two hundred thousand square miles.¹

Angra
Pequena

In the same year Herr Luederitz, a Bremen merchant, acting under orders from Bismarck, raised the German flag at Angra Pequena (a point on the west coast a short distance above the English possessions at the Cape), where German merchants and traders had been active for some time. This region had long been coveted by the Cape colonists, but the delay of the English government in taking action allowed it to fall into the hands of the Germans. By subsequent agreements with Portugal and England, who control the adjacent regions, the German government carved out a block of territory estimated at over three hundred and twenty thousand square miles, an area far greater than that of the entire German Empire.

German
Southwest
Africa

¹ See map of Africa below, p. 356.

This colony bears the name of German Southwest Africa, but its entire European population is less than five thousand.

Even larger territories were secured by Germany in East Africa. In 1884 the Society for German Colonization sent Dr. Karl Peters to determine what could be done in that region. The sultan of Zanzibar was induced in 1888 to lease a narrow strip of territory over six hundred miles long to the Germans, and in two years transferred all his rights to the German Empire for a million dollars. The few German settlers then established plantations of cocoa palms, coffee, vanilla, tobacco, caoutchouc, sugar, tea, etc., and the government founded several experiment stations for determining the possibilities of profitable agriculture. Railways were begun and telegraphic communication established.

German East
Africa

At the same period German agents found their way into the Pacific and occupied a region in New Guinea to which the name of Kaiser Wilhelm's Land was given. The Caroline Islands (except Guam, which belongs to the United States) and a part of the Solomon group were also acquired.¹

Germany in
the Pacific

REIGN OF WILLIAM II

74. With the accession of the present emperor, William II,² in 1888, Prince Bismarck lost his power. He had been implicitly trusted by the old Kaiser, William I, who had been content to leave the practical management of the empire largely in the hands of the chancellor. The new emperor proved a very different man. He is fond of making speeches in which he has much to say of the power which God has given him ;

Accession of
William II,
1888

¹ German merchants and investors are also developing railways in Asia Minor, Syria, and Mesopotamia with a view of opening up the natural resources. Their activities in Morocco brought them into conflict with the French, who believed that they possessed special rights there, and for a time there was talk of war, but matters were adjusted in 1906 at a congress of European powers held at Algiers on the Strait of Gibraltar. See below, p. 362.

² William II is the eldest son of Frederick III (who succeeded his father, William I, in March, 1888, and died in June of the same year) and of Victoria, the daughter of Queen Victoria of England.

indeed, he seems to be a stout adherent of that conception of kingship which Bossuet extracted from the Holy Scriptures and urged upon the willing Louis XIV.¹ On his accession to the throne he expressed himself as follows: "Summoned to the throne of my fathers, I have taken up the reins of government, looking for aid to the King of kings. I have sworn to God to follow the example of my fathers and be to my people a just and firm ruler, to nurture piety and the fear of

God, to cherish peace, and to be a helper of the poor and oppressed, and a faithful guardian of justice." To the army he said, "We belong together, I and the army; indeed we are born for each other and we will act together, it matters not whether God wills peace or storm."

It is not strange that Bismarck, who, with firm hand, keen vision, and unswerving devotion, had guided the ship of state through troubled waters for over a quarter of a century, should have found it hard to tolerate the intervention of the inexperienced young



Dismissing the Pilot²

emperor. In March, 1890, he presented his resignation, and, amid a great demonstration of popular feeling, the "Iron Chancellor," the most extraordinary statesman Germany has

¹ See above, Vol. I, p. 7, note.

² Caricature from *Punch*, 1890.

Bismarck
resigns,
March, 1890

ever produced, retired to private life. He had assumed no responsibility for the policies of William II, and may have cherished some bitterness against him. At any rate, upon his death in 1898 these simple words were carved upon his tomb, "Here lies Prince Bismarck, a faithful servant of Emperor William I." Upon the announcement of Bismarck's resignation, William II declared, "I am as much afflicted as if I had lost my grandfather anew, but we must endure whatever God sends us, even if we should have to die for it. The post of officer of the quarterdeck of the ship of state has fallen to me. The course remains unchanged. Forward, with full steam!"

For a time it seemed as if William II proposed to conciliate the socialist party, although he could not possibly have had any real sympathy with its aims. The legislation against the socialists which Bismarck had inaugurated in 1878 was allowed to lapse in 1890, and they now carried on their agitation openly and with vigor and success. The emperor pledged himself to continue the social legislation begun by his grandfather, since he deemed it one of the duties of the State to relieve poverty, and declared that the welfare of the workingman lay close to his heart. He attempted to adjust strikes by arbitration, and in 1890 called together an international congress for the protection of labor, where he took occasion to make many lengthy addresses. Irritated, however, at his failure to check the expression of discontent on the part of the working classes, he grew angry and pronounced the social democrat as "nothing better than an enemy of the empire and his country." In 1894 he proposed a bill to stop the "virulent machinations" of the socialists; but this, like other measures aimed at the party, failed to pass the Reichstag. Of late the emperor has had less to say about helping the workingman, but he watches with no little uneasiness the steady increase of the number of socialist voters.¹

Attitude of
William II
toward
socialism

¹ See table below, p. 149, note.

Germany in
the Far East

United Germany, like united Italy, had embarked on a colonial policy, and William II has shown himself very ready to participate in world politics. At the close of the war between China and Japan, in 1895, he joined with Russia and France in preventing Japan from occupying the Liaotung peninsula. Two years later the Germans seized the port of Kiauchau on the Shantung peninsula opposite Korea. In an address to his brother, Prince Henry, when he assumed command of the Oriental fleet, the emperor said that the expedition was but the first expression of the transoceanic ambition of the newly united German people. "We simply wish equal rights for German commerce under the banner of the empire. Imperial power is sea power; the two are mutually dependent, one cannot exist without the other. Our citizens abroad may rest absolutely assured that the protection of the empire will everywhere be given them through the imperial navy. Should any one infringe our rights, then use the mailed fist and earn your laurel wreath." An excellent opportunity for employing "the mailed fist" was afforded shortly afterwards; for in 1900 Germany coöperated with the other great European powers in suppressing the Boxer uprising in China.

Doubtful
value of Ger-
many's ex-
periments in
colonization

Notwithstanding Germany's extensive colonial dominion and commercial adventures in the Far East, the whole enterprise has been of doubtful value. None of the lands acquired are really suitable for settlement by German people who wish to emigrate from the fatherland,¹ and there is a steadily increasing expenditure for new battleships and the maintenance of troops in the colonies. Especially in Africa, the native races under the German flag are very warlike, and in 1905-1906 the government spent the sum of nine million dollars in suppressing local uprisings, while the value of the exports and imports of the provinces scarcely exceeded two million dollars.

¹ In 1905 there were only 216 Germans in Togoland, 738 in Kamerun, about 4000 (mostly soldiers) in German South West Africa, 1324 in East Africa, and less than 500 in the Pacific Islands.

The whole question therefore remains one of the most hotly contested in German politics and was made the leading issue in the elections for the Reichstag in 1907, when a majority was returned in favor of continuing the existing imperial policy.

However, both the colonial policy and the system of autocratic government represented by the Kaiser are not without powerful opponents, for in spite of the fact that the imperial government is founded on a written constitution and the Reichstag is elected by popular vote, the German government is the least democratic in western Europe. The emperor is not controlled by a ministry representing the majority in parliament, and public criticism of the government is liable to cause the arrest and imprisonment of the offender. Furthermore, the Reichstag can scarcely be regarded as really representing the views of the nation. The government has refused to revise the apportionment of representatives as it was arranged in 1871, although great changes have taken place since that year. As a result Berlin, for instance, has only six members in the Reichstag, although its population of two million inhabitants would entitle it to twenty. This accounts for the relatively small number of socialists and the large number of conservatives in the parliament, for in 1907 the socialists, although they could muster 3,250,000 voters, returned only 43 members, whereas the conservatives secured 83 seats with less than 1,500,000 supporters, mainly in the country districts.¹

Sources of dissatisfaction on the part of the liberals and socialists

There is no large liberal party in Germany to advocate the more democratic institutions of responsible ministers, equal electoral districts, and retrenchment in military expenditures; consequently the principal opposition to the methods of William II comes from the socialist party which steadily increases in

¹ The steady increase of socialism is shown by the following table:

Year of election	Socialist votes	Members elected	Year of election	Socialist votes	Members elected
1877	493,288	12	1890	1,497,298	36
1881	311,961	12	1903	3,008,000	81
1887	763,000	11	1907	3,251,009	43

numbers and in the effectiveness of its organization. It stoutly resists any increase in expenditure for colonial purposes, favors international peace, and scorns the "divine right" theories of the emperor. Whether it will be possible for the German government to continue to adhere to its present methods in the face of the rising tide of democracy all over the world remains for the future to decide.

REFERENCES

The Government of Germany: LOWELL, *Governments and Parties in Continental Countries*, Vol. II, pp. 1-8.

Development of Parties in Germany: LOWELL, Vol. II, pp. 9-69.

The Kulturkampf: SEIGNOBOS, *Political History of Europe since 1814*, pp. 491-496; ROSE, *Development of Modern European Nations*, Vol. I, pp. 164-168; ANDREWS, *Historical Development of Modern Europe*, Vol. II, pp. 370-375.

The Conflict with the Socialists: SEIGNOBOS, pp. 496-498; DAWSON, *German Socialism and Ferdinand Lassalle*, pp. 247-278; ANDREWS, Vol. II, pp. 375-378.

Bismarck and Social Reform: ROSE, Vol. I, pp. 178-183; DAWSON, *Bismarck and State Socialism*, pp. 23-36, 72-127; ANDREWS, Vol. II, pp. 378-381.

Bismarck and Tariff Reform: DAWSON, *Bismarck and State Socialism*, pp. 47-61; ROSE, Vol. I, pp. 168-178.

The Establishment of the Colonial Empire: DAWSON, *Bismarck and State Socialism*, pp. 145-155; ROSE, Vol. II, pp. 235-263.

William II: SEIGNOBOS, pp. 502-510; ANDREWS, Vol. II, pp. 383-390.

CHAPTER XXIV

FRANCE UNDER THE THIRD REPUBLIC

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE THIRD FRENCH REPUBLIC

75. On September 3, 1870, Napoleon III telegraphed from Sedan to Paris, "The army is defeated and captured, and I am a prisoner."¹ This meant an immediate collapse of the empire which he had established some twenty years before. The Chamber of Deputies was invaded by a mob shouting for the republic, and a motion was made to dethrone Napoleon and his dynasty. Next day Gambetta and the deputies representing the city of Paris betook themselves to the old revolutionary storm center, the City Hall, and there proclaimed the reestablishment of a republic. This was sanctioned by an overwhelming majority of the Parisians. Meanwhile other large cities, such as Bordeaux, Marseilles, and Lyons, took similar action.

The third French Republic proclaimed, September 4, 1870

The terrible defeat at Sedan and the capture of the emperor did not, as we know, bring the war to a close. The German invaders pressed on; city after city was taken; the strongly fortified Strassburg fell at the end of September after a terrific bombardment, and the fortress of Metz a month later. Paris itself was surrounded by an immense German army, and the king of Prussia took up his quarters at Versailles. Gambetta, the energetic republican leader, escaping from Paris in a balloon, floated safely over the lines of the besieging Germans and reached Tours. Here he invoked the memories of 1793 and sought to organize a national army of volunteers; but the raw French battalions were easily defeated by the

The Germans invade France and lay siege to Paris

¹ After the conclusion of peace between France and Germany the Germans set Napoleon III free and he retired to England, where he died in 1873.

disciplined German regiments which had been set free by the surrender of Metz. In January, 1871, the French made their last effort to bring the enemy to terms by endeavoring to cut off its communications with Germany, but the attempt failed and the remains of the French forces were compelled to take refuge in the neutral territory of Switzerland, whither the Germans could not pursue them. Paris, reduced after a terrible siege to the point of starvation, capitulated on January 28, and an armistice was concluded.

The National Assembly elected February, 1871, proves to be strongly monarchical

Since the dissolution of the government of Napoleon III early in September, France had had no opportunity to work out a new constitution, and had drifted on under a provisional "Government of the Public Defense" which Gambetta, Favre, and others among the former deputies had improvised. It was questionable whether this revolutionary body was authorized to conclude a peace, and accordingly it was arranged, upon the surrender of Paris, that the French should elect a national assembly which would legally represent the nation in dealing with the victorious enemy. The result of the elections was surprising, for only two hundred republican candidates were chosen as against five hundred monarchists of various kinds, namely, legitimists, Orleanists, and a few Bonapartists. This was largely due to the fact that Gambetta and other prominent republicans had talked so fervidly of continuing the war at any cost that the mass of the people was fearful lest if put in power they might prolong the disastrous conflict which was ruining the country. The National Assembly, aware that Paris was strongly republican in its sentiments, determined to meet in Bordeaux, where it held its first session on February 12th.

Adolphe Thiers

Foremost among the brilliant men who composed this body was Adolphe Thiers, the historian, journalist, and politician, who for more than forty years had been a prominent figure both in literature and in affairs of state. He had aided in the expulsion of Charles X in 1830 and had zealously championed

the cause of Louis Philippe, whom he had served as minister for some time. Amid the subsequent political changes he managed by shrewd conduct, which his opponents often denounced as unscrupulous, to win a certain degree of favor even in the eyes of his political enemies. Though a critic of the second empire, his twenty-volume history of the *Consulate and Empire* elicited high praise from Napoleon III; though a monarchist, he called himself "a son of the Revolution" and had long prophesied the inevitable establishment of a republic. In the grave crisis in which France found herself in February, 1871, he appeared, therefore, to be the natural leader. His popularity was now demonstrated by the fact that in the elections for the National Assembly he had received over two million votes.

The National Assembly therefore appointed Thiers "Head of the Executive Power of the French Republic" and provided that he should exercise his authority through ministers of his own choice. This was, of course, a temporary arrangement, and the vital question whether France was to remain a republic or to be reconverted into a monarchy was deferred until the hated Germans should be got rid of. France, as Thiers urged with a statesman's insight, had been precipitated into a war without serious motive or adequate preparation; she had seen her armies destroyed, half her territory occupied by the enemy, and hundreds of thousands of her children torn from their labors to defend the fatherland. In the face of such a situation surely all enlightened and patriotic citizens, whatever their individual views of government, should unite to free France from the invader and restore her to her former prosperity.

The first step in the realization of this policy was the conclusion of a final peace with the Germans, for the armistice which had been agreed upon at the capitulation of Paris had almost expired. On February 21 Thiers hurried to Versailles to open negotiations with the German emperor and Bismarck,

Thiers
chosen as
head of the
government

The conclu-
sion of peace
with the
Germans.
Treaty of
Frankfort,
May 10, 1871

and on the 26th, after many stormy scenes, the terms of the preliminary treaty were formulated. France was to renounce Alsace and a part of Lorraine, which together included a population of almost 1,600,000; pay an enormous indemnity of five billion francs; and submit to the presence of German troops until the last payment was made. When Thiers laid this proposal before the Bordeaux assembly for its approval the deputies wept aloud as the clauses containing the cessions of territory were read. Thiers, however, maintained that a continuation of the conflict was impossible because their armies were now thoroughly disorganized, the capital in the possession of the enemy, and the treasury empty. In spite of the passionate declarations of the republicans that it would be better to fight to the end rather than to endure this new disgrace of surrendering French provinces, the Assembly, convinced that a renewal of the war would be futile, accepted the terms imposed by the victorious Germans, and they were formally signed at Frankfort on May 10.¹

The National Assembly moves to Versailles, March, 1871

As soon as peace had been duly concluded with Germany the republican minority urged that the National Assembly should dissolve itself, since it had now fulfilled its purpose. The majority, however, insisted upon continuing to govern France and proceeding to draft a constitution. The Assembly refused to remove to Paris, the "headquarters of sedition and the center of revolution," where the monarchists had good reason to fear the strong republican sentiment, so they chose Versailles as their place of meeting.² Louis Blanc warned the members that if they thus neglected the claims of Paris as the seat of government there might arise "from the

¹ The Germans were disappointed in their hope that the indemnity would seriously cripple France, for the first loan of two billion francs was secured in 1871 with ease, and the next year the second loan of three billions was subscribed twelve times over, — thus demonstrating both the patriotism and the credit of the French people. In the autumn of 1873 the amount was paid in full and the last German soldier left the soil of France.

² Not until 1879 did the French legislature again return to Paris.

ashes of a horrible war with the foreigner a still more horrible civil conflict." His fears proved only too well founded, for Paris rose in revolt against an assembly which it regarded as made up of obstinate and benighted "rustics" who still clung to monarchy and had no sympathy with the needs of the great cities.

Trouble had been brewing in Paris for several months. The siege had thrown tens of thousands out of work and had produced general demoralization. During the war many men had received a franc and a half a day for acting as national guardsmen, but the Assembly at Versailles now ordered that this payment, upon which many workmen in enforced idleness were relying, be discontinued. The guardsmen thereupon chose a committee to defend their interests and those of the republic. This committee united with a newly elected city council, very revolutionary in its make-up, which determined to govern Paris as a practically independent city, and together they bade defiance to the National Assembly, which they charged with usurping power that had not been delegated to it by the nation.

The revolutionary group who now attempted to govern Paris included ardent republicans, socialists, communists, anarchists, and some who could scarcely be said to have had much interest in anything except disorder. Many of the leaders were men of unquestionable integrity, who were determined to defend the republic, even by the sacrifice of their lives, as the "only form of government compatible with the rights of the people and the development of a free society." They all agreed in demanding that every commune, or municipality, should be left free to manage its own affairs in the interests of its own people. France would then become a sort of federation of communes, each community electing its own officers and introducing freely such social reforms as suited local conditions. In this way "militarism," "officialism," and "privilege" would disappear. The idea of keeping all France under a single strong empire or monarchy was denounced as despotic and unintelligent. It

Paris resolves to bid defiance to the National Assembly

Views of the communards

was this exalted confidence in the commune, or local government, that gained for the leaders the name of "communards."¹

The Com-
mune sup-
pressed with
terrible loss
of life and
property,
April-May,
1871

The doctrines of the communards failed, however, to gain any considerable support in the other cities of France, and the Assembly at Versailles determined to reduce rebellious Paris to subjection. Toward the close of April Thiers ordered a bombardment of the fortifications on the outskirts of the city preparatory to its capture. This was the beginning of a desperate struggle; the Versailles troops, under orders, refused to accord to the communards the rights of soldiers, and shot, as traitors and rebels, all who fell into their hands. After three weeks of fighting on the outskirts, the forces of the Assembly entered Paris by an unguarded gate on May 21, and then began a terrible week of war, murder, and arson in the city itself. Beautiful public buildings, like the City Hall and the palace of the Tuileries, were destroyed by excited mobs; residence districts were raked with bursting shells, and the streets were filled with maddened soldiers, crying "no quarter," against whom the desperate communards struggled with passionate despair. For a whole week the fratricidal strife raged, until finally on May 28 Marshal MacMahon, who was in command of the troops, was able to announce the close of the conflict and the restoration of order. The slaughter, however, was not yet at an end, for the monarchists set up courts martial and, with scarcely the semblance of a trial, shot hundreds of the prisoners that had been taken. Unlike the government of the United States after the close of the Civil War, that of France under the leadership of Thiers—once a revolutionist himself—forgave no one. Seventy-five hundred of the insurgents were sent to the penal colony in New Caledonia and thirteen thousand were condemned to imprisonment with hard labor or sent into exile.

¹ The word "communist" is often unhappily applied to the communards. But "communist" is best reserved for those who advocate the more or less complete abolition of private property and maintain that society as a whole should own and control, in the interests of all, what is now left in the hands of individuals. Many of the communards were communists, but the terms are not synonymous.

The National Assembly was at last free to turn to the vexed question of settling upon a permanent form of government for the distracted country. There would have been little difficulty in reëstablishing the monarchy if the monarchists had not been hopelessly divided among themselves. Some of them, known as the "legitimists" because they regarded the older Bourbon line as the lawful one, were in favor of bestowing the crown on the count of Chambord, a grandson of Charles X who had been deposed by the Orleanist revolution in 1830. The "Orleanists," who wished to see a restoration of the House of Orleans which had been overthrown in 1848, had a strong candidate in the person of the count of Paris, a grandson of Louis Philippe. These two groups of monarchists had nothing in common but their opposition to a republic; their hatred of each other was bitter and uncompromising. The legitimists could not bring themselves to look upon the Orleanists as anything more than usurpers who had been responsible for the insurrection of 1830, while the Orleanists regarded the legitimists with scarcely less ill feeling.

In view of these divisions all factions were willing to postpone for a time the final solution of the problem, each hoping meanwhile to gain strength by delay. This policy was sanctioned by Thiers, who urged the assembly to devote its attention to the pressing task of strengthening the army and restoring the prosperity of France. Smarting under the humiliation of their defeat by the Germans, the Assembly passed a new army law modeled upon that of Prussia, which bound every Frenchman to military service for five years in the active service and fifteen years in the reserve force.¹ The frontier defenses were strengthened, the army equipped with the most improved instruments of war, and the war department completely reorganized.

At last, in December, 1872, Thiers, who had been an Orleanist, declared himself for the republic, arguing that its overthrow

Dissensions
between
legitimists
and Orlean-
ists in the
National
Assembly

Thiers
(elected pres-
ident of the
republic,
August,
1871) under-
takes to
strengthen
the French
army

¹ The term of service in the active army, from which no able-bodied man is exempted, is now two years, followed by eleven years in the reserve.

Thiers overthrown and MacMahon elected president, 1873

would mean a new revolution. His conservative republicanism, however, did not save him from attacks by Gambetta and the radical republicans of the extreme left; while the monarchists, angered by his defection, determined on his downfall. In May, 1873, they secured a majority vote in the Assembly for a resolution condemning Thiers's policy, and he thereupon resigned, leaving the government in the hands of the monarchists, who chose Marshal MacMahon as president and formed a coalition ministry representing Orleanists, legitimists, and Bonapartists under the leadership of the duke of Broglie, a member of the Orleanist group.

The legitimists and Orleanists agree on a compromise, 1873

The various monarchist parties now agreed to combine for the purpose of overthrowing the republic. The large cities, especially Paris, were placed under martial law, republicans were dismissed from government positions, republican newspapers were watched by the police, and the clergy exhorted to use their influence in the cause of monarchy. In spite of these measures, when elections were held to fill vacancies in the Assembly, republican candidates were chosen for the most part, and the monarchists saw that they must arrange a compromise if they wished to restore the monarchy. Accordingly the Orleanists and legitimists agreed that the count of Chambord should be recognized as Henry V, and that since he had no children he should be succeeded by the count of Paris, the candidate of the Orleanists. The thorny question whether France should cling to the tricolored flag, which suggested revolution, or adopt the ancient white banner of the Bourbons was deferred until the monarchy should be securely established.

The count of Chambord refuses to abandon the white flag of the Bourbon

In this adjustment of affairs the parties had not reckoned with the character of the count of Chambord. He was then over fifty years of age and had spent most of his life as an exile in Scotland, Germany, Austria, and Italy. He had been educated by pious Catholics and ardent supporters of the legitimist cause, who had imbued him with a passionate

devotion to the ancient rights of his house and with an equally passionate hatred of revolution in every form. Immediately after the suppression of the Paris Commune he had issued a manifesto in which he declared, "France will come to me, and I to her, just as I am, with my principles and my flag." Though ardently desiring to be restored to the throne of his ancestors, he could not bring himself to agree to any compromises with plans which he believed to be hostile to the supremacy of the elder Bourbon line and to the claims of the Catholic Church. He consented to negotiate with the count of Paris only on condition that he himself should be recognized as the legitimate head of the family and the lawful king. He then published an open letter in which he declared that he would not renounce the white flag which had so long been the standard of his house.

The Orleanists, enraged by the conduct of the fusion candidate, determined that he should not ascend the throne upon his own terms and took measures to prevent his coronation, although he had come to Versailles to superintend the preparations. They turned to the Bonapartists and republicans with a proposition to prolong the term of Marshal MacMahon, as president of the republic, for a period of seven years, in the hope that by the time his term expired they might have gained sufficient strength to place their own candidate on the throne.

The Assembly meanwhile continued its confused and heated debates, the republicans demanding the establishment without further delay of a republican constitution; the legitimists, the retirement of Marshal MacMahon in favor of the count of Chambord; and the Orleanists, the president's continuance in office until 1880. Finally, at the beginning of the year 1875, four years after the election of the Assembly, it at last took up seriously the consideration of a permanent form of government, and on January 29 a motion was carried by a majority of one providing that the president of the *republic* should be elected by the Senate and Chamber of Deputies meeting

MacMahon's term prolonged to seven years

The Assembly at last agrees to sanction a republican form of government, January, 1875

together in a single assembly. Thus the republicans at last carried the day by the narrowest possible margin.

Peculiar form
of the present
constitution
of France

The restoration of the monarchy having now become impossible, for the time being at least, the Assembly proceeded with the work of completing a form of government, not by drafting an elaborate constitution but by passing a series of laws. These separate laws, supplemented by later amendments, form the constitution of the Third Republic, which consequently differs in many fundamental ways from all the previous French constitutions. It contains no reference to the sovereignty of the people; it includes no bill of rights enumerating the liberties of French citizens; and it makes no definite provision for maintaining a republican form of government. It is, in fact, by no means a logically arranged and finished document; on the contrary, it bears throughout the marks of hasty compilation, designed as it was to tide the nation over a crisis until one of the contending parties in the Assembly should secure a triumphant majority. Nevertheless, despite the expectations of many who took part in its making, it has lasted longer and provided a more stable government than any of the numerous constitutions France has had since 1789.

Position of
the president
of the French
republic

Under this new constitution the president of the French republic occupies a position rather more like that of the king of England than that of the president of the United States. He is elected for a term of seven years, not by the people at large but by the Senate and Chamber of Deputies which meet together as one body in Versailles for the purpose. There is no vice president, and in case of the death or resignation of the president a new one is immediately chosen for the full term of seven years. He must select his cabinet from among the members of the chambers, and the ministers thus chosen exercise a powerful control over his policy and appointments. The real head of the government is the prime minister, as in England. The president has no veto, but may return a measure to the Chamber and Senate for reconsideration.

The parliament consists of two houses, differing in this respect from the legislative bodies established in 1791 and 1848. The members of the Chamber of Deputies (now 584 in number) are chosen for a term of four years directly by the people, and every man over twenty-one years of age — unless he be in active service in the army — is permitted to vote. The three hundred senators are chosen indirectly for a term of nine years by a small group of electors in each department.¹

The Senate
and Chamber
of Deputies

It will be observed that the French parliament is more powerful than the Congress of the United States. It not only elects the president, who is under the control of a ministry representing the majority in the chambers, but it may by meeting in joint session amend the constitution without the necessity of submitting the changes to the people for their ratification. There is no supreme court in France to declare the measures of parliament unconstitutional, and the president cannot veto them. Like the members of the English cabinet, the French ministers resign when they find their policy is no longer supported by a majority in the Chamber of Deputies.

Exceptional
powers of
the French
parliament

THE THIRD FRENCH REPUBLIC SINCE 1875: THE DREYFUS AFFAIR

76. The National Assembly, after completing the laws which now serve France as a constitution, dissolved on December 31, 1875, and a regular election was held throughout France for the purpose of choosing the members of the Senate and Chamber of Deputies. This resulted in an overwhelming majority for the republicans in the Chamber, while even in the Senate there were enough of them to give them the balance of power among the conflicting royalist factions. The Orleanist

Strength of
the republic
ans causes
MacMahon
to resign,
1879

¹ This electoral body is composed of the members of the various local councils, to which are added the senators and deputies representing the department. Originally there were seventy-five life senators chosen by the National Assembly before it dissolved, but in 1884 a law was passed providing that as these life members died they should be replaced by senators chosen in the regular way.

president, Marshal MacMahon, found himself unable to work in harmony with the deputies, and in 1877 he dissolved the Chamber with the hope that by meddling in the elections and manipulating the returns he could secure at last a monarchical majority. This *coup d'état* failed. The new election left the republicans still in power; they denounced the president's policy and refused to approve the budget that he presented. After continuing the struggle until 1879, MacMahon resigned and was succeeded by an unmistakable republican, Jules Grévy, who enjoyed the entire confidence of the Chamber.

Freedom of
the press and
of public
assemblies

Still further strengthened by the elections of 1881, the republicans undertook a number of urgent reforms. The press had been declared free in 1789 and in 1815, but the government had constantly watched the newspapers and punished editors who offended it by too frank criticism. At last, in 1881, the licenses previously required of those who wished to undertake new publications were abolished, publishers were no longer forced to make deposits in order to insure their respectful treatment of the government, and the police courts were deprived of their right to try those accused of defaming government officials. The newspapers now enjoy almost as complete freedom as those of the United States or England. Akin to this reform was the right extended to any group of citizens to hold public meetings, on condition that they should merely announce their intention to the authorities. In 1884, after nearly a hundred years of harsh repressive legislation directed against all labor associations, a law was passed permitting workingmen to form unions. Finally, the government undertook a series of measures with a view of freeing the schools from the influence of the clergy, who were accused of undermining the loyalty of the children to the republic. These measures will be considered presently.

Disappearance
of the
monarchical
parties

Year by year the French republic gained in the number of its adherents and in the confidence of the other powers of Europe. The death of the son of Napoleon III in 1879 was a

fatal blow to the already declining hopes of the Bonapartists, and the death of the childless count of Chambord in 1883 left the legitimist faction without a head. A few Orleanists clung to their candidate, the count of Paris, until his death in 1894, but the elections of the preceding year, which resulted in the choice of only seventy-three royalist deputies — legitimists, Orleanists, and Bonapartists — had shown that France was at last irrevocably committed to the republic.

Only twice since the formation of the republic has it been seriously threatened by political disturbances. The death of Gambetta in 1881 left the republicans, who naturally split up into several factions, without any distinguished leader. Encouraged by this situation a popular officer, General Boulanger, began courting the favor of the army and the workingmen in somewhat the same way that Napoleon III had done when he was planning to make himself master of France. As minister of war in 1886, Boulanger talked of avenging the defeat that France had suffered in the conflict with the Germans — always a popular theme — and he won some distinguished adherents by his denunciation of party divisions and corruption. He declared himself in favor of calling a national assembly to revise the constitution and do away with the Senate and the presidency, but what his further plans were he did not explain. In 1889 he was reëlected to the Chamber of Deputies by an overwhelming majority, and it seemed for a time that he might be able to gain sufficient popularity to enable him to get control of the government. His enemies, however, charged him with threatening the safety of the State, and he was tried and condemned to life imprisonment. He escaped from France, however, and in 1891 committed suicide, leaving his party to go to pieces. This episode served rather to discredit the monarchists than to weaken the republic.

France had scarcely settled down after the Boulanger episode before a singular incident rent the country into angry factions and stirred up the most bitter animosity which had distracted

Boulanger's attempt to overturn the republic

The opening of the Dreyfus affair, 1894

the nation since the Franco-German War and the suppression of the Commune. In 1894 Captain Alfred Dreyfus, an Alsatian Jew in the French artillery service, was charged with having delivered to a representative of the German government "a certain number of confidential documents relating to national defense," which might enable Germany to undertake war against France. He was secretly tried by a military tribunal, condemned to life imprisonment, degraded from his rank, and sent into solitary confinement on the lonely Devil's Island off the coast of French Guiana.

Colonel
Picquart
finds evidence
pointing to
Dreyfus's
innocence

Dreyfus had consistently protested that he was entirely innocent of the charge, and his friends began to work for a new trial. In 1896 Colonel Picquart, head of the detective department of the army, received information which led him to believe that the real offender was not Dreyfus but a Major Esterhazy. His superior officers, however, were determined that the Dreyfus affair should not be reopened for fear, apparently, that something discreditable to the army might be unearthed. Colonel Picquart was accordingly removed from office; and his successor, Colonel Henry, at once charged him with having forged the evidence which had come to light in favor of Dreyfus. Esterhazy, after a farcical trial, was thereupon declared innocent.

France
roused to
frenzy over
the affair

These charges and countercharges now began to attract general attention and to arouse bitter feeling. The supporters of Dreyfus charged the army officers with unscrupulousness and corruption; his opponents, on the other hand, appealed to the country in the name of the honor of the army; churchmen attacked him as a Jew and as an enemy of Christian France. Government officials in general maintained his guilt, but many politicians, journalists, and prominent radicals declared their belief in his innocence and accused those in power of shielding criminal injustice. Monarchists cited the whole scandal as conclusive evidence of the failure of republican government. Thus the Dreyfus affair became a military, religious, and

political question, which created a sort of frenzy in France and aroused the interest of the whole civilized world.

The controversy reached a crisis in 1898 when the well-known novelist, Émile Zola, published an article accusing all the officials connected with the trial and conviction of Dreyfus not only of wanton injustice but of downright dishonesty. Zola's charges greatly increased the excitement, and distinguished scholars and men of letters raised their voices in defense of Dreyfus. Zola was scarcely tried and condemned for his bold indictment¹ when Colonel Henry was himself imprisoned on the charge of having forged evidence against Dreyfus; later he was found dead in his cell, and this was construed as a confession of guilt. The reconsideration of the whole case could not be postponed any longer, and a new trial was ordered which began at Rennes in the summer of 1899. This resulted in the condemnation of Dreyfus to six years' imprisonment, but he was immediately pardoned by President Loubet. It was hoped that the credit of those who had originally condemned Dreyfus might in this way be saved and yet no penalty be imposed on an innocent man.

Naturally enough, however, this did not satisfy Dreyfus, who wanted not freedom as a pardoned criminal but a judicial declaration of his innocence and a restoration to his former rank. Consequently his numerous friends and sympathizers continued to work for a new trial, and finally, in June, 1906, a third trial began in the highest court in France (the Court of Cassation). The following month the court quashed the verdict of the court at Rennes; the Senate and Chamber of Deputies concurred in a bill promoting Dreyfus to the rank of major; and on July 21, 1906, he was presented with the decoration of the Legion of Honor in the courtyard of the *École Militaire*, where eleven years before he had been degraded.

The affair was thus at an end, but the effects of the controversy on the political situation in France could not be undone.

Dreyfus at last secures a new trial, 1899

Dreyfus declared innocent, 1906

Effects of the controversy

¹ He escaped punishment by retiring to England.

The formation of the "bloc"

It produced an alliance, called the "*bloc*," among the republicans of all shades, including the socialists, for the purpose of reducing the political importance of the army and Church. The army was republicanized by getting rid of the royalist officers; the destruction of the political power of the clergy was by no means so easy a matter.

THE SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE

Natural hostility of the clergy to the French republic

77. The Catholic clergy had from the first been hostile to the republic, for they had every reason to fear that the new government, with its confidence in popular sovereignty, freedom of the press, and public schools, would sooner or later undermine their authority. The head of the Church, Pius IX, in a solemn statement called the Syllabus of 1864, had denounced in no uncertain terms what he regarded as the great dangers and errors of the age. Among these were religious toleration, liberty of conscience, freedom of the press and of speech, separation of Church and State, and secular education. The republicans were, therefore, pledged to just those things which the Pope condemned; indeed some of the most prominent among them regarded the Church as a serious impediment in the path of progress and, like Voltaire a hundred years before, would gladly have seen France abandon the Christian religion itself since they believed it opposed to reason and modern science. It was inevitable, therefore, that the clerical party should do all in its power to discredit the republic and bring about a restoration of the monarchy. The Jesuits and other religious orders who maintained schools roused in the children's minds a distrust of the government, and the clergy actively engaged in electioneering whenever there was hope of electing deputies who would favor their cause. The religious newspapers represented the republic as an unfortunate accident which had put ungodly men in power but which would doubtless speedily give way to a more legitimate form of government.

This attitude on the part of the clergy naturally made the republicans more strongly anticlerical than ever. They came to hate the clergy and all they stood for. Gambetta declared that clericalism was "*the enemy*." In a letter to Pope Leo XIII in 1883 President Grévy told his Holiness quite frankly that the denunciation of religion so common in France was due chiefly to the bitter hostility of the clergy toward the republic, which they had opposed from its advent, invariably siding with its enemies in all the struggles which it had faced in order to maintain itself. This letter seems to have had some effect at the Vatican, for the following year the Pope instructed the French clergy to moderate their opposition to the government. It was not until 1892, however, that Leo XIII admonished the French bishops and priests to "accept the republic, that is to say, the established power which exists among you; respect it and submit to it as representing the power which comes from God."

The republicans become anticlerical

In spite of this peaceful advice on the part of the head of the Church there has been no peace; for during the past twenty-five years an extraordinary struggle between Church and State has been in progress in France in which the republic has proved the victor and has succeeded in depriving the Church of a great part of those sources of political influence which remained to it after the losses it suffered during the French Revolution. The opponents of the Church have had two main objects in view: (1) to free the schools from the influence of the clergy and thus prevent the children of France from being brought up as monarchists, and (2) to relieve the government from the burden of paying the salaries of the clergy and to bring about the complete separation of Church and State.

Main objects of the anticlericals during the past twenty-five years

The first step was to increase the number of public schools which might serve to attract pupils away from the convent and other Church schools. Two hundred millions of dollars have been appropriated for this purpose during the past thirty years. By laws passed in 1881-1886 instruction was made absolutely free in the primary public schools, children were

Establishment of public schools under purely secular influence

required to attend them from the age of six to thirteen, and no clergyman was to be employed as a teacher in them. The private schools were also placed under strict government supervision.

Opposition
to the reli-
gious associa-
tions

Many of the monastic orders and various other religious associations which had lost their property and then been abolished during the first revolution had been reëstablished, and new ones had been created. Most of them were devoted to charitable work or to education. The Jesuits were accused of working, as always, in the interests of the Pope, and the Dominicans of preaching openly against the republic, while the innumerable schools in the convents and elsewhere were reproached with instilling monarchical and reactionary ideas into the tender minds of the children committed to their charge.

The Associa-
tions Law of
1901

From time to time some anticlerical deputy would propose the abolition of all the religious associations, and finally, in 1900, Waldeck-Rousseau, then prime minister, committed himself and his cabinet to a measure for greatly reducing their number, declaring that "There are too many monks in politics and too many monks in business."¹ The following year the Associations Law was passed. This provided that no religious order could continue to exist in France without a specific authorization from the parliament, and that no one belonging to a nonauthorized association should be permitted to teach or to conduct a school. At the time of the passage of the law there were about one hundred and sixty thousand members (mainly women) in the various religious associations, which maintained about twenty thousand establishments. The parliament refused to grant most of the applications made by the many unauthorized associations, and as a result numerous teaching, preaching, and commercial societies which had been organized under

¹ Sometimes the orders carried on a little industry in the interests of their convent. For example, the monks of the great Carthusian monastery above Grenoble manufactured the famous liqueur known as Chartreuse. The labor parties denounced the monks for thus going into business and competing with other manufacturers.

the auspices of the Catholic Church were broken up, and within two years ten thousand religious schools were closed. In the year 1904-1905 there were over five million French children in the public and other secular schools and only about five hundred thousand enrolled in those connected with religious associations. A law of 1904 provides that within ten years all teaching by religious associations shall cease.

The attack on the religious orders was only the prelude to the complete separation of Church and State which had been advocated for a century by the opponents of the Church. It will be remembered that the French Convention proclaimed this separation in 1795 and refused longer to pay the salaries of the clergy, or in any way to recognize the existence of the Church except as a voluntary association which should be supported by those who wished to belong to it. Bonaparte, however, partially restored the old system in the Concordat which he arranged with the Pope in 1801. This, with a supplementary act, remained the basis of the relations between Church and State in France down to 1906.¹ Bonaparte did not give back the property of the Church of which it had been deprived by the first French Assembly in 1789, but he agreed that the government should pay the salaries of the bishops and priests whose appointment it controlled. Although the Catholic religion was recognized as that of the majority of Frenchmen, the State also helped support the Reformed and Lutheran churches and the Jewish religious community.

From the standpoint of the government this was in many ways an excellent arrangement, for it was thus enabled profoundly to influence public opinion through its control over the clergy. Consequently, amid all the later political changes, the settlement reached by Bonaparte was retained essentially

The Concordat of 1801 established a close relation between Church and State

Power of the clergy during the nineteenth century

¹ The policy of the leaders of the French Revolution and of Bonaparte in regard to the clergy and the religious associations has already been carefully described with a view of preparing the way for an understanding of the recent important legislation in France affecting the Church. See above, Vol. I, pp. 243 *sqq.*, 257 and 310 *sqq.*

unaltered. Louis XVIII, Charles X, Louis Philippe, and Napoleon III had no desire to do away with the Concordat which afforded them such great political power, and under them the Church so throve that a Catholic clergyman of our day could say with much truth: "Thirty years ago, in this our land of France, the Catholics were in power. They had on their side money and influence, the judges, the army, a great majority in parliament, the ministers, and the chief of the State. The anticlericals were a minute and feeble minority."

Final separation of Church and State in 1905

But with the establishment of the republic all this was changed, owing to the strong monarchical sympathies of the clergy. There are, moreover, large numbers of Frenchmen who, if not actively opposed to the Church, have no interest in religion. To this class it seemed absurd that the government should be paying forty million francs a year to clergymen for teaching the people what seemed to them nonsense and for stirring up hostility to the government. Nevertheless it was no easy task to put asunder Church and State, which had been closely associated with one another from the times of Constantine and Theodosius the Great. It was not until 1904 that Premier Combes boldly announced his intention to undertake this separation. His plans were defeated, but his successor, Rouvier, continued the work he had begun, and after almost a year of heated debate the Separation Law was promulgated, December 9, 1905.

Main provisions of the Separation Law

The main provisions of the new law are relatively simple. It suppresses all government appropriations for religious purposes but provides pensions for clergymen of long service and the gradual extinction of the salaries of others. It declares that cathedrals, churches, the residences of bishops, and other ecclesiastical buildings belong to the government, but shall be placed at the disposal of congregations and their pastors free of charge. The management of these edifices and the control of other property of the Church are vested in Associations for

Public Worship¹ (*associations cultuelles*) composed of from seven to twenty-five persons according to the size of the commune. The Concordat concluded in 1801 is, of course, expressly abolished.

A period of twelve months was allowed to the various churches to form these associations and prepare for the full execution of the law; but it soon became evident that the Pope and a large Catholic party were determined not to accept its provisions. Crowds collided with the soldiers sent to guard the churches while inventories were being made of the property to be handed over to the Associations for Public Worship. In February, 1906, the Pope condemned the entire law in a long encyclical letter to the archbishops and bishops of France in which he protested especially against the religious associations for which it provided. As they are really associations of private persons in whom is vested the management of Church property and finances, the Pope regarded them as not assuring the "divine constitution of the Church, the immutable rights of the Roman pontiff and of the bishops, and their authority over the necessary property of the Church, particularly over the sacred edifices." Moreover he considered the repeal of the Concordat without consulting him as a violation of international law and a breach of faith. Unfortunately he did not advise the French clergy just how to get out of the predicament in which they found themselves.

The clergy, obedient to the commands of the head of the Church, refused to countenance the formation of associations, and many of them declined the proffered pensions. The nation at large, however, evidently supported the government in its plans, for the elections held in May, 1906, returned a large majority of radicals, socialists, and progressives committed to the full execution of the law.

¹ These closely resemble the various Church associations, both Catholic and Protestant, in the United States, which are, from the standpoint of the law, merely religious societies on the same footing as social, literary, or scientific associations.

The Pope and clergy oppose the new law

National elections uphold the government

The govern-
ment permits
the continu-
ance of public
worship by a
new law,
December,
1906

When the year allowed for the formation of the religious associations expired in December, 1906, the Church property which had no legal claimants passed into the hands of the government. However, the minister of public worship, M. Briand, a socialist, unwilling to stop religious services, took steps to allow the churches to remain open in spite of the failure to comply with the law. At his instigation the French parliament passed a very important supplementary measure which provides that buildings for public worship and their entire furniture shall remain at the disposal of priests and their congregations even if the associations required by the original law are not formed.

The situation
in 1907

In January, 1907, the Pope again denounced the government, which, he declared, was confiscating Church property and attempting to destroy Christianity in France. And it is quite clear that the Republic means to render permanent the separation of Church and State. Subsidies to the clergy are no longer provided, although the promised pensions are paid to such clergymen as apply for them. The government leaves the Church to choose its own bishops and priests and hold conventions when and where it wishes. It has converted the palaces of the bishops, the parsonages, and the seminaries into schools, hospitals, or other public institutions, although it still permits the churches to be used for public worship.

POLITICAL PARTIES IN FRANCE

Parties in
the French
parliament

78. The parties and factions in the French parliament are bewildering in number. The election of 1906 sent to the Chamber of Deputies representatives of the following groups: radicals, socialist radicals, dissident radicals, independent socialists, unified socialists, republicans of the left, progressivists, nationalists, monarchists and Bonapartists, and a few other minor groups. With the exception, of course, of the monarchists and Bonapartists, they all agree that the republic shall be

maintained, and they have been able to unite upon many important measures, such as those relating to education and the relations of the State to the Church, but they differ on other questions of reform which are constantly coming up. Some are pretty well satisfied with things as they are, while others, especially the various socialist groups, would like to see the government undertake a complete social and economic revolution for the benefit of the laboring classes. The State should, they believe, take possession of lands, mines, mills, and other sources of wealth and means of production, and see that they are used for the benefit of those who do the work and no longer serve to enrich men who seem to them to sit idly by and profit by the labor of others.

The socialistic party, which figured so prominently in the Revolution of 1848 and the revolt of the Paris Commune, disappeared for a time after the suppression of the insurrection in 1871, but again reappeared shortly after the final establishment of the republic. In 1879 the socialists held their first congress under the republic at Marseilles, where they may be said to have initiated the present socialist movement in France. The following year a general amnesty was granted to all who had been connected with the Commune, and a great labor convention was immediately held in Paris, where, under the inspiration of Jules Guesde, the doctrines of Karl Marx were accepted as the fundamental principles of French socialism. The congress declared in favor of separation from all other parties and the organization of a workingman's party designed to secure by the ballot the public ownership of all the means of production. As a practical program they proposed freedom of the press, of public meetings, and of labor associations, reduction of the hours of labor, one holiday a week, free instruction, state aid for the old and infirm, employers' liability for injuries to their workmen, and the transformation of indirect taxes into an income tax. A number of these measures were carried through in the following years, as has been said above.

Socialism
reappears
under the
Third
Republic

Divisions
among the
socialists, —
Marxians and
possibilists

Notwithstanding their general agreement as to their ends, the French socialists have from the very first been divided over the question of the best methods of attaining their aims. Broadly speaking, there have been two groups, each with varying shades of opinion. In the first place there are the Marxians, — who are in general strongly opposed to voting for candidates of other parties, though willing to wring concessions from them in the Chamber of Deputies, — who expect socialism to be ushered in by a crisis in which the workingmen will seize the supreme power and use it for their own benefit, as the middle class did in the previous revolutions. The second, and more numerous, socialist group goes by the name of the “possibilists,” because they do not believe that socialistic ideas can be carried into effect as the result of a violent revolution, but hope to see them realized by a gradual process in which the government will assume control and ownership of one industry after another.

The socialists
become a
political
factor

The various socialistic factions, numbering six or seven at times, united at the general election in 1893, and by remarkable energy succeeded in returning about fifty members to the Chamber of Deputies, thus inaugurating a new era in French politics. The socialist vote steadily increased until in 1899 the prime minister, Waldeck-Rousseau, was forced to accept a socialist, M. Millerand, as Minister of Commerce in order to control enough votes in the chamber to carry on the government. Since then the possibilists have from time to time been represented in the cabinet, and they have worked for their ends by combining with other parties, in spite of those among their socialist brethren who scorn all fusion and compromise.

Contrast
between the
French parties
and those
in England
and the
United States

In England and the United States there are two great parties, one of which is ordinarily in unmistakable control. In France there are so many parties that no single one can ever long command a majority of votes in the Chamber of Deputies. As a result measures cannot be carried simply because the

leaders of one party agree on them, but they must appeal to a number of groups on their own merits. Minorities, consequently, have an opportunity to influence legislation in France, and there is little chance for machine politics to develop. It is true that French ministries rise and fall at very short intervals, but nevertheless the laws which do pass receive more careful attention, perhaps, than they would if pushed through as party measures.¹

The opponents of a ministry in the Chamber of Deputies take advantage of the privilege of asking the ministers to answer questions in regard to their policy and to explain their motives. When a deputy formally announces that he is going to "interpellate" the ministers, he must be given an opportunity to do so within a month at a regular session of the Chamber. These "interpellations" are more common in France than elsewhere, but are not unknown in other governments.

"Interpellation"

EXPANSION OF FRANCE

79. While solving grave problems at home the Third Republic has pushed forward its commercial, exploring, and military enterprises until it has built up a colonial dominion vaster than that lost during the eighteenth century in the conflicts with England, though less valuable and less inviting to French emigrants. When the Third Republic was established French colonial possessions consisted of Algeria in northern Africa, the Senegal region on the west coast of Africa, some minor posts scattered along the Gulf of Guinea down to the Congo River, a foothold in Cochin China, and a number of small islands in various parts of the world. The basis of territorial expansion had thus been laid, and after the quick recovery which followed the reverses of the German War, the French government frankly committed itself to a policy of imperialism.

French colonial dominion in 1870

¹ For the influence of the labor unions in French politics, see below, p. 390.

The French
annex
Algeria

While the national assembly was deliberating on the form of government at home, a revolt in Algeria forced France to formulate a colonial policy. That province had been seized in 1830 on account of the refusal of the native ruler to give satisfaction for having slapped the French consul general in the face at a public reception. After the defeat of France by Germany in 1870 the Algerians rose in a serious insurrection that was not put down until more than two hundred battles and skirmishes had been fought. The last of the rebellious chieftains was defeated in 1874.

The great province of Algeria thus acquired is only slightly smaller than France itself, and has a population of over four millions, of whom only about five hundred thousand are of European origin. It is divided into three departments, each sending one senator and two deputies to Paris; it has a railway system of nearly two thousand miles, and a large number of institutions for primary, secondary, and higher education, and it carries on a lively traffic, especially in grain, wine, olives, and metals. Nevertheless the receipts derived from taxes and other sources of revenue fall greatly below the cost of maintaining the civil and military government.¹

A protector-
ate estab-
lished over
Tunis

To the east of Algeria lies the province of Tunis, equaling in area the state of New York and having a population akin to that of Algeria in race and religion. For a long time after the conquest of Algeria France maintained friendly relations with the ruling Bey of Tunis and secured from him important concessions for building railways, telegraph lines, and other public works. A pretext for a further advance was finally found; Tunisian tribes were accused of disturbing the peace of the Algerian border, and it was rumored that Italy was contemplating the annexation of the region.² In 1881, therefore, France dispatched troops into Tunis, and after some serious fighting

¹ The French have also been mapping out and occupying the vast desert to the south, and the Algerian Sahara is now a French dependency of about the extent of Algeria itself, but with a population of only sixty-two thousand.

² See above, p. 102.

occupied the province. The Bey was forced to sign a treaty binding himself to conduct his government according to the wishes of the French, and thus virtually surrendered the administration of his possessions to French officials.

While these enterprises were bringing northern Africa under French dominion, a series of daring explorations and conquests in western and central Africa were adding vast regions and millions of African natives to the French colonial domain. France had taken formal possession of the province of Senegal on the west coast as early as 1637, but no serious efforts to extend her control inland were made until the annexation of Algeria called attention to the possibility of joining the two provinces. The Senegal River afforded special opportunities for advancing inland, and by 1865 one of the most distinguished of the French governors and explorers was able to announce that all the upper Senegal region had been occupied. The steady pressure inland still continued, however, and Timbuktu was conquered in 1894.

The French
in Senegal

Four years later Marchand, a French explorer, pressed eastward across the desert and reached the Nile region, where he raised the French flag at Fashoda over lands claimed by the English. An English force, however, compelled Marchand to lower the flag, and for a time it looked as if the two countries might come to blows. Fortunately, however, the French withdrew, and the two nations arranged the disputed boundaries between them, thus closing the "Fashoda incident," as it was called.

The Fashoda
incident

A post on the equator at the mouth of the Gabun River, bought in 1839, became the base for celebrated expeditions headed by du Chaillu and de Brazza, which added a vast region north of the Congo River more than twice the size of France and now known as French Congo.¹ The vast extent of the French possessions in northwestern Africa will become apparent as one glances at the map, p. 356, below.

French
Congo

¹ In addition to their larger African dependencies the French control French Guiana, south of Senegal, the Ivory Coast, and the native kingdom of Dahomey.

The annexation of Madagascar, 1896

While the French explorers were pushing their way through the jungles of the Senegal and Congo regions, or braving the sand storms of the Sahara,¹ French missionaries and commercial agents were preparing the way for the annexation of the island of Madagascar. That island, larger in area than all France, and rich in agricultural, textile, and mineral products, had been the object of attention on the part of France since the age of Louis XIV. Using as a pretext the murder of some French citizens by the natives, the French waged war on the ruler of Madagascar (1882-1885), and succeeded in establishing a protectorate over the entire island. Later they accused Queen Ranavalona III of bad faith and of inability to suppress brigandage. A second war which broke out in 1895 ended in the deposition and expulsion of the queen.

Beginnings of French enterprise in southeastern Asia

The Third Republic also has extensive colonial dominions in Asia, where French missionaries and traders had been attracted under Colbert's administration. Though still retaining the five towns which remained to them in India after the close of the disastrous Seven Years' War, France was precluded from further gains in the peninsula of Hindustan by the success of the English. As the Dutch remained powerful in the islands to the eastward, the most promising field for the French lay in the crumbling empire of China. The vast peninsula, washed on the westward by the Gulf of Siam and on the eastward by the China Sea, was occupied in part by kingdoms and provinces over which the emperor of China exercised a vague sort of suzerainty. On the eve of the Revolution French missionaries had found an excellent opportunity to extend their influence in Anam by persuading Louis XVI to intervene in a dispute over the succession to the throne, and certain lands were received as a reward from the successful contestant for the crown.

¹ In the contest for the east coast of Africa the French have taken little part. In 1862 they purchased from a native chief the post of Obock, but it was not actually occupied until 1884. Since that time, however, slight additions of land have been made, and the post has grown into French Somaliland, a province of about twelve thousand square miles.

Interest in the province of Anam was renewed about 1850 when some French missionaries were murdered there. Napoleon III waged war on the king in 1857, forcing from him the payment of an indemnity and the cession of a small portion of his territory. The foothold thus obtained formed the basis for rapid expansion in every direction ; a protectorate was extended over the kingdom of Cambodia in 1864 ; and in 1867 Cochin China was entirely annexed. An attempt in 1873 to force the opening to navigation of the Red River in Tonkin led to a war with the ruler of that province which resulted in the extension of a protectorate over all of Anam, of which Tonkin was a district. This defiance of the Chinese emperor's claims at length stirred him to resistance ; but the war of 1884 which resulted cost him all his rights over Tonkin and the remainder of Anam. In 1893 France extended her authority over the territory of Laos to the south. The French possessions are thus in close contact with the provinces of southern China into which French influence is already penetrating in the form of railways and mining concessions. France is therefore deeply involved in the rivalry of the powers of the world in the Far East, among which the United States must now be reckoned on account of its possession of the Philippine Islands lying just eastward from the coast of French Indo-China.

Advance of
France in
Asia

COLONIES AND DEPENDENCIES OF FRANCE

IN ASIA: Five towns in India, Anam, Cambodia, Cochin-China, Tonkin, and Laos. Total area, 254,000 square miles, with 21,500,000 population.

IN AFRICA: Algeria, Tunis, Sahara, Senegal, Senegambia and Niger, French Guinea, Ivory Coast, Dahomey, Congo, Somaliland, Madagascar, the islands of Réunion and Mayotte, and the Comoro Isles. Total area, 3,932,000 square miles, with 34,000,000 population.

IN AMERICA: Guiana, Guadeloupe, Martinique, St. Pierre, and Miquelon. Total area, 31,600 square miles, with 425,000 population.

IN OCEANIA: New Caledonia and dependencies. Various stations in Pacific. Total area, 9000 square miles, with 82,000 population.

REFERENCES

The Commune: SEIGNOBOS, *Political History of Europe since 1814*, pp. 187-194; ROSE, *Development of Modern European Nations*, Vol. I, pp. 126-134; COUBERTIN, *The Evolution of France under the Third Republic*, pp. 17-22; ANDREWS, *Historical Development of Modern Europe*, Vol. II, pp. 343-349.

Establishment of the Third Republic: SEIGNOBOS, pp. 194-204; ROSE, Vol. I, pp. 135-152; COUBERTIN, pp. 1-52; ANDREWS, Vol. II, pp. 349-355.

The Government of France: LOWELL, *Governments and Parties in Continental Europe*, Vol. I, pp. 1-68; BODLEY, *France*.

Political Parties in France: LOWELL, Vol. I, pp. 69-145; SEIGNOBOS, pp. 205-221.

The Struggle between Church and State: PAUL SABATIER, *Disestablishment in France*; BODLEY, *The Church in France*, pp. 13-114; COUBERTIN, pp. 272-307.

The French Colonial Empire: COUBERTIN, pp. 162-197; *The Statesman's Year-Book* (1907), pp. 927-972.

CHAPTER XXV

POLITICAL REFORMS IN ENGLAND

PARLIAMENTARY REFORM

80. In the eighteenth century the English government had been extolled by Montesquieu and others as by far the most liberal and enlightened in Europe. But the reforms of the French Revolution made England appear almost mediæval in its backwardness. Its Parliament was, after all, only a council of wealthy landlords and nobles who often gained their seats by bribery and could not be said to represent the nation, which had, indeed, little to do with their election. The English law was still shockingly brutal; citizens who did not accept the Thirty-Nine Articles were excluded from office; and education was far from the reach of the masses. When the downfall of Napoleon left the English free to turn their attention to the problems which faced them at home, they were forced to undertake a thorough modernization of their institutions almost as radical as that which was being effected with more turmoil on the Continent.¹

Backwardness of England at the opening of the nineteenth century

The leading issue was the reform of Parliament, — a matter which had begun to attract the attention of English liberals before the opening of the French Revolution. It is a cardinal principle of modern democratic government that at least one of the houses in the legislative body shall be made up of representatives of the people, fairly apportioned among the

Origin of the "rotten boroughs"

¹ The important reforms which England carried through during the nineteenth century with little bloodshed or disorder are sometimes cited as showing the superior political genius of the English. It should be remembered, however, that the supremacy of the Parliament over the king had only been established after a bloody civil war, the execution of one king, and the expulsion of another. Louis XIV's minister, Torcy, regarded the English of his time as fickle and incompetent in governmental matters.

various election districts. In England, however, such towns as had in earlier times been summoned by the king to send their two representatives to Parliament, still continued to do so at the opening of the nineteenth century, regardless of the number of their inhabitants, and no new boroughs had been added to the list since the reign of Charles II. Mere villages had grown into great cities, and the newer towns which had developed under the influence of the Industrial Revolution, like Birmingham, Manchester, and Leeds, had no representatives at all. On the other hand, Dunwich, which had been buried under the waters of the North Sea for two centuries, was duly represented, as well as the famous borough of Old Sarum, which was only a green mound where a town had once stood. There were only twenty-three voters in Truro, nineteen in Helston, and thirteen in Malmesbury; yet each of these places sent two members to the House of Commons to help determine the policy of the nation.

General unfairness of the apportionment of members

Moreover, it was not only in the towns that representation was wholly unequal. Ten southern counties of England which contained less than three million inhabitants sent 237 members to Parliament, while thirty other counties with over eight million inhabitants returned only 252 members. The county of Cornwall, with a population of a quarter of a million, had forty-four representatives, while all Scotland, with eight times that population, was entitled to only one more member.

Few persons permitted to vote

A second cardinal principle of modern democracy was violated by the restrictions on the right to vote. In the towns there was no uniform rule. In some boroughs all taxpayers had the right to take part in elections, but in one of these — Gatton — there were only seven voters. In other boroughs the right of choosing the members of Parliament was exercised by the mayor and town council, who were often not elected by the people at all.¹

¹ See below, p. 198.

Many of the boroughs were owned outright by members of the House of Lords or others, who easily forced the few voters to choose whatever candidate they proposed. The duke of Norfolk chose eleven members of the House of Commons, Lord Lonsdall, nine, and Lord Darlington, seven ; while other peers had one or more representatives in the Commons. In 1828 the duke of Newcastle evicted over five hundred of his tenants because they refused to vote for his candidate, and when this led to a protest in Parliament he replied, "Have I not a right to do as I like with my own?" Some of the lords sold the seats they controlled to the highest bidder, receiving sometimes as much as five thousand pounds from those eager to gain the privilege of membership in the House of Commons.

Many seats controlled by members of the House of Lords

In the country districts matters were no better. It is true that every person owning land which brought in forty shillings a year was permitted to vote for members of Parliament, but the disappearance of most of the small farmers had reduced the voters to the few who owned large estates. In the Scottish county of Bute, with its population of fourteen thousand inhabitants, there were twenty-one voters of whom all but one were nonresidents. In 1831 the Lord Advocate declared: "At an election in Bute, not beyond the memory of man, only one person attended the meeting except the sheriff and the returning officer. He, of course, took the chair, constituted the meeting, called over the roll of freeholders, answered to his own name, took the vote, and elected himself."

Situation in the country districts

Bribery was prevalent and was fostered by the system of public balloting which will be described presently. By long-established custom the price of a vote at Hull was two guineas (something over ten dollars), at Stafford, seven. By his own confession, Lord Cochrane paid ten guineas to each of the voters in Honiton and sent the town crier around to inform them where they could get their money.

Prevalence of bribery

Thus, through the gross inequalities in apportioning the votes, the curious methods of balloting, open bribery, and ownership

England really governed by an oligarchy

of boroughs, the House of Commons was ordinarily under the control of a comparatively few men. It was alleged in 1792 that one hundred and fifty-four patrons, forty of whom were peers, returned a majority of the house. A very cautious scholar of our own day estimates that not more than one third of the representatives in the House of Commons were fairly chosen. In short, Great Britain was governed by an oligarchy as little in sympathy with democracy as the courtiers who crowded around Louis XVI.

Proposals for reform before the nineteenth century

The whole system was so obviously preposterous that it is not surprising that objections to it had long been common. As early as 1653 Cromwell attempted parliamentary reform by increasing the number of county members and striking small boroughs from the list. This measure was revoked, however, on the restoration of the Stuarts, and for nearly a hundred years was almost forgotten. About the middle of the eighteenth century the abuses were again brought forward, and during the democratic agitation which preceded and accompanied the French Revolution several attempts were made to induce Parliament to reform itself. The elder Pitt (Lord Chatham), in 1770, and later his distinguished son, the younger Pitt, proposed changes which were, however, successfully opposed by those who were well content with the existing system.

The French Revolution puts an end for a time to hopes of reform in England

The excesses of the French Convention during the Reign of Terror put an end to all hope of reform for some time. Even the more cool headed and progressive among the English statesmen were discouraged by the apparently disastrous results in France of permitting the people at large to vote. Burke wrote a furious attack upon the Revolution, and the English government adopted harsh measures to prevent all agitation for reform. The publishers of Thomas Paine's works were many times prosecuted, and the stamp duties on publications were increased to prevent the circulation of cheap literature. The editors of a newspaper were punished for declaring that

"The Emperor of Russia is rendering himself obnoxious to his subjects by various acts of tyranny, and ridiculous in the eyes of Europe by his inconsistency." Scores of honorable men were fined, imprisoned, or exiled for advocating annual elections and universal suffrage, and it became increasingly difficult for them to get a hearing while the nation was engaged in a death struggle with Napoleon.

The demand for reform was not, however, wholly stifled and found a remarkable spokesman in William Cobbett, the son of a yeoman in Surrey. In early life he was an ardent defender of the rights of king and lords, but was drawn into the path of the reformer by a keen realization of the misery of the people and the existing political abuses. He founded a newspaper to forward his views but was soon imprisoned for venturing to denounce the horrible practice of flogging which prevailed in the army. After his release he spent some time in the United States, where he continued to write articles and pamphlets advocating reform. On his return to England after the close of the Napoleonic wars he became the most formidable adversary of the Tory party and reached a wide circle of readers through his newspaper, *The Weekly Register*, which he sold for three cents, an extraordinarily low price for this period.

William
Cobbett
(1762-1835)

Meanwhile other orators, writers, and agitators were busy arousing the working classes to action. Hampden clubs were founded to propagate reform doctrines, and monster demonstrations and parades were organized to prove to the government the strength of the popular feeling. At one of these meetings in Manchester in 1819, the police and soldiers charged the populace without provocation and killed and wounded a large number.¹ The government followed this up by a series of laws known as the Six Acts, which restricted the rights of free press, free speech, and public meeting.

The "Peterloo massacre," 1819

¹ This assault, known as the "Peterloo massacre," occurred in St. Peter's Field, then on the outskirts, but now in the heart of Manchester.

Merchants
and manu-
facturers
begin to urge
reform

This attempt at repression proved unavailing, for it was not only the working classes but the rich and powerful merchants and manufacturers as well who demanded the revision of a system which excluded them from political power. Under the leadership of Lord John Russell parliamentary reform was again and again urged in the Commons. The revolution of 1830 in France added impetus to the agitation in England, and that staunch Tory, the duke of Wellington, was led to resign his premiership under pressure of a growing public opinion that seemed verging on open violence.

The passage
of the Reform
Bill of 1832

A new ministry was organized, and in March, 1831, Lord John Russell introduced a reform bill into the House of Commons. The violent opposition which the measure encountered at the outset led to a dissolution of Parliament and a general election. The result was a triumph for the reform party, which then carried the bill through the Commons by a substantial majority. It was, however, rejected by the House of Lords. The Commons then replied by passing another bill of the same character as the first, and the country awaited with breathless anxiety the action of the peers. Finally, King William IV granted permission to the prime minister "to create such a number of peers as will insure the passage of the reform bill." The lords, realizing that further opposition was useless, gave way, and in June, 1832, the long-debated bill became a law.

Provisions of
the Reform
Bill

According to its provisions fifty-six "rotten boroughs," each containing less than two thousand inhabitants, were entirely deprived of representation; thirty-two more, with less than four thousand inhabitants, lost one member each; and forty-three new boroughs were created with one or two members each, according to their respective populations. The counties were divided into election districts and assigned a representation corresponding more nearly than heretofore with the number of their inhabitants. The suffrage was given in the towns to all citizens who owned or rented houses worth ten pounds a

year, and to *renters* as well as *owners* of lands in the country. In this way the shopkeepers and manufacturers and some of the more prosperous people in the country were given the right to vote, but nearly all workingmen and agricultural laborers were still excluded from the franchise.

The great Reform Bill of 1832 was therefore not really a triumph for democracy. It was estimated from official returns in 1836 that out of a total number of 6,023,752 adult males there were only 839,519 voters. The thousands whose parades and demonstrations had frightened the duke of Wellington and the king into yielding were naturally dissatisfied with the outcome. The fact that those who came into power under the new bill showed little inclination to relieve the condition of the working classes, whose wages were pitifully low and whose homes were miserable hovels, added bitterness to their disappointment.¹

The Reform Bill had scarcely been signed before a veritable flood of pamphlet literature appeared, proposing more radical measures. Translations of Magna Carta and reprints of the Bill of Rights and the acts of the Long Parliament abolishing the House of Lords and the kingship were circulated as leaflets among the working classes. One pamphleteer cited the United States as a model for England, saying, "In republican America, members of parliament are chosen by universal suffrage; few taxes and no tithes are imposed; hereditary pauperism, pensions, and plunder are not suffered; and the chief magistrate lives with dignity on an income from the public of five thousand pounds a year." Another prefaced his leaflet with these lines from Byron, —

I have seen some nations, like o'erloaded asses,
Kick off their burden, — meaning the high classes.

¹ The death rate is the most eloquent evidence of the condition of the working classes. In the country it was 18.2 per thousand; in Birmingham and Leeds, 27.2; in Manchester, 33.7; in Liverpool, 24.8. In the last named city forty thousand people were found living "in cellars, dark, damp, dirty, and ill-ventilated." Report of Royal Commission in 1843.

The Reform Bill of 1832 far from a democratic measure

Agitation for further reforms

Demands of
the reformers
after 1832

In 1832 a little book¹ was issued which gives an excellent notion of the demands of a large class of the poorer Englishmen. These were: (1) The abolition of aristocratic and exclusive, plundering and inefficient government and the substitution of representative and liberal, cheap and efficient government; (2) the abolition of all taxes on paper, printed and unprinted; (3) the establishment of a system of national education, unfettered and untainted by religious tenets; (4) the abolition of hereditary peerage; (5) the abolition of hereditary nobility, titles, honors, and distinctions; (6) the prevention of the monstrous extravagance of the king; (7) the abolition of the State Church and State religion, leaving priests, parsons, preachers, and ministers to be paid by those who choose to employ them; (8) the establishment of a new code of laws, just, simple, and clearly expressed, so that all may understand them, with a catalogue of every legal cost fixed at the lowest farthing, as in the French code; (9) the abolition of the standing army and the substitution of a national militia; (10) the limitation of the extent of landed property; (11) the abolition of imprisonment for debt; (12) the discharge of the national debt; and (13) free press, universal suffrage, vote by ballot, and annual parliaments.

The Chartist
movement

The reformers at last agreed on pressing six of these demands which they embodied in a charter; to wit, universal suffrage, vote by secret ballot, annual parliaments, payment of members of Parliament, abolition of property qualifications for members of Parliament, and equal electoral districts. This charter soon won thousands of adherents to whom the name of "Chartists" was given. Local Chartist clubs were founded in every manufacturing town, and in 1840 a national Charter Association was organized for the purpose of federating the various clubs. Leaders of remarkable oratorical ability sprang into prominence; papers were established; Chartist songs and poems were composed, and national conventions assembled. Great

¹ *The People's Charter*, London, 1832.

meetings and parades were held all over England ; the charter was transformed into a petition to which it was claimed that over a million signatures were obtained. This petition was presented to Parliament in 1839 only to be rejected by a large vote.¹

Despairing of securing reforms by peaceful means, many of the leaders began openly to advocate revolutionary violence, and rioting spread to such an extent that the government had to resort to extraordinary police measures to suppress it. Birmingham was for a time in the hands of revolutionists, and at Newport in 1839 twenty Chartists were shot in an attempt to seize the town and start an insurrection. Though the police were successful in quelling these armed uprisings, agitation continued, several Chartist members were elected to Parliament, and another petition submitted to that body.

Some of the
Chartists
advocate
violence

The Revolution of 1848 in France and the establishment of the Second Republic gave the signal for the last great outburst of Chartist enthusiasm. Owing to the hard times in that year, thousands of workmen were unemployed, and the poor were roused to bitter hatred for a government that replied to demands for reform by police measures. Preparations were made to present another gigantic petition to the House of Commons to which it was claimed that six million names had been secured ; and the Chartist leaders determined to overawe

Final Chart-
ist petition
of 1848

¹ The Chartists were violently attacked by the opponents of their democratic proposals, which seem harmless enough to-day. In 1840 the Reverend E. Jenkins issued a book called *Chartism Unmasked*, in which he made the following observations: "What would you gain by universal suffrage? I am certain that you would gain nothing but universal confusion, universal setting of workmen against each other. . . . All workmen would then become politicians—they would neglect their vocations in life—spend their time, their strength, their talents in what would increase their poverty. Vote by ballot would be nothing but a law for rogues and knaves, nothing but a cloak for dishonesty, insincerity, hypocrisy and lies. . . . With respect to having members of Parliament paid and void of property qualifications—really this is too absurd for an idiot to be the author of it. . . . The famous Chartist doctrine of Equality is diametrically opposed to Nature and the word of God; it is a doctrine taught only by lying prophets—men who are of their father the Devil, for his works they do."

Parliament by a march on London. Though this show of force was frustrated by Metternich's friend, the duke of Wellington, then commander of the forces policing London, the petition was finally presented to the House of Commons. It was there referred to a committee, which reported that there were less than two million names and that many of these were evident forgeries, such as "Victoria Rex," "the Duke of Wellington," "Pugnose," and "Snooks." The petition was thereby greatly discredited, and Parliament refused to take any action on it. Chartism, as an organized movement, thereupon collapsed.

Gladstone
espouses the
cause of
parliamentary reform
in 1866

The cause of parliamentary reform was not, however, lost with the failure of the Chartist movement. The doctrines of democracy had been spread among the people by the agitation, and from time to time advocates were found to introduce reform measures in the House of Commons. Although these proposals were easily defeated, there was a steadily growing recognition that some changes were inevitable, and at length in 1866 Gladstone, as leader of the House of Commons, made the question an issue of practical politics. Mr. Gladstone was then fifty-seven years old. He had entered Parliament as a Tory at the first election after the Reform Bill of 1832, and had quickly shown himself a commanding orator and a capable politician. At the end of a few years his views on public questions began to change, and at length he broke with the conservative traditions of his youth. In a debate on parliamentary reform in 1864 he maintained that the burden of proof rested on those "who would exclude forty-nine fiftieths of the working classes from the franchise." The very next year the veteran reformer of 1832, Lord Russell, now elevated to the peerage, was called upon to form a new ministry, and he selected Gladstone as leader of the House of Commons.

Disraeli
succeeds
Gladstone
as leader of
the House of
Commons

At the opening of Parliament in 1866 Gladstone proposed a moderate extension of the franchise, which was still based on property qualifications, and added only four hundred thousand voters out of the five millions of adult males excluded under

the law of 1832. This measure displeased many of Gladstone's followers because it went too far, and others because it did not go far enough. Consequently the cabinet felt compelled to resign, and a Conservative ministry was formed under the leadership of Lord Derby, who was represented in the House of Commons by Benjamin Disraeli (afterwards created Lord Beaconsfield), one of the most striking figures in the political life of England during the nineteenth century. When a young man of twenty-two he had sprung into prominence as the author of a successful novel, *Vivian Grey*, and at the age of thirty-three he entered upon his political career as a Conservative member of Parliament. His Jewish origin, his obtrusive style of dress, and his florid oratory immediately brought him into conspicuous notoriety; but those who laughed at him at first soon came to recognize him as a leader of great force and a politician of remarkable ability.

The Conservatives, as the old Tory party had come to be called, were alarmed by the general demand for reform and some rioting which took place in Hyde Park, but Disraeli undertook to secure the passage of a reform bill in spite of the denunciations of some of his fellow-Conservatives and the smiles of the Liberals, who taunted him with advocating changes which he had long opposed. The new law of 1867 granted the right to vote to every adult male in the larger towns who occupied for twelve months, either as owner or tenant, a dwelling within the borough, and paid the local poor tax; also to lodgers who paid ten pounds or more a year for unfurnished rooms. In the country it permitted those to vote who owned property which produced an income of at least five pounds net a year, and all renters paying at least twelve pounds annually. This served to double the previous number of voters.¹

Disraeli's
reform bill of
1867 doubles
the number
of voters

¹ It may be said here, once for all, that in England, as in most European countries, it is customary to exclude from the suffrage all paupers, criminals, the insane, and certain other classes of persons.

Barbarous
method of
public voting

The Reform Bill of 1867 did not remedy the abuses connected with the system of voting,—an incredibly rude and disorderly practice which had come down from barbarous times and was largely responsible for the bribery and intimidation at the polls. According to this ancient method the election was held in the open air; the sheriff proposed the names of the candidates one after the other, and the voters indicated their preference by shouting and raising their hands. If the defeated candidate was not satisfied he could demand a roll call, and each voter then had to register his name in a poll book so that every one might know how he voted. This registration was not only a long and tedious process, but it enabled those who had bought votes to see that the “goods” were really delivered.

The Aus-
tralian ballot
introduced in
England in
1872

The system had been defended against the attacks of reformers on the ground that a man should assert his independence by an open vote, and that if he sold his vote under a system of secret ballot he might be guilty of falsehood as well as corruption. However, the Chartists had made a secret ballot one of their demands, and the idea found many supporters among the Liberals. It counted among its champions Grote, the famous historian of Greece, who began his advocacy of this reform in Parliament as early as 1833; but it was not until 1872 that a measure was carried which introduced into England the secret-ballot system invented in the Australian colony of Victoria.

Extension of
the franchise
in 1884

In 1884 the Liberal party, again under Gladstone's leadership, resolved to carry still further the reforms of 1832 and 1867, for over two million men, chiefly agricultural laborers, were still denied the right to vote. By extending the suffrage to them the Liberals hoped to gain their support to offset the control of the rural districts which had hitherto been enjoyed by the Conservatives. The new law which they succeeded in passing provided that the franchise established for the larger towns in 1867 should be extended to all towns, and to the

country districts as well, thus introducing general uniformity throughout the United Kingdom. While this measure seemed to establish something approaching the manhood suffrage already common on the Continent, many men are still excluded from voting, especially unmarried laborers who, owing to the low rents in England, do not pay as much as ten pounds (fifty dollars) a year for unfurnished lodgings.

In 1858 the property qualification for members of Parliament was done away with, but no provision has yet been made for paying salaries to them. Consequently poor men or those of moderate means cannot enter Parliament unless they are aided by the contributions of their sympathizers. In the case of the representatives of the laboring classes, of whom more than fifty were elected in 1906, the support of those without private means is provided from a large fund raised among the trade unions and by private subscription. The desirability of remedying this condition of affairs is recognized by the Liberal party at present¹ in power under the leadership of Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman. A resolution in favor of the payment of members was adopted by the House of Commons in 1906, but this cannot be regarded as anything more than an expression of opinion until a law is passed and the funds provided.

Question of salaries for the members of the House of Commons

THE ENGLISH CABINET

81. These reforms, which at last permit the people at large to select the members of the House of Commons, have left untouched, so far as appearances are concerned, the ancient and honorable institutions of the king and the House of Lords. The sovereign is crowned with traditional pomp; coins and proclamations still assert that he rules "by the grace of God"; and laws purport to be enacted "by the king's most excellent Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal and Commons in Parliament

The position of the English sovereign

¹ 1907.

assembled." Justice is executed and the colonies governed in the name of the king. The term "royal" is still applied to the army, the navy, and the mail service, reserving, as a wit once remarked, the word "national" only for the public debt.

Parliament
really controls the
English
government

There was a time, of course, when the highest prerogatives were really exercised by the king of England. Henry VIII, for example, appointed his own ministers and dismissed them at will. He made war and peace at his pleasure and exercised such an influence on the elections that Parliament was filled with his supporters. The long struggle, however, between the king and the Parliament in the seventeenth century, and the circumstances of the revolution of 1688 which placed William and Mary on the throne, made Parliament the predominant element in the English government. The king is still legally empowered to veto any bill passed by Parliament, but he never exercises this power. He has in reality only the right to be consulted, the right to encourage, and the right to warn. He cannot permanently oppose the wishes of the majority in Parliament, for should he venture to do so, he could always be brought to terms by cutting off the appropriations necessary to conduct his government.

The cabinet

The king of England must now act through a ministry composed of the important officers of the government, such as the first lord of the treasury, the foreign secretary, the colonial secretary, the secretary of the war department, with the prime minister as their head. The development of this ministry, which is known as the cabinet, has been described in an earlier chapter.¹ It was pretty firmly established under George I and George II, who were glad to let others manage the government for them. While the king nominally appoints the members of the cabinet, that body is in reality a committee selected from the party which has a majority in the House of Commons. The reasons for this were also explained earlier

¹ See above, Vol. I, pp. 198 *sqq.*

in dealing with the English government in the eighteenth century and need not be repeated here.

The party which secures the majority in a parliamentary election is entitled to place its members in all the important government offices. The party leaders hold an informal caucus and agree on a prime minister, who then takes one of the cabinet offices. (For example, the Right Honorable Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman is at present prime minister and first lord of the treasury.) After the party has chosen its leader he is appointed prime minister by the king, who charges him with the task of naming, with the advice of his political associates, the other occupants of cabinet positions, who may be selected from among the lords as well as the commons. Thus it comes about that, unlike the President of the United States and his cabinet, who must communicate with Congress through messages, reports, or other indirect means, the prime minister and the heads of departments in England themselves sit in Parliament and can therefore present and defend their own proposals.

How the members of the cabinet are chosen

The body of officials so constituted draft the more important measures to be laid before Parliament and decide on the foreign and domestic policy to be pursued by the government. At the opening of each session of Parliament the general program of the cabinet is laid before the House of Lords and the House of Commons in the form of the "king's speech," which is read by the sovereign or his representative. In its secret sessions the head of each department presents to the cabinet the measures which he recommends in his particular branch of the government. If, after discussion, these are approved by a majority of the other members, they are submitted to the House of Commons. In all matters the cabinet acts as a unit, and whenever a member cannot agree with the majority on an important point he is bound to resign. - The cabinet therefore presents a united front to Parliament and the country. An interesting illustration of this is to be found in the story told

The cabinet acts as a unit

of Lord Melbourne when prime minister. His cabinet was divided on the question of the duty on grain, and with his back against the door, he declared to them: "Now, is it to lower the price of corn, or is n't it? It does not matter much what we say, but mind, we must all say the same thing."

How minis-
tries rise and
fall

Whenever the House of Commons expresses its disapproval of the policy of the ministry, either by defeating an important measure or by a direct vote of censure, the cabinet is bound to do one of two things. It may resign in a body and thus make room for a new ministry made up from the opposite party. If, however, the ministers feel that their policy has popular support outside of Parliament, they may "go to the country," that is to say, they may ask the king to dissolve the existing Parliament and order a new election in the hope that the people may indicate its approval of their policy by electing their supporters. The further action of the ministry is then determined by the outcome of the election. The return of a majority of members in favor of the ministerial policy is taken as justification for retaining office. On the other hand, a failure to gain a majority is the signal for the resignation of the entire ministry and the transference of power to their opponents.

The English
government
more under
the influence
of public
opinion than
that of the
United States

As the members of the House of Commons are not elected for a definite term of years (though according to law elections must be held at least every seven years), that body may be dissolved at any time for the purpose of securing an expression of the popular will on any important issue. It is thus clear that the British government is more sensitive to public opinion than are governments where the members of the legislatures are chosen for a definite term of years. For example, in the United States, Congressmen are elected for two years and Senators for six; consequently when a crisis arises it usually has to be settled by men who were not chosen according to their views on that particular question, while in England a new election can be held with direct reference to the special issue at hand.

Nevertheless, the reader will naturally ask, how is it that the British government can be so democratic and yet retain, in its upper house, a body of hereditary peers responsible to no constituents? The explanation is that the House of Commons, by reason of its ancient and exclusive right of initiating all money bills, can control the king and force him, if necessary, to create enough new peers to pass any measure blocked by the House of Lords. In practice the king does not have to do more than threaten such a measure to bring the House of Lords to terms.

The House
of Lords

Although many bills have been defeated in the House of Lords during the nineteenth century, a sort of constitutional understanding has grown up that the upper house must yield to an unmistakable and definite expression of popular opinion in favor of a measure which it has previously opposed. However, the House of Lords is increasingly unpopular with a large class in England. Its members for the most part take little or no interest in their duties and rarely attend the sessions. The opposition of the peers to the educational bill introduced in 1906 has again raised the question of the abolition or complete reorganization of the upper house.

Unpopularity
of the House
of Lords

The smooth working of the English cabinet system may be partially attributed to the fact that during the nineteenth century there were only two political parties represented in Parliament, — the Conservatives, who dropped the name Tory after the first parliamentary reform, and the Liberals, who abandoned the name of Whig about the same time.¹ The leaders of the former party came principally from the aristocracy and landed proprietors, while the latter found its chiefs among the middle classes. These two parties were alternately in power, and it was not until 1906 that their joint monopoly of politics was threatened by the election of over fifty labor members, some of whom are organized into a solid group acting independently. The Irish party, of course, stands firmly for home rule, but is willing

English
political
parties

¹ See above, Vol. I, pp. 197 *sqq.*

to coöperate with other parties, especially the Liberals, to obtain its ends. At the present juncture it appears possible that England may develop a many-party system comparable to that existing in the countries of the Continent.

REFORM OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT IN ENGLAND

Government
in the Eng-
lish towns at
the opening
of the nine-
teenth
century

82. Parliament was not the only branch of the English government that was characterized by undemocratic features when the age of reform opened. Local government in town and country had grown up in a haphazard fashion during the preceding centuries and, like Parliament, was in the hands of small minorities. The towns usually had, it is true, a mayor, aldermen, and common councilors, but in most instances these dignitaries were not elected by the people. They had been appointed by the king when he chartered the borough some centuries before, and empowered to choose their successors forever. When Henry VIII, for example, chartered a town he named the first governing body himself, and authorized it to select a new member whenever one died or surrendered his position through any other cause. In a few towns the governing body was elected by so-called "freemen," but these privileged persons formed a very small part of the inhabitants.¹ Liverpool, with a population of one hundred and sixty-five thousand, had only five thousand freemen, and Ipswich, with twenty thousand inhabitants, had three hundred and fifty resident and seven hundred and sixty nonresident freemen. The qualities, exemptions, and privileges of a freeman were secured by inheritance, marriage, purchase, apprenticeship to a freeman, or by a grant from the town government.

The freemen

Under this system municipal corruption and inefficiency were notorious. Paving and street lighting were neglected ; drainage

¹ In 1833, among one hundred and ninety-eight of the chief English towns, the freemen elected the governing body in only twelve, while in one hundred and eighty-six towns it was coöptative, that is, it perpetuated itself.

and water supplies were bad ; municipal offices were often sold or made the reward for political work ; and town revenues were frequently used by private persons for their own benefit. It was declared in Parliament by Lord John Russell that some of the town councils had borrowed money from year to year to divide among the members. All these rumors were substantiated by the parliamentary commission charged, in 1833, with investigating conditions in the towns. After presenting the long list of abuses they had discovered, the commission stated, "There prevails among the inhabitants of a great majority of the incorporated towns a general and, in our opinion, a just dissatisfaction with their municipal institutions, and a distrust of the self-elected municipal councils whose powers are subject to no popular control and whose acts and proceedings, being secret, are unchecked by the influence of public opinion."

Parliament orders an investigation of the abuses of municipal government in 1833

On the basis of this commission's report, Parliament, in 1835, passed a Municipal Corporations Bill which is scarcely less famous than the reform measure enacted three years before. This municipal reform act provided a uniform constitution for all municipalities ; it vested the government in a body consisting of the mayor, aldermen, and common councilors, and abolished the self-elected bodies entirely. It provided that the common councilors should be chosen every three years by those who paid local taxes in the borough, and that the common councilors in turn should choose the aldermen to form a sort of second chamber. Finally, the mayor was to be elected annually by the council.

The Municipal Corporations Bill, 1835

Notwithstanding this establishment of democratic government in the towns, the administration in rural districts, counties, and villages remained in the hands of wealthy landowners who, as justices of the peace appointed by the king, or as parish vestrymen, settled questions of roads, public buildings, reformatories, and other matters which are usually under the supervision of the county commissioners in the United States. It was not until after Mr. Gladstone's ministry enfranchised

Reform of the administration in the country districts (1888-1894)

the agricultural laborers in 1884 that this ancient system, which had originated in the Middle Ages, was abolished and rural government vested in the hands of councils elected by popular vote.

REFERENCES

Parliament at the Opening of the Nineteenth Century: Extract from WALPOLE, *History of England since 1815*, in BEARD, *Introduction to the English Historians*, pp. 538-548; SEIGNOBOS, *Political History of Europe since 1814*, pp. 10-18.

The Reform Bill of 1832: Extract from WALPOLE, *History of England since 1815*, in BEARD, pp. 549-565; ROSE, *Rise of Democracy in England*, pp. 9-52; LEE, *Source Book of English History*, pp. 519-529; TERRY, *A History of England*, pp. 990-995.

The Chartist Movement: ROSE, pp. 84-146; LEE, pp. 530-539.

The Reform Bill of 1867: Extract from PAUL, *A History of Modern England*, in BEARD, pp. 566-581; TERRY, pp. 1037-1042.

The Enfranchisement of the Agricultural Laborer: Extract from MORLEY, *Life of Gladstone*, in BEARD, pp. 582-593.

The Cabinet System: Extract from BAGEHOT, *The English Constitution*, in BEARD, pp. 594-607.

CHAPTER XXVI

SOCIAL REFORMS IN ENGLAND

FREEDOM OF DISCUSSION AND RELIGIOUS TOLERATION

83. While England was transforming herself into a democracy by modeling her Parliament and her local government, the people gradually gained the right freely to discuss political questions in the newspapers and in public meetings and to express religious opinions differing from those sanctioned by the government without thereby sacrificing the possibility of holding office.

Freedom of the press from governmental censorship is commonly regarded as having been established in 1695 by the refusal of Parliament to renew an old law providing for such control. However, in times of disturbance, the government adopted repressive measures, as for instance during the French Revolution and in 1819, when there was extensive popular agitation. Moreover the stamp duties on newspapers and advertisements hampered the publication of cheap journals for the diffusion of political information among the masses and were systematically used by the government for this purpose. In 1819 the tax was extended even to leaflets and tracts which had hitherto been allowed free circulation. The necessity of paying an eight-cent tax on each copy made the average price of a newspaper fourteen cents, while the price of the London *Times* was eighteen cents. In addition to these stamp duties there was a special tax on paper, which increased its cost about fifty per cent.

These "taxes on knowledge," as they were called, were attacked by those who advocated popular education, and also by the political reformers who wanted cheap newspapers through

Taxes on newspapers and other publications

Opposition to the "taxes on knowledge"

which to carry on their agitation. In 1830 a society was organized in London for the purpose of conducting a campaign against stamp duties. Some reformers openly defied the law by issuing political journals unstamped. The *Poor Man's Guardian* bore the motto "established contrary to law to try the power of right against might." The publisher of this journal adopted the ruse of sending waste-paper parcels out at the front door to engage the attention of the police while the regular copies were rushed out of the back door to be distributed to the public.

England at
last given a
free press

The laboring class was by no means alone in the struggle for a free press. Eminent men, such as Grote and Bulwer Lytton, the novelist, joined in the movement for the repeal of the obnoxious taxes. In 1833 the tax on advertisements and in 1836 the stamp tax were reduced, bringing the price of most of the London papers down to ten cents each. Twenty years later the attacks of Cobden and Bright on the stamp duty and the tax on advertisements resulted in their entire abolition; and in 1861 the duty on printing paper was removed, thus giving England a free press, although special privileges in the form of low postal rates are not afforded to the newspapers as in the United States.

Punishment
of those who
ventured to
criticise the
government

No less important to democracy than freedom of the press is the right of holding public meetings and criticising the policy of the government. In common with all other European monarchies, England, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, imprisoned, pilloried, and otherwise severely punished those who were bold enough to speak disrespectfully of the king and the government; and even after the revolution of 1688 Parliament occasionally ordered the flogging or imprisonment of critics.

How Parli-
ment sought
to check
agitation

Moreover, on occasions, when there was deemed to be some extraordinary public danger, special laws were directed against those who attacked the policy of the king and Parliament. In 1795 a Treasonable Practices Bill was passed which made all adverse criticism of the government a high misdemeanor

punishable by deportation to a penal colony for the second offense. This was followed four years later by a Corresponding Societies Bill which suppressed political societies propagating reform doctrines, required the registration of all printing establishments, and even imposed penalties on lending books and papers for hire. Again, in 1819, when renewed agitation had frightened the government, the reactionary Six Acts mentioned above¹ were passed subjecting public meetings, the press, and free speech to constant police surveillance.

The growth of the democratic spirit among the working classes, the numerical strength of the reform parties as demonstrated in the Chartist movement, and the utter impossibility of longer suppressing political discussion finally led the government to abandon the prosecution of political offenders. Freedom of discussion is therefore recognized in England, but in the language of a distinguished lawyer it is "little else than the right to write or say anything which a jury consisting of twelve shopkeepers think it expedient should be said or written."

Freedom of speech as now existing in England

The contest for political rights and freedom of discussion was accompanied by a successful struggle to remove those disabilities which had long been imposed on Dissenters and Catholics and thus permit any one to stand for Parliament or hold government offices, regardless of his opinion on baptism, the Trinity, or the Mass.

Religious toleration

The famous Toleration Act of 1689, which, as we have seen,² granted a certain liberty of worship to Dissenters, did not free them from the disabilities which rested on all persons who did not belong to the State Church, namely, exclusion from municipal offices and from all places of trust, civil and military, in the State, as well as from certain educational advantages. It was therefore only by connivance, or by special "indemnity" from Parliament, that Dissenters could take any office or place in the government, although, curiously enough, they were not prohibited from sitting in Parliament.

Disabilities of Dissenters

¹ See above, p. 185.

² See above, Vol. I, pp. 155 *sq.*

The Dis-
sentsers pro-
test against
their
disabilities

At the close of the eighteenth century, however, the dissenting sects were rapidly increasing in wealth, numbers, and influence, especially after the appearance of the Methodists. An able argument presenting their grievances was laid before Parliament in 1787; it pointed out that the successful merchant whose activities had helped to enrich the city might be punished for accepting an office in its government. It was forcibly argued that it was absurd to allow a Dissenter to enter Parliament and assist in the making of laws which he could not help to enforce by occupying the meanest office.

Disabilities
of Dissenters
removed,
1828

This plea was, however, disregarded, and Lord North declared that the Test Act passed under Charles II, which had imposed these disabilities, was "the bulwark of the constitution to which we owe those inestimable blessings of freedom which we now happily enjoy." Dissenters had to wait forty years longer for the granting of their claims to civil rights. It was not until 1828 that Parliament was finally induced to pass an act repealing the old laws against Dissenters and admitting them freely to public offices on condition that they took an oath "upon the true faith of a Christian" not to use their influence to injure or weaken the Established Church.

Position of
the Catholics
in England

The Catholics during this period were not only excluded from municipal and state offices but from Parliament as well, and their religious worship was subject to serious limitations. By a harsh law of 1700 all adherents of the Catholic faith were compelled to abjure the doctrine of the Mass before reaching the age of eighteen years, under penalty of forfeiture of property for failure to comply; and Catholic priests were forbidden to exercise their functions under pain of perpetual imprisonment.

This law, which, if strictly enforced, would have exterminated the Catholic faith in England, was, however, practically disregarded, since there was, at the close of the eighteenth century, no longer any religious or political danger from Catholics, and in 1778 an act was passed removing these penalties on

condition that priests and Catholic heirs of estates should abjure belief in the temporal power of the Pope, as well as in the right which he claimed of deposing princes.

Though this law gave them certain rights of worship, Catholics were still excluded from public offices until 1828, when the Test Act was repealed. The next year the Catholic Emancipation Act was finally passed. This explicitly admitted them to both houses of Parliament and to municipal and state offices with three exceptions.¹ They were, however, still required to take an oath renouncing the temporal supremacy of the Pope and disclaiming any intention of injuring the Protestant religion or Protestant government established in the United Kingdom. This enlightened measure was violently denounced by members of the Established Church and Dissenters alike, and there is reason to believe that it would not have passed a reformed Parliament representing the sentiments of the English people at large.

Catholic
Emancipa-
tion Act,
1829

Though Catholics and Dissenters thus obtained their political rights in 1828-1829, the Established Church did not entirely surrender the monopoly of religion which it had done all it could to retain since the time of Elizabeth.² For instance, Dissenters and Catholics could be lawfully married only by the ceremony provided in the official Book of Common Prayer, and the legal registration of their children's births depended, strictly speaking, upon baptism by an Anglican clergyman. Furthermore, since subscription to the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Anglican faith was necessary to matriculation at the University of Oxford, Catholics and Dissenters were excluded from the privileges of that institution; and though admitted to the University of Cambridge, they could not receive degrees there. Finally, they were compelled to pay tithes for the support of the State Church.

Position of
the Church
of England

¹ Catholics were excluded from the offices of Regent, Lord Chancellor in England and Ireland, and Lord Lieutenant of Ireland.

² See above, Vol. I, pp. 150 *sqq.*

Civil marriage (1836) and abolition of tithes (1868)

The removal of these grievances was finally begun by the reformed Parliament in 1836, when provision was made for the civil registration of births, marriages, and deaths. After prolonged agitation, repeated introduction of bills into Parliament, and widespread refusal to pay the church tithes, these were abolished in 1868. The religious test at the universities was removed in 1870, making degrees and academic offices "freely accessible to the nation." Thus by no declaration of rights or general acts as in France, but by innumerable partial measures, religious disabilities have been removed and all inhabitants of the United Kingdom have secured equality before the law and in the government of the country.

HUMANITARIAN LEGISLATION

The barbarous criminal law of England at the opening of the nineteenth century

84. The spirit of enlightened humanity manifested in many instances by the reformers of the French Revolution was a long time in finding its way into English criminal law which, as an English writer has observed, sacrificed the lives of men with a reckless barbarity worthier of an eastern despot than of a Christian state. Strange to say, this drastic code, with its two hundred and fifty offenses for which the death penalty was meted out, was not entirely a relic of ancient savagery. Between the death of Cromwell and that of George III at least one hundred and eighty offenses were added to the list of capital crimes; indeed in George III's reign alone more than sixty offenses, including some of the most trivial, were made punishable by death.

As late as 1815 a young woman was executed because she stole a trifling article in the hope of getting herself transported to Australia, where her husband had been sent for the same offense, the judge declaring that he wanted to make an example of the poor creature. Some twenty years later a boy nine years old was sentenced to death for breaking a window and stealing twopence worth of paint from a shop. It is

estimated that within thirty-five years there were fourteen hundred executions for acts which after 1845 were no longer reckoned as capital offenses.

The treatment of criminals was, generally speaking, in keeping with the criminal law. The jails, instead of being maintained at public cost, were in the hands of private persons, who made as much as they could from the prisoners committed to their charge. The poor, therefore, suffered far greater privations than those who could afford to pay for better treatment. There are a number of instances reported of debtors, unable to pay any fees to the prison keeper, being locked up with small-pox victims from whom they caught the fatal disease. Dr. Johnson estimated that there were twenty thousand debtors in prison in 1759 and that one fourth of them died of bad treatment. It was a common practice for jailers to exhibit to the public, for a small admission fee, notorious criminals about to be executed. Even more atrocious than the treatment of individual offenders was the common practice of putting men and women, old and young, hardened murderers and children who had committed trifling offenses, in the same cells.

Atrocities of
the English
prisons

Beccaria's wonderful treatise on *Crimes and Punishments*¹ had been translated into English and had served to open the eyes of its readers to the needless cruelty of the law. Protests had for a long time been made against a system so brutal and so vicious; Burke had denounced it with his eloquent tongue; John Wesley had pleaded for reform; and year after year Sir Samuel Romilly had brought forward remedial measures in Parliament without avail. When, in 1813, he presented a bill proposing to transport to the penal colony in the southern hemisphere persons who stole five shillings from a shop rather than hang them, twelve judges, including the Chief Justice, solemnly protested to the House of Lords that such a measure would undermine the morals of the nation and the criminal code. The measure was therefore defeated, five bishops voting against it.

Slow progress
of reform

¹ See above, Vol. I, pp. 177 *sqq.*

Gradual
reduction of
the list of
capital
offenses,
1820-1861

But the reformers were not discouraged ; they patiently continued to educate public opinion, and in true English fashion one capital offense after another was removed from the list, while unfortunate persons continued to be hanged for light offenses. In 1820 the act making it a capital offense to steal the sum of five shillings or more from a shop was finally repealed ; in 1822 four statutes removed about one hundred offenses from the number for which the death sentence was prescribed ; in 1823 transportation was substituted for death in cases of making false entries on marriage registers ; in 1832 Parliament repealed the death sentence for housebreaking, horse and sheep stealing, and counterfeiting ; in 1834 hanging in chains was abolished ; in 1837 a number of offenses, including smuggling and rioting, were removed from the list of capital crimes ; and at last, by 1861, Parliament had removed the death penalty from all offenses except murder, treason, and piracy.

The prisons
reformed

While some reformers were attacking the criminal law itself, others, like John Howard and Elizabeth Fry, were advocating a revolution in the management of prisons and the treatment of prisoners. Parliament appointed committees of investigation, which revealed the horrible conditions, and in 1835 a law was passed providing for government inspection of the prisons and for improving their administration. The government at length began to build its own large, airy prisons, assumed the support of the inmates, and classified them according to their offenses, thus adopting the modern view that imprisonment is for the protection of society and the reformation of the criminal rather than to wreak vengeance upon him.

Wretched-
ness of life
in the
English
factories

The cruelty of the criminal law had its origin in the Middle Ages, but with the coming of the Industrial Revolution in the reign of George III new forms of inhumanity had arisen. These were the result of the factory system, which brought untold misery to the working classes of England. Great factory buildings were hastily erected by men ignorant of the most elementary principles of sanitary science, and often too avaricious

to care for anything but space enough to operate the machines and light enough to enable the laborers to do their work. Around the factories there sprang up long, dreary rows of grimy brick cottages, where the workmen and their families were crowded together. To these industrial centers flocked thousands of landless and homeless men and women dependent upon the factory owners for the opportunity to earn their daily bread. Fluctuations in trade caused long periods of enforced idleness, which resulted in great uncertainty in the life of the workman.

The introduction of steam-driven machinery had made possible the use of child labor on a large scale, and it was the condition of the children which first attracted the attention of philanthropists and reformers. Thousands of little paupers were taken from the poorhouses and nominally apprenticed, but practically sold, to the proprietors of the mills. According to Mr. Fielden, an enlightened manufacturer, the most heart-rending cruelties were often inflicted on these hapless children; they were "flogged, fettered, and tortured," and sometimes "starved to the bone while flogged to their work."¹ Nor were pauper children the only ones to suffer. Necessity or greed on the part of parents, and the demand for "cheap labor" on the part of the manufacturers, brought thousands of other children into industrial life. Parliamentary reports tell us of children under five years of age working in the mines, of coal drawers but little older crawling on hands and knees through narrow subterranean passages dragging heavy carts of coal, and of mere lads laboring in pin mills at high tension for twelve hours a day. These practices were even justified by a committee of mine owners on the ground that, owing to the cramped conditions in the mines, children should begin work early while their backbones were flexible.

Horrors of
child labor

¹ In his memoirs of factory life of Robert Blencoe we read that girls suspected of intending to escape "had irons riveted on their ankles, reaching by long links and rings up to their hips, and in these they were compelled to walk to and from the mill, to work, and to sleep."

General
misery of the
factory hands
and opera-
tives in the
mines

The conditions of adult labor, save in the most skilled classes, were almost as wretched as those of child labor. Women and girls were employed in great numbers in mills and even in the dark and dangerous recesses of the mines, which were badly ventilated and perilous to work in; dangerous machinery was not properly safeguarded, and the working time was excessively prolonged. Indisputable evidence of this distressing state of affairs is to be found in the bulky volumes of various parliamentary reports on factory conditions, in the memoirs of many enlightened men who investigated the life of the new industrial centers, and also in the dry pages of the statutes which reveal the wrongs that Parliament sought to remedy. The misery of the poor is reflected in Mrs. Browning's poem, "The Cry of the Children," in the bitter scorn which Carlyle poured out on the heads of the factory owners, in the impassioned pages of Kingsley's *Alton Locke*, and in the vivid word pictures of Dickens.

Opposition
of economists
and states-
men to
factory
legislation

The working classes were excluded from representation in Parliament, they were denied opportunities for education, and the statesmen of the time refused to take action in their behalf until after long and violent agitation. In this refusal Parliament was supported by the economic theorists, — Malthus, Ricardo, and others, — who defended the rights of mill owners as Bossuet had defended the divine right of kings. Acting on this theory, a select committee of the House of Commons reported in 1811 that "no interference of the legislature with freedom of trade or with the perfect liberty of every individual to dispose of his time and his labor in the way and on the terms which he may judge conducive to his interest can take place without violating general principles of the first importance to the prosperity and happiness of the country, without establishing the most pernicious precedent, or even without aggravating, after a very short time, the pressure of the general distress, and imposing obstacles against that distress ever being removed." Five years later, when some starving

workmen tried to destroy the new machinery to which they attributed their woes, Parliament did not hesitate to impose the death sentence on those who "riotously broke mining machinery."

Ardent reformers disregarding the advice of the theorists and discontented workmen filling the country with riot at last forced Parliament to undertake to improve conditions. Indeed, the bad ventilation, scanty food, long hours, and lack of sanitation led to the spread of epidemics in the factory districts, and action could not longer be delayed without endangering the health of the well-to-do. Parliament, however, at first refused to do more than assume some responsibility for the pauper apprentices, by passing an act (1802) reducing the hours of labor for such children to seventy-two per week, and in making some other regulations on their behalf, such as compelling employers to furnish at least one suit of clothes a year.

Parliament
at last begins
to adopt
reforms

An unselfish champion of the working class now appeared in the person of Robert Owen, a successful manufacturer, who had shown by experiments the advantages of treating employees with consideration. Beginning in 1815, he labored for four years to secure the passage of an effective measure in the interests of children. He declared to his brother cotton manufacturers, "Deeply as I am interested in the cotton manufacture, highly as I value the extended political power of my country, yet, knowing as I do from long experience, both here in Scotland and in England, the miseries which this trade, as it is now conducted, inflicts on those to whom it gives employment, I do not hesitate to say, 'Perish the cotton trade!'" His appeal to the manufacturers for support of his factory legislation was, however, unavailing, and the outcome of his efforts was the mutilation of his original bill beyond recognition in an act of 1819, which merely forbade the employment in the cotton mills of children under nine, and limited the working time for those between nine and sixteen to twelve hours per day.

Robert
Owen

The report of the factory commission appointed by Parliament in 1832

New advocates of factory reform continued to urge additional measures on Parliament. Among these were Richard Oastler, Thomas Sadler, John Fielden, and Lord Ashley, to whose unselfish and untiring labors were largely due the pressure of public opinion which induced Parliament in 1832 to appoint a select commission for the purpose of investigating the whole question of factory legislation. The following year it made an unqualified report in favor of interference on behalf of children employed in factories, which resulted in a new bill still further reducing the working hours for children and providing for the first time for regular factory inspectors. In 1842 Lord Ashley carried through Parliament a mining law which forbade the employment of women and children in underground occupations.

Agitation for a ten-hour day for women and children

These laws did not satisfy the reformers and they now began to work for radical measures, restricting the labor of women and children in mills to ten hours per day exclusive of meal times. This proposition gave rise to a heated contest in the House of Commons between manufacturers and landed proprietors. In vain did a distinguished economist defend the factory owners by declaring that their profit was made during the last hour and that its curtailment would ruin British industries; in vain did John Bright (champion of the abolition of slavery in the United States) denounce the proposition as "most injurious and destructive to the best interests of the country," "a delusion practiced upon the working classes," and "one of the worst measures ever passed." Smarting under the action of the manufacturers in forcing free trade upon them,¹ the landed proprietors rejoiced in this opportunity to retaliate, and in 1847 the ten-hour bill for women and children became a law. In practice it applied to all adults as well, for the mills could not run after the women and children had stopped working.

With this great victory for the reformers the general resistance to state interference was broken down, and year after year new

¹ See below, p. 216.

measures were carried through Parliament, revising and supplementing earlier laws, until to-day England does more than any other European country to protect the factory operatives. In the language of John Morley, England has "a complete, minute, voluminous code for the protection of labor; buildings must be kept clear of effluvia; dangerous machinery must be fenced; children and young persons must not clean it while in motion; their hours are not only limited but fixed; continuous employment must not exceed a given number of hours, varying with the trade, but prescribed by law in given cases; a statutable number of holidays is imposed; the children must go to school, and the employer must every week have a certificate to that effect; if an accident happens, notice must be sent to the proper authorities; special provisions are made for bake houses, for lacemaking, for collieries, and for a whole schedule of other special callings; for the due enforcement and vigilant supervision of this code of minute prescriptions, there is an immense host of inspectors, certifying surgeons, and other authorities, whose business it is to 'speed and post o'er land and ocean' in restless guardianship of every kind of labor, from that of the woman who plaits straw at her cottage door to the miner who descends into the bowels of the earth, and the seaman who conveys the fruits and materials of universal industry to and fro between the remotest parts of the globe."

John Morley's description of England's measures for protecting the laboring classes

FREE TRADE

85. From the fourteenth century onward England endeavored, by high tariffs, navigation laws, and numerous other measures, to protect her manufacturers, farmers, and ship owners against foreign competition.¹ Special tariffs were imposed on the manufactured goods of other countries; bounties were paid from the government treasury to encourage various forms of commercial enterprise; Englishmen were obliged to

Policy of protection in England before the nineteenth century

¹ See above, Vol. I, p. 118.

import their goods from the colonies in English ships, no matter how much cheaper they could get them carried by Dutch merchantmen ; and high duties were imposed on grain coming from France and the other continental countries. At the opening of the nineteenth century statesmen still maintained that the best way to enrich English merchants and manufacturers was to secure to them as much as possible of the business of England. It was argued that all classes of the nation would thus be benefited ; workmen would be paid higher wages and given steady employment ; the number of merchant vessels and sailors would be increased, thus incidentally strengthening the navy ; and English money would not be sent out of the realm to buy foreign goods.

Adam Smith and the doctrine of free trade

Critics of the system who advocated the doctrines of free trade and *laissez faire* had, it is true, already appeared. Adam Smith, in his memorable work on the *Wealth of Nations*, published in 1776, attacked the whole protective policy, arguing that instead of enriching the country it really checked the increase of wealth. He maintained that it was poor policy to have goods manufactured at a high price in England if they could be bought cheaper from some other country ; that English merchants would be more active and enterprising if they were compelled to face the competition of foreigners ; and finally, that by a system of free trade among nations, each would turn to those manufactures which by reason of its climate, soil, and natural products it could manufacture cheapest. Thus industries would not be fostered artificially, but would arise naturally where conditions were most favorable to the lowest cost of production.

Manufacturers demand a repeal of the duties on grain

Though Adam Smith's great treatise made a deep impression on the younger Pitt, most of the statesmen of the time passed it by unheeded, and it was not until fifty years later that the practical application of his ideas was seriously considered. The immediate impetus to the movement for abolishing protective duties and opening British markets freely to the products of

all nations was given by the objections of the owners of the new factories to the tariffs on grain, which they argued made the bread of their workmen dear and prevented undeveloped countries from procuring English manufactures in exchange for their breadstuffs. They contended, for example, that Russians and Americans would be happy to buy English cloth, shoes, and cutlery, if they could freely send to England, in return, a portion of their great crops of wheat, rye, oats, and barley. Since the English manufacturers enjoyed a practical monopoly of the market, owing to their use of the new and marvelous machinery, their ideal was to make England the world's workshop, buying cheap grain from other countries and selling in exchange their finished products. Having little or no fear of foreign competition in their industries, and owning no farming land, they wanted no protection either for themselves or the farmers.

The manufacturers began, therefore, to attack the Corn Laws,¹ as the tariff acts protecting grain were called. The duties on grain had been made especially high after 1815 when the fall of the inflated war prices threatened to ruin the farmers. One measure even forbade the importation of wheat altogether whenever its price in England was below two dollars and a half a bushel, and later acts attempted to keep the price high by a sliding scale of duties according to which the tariff varied with the price. That is, when the price of wheat rose too high in England, the tariff would be lowered to admit foreign grain, but when English prices were low the tariff would be raised to check foreign competition and so benefit the farmers.

To secure the repeal of these duties on grain and to propagate the principles of free trade generally, the manufacturers founded in 1838 the Anti-Corn Law League, and for almost ten years this organization, under the brilliant leadership of Cobden and Bright, carried on the most thoroughgoing

The Corn
Laws

The Anti-
Corn Law
League, 1838

¹ The term "corn," usually confined to Indian maize in the United States, is commonly used in England to mean grain in general.

campaign of popular education in the history of democracy, expending in one year over a million dollars in publications and meetings. The attack was concentrated on the Corn Laws because it was easier to rouse feeling against the landlords than in favor of any abstract theories of political economy. It was a war on the landed aristocracy; in Cobden's words: "Was there ever an aristocracy so richly endowed? They have the colonies, the army, the navy, and the Church, and yet they condescend to contend for a slice from the poor man's loaf." On the other hand, a member of the aristocracy, Lord Essex, described the free traders as "the most cunning, unscrupulous, knavish, pestilent body of men that have ever plagued this country or any other."

Sir Robert Peel carries the repeal of the Corn Laws, 1846, and opens the way to free trade

The agitation was brought to a crisis in 1845 by a failure of crops in England and a potato famine in Ireland, which raised the price of food stuffs enormously and brought thousands to the verge of starvation, especially in Ireland. In the midst of such distress it appeared to thinking men nothing short of criminal to maintain high prices of grain by law. Consequently Sir Robert Peel, then prime minister, determined that the Corn Laws must go, in spite of the fact that he had hitherto defended them, and in 1846 he succeeded in carrying through Parliament a law which led to their practical repeal. Though compelled to resign immediately after the passage of this bill, Peel had given the whole protective system in England its death blow, since it was chiefly the tariff on grain that could claim any really active defenders.

Free trade established, 1852-1867

Within ten years all of the old navigation laws were abolished and English ports opened freely to the ships of other nations. Gladstone, as Chancellor of the Exchequer in 1852, removed the duties on one hundred and twenty-three articles entirely, and reduced them on one hundred and thirty-three more. On his return to office, some fifteen years later, he made a clean sweep of all *protective* duties, retaining, for revenue purposes, those on tea, wines, cocoa, and a few other articles.

The tendency toward free trade was not confined to England. Indeed, until the seventies, it looked as if a network of commercial treaties, combined with low tariffs, would carry all Europe into a free-trade policy. The liberals in France under Napoleon III favored it, and, as we have seen, Germany had accepted it in a modified form until Bismarck's tariff law of 1879.¹ At last, however, a reaction set in. The protectionists rose to power in the continental countries; the United States converted what was once regarded as a temporary policy of encouraging infant industries and of increasing the revenue during the Civil War into a permanent policy of high protection; and foreign competitors, having free access to England's markets, began to undersell her at home as well as abroad.

Tendency toward free trade in Europe followed by a reaction in the seventies

This radical change in the economic conditions in the continental countries of Europe and the United States has convinced many Englishmen that some alteration will have to be made in England's free-trade policy. In the election of 1906 Mr. Chamberlain sought to make the establishment of some form of a protective tariff the leading campaign issue, and although the free traders carried the day, the arguments of the protectionists will doubtless continue to be urged with ever greater insistence. Their views are clearly summed up in a political speech made by Lord Salisbury in 1892: "We see now, after many years experience, how foreign nations are raising one after another a wall, a brazen wall, of protection around their shores which excludes us from their markets, and, so far as they are concerned, do their best to kill our trade. And this state of things does not get better. On the contrary it constantly seems to get worse. . . . We live in an age of a war of tariffs. Every nation is trying how it can, by agreement with its neighbors, get the greatest possible protection for its own industries and at the same time the greatest possible access to the markets of its neighbors. . . . I want to point out to you that what I observe is that while A is anxious to get

Growing dissatisfaction with free trade in England

Lord Salisbury's views

¹ See above, p. 143.

a favor of B and B is anxious to get a favor from C, nobody cares two straws about getting the commercial favor of Great Britain.

“What is the reason of that? It is that in this great battle Great Britain has deliberately stripped herself of the armor and the weapons by which the battle has to be fought. . . . The weapon with which they all fight is admission to their own markets; that is to say, A says to B, ‘If you will make your duties such that I can sell in your market, I will make my duties such that you can sell in my market.’ But we begin by saying, ‘We will levy no duties on anybody,’ and we declare that it would be contrary and disloyal to the glorious and sacred doctrine of free trade to levy duty on anybody for the sake of what we can get by it. It may be noble, but it is not business.”

EDUCATIONAL REFORM

Opposition
to public
education in
England at
the opening
of the
nineteenth
century

86. When Burke appealed, in 1792, to the “free and enlightened” people of England to take up arms against the French Revolution, by far the greater part of the population could not read or write. No statesman had ever considered it the duty of the government to educate the people at large; and when Samuel Whitbread proposed to Parliament in 1807 that parish schools should be supported at public expense, he was met by the objection that giving education to the working classes would be “found prejudicial to their morals and their happiness; it would teach them to despise their lot in life instead of making them good servants in agriculture and other laborious employments to which their rank has destined them; instead of teaching them subordination it would render them fractious and refractory, as was evident in the manufacturing counties; it would enable them to read seditious pamphlets, vicious books, and publications against Christianity; it would render them insolent to their superiors.”

After the overthrow of Napoleon a regular campaign for popular education was instituted by Lord Brougham, and at last, in 1833, the government voted twenty thousand pounds to be distributed between two private associations for the advancement of primary schools. Six years later this grant was increased to thirty thousand pounds for the use of over three million children, while at the same time seventy thousand pounds were voted for the erection of royal stables for the new queen. This grant in aid of private schools was gradually increased, but it was not until 1870 that the government provided for the erection and equipment of schools at public expense. In that year a law was passed which authorized towns to create school boards elected by popular vote, to erect buildings, and maintain instruction. In time attendance at school was made compulsory and all fees for instruction were abolished.

Parliament begins to grant money for education, 1833

The interference of the State in education met with stout opposition for many reasons. There were some who held that public schools were socialistic institutions which the government had no business to undertake. The strongest opposition came, however, from the various religious bodies. Anglicans, Catholics, and Dissenters all had their own schools and objected to the encroachment of the government institutions; but while all the sects agreed that education without religious instruction was bad, they differed hotly on the particular kind of religious instruction that should be given.

The hostility of the religious schools to those established by the government

The controversy among the different churches was intensified by a new education bill passed in 1902, which destroyed the old school boards. The public schools erected in towns under the law of 1870 were henceforward to be managed by a committee of the town council, and schools belonging to churches were to be in charge of boards composed of two members from the educational committee of the town council and four members representing the sect controlling the school in question. As the bill provided that the government should pay eleven twelfths of the running expenses of both public

The Education Bill of 1902

and sectarian schools, the result was that a particular sect was given a majority in the management of a school, while the cost of its maintenance was thrown upon the general taxpayer.

Hostility to the law leads to the defeat of the Conservative party in 1906

Now there are in England about twenty thousand primary schools; of these more than one half belong to the Anglican Church, about two thousand are under the control of Dissenters and Catholics, and less than seven thousand are nonsectarian, having been organized under the earlier law. The new bill was therefore denounced as a scheme to increase the power of the schools belonging to the Anglican Church because the greater portion of the money voted by the government went to their support. Many Dissenters refused to pay their school taxes; they began an agitation against the Conservatives, who had passed the bill and were influential in defeating that party in the election of 1906. The victorious Liberal party, which had made the educational question a campaign issue, then passed a new law, only to have it cut to pieces by the House of Lords. The educational problem still remains, therefore, one of the main issues of English politics at the present time.

Decline of illiteracy in England

However, in spite of these controversies over education, the efficiency of the schools has steadily increased, and there has been a corresponding decline in illiteracy. In 1843 thirty-two per cent of the men and forty-nine per cent of the women had to sign their names in the marriage register with a cross. In 1903 only two per cent of the men and three per cent of the women could not write their names in the register.

THE IRISH QUESTION

Great importance of the Irish question in English politics

87. In addition to the important problems the English have had to solve at home, they have been involved in constant perplexities in their dealings with the Irish, who belong to the Celtic race and differ essentially from their English neighbors in their sentiments and traditions. Their little island, which is less than one half the size of Great Britain and could

be put into the dominion of Canada one hundred times over, has caused the British government more trouble during the past century than all of the remainder of her vast empire put together. The grievances of the Irish have caused insurrections, incited to murder and riot, induced military oppression, overthrown ministries, blocked the business of Parliament for days, contributed to the ancient ill will between England and the United States, and, in spite of volumes of statutes designed to remedy them, still remain to plague future parliaments.

The original source of Irish discontent is to be found in the repeated invasions of their island by the English, who long treated them as a subject race. For centuries after the earliest conquests under Henry II (1154-1189), the authority of the English sovereigns extended only to certain eastern districts known as the "Pale." To the north and west the wild Irish chieftains and their people dwelt in practical independence under Irish law and custom, constantly fighting among themselves and against the invaders. Within the Pale and on its borders the English barons built great castles and reduced the peasants to serfdom. The "Pale"

Henry VII (1485-1509) determined to get a firmer grip on Ireland than his predecessors had secured and sent over an able administrator, Sir Edward Poyning, who forced the Irish parliament which had been established within the Pale to accept certain measures which bore the name of their author, and which remained in vigor for four centuries. These provided that English statutes should have the same force in Ireland as in England, that no Irish parliament could be called without the English king's consent, and that no acts could be passed until first approved by king and council. While this new system did not work any great hardship so long as the authority of the Irish parliament was confined to the English Pale, it completely destroyed the independence of the Irish when it was later extended to the entire island. Poyning's measures

Henry VIII
shocks the
feelings of
Catholic
Ireland

Henry VIII (1509-1547) took the title of King, instead of that of Lord, of Ireland, which his predecessors had borne, and ordered the Irish to adopt the English language, English dress, and even the English fashion of cutting the hair. This, however, was unimportant when compared with his attempt to force them to accept him instead of the Pope as head of the Church. Though the Irish people clung steadfastly to the Pope and their ancient faith, all government officials were compelled to take the oath acknowledging Henry as supreme head of the Church; the monasteries were suppressed, the monks driven out, and their lands seized and handed over to Henry's supporters.

The Anglican
Church
forced upon
Ireland

This interference in Irish religious matters was continued under Edward VI, when the Catholic clergy began to be expelled from their parishes and Protestant priests installed in their places to be supported by tithes collected from a people still loyal to the old faith. When the form of the English Church was finally fixed under Queen Elizabeth, it was forced in its entirety upon the Irish. They were compelled to accept Elizabeth as supreme governor in things spiritual as well as temporal and to attend Protestant services under pain of severe penalties.

O'Neill's
insurrection

Although this religious settlement could be made really effective only within the Pale, it was the source of great friction, and toward the close of Elizabeth's reign nearly all of Celtic Ireland made a united and desperate attempt under O'Neill to throw off English rule. This uprising was, however, cruelly suppressed and such havoc wrought in the island that a contemporary declared that "Nothing was more frequent in the ditches of the towns, and especially in wasted countries, than to see multitudes of these poor people dead, with their mouths all colored green by eating nettles, docks, and all things which they could rend up above ground." Vast areas, especially in the north, were declared forfeited and were handed over to English and Scotch settlers, thus adding to the bitterness which already existed between the natives and the foreign colonists.

This bitterness took the form of sullen resentment until the quarrel between Charles I and Parliament gave the Irish another excellent opportunity to revolt (1641). Hoping to regain the lands which had been taken from them, as well as to shake off the hated English yoke, they savagely attacked the English and Scottish colonists, especially in the northern part of the island, and committed atrocities which repaid with interest the outrages of which the English had been guilty in the preceding century. After Cromwell and the Puritans executed Charles I in 1649, the Irish declared in favor of his son, Charles II, and Cromwell immediately crossed over into Ireland to put down resistance to his newly established Commonwealth. With fire and sword he scourged the country. At Drogheda he put two thousand to the sword after the garrison had surrendered, saying, "I am persuaded that this is a righteous judgment of God upon those barbarous wretches who have embued their hands in so much innocent blood; and that it will tend to prevent the effusion of blood for the future — which are the satisfactory grounds to such actions which otherwise cannot but work remorse and regret." Within six months the whole island was reconquered.

Cromwell ruthlessly suppresses a new revolt of the Irish (1649)

This conquest was the occasion of a new and more extensive confiscation of Irish lands. Thousands of Irish landlords and peasants were driven from the soil to make room for large colonies of the English conquerors. Vast estates were apportioned out among the soldiers. It is estimated that before the uprising of 1641 the Protestants held only one third of the arable land in Ireland, while forty years later they owned about two thirds of it.

Confiscation of Irish lands by English Protestants

But the woes of Ireland were not yet at an end, for that unhappy land became involved in the English Revolution of 1688 which resulted in the expulsion of the Catholic king, James II, who naturally found many supporters among his Irish subjects. They refused to recognize the Protestant king, William III, who thereupon undertook a new subjugation of

William III forced to reconquer Ireland

Ireland. In this war the native Irish had again to bear the brunt of the conflict, for they alone were loyal to the Catholic James, while the colonists favored William. Two years of fighting brought Ireland once more under the English yoke.

Harsh
measures
against the
Catholics

This renewed victory was followed by measures designed to stamp out Catholicism altogether and to make Irish industry and commerce subservient to the interests of English manufacturers and farmers. Both public and private teaching by Catholics was prohibited, nor might children be sent out of the island to be educated. Parish priests were allowed to remain only under onerous conditions, while bishops, monks, and friars were ordered to leave the country. Catholics were forbidden to carry firearms; they could not buy land or lease it for more than thirty-one years; and the son of a Catholic, by turning Protestant, could secure possession of his father's property.

Oppressive
measures of
the English
Parliament

To prevent farmers in Ireland from competing with those in England, the English Parliament prohibited the importation of cattle, sheep, swine, beef, pork, mutton, butter, and cheese from Ireland. To crush the Irish woolen industry it prohibited the sending of woolen goods to any other country than England, from which they were practically excluded by high protective duties. Moreover the landlords, many of whom lived in England and never even visited their estates, charged the peasants high rents and evicted them when they failed to pay.

In the latter
part of the
eighteenth
century
Parliament
begins to
repeal the
harsher laws
directed
against
the Irish
Catholics

Quite naturally Ireland was filled with discontent from Cork to Sligo and from Dublin to Galway; local disorders were chronic during the eighteenth century; and by constant agitation the Irish finally managed to secure the reform of some of the old laws. Fearing that the Irish might break away during the American Revolution, England conceded to Catholics the right to buy land and relieved them of the necessity of stating under oath where they had last heard Mass. Again, in 1793, when the French Revolution was in progress and England was going to war with the new republic, the English government freed the Irish Catholics from the restrictions which had been imposed

upon their religion, gave them the right to vote for members of their Parliament, and opened important civil and military offices to them.

These concessions did not, however, satisfy the Irish, and hoping for assistance from the French, they planned another desperate uprising. The rebellion of 1798, like all previous attempts, was put down with great loss of life, and the English government decided to destroy entirely the appearance of legislative independence by abolishing the Irish parliament altogether. This body, which had been under the complete control of the English crown since the passage of the Poyning's Laws, was in no way representative of the Irish people. The House of Lords was composed of Anglican prelates and nobles, and the House of Commons, which was assumed to represent the people, was closed to Catholics, who made up nine tenths of the population. The Irish parliament also had every vice of the English system of rotten boroughs. Almost one half of the three hundred members were chosen by twenty-five landlords.

Irish rebellion of 1798

The vices of the Irish parliament

Nevertheless it was not because the Irish parliament was corrupt and undemocratic that the English government determined to abolish it, but because it enjoyed a larger measure of independence than was deemed compatible with the security of the English rule. An Act of Union was accordingly passed in 1801 suppressing it altogether and providing for the representation of Ireland in the Parliament of Great Britain. Ireland was assigned one hundred members in the British House of Commons, and twenty-eight temporal peers, chosen for life by the Irish baronage, were admitted to the House of Lords. This measure, by which the Irish representatives at Westminster were swallowed up in an overwhelming majority of English and Scotch, was stoutly opposed by Irish patriots, but by flagrant bribery, which Lord Cornwallis, who was charged with a portion of the negotiations, called "dirty business," the Irish parliament was induced to accept the proposed change and to put an end to its own existence.

Abolition of the Irish parliament, 1801

Catholic
Emancipa-
tion Act of
1829

The agitation of the Irish question was now transferred to the Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and the first great contest took place over the provisions which excluded Irish, as well as all other Catholics, from that Parliament. Again and again the measure for admitting Catholics was introduced, debated, and defeated. Finally, in 1821, it was passed by the House of Commons only to be rejected by the Lords. In 1828 Daniel O'Connell, although he well knew that he would not be admitted to Parliament, stood for the district of Clare and was triumphantly elected in the midst of great excitement. Convinced that civil war could be averted only by yielding, the duke of Wellington, then prime minister, consented to the introduction of a bill for relief. It was under these circumstances that the Catholic Emancipation Act, which we have described above, was passed,¹ and the Irish Catholics were admitted to Parliament and to practically all civil and military offices, on condition that they would abjure the temporal power of the Pope and disclaim any intention of injuring the authority of the English Church.

Sad condition
of the Irish
people in the
middle of the
nineteenth
century

The admission of Catholics to Parliament, however, did nothing to allay the state of chronic poverty and distress among the peasants of Ireland. The report of a government commission in 1836 showed that while English agricultural laborers received an average wage of eight to ten shillings a week (\$2.00 to \$2.50), those of Ireland got scarcely one fourth that small amount. Nearly one third of the entire population, which was nevertheless increasing rapidly, subsisted chiefly on potatoes, — commonly on an inferior coarse variety which had once been cultivated for swine alone. The census of 1841 revealed the startling fact that in the case of forty-six per cent of the population the entire family lived in a single-roomed cottage, and that seven tenths of these rooms were unfit for human habitation.

¹ See above, p. 205.

In spite of this desperate and well-nigh universal wretchedness, Ireland was drained of millions yearly to pay landlords whose ancestors had secured estates after the wars and confiscations of Cromwell and William III, — landlords, moreover, who rarely set foot in Ireland and took little or no interest in their tenants beyond the collection of their rent. Money that should have gone to drain, improve, stock, and fertilize Irish land was spent in London or in traveling on the Continent. The annual rent had to be wrested from the people by the landlord's agent at any cost; and if it was not paid by a tenant he was speedily evicted from his cottage and lands, often without any compensation for such improvements as he had made with his own hands and at his own expense.¹

Absentee
landlords

The height of Irish misery seems to have been reached in the "Black Year of Forty-Seven." In 1846 the potato crop, upon which one third to one half of the population depended for food, failed almost entirely, and the government was compelled to open temporary relief works (building roads, etc.) in which toward a million persons sought employment. At one time a third of the entire population was in receipt of charity, yet thousands died of starvation.

Famine of
1847

According to the report of the census commissioners in 1851, "No pen has recorded the numbers of the forlorn and starving who perished by the wayside or in the ditches, or of the mournful groups, sometimes of whole families, who lay down and died, one after another on the floor of their cabins, and so remained uncoffined and unburied until chance revealed the appalling scene."

It was in the midst of this terrible famine that the stream of immigration began to flow toward America and a steady decrease in the Irish population set in. Within half a century four million emigrants left the shores of Ireland for foreign

The Irish
begin to
emigrate to
the United
States

¹ In 1847 the rent paid to absentee landlords was estimated at four million pounds, or about one third of the entire rental of Ireland. From 1839 to 1843, according to O'Connell, one hundred and fifty thousand peasants had been evicted.

countries, principally the United States, but they did not leave behind them in the "old country" their bitter resentment against England, which they believe has wronged them so deeply.

Trouble over
the revenue
collected by
the Anglican
Church

Through all these years of distress and famine the Anglican Church, which had been established in Ireland under the Tudors, continued to draw ample revenues from the tithes and endowments. Though its members numbered but one tenth of the population, it was in possession of the ancient churches of the island; its fourteen hundred benefices had a revenue of three million dollars a year; its twenty-two bishops and archbishops enjoyed together an income of seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars a year; and, not content with this, an extra *cess*, or tax, for general purposes, yielding about three hundred thousand dollars, filled the cup of bitterness against the Established Church to overflowing. The tithes were collected from the peasants only with the utmost difficulty, and pitched battles were often fought between them and the police when the latter undertook to drive off cattle to pay the tithe. The opposition grew into an organized movement; a favorite amusement was to make the tithe proctor eat the paper authorizing him to seize property for the debt; and in one case a company of lancers and two companies of the Ninety-Second Highlanders, with two pieces of artillery, were detailed to keep order at the sale of one cow for a peasant's tithe. In 1833 only about twelve thousand pounds out of the one hundred and four thousand due could be secured by the government, which had assumed the burden of collecting the money.

The origin of
the Fenians
in 1858

For years this contest over the tithes continued and, with other grievances, led in 1858 to the formation of a powerful society known as the Fenians, from *Fiana Eirean*, or national militia. This society was especially strong in the United States, where enormous sums of money were collected to further the agitation carried on by the organization. A great convention was held in Chicago in 1863 to plan a special campaign in

Ireland, and at the same time Stephens, a leader in the movement, founded a paper in Dublin called *The Irish People*, which openly advocated rebellion against British rule. Stephens was soon arrested for conspiracy, but he escaped to America, though many of his supporters were condemned to penal servitude. An attempt of the Fenians to blow up the Clerkenwell jail in London, where a conspirator was imprisoned, resulted in the death of twelve and the injury of more than a hundred persons. The English government, thoroughly alarmed, put down Fenianism by military force, but at the same time determined to remove some of the abuses which had given rise to the movement.

Disestablishment and disendowment of the Anglican Church in Ireland were made the great issues in the general election of 1868, and the Liberal party, which favored these measures, was carried into power by a huge majority. The Methodists and Baptists, who supported Gladstone, Bright, and the other Liberals, were heartily opposed to the Anglican Church in England itself, and therefore all the more desirous to see its destruction in Ireland; and the workingmen, newly enfranchised by the Reform Bill of 1867, had no marked sympathy for Irish landlords. Under these influences Parliament in 1869 disestablished the English Church in Ireland and abolished its hated tithes, but allowed it to keep the beautiful buildings which had been seized in the period of the Reformation, and created a fund for the support of the Anglican clergy in Ireland.

The land question, which always has been and still is a fundamental one, remained unsolved. The tithe collector had gone, but the equally hated agent of the absentee landlord remained. Even in this age of manufacturing, three and one half out of the four and one half millions of the Irish people are still dependent upon the cultivation of the soil. A land commission has shown that between the landlord and the tenant there were often three middlemen who made their living from

The Anglican Church disestablished in Ireland, 1869

The land question in Ireland

the necessities of the peasant, whom they had entirely at their mercy. The emigration to America had not relieved the intense competition for land, and as tenants generally held at the will of the landlord they could be driven from their holdings with little difficulty. And it was a terribly serious matter for the peasant to be evicted, for even a mud floor and a smoky peat fire were preferable to the open moor.

Parnell and
the Land
League, 1879

In 1879 a great Land League, with Charles Stewart Parnell, a member of Parliament, at its head, was established with the aim of securing three things for the Irish peasant,—fair rent, fixed holding, and fair sale; that is to say, they asked for legislation providing that the rent should not be fixed by the landlord at any amount he thought he could get, but by a court taking into consideration the fair value of the land; that the tenant should hold as long as he paid the rent so fixed; and finally that, should he surrender his holding, he should be allowed to sell his improvements to the tenant who succeeded him.

The Irish
land acts,
1881-1903

Parnell, with the support of the Irish members in Parliament, resorted to "filibustering" until that body was forced in 1881 to pass a land act granting these three demands. This measure has been supplemented by land-purchase acts by which the government puts at the disposal of the tenants money to buy their holdings, with the privilege of repayment on the installment plan. The last of these acts, passed in 1903 during the administration of Mr. Balfour, appropriates a practically unlimited amount for this purpose, and offers a considerable inducement to landlords to sell, so that the land question seems in a fair way to be settled to the satisfaction of the peasantry.¹

Demand for
Home Rule

All these concessions made by the English government have not yet settled the Irish question, for the demand for Home

¹ The Land-Purchase Act of 1885, passed by Lord Salisbury, set apart twenty-five million dollars; that of 1888, a second sum of the same amount; that of 1891 devoted one hundred and seventy million dollars to the purchase of lands, and that of 1903 an almost unlimited sum.

Rule, or complete legislative independence of Great Britain, is still extensively advocated and frequently debated in the House of Commons. As we have seen, the union of 1801 was really forced upon the Irish by bribing those who could in no way be regarded as representing that nation. The repeal of the Act of Union was warmly urged by Daniel O'Connell after the emancipation of 1829, and at the general election of 1834 forty members of Parliament favored Home Rule. In 1842 *The Nation* was founded to champion the cause, and a staff of brilliant writers were engaged to voice it. A Repeal Association was organized, monster meetings, said to have been attended by half a million people, were arranged by O'Connell, and the examples of Belgium and Greece in winning independence were cited as indications of what the Irish might do. All Ireland seemed on the verge of rebellion, and Irish Americans planned an invasion of Canada. The British government met this agitation by stationing thirty-five thousand troops in the island, and O'Connell, in spite of his violent and inflammatory speeches, shrank from the test of civil war.

Daniel
O'Connell

O'Connell died in 1847, but the cause of Home Rule did not perish with him, for it was taken up by the Fenians and the Land League and thus kept steadily before the people. In 1882 a decided impetus to the movement was given by the shocking murder of Lord Frederick Cavendish and Thomas Burke, the undersecretary for Ireland, in Phoenix Park, Dublin. This deed aroused the horror of the civilized world and convinced Gladstone that nothing short of Home Rule could solve the perennial Irish problem. After the parliamentary election of 1886, which gave him a small majority in the Commons and made him dependent upon the Irish members for their support, he undertook to secure the repeal of the Act of Union. Many of his followers, who did not believe in the policy of Home Rule, broke away from his leadership and formed the party of the Liberal Unionists, thus defeating the bill by about thirty votes. Seven years later, when

Gladstone
espouses the
cause of Irish
Home Rule,
1886

Gladstone was again in power, he brought forward a new Home Rule bill providing that the Irish should have a parliament of their own at Dublin and also retain representation in that of the United Kingdom. This bill, though passed by the Commons, was rejected by the House of Lords. For some years thereafter the issue almost dropped out of English politics, but the majority of the Irish members of Parliament have continued to agitate the question, and the great Liberal victory in the elections of 1906 has again raised hopes for Irish independence.

REFERENCES

The Establishment of Religious Liberty in England: MAY, *Constitutional History of England*, chaps. xii-xiv; LEE, *Source Book of English History*, pp. 497-518; KENDALL, *Source Book of English History*, pp. 382-387.

Factory Legislation: CHEYNEY, *Social and Industrial History of England*, pp. 244-260; KENDALL, pp. 401-406.

The Free Trade Movement: KENDALL, pp. 406-413.

The Religious Controversy and Disestablishment of the Anglican Church in Ireland: JOHNSTON AND SPENCER, *Ireland's Story*, pp. 293-301, 313-323.

The Land Question in Ireland: JOHNSTON AND SPENCER, pp. 324-338.

Home Rule Movement in Ireland: KENDALL, pp. 391-400.

The Irish in America: JOHNSTON AND SPENCER, pp. 348-359.

CHAPTER XXVII

THE BRITISH EMPIRE IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

THE EXTENSION OF BRITISH DOMINION IN INDIA

88. While Lord Russell, Disraeli, and Gladstone were guiding the forces which transformed the House of Commons into a democratic body, and humanitarians were carrying out the reforms demanded by the enlightened spirit of the new age, British soldiers far away on the frontiers of the British dominions were fighting Rajputs in India, Zulus in Africa, and Maoris in New Zealand, and widening the borders of the empire whose foundations had been laid in the eighteenth century. The story of the early contest for dominion — the rivalry with the Dutch in the Spice Islands, the wars for Spanish trade, the struggle with France in India and North America — we have brought down to the settlement at Vienna, which left England foremost among the commercial and colonial powers of all time. The task of developing the resources acquired in India, Africa, Canada, and Australasia was one of the important problems which the eighteenth century bequeathed to the nineteenth.

Turning first to India, the British rule, in the opening years of the nineteenth century, extended over the Bengal region and far up the Ganges valley beyond Delhi. A narrow strip along the eastern coast, the southern point of the peninsula, and the island of Ceylon had also been brought under England's control, and in the west she held Bombay and a considerable area north of Surat. In addition to these regions which the English administered directly, there were a number of princes, such as the Nizam of Hyderabad, over whom they exercised the

The British extend their empire while making reforms at home

British dominion in India at the opening of the nineteenth century

right of "protection." They had secured a foothold which made it evident that the Mogul emperor, who retained but the shadow of power at Delhi, could never recover the shattered dominions of the great Aurangzeb. The French and Portuguese possessions had declined into mere trading posts, and in the heart of India only one power disputed the advance of the English toward the complete conquest of the peninsula.

The origin of
the Mahratta
Confederacy


This one power was a union of native princes known as the Mahratta Confederacy.¹ The country occupied by this confederation extended inward from the Bombay coast and was inclosed on the western border by mountain ranges. When the Mohammedan invaders under Baber swept down into the peninsula they easily conquered the plains to the eastward, which were occupied by peaceful peasants, but to the westward the boldest of the native Mahrattas fled to the mountains, and from their strongholds there they frequently dashed down into the plains and harassed the Mohammedan rulers. These terrible warriors rode horses famed for their fleetness, and when attacked they easily took refuge in their inaccessible mountain fastnesses or in the wild jungles of the valleys. In the time of Louis XIV these occasional ravages grew into a war of conquest and occupation under a powerful leader by the name of Sivaji, who carved out of the Mogul's dominions a realm for himself which was called Kokan.

The
Mahratta
Confederacy
in 1800

The kingdom thus founded grew in time into a vast realm, but its ruling family sank into "do-nothing kings," and the real power fell into the hands of a mayor of the palace called the Peshwa, who had his seat of government at Poonah. At the opening of the nineteenth century the kingdom had fallen apart, and beside the domains of the Peshwa there were four other great districts ruled by viceroys bearing the remarkable names of the Gaekwar of Baroda, Sindhia of Gwalior, Holkar of Indore, and the Bhonsla of Nagpur. The Mahratta kingdom was therefore only a loose confederation, and the ruling princes

¹ See map above, Vol. I, p. 93.







were usually warring with one another except when pressure from without compelled them to unite. The prevailing disorder was increased by the fact that scattered among their territories there were innumerable petty rulers who might be compared to the imperial knights of the Holy Roman Empire.

If it had not been for the jealousy that existed among the Mahrattas, they might have checked the growing power of the English and seized India for themselves as it fell from the relaxing grasp of the great Mogul. As it was they constituted a powerful barrier in the way of the extension of British dominion over central and western India, and by their restless and unsettled life kept the surrounding territories already under British control or influence in a constant state of turmoil. They encouraged the wild native horsemen to attack Madras and ravage the Bengal frontier, and repeatedly put British military genius to a severe test.

Overthrow
of the
Mahrattas
(1816-1818)

However, the lawless Mahrattas were unable in the long run to resist the steady and disciplined pressure of European warfare, and in their last great conflict with the British (1816-1818) they were finally conquered. The office of the Peshwa of Poonah was abolished, a large part of his territories were annexed by the English, and the rulers of Baroda, Gwalior, and Indore were transformed into feudal princes under British sovereignty, — a position which they retain to-day. The extension of their rule over the entire peninsula now became the avowed policy of the British. Henceforward native states were compelled to submit their external disputes to them, to accept the presence of British residents at their courts to advise them on domestic questions, and finally, to place their military forces under the supervision of British officers.

While pacifying the interior of India the British were also occupied with the defense and extension of their frontiers on the north, east, and west. For six hundred miles along the northern frontier, where the foothills of the Himalayas gradually sink into the valley of the Ganges, there was chronic

The British
advance to
the borders
of China

disorder fomented by the Gurkhas, — a race composed of a mixture of the hill men and the Hindu plain dwellers. Periodically the Gurkha chieftains, like the Highlanders of Scotland or the Mahrattas of western India, would sweep down into the valley, loot the villages of the defenseless peasants, and then retire to their mountain retreats. A few of the most powerful of these chieftains succeeded in conquering the smaller hill tribes and in building up a sort of confederation under a rajah in whose name they governed Nepal, as their kingdom was called. They then sought to extend their sway at the expense of the British in the Ganges valley, but were badly beaten in a two years war (1814–1816) and compelled to cede to the British Empire a vast western region, which brought the Anglo-Indian boundary at that point to the borders of Tibet, high up into the Himalaya mountains.

Annexation
in Burma,
1826–1885

While the British were busy with the Mahrattas and Nepalese, the Burmese were pressing into the Bengal districts from the east, and as they had never met the disciplined Europeans in armed conflict, they were confident that they would be able to expand westward indefinitely. Their ambitions were, however, checked by the British (1824–1826) and they were compelled to cede to the victors a considerable strip of territory along the east coast of the Bay of Bengal. Having thus made their first definite advance beyond the confines of India proper, the British, after twenty-five years of peace with the Burmese, engaged in a second war against them in 1852 and made themselves masters of the Irawadi valley and a long narrow strip of coast below Rangoon.¹

Conquest of
the Sindh
and Punjab
regions

After the gains made at the expense of the Burmese, the northwestern frontier next attracted the attention of the conquering British. In the valley of the Indus, where the soldiers of Alexander the Great had faltered on their eastward march, there was a fertile region known as the Sindh, ruled over by an Ameer, who seems to have been a wicked and disorderly prince,

¹ Additional annexations were made after another Burmese war in 1884–1885.

and to have shown an irritating independence in his dealings with the British. On the ground that the Ameer's government was inefficient and corrupt, the British invaded his territory in 1843, and after some brilliant campaigning they wrested his domain from him and added it to their Indian Empire, thus winning a strong western frontier. This enterprise, which has been severely condemned by many British writers, was scarcely concluded when a war broke out with the Sikhs in the north-west, which resulted in the addition of the great Punjab region farther up the valley of the Indus, northeast of Sindh, and the extension of the boundary of the Anglo-Indian Empire to the borders of Afghanistan.¹

In addition to this policy of annexation through war with the natives, a process of "peaceful assimilation" was adopted under the governorship of Lord Dalhousie (1848-1856), who quietly transformed "protected" states into British provinces whenever the direct line of the ruling houses became extinct. Through the application of this "doctrine of lapse," as it was called, the territories of the Rajah of Nagpur and other princes came under the direct control of the British government. In 1856 Lord Dalhousie deposed the Nawab of Oudh and annexed his fertile domains, on the ground that "the British government would be guilty in the sight of God and man if it were any longer to aid in sustaining, by its countenance, an administration fraught with the suffering of millions."

It was inevitable that the conquest and annexation of so many native Indian states should stir up intense hatred against the British aggressors. In the provinces which were under the

"Protected" states are transformed into British provinces

Causes of discontent in India

¹ The province of Baluchistan on the northwest has been brought under British dominion by gradual annexations beginning in 1876 and extending down to 1903. Several of the districts were formally organized as British Baluchistan in 1887. In attempting to extend their authority over the neighboring Afghanistan, the British have waged two wars with the ruler of that country, one in 1837-1843 and the last in 1878-1880. The problem how to maintain control over Afghanistan and use it as a protecting state against Russia's southeasterly advance now constitutes one of the fundamental issues of Anglo-Indian politics.

direct administration of the British, ruling families and the official classes attached to them had been set aside, and in those which were merely under the suzerainty of the conquerors as feudal states, the rulers chafed at their vassalage. The Mohammedans cherished a religious abhorrence for the Christian intruders in addition to their bitterness at the loss of their former power. The native Mahrattas had good reason to feel that only the advent of the British had prevented them from transforming the peninsula into a Mahratta empire. Finally, the sudden and violent "pacification" of a country which for centuries had been the prey of ambitious military adventurers left no further scope or outlet for their troublesome energies, especially as the British monopolized, for the most part, all the highest and most lucrative positions.

British
dependence
on native
soldiers

For the repression of all these elements of discontent the British depended largely upon the aid of native soldiers. Indeed, from the days of Plassey down to the war in the Punjab, sepoys had formed the bulk of the English armies, even in the process of conquering the peninsula. Though outnumbering the British five to one, they had been, on the whole, heroic and faithful soldiers, sharing both glories and defeats with their white companions in arms. It is true there had been occasional mutinies among them, but these had been speedily suppressed and had never spread to any alarming extent.

Introduction
of greased
cartridges
causes
trouble

Nevertheless the embers of discontent remained, and they were fanned into a consuming flame in 1857 by several military reforms undertaken by the English government. The year before, the British had become impressed with the advantages of a new rifle invented by a Frenchman. This was loaded with a paper cartridge containing powder and ball, which was slipped into the barrel and then rammed down into place. In order to slide more easily into the gun the paper was greased, and the soldier had to tear off one end of it with his teeth so that the powder would take fire when the cap was exploded.

The introduction of this new rifle seemed innocent enough, but the government had not taken into account certain religious scruples of the sepoy. The Hindu regarded touching the fat of a cow as contamination worse than death, and to Moham-medans the fat of swine was almost as horrifying. The government soon heard of this grievance and, promising not to use the objectionable grease, offered to allow the soldiers to substitute some other kind of lubricant. Peace was thus maintained for a time, but in May, 1857, some soldiers at Meerut, in the broad plain between the Jumna and the Ganges, refused to receive the cartridges served out to them and were there-upon sentenced to prison for ten years. Their native companions rallied to their support and rose in rebellion; the next day, May 11, the soldiers mutinied at Delhi, massacred the English inhabitants of the city and besieged the garrison; in a few days the entire northwest was in full revolt. Lucknow, with its population of seven hundred thousand natives, rose against the British and besieged them in their fortifications. At Cawnpore, about forty miles to the south, a thousand British men, women, and children were cruelly massacred after they had surrendered, and by the middle of July all Oudh and the northwest seemed lost.

The sepoy
mutiny in
1857

Immediately after the insurrection at Meerut the governor general telegraphed to Bombay, Madras, and Ceylon for instant help. Though there were as yet no railroads in the rebellious provinces, the telegraph helped to save the empire. Aid was at once sent to Lucknow under the command of General Colin Campbell, a hero of the Napoleonic and Crimean wars, and in November he succeeded in relieving the brave garrison, which had held out for nearly six months. Many of the sepoy remained loyal, and with aid from the coast provinces city after city was wrested from the mutineers until by the end of November British India was saved, but at a frightful cost. The frenzied English showed themselves as cruel as the natives in the punishment of the rebels. Delhi was given over to a

The rebellion
crushed

terrible pillage when it fell again into their hands; hundreds of natives were shot without even the form of trial; and one commander even forced some natives before he hanged them to lick up the blood of other victims.

Queen
Victoria
assumes the
East India
Company's
political
power, 1858

After the suppression of the sepoy rebellion the Parliament of Great Britain revolutionized the government of India. The administration of the peninsula was finally taken entirely out of the hands of the East India Company, which had directed it for more than two hundred and fifty years, and vested in the British sovereign, to be exercised under parliamentary control. In November, 1858, a royal proclamation announced to the inhabitants of British India that all treaties made under the authority of the East India Company would be maintained, the rights of feudatory princes upheld, and religious toleration granted. The governor general of the company in India was supplanted by a viceroy, and the company's directors in London surrendered their power into the hands of the Secretary of State for India. The Mogul of Delhi, successor of the great Aurangzeb, was expelled from his capital, but when, nearly twenty years later (on January 1, 1877), Queen Victoria was proclaimed Empress of India amid an illustrious gathering of Indian princes and British officials, the pomp and magnificence of the ancient Moguls were invoked to bind their former subjects more closely to their English conquerors.

Queen
Victoria pro-
claimed
Empress of
India, 1877

Progress in
India since
the mutiny

Since the great mutiny the British government in India has been concerned chiefly with problems of internal reform and administration and with the defense of the frontiers, especially on the northwest. The proportion of natives to white men in the army was greatly reduced and the artillery placed almost entirely in charge of the latter. Codes of law and of criminal procedure were introduced in 1860 and 1861. The construction of railway lines was pushed forward with great rapidity for military and economic purposes, so that the vast interior might be quickly reached by troops, and an outlet opened for its crops of cotton, rice, wheat, indigo, and tobacco.

About twenty-seven thousand miles of railway are now open and large extensions are projected. Calcutta and the frontier of Afghanistan are linked by a line touching Lucknow and Delhi, the ancient Mogul capital, and connected with Bombay by two branches, one of which is continued in a southeasterly direction entirely across the peninsula to Madras and thence to the coast opposite Ceylon. Cotton mills are rising by the tombs of ancient kings, cities are increasing rapidly in population, and the foreign trade by sea has multiplied twenty-fold in the past seventy years. About eight hundred newspapers, printed in twenty-two languages, including Burmese, Sanskrit, and Persian, are published; educational institutions have been provided for nearly five million students. In short, an industrial and educational revolution is taking place in India, and Governor Clive would scarcely recognize his office were he called to the post of viceroy to-day, with all its responsibilities of military, railway, and educational administration, and the extraordinary obligations that come with the terrible famines produced by the periodic failure of the crops.

Railroads
and news-
papers

As a result of the methods by which British dominion has been extended in the peninsula, India to-day is a collection of provinces, varying greatly in size, language, population, and customs. To these must be added a number of states ruled by native princes under British protection. The total area now under British authority is 1,766,642 square miles, and the population reaches the astounding number of over two hundred and eighty-seven millions, of whom less than one million is European in origin. The government of this immense empire is vested in the hands of a viceroy appointed by the crown and a local council composed of heads of the finance, military, commerce, and other departments of government, likewise chosen by the crown. Subject to the acts of the Parliament of Great Britain, the viceroy and this council legislate for all India and enforce their laws through the governors of the nine great provinces into which India is divided. The local government, however,

British do-
minion in
India to-day

is subject to the Secretary for India in England, who is a member of the British cabinet and is assisted in his work by a council of ten men, nine of whom must always be persons who have had experience in India.

THE DOMINION OF CANADA

The French in Canada obtain a liberal government by the Quebec Act, 1774

89. When the English government was established in Canada after the capture of Montreal in 1760, only about two hundred of the sixty-five thousand inhabitants were of English origin; the rest were French. Barriers of race, language, laws, and religion separated the conquerors from the conquered. For a few years the English administration, not unnaturally, was badly adapted to the needs of its new subjects, but in 1774, on the eve of the war with the American colonies, the British Parliament, in order to insure the allegiance of the Canadians, passed the famous Quebec Act, — one of the most remarkable enactments in the history of English law. In an age of intolerance it recognized the Catholic faith, allowed the clergy to collect their tithes, perpetuated the French civil law, and left French customs and traditions undisturbed.

Loyalists settle in Canada during the American Revolution

Under this act the new colony stood patriotically by England during the American Revolution, and though France was herself allied with the revolting colonies, the Canadians repulsed their advances and received fugitive loyalists in great numbers. The latter, known as the United Empire Loyalists, settled in what are now the Maritime Provinces and also in Upper Canada, — the region lying along the Great Lakes, which was to become the province of Ontario. It is estimated that by 1806 about eighty thousand loyalist immigrants had crossed the frontier from the United States, — the British government offering lands and subsidies to encourage their coming.

Canada divided into two provinces, Ontario and Quebec

The influx of an English population necessitated a change in the government, which had been designed, especially for the French. Consequently, in 1791, representative government was established in Canada by a new act of Parliament. The

country was divided into two provinces,—an upper one, Ontario, inhabited by the English, and a lower one, Quebec, which had long been the home of the French. Each province was given a governor, a lieutenant governor, and a legislature composed of a council appointed by the governor and an assembly elected by popular vote. To prevent disputes over taxation such as had led to the American Revolution, it was provided that no British taxes should be imposed on Canada except for the regulation of commerce, and in such instances only by the colonial legislature. Thus Canada was freed from contributions to the military and naval forces of the mother country.

Under this new government the English and French inhabitants once more showed their loyalty to England when the armies of the United States prepared to invade Canada during the War of 1812, for the old loyalists in Ontario still remembered with bitterness their expulsion during the American Revolution. The French Canadians likewise flocked to the support of the English cause, and the result of the conflict was merely to increase the ill will already felt for the neighboring republic, whose designs of annexation were regarded with distrust and aversion.

Amicably as the Canadians in the two provinces coöperated against the United States, they were constantly troubled by domestic dissensions. In Quebec the quarrel was between the great mass of the French citizens and a small group of English who controlled the government. In Ontario, although there was no question of nationality, there was some bitterness between the newcomers in the province and the officials who were nearly all from the old loyalist stock. In 1837 this ill feeling developed into open rebellion. The uprising in Ontario was headed by William MacKenzie, a Scotchman and a radical, who hated the "Tories" and became an impassioned advocate of independence. In the French province of Quebec the malcontents found a leader in Louis Papineau, who dreamed

French
Canadians
loyal to
Britain in
the War of
1812

The Cana-
dian rebellion
of 1837

of establishing a French republic on the banks of the St. Lawrence. The rebels, however, did not manage their enterprise very skillfully and were easily dispersed with little loss of life.

Self-govern-
ment estab-
lished in
Canada

The pacification of the revolted colonies was committed to the care of Lord Durham, a liberal statesman, who was given full power to restore order and introduce reforms. The result of his mission was a new act of Parliament, the Reunion Act of 1840, which united the two provinces into one, with a single legislature of two houses and a ministry responsible to it. Within ten years Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Prince Edward Island were likewise enjoying self-government through responsible ministries.

Canadian
provinces
federated in
1867

This was an important step in the direction of the Canadian federation which was organized a few years later. By the British North America Act of 1867, Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick, and Nova Scotia were united into the Dominion of Canada, with the provision that the remaining provinces and territories might be admitted later. This federation was given a constitution providing for a governor general representing the sovereign of England, a Senate, the members of which are appointed for life by the governor general, and a House of Commons elected by popular vote. In methods and spirit this government is remarkably like that of Great Britain, for the real administration is in the hands of a cabinet selected by the governor general from the party which has a majority in the lower house. The new plan of federation went into effect on July 1, 1867,—a day which is celebrated as the Canadian national holiday, like the Fourth of July in the United States.

New prov-
inces ad-
mitted to the
federation

Since the formation of the federation, the history of the dominion has been characterized by rapid material development and the growth of a national spirit among the Canadian people. The great western regions have been divided into territories and provinces, just as the western part of the United States has been organized into territories and then into states.

In 1869 the extensive rights which the Hudson Bay Company had possessed for more than two hundred years over vast regions encircling the Hudson Bay were purchased. The province of Manitoba was laid out in 1870; in 1871 British Columbia, which had been occupied after the settlement of the Oregon controversy with the United States, was admitted to the federation; Prince Edward Island followed two years later; and in 1905 the great provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan came into the union, leaving only Newfoundland outside. The tide of immigration has steadily risen so that the population, which was a little over half a million in 1820, was more than five millions at the close of the century.

To bind these distant provinces together a network of railways, including great trunk lines, has been constructed. The Canadian Pacific connects Montreal with Vancouver, almost three thousand miles away, and as there is a magnificent line of steamers running from that point to Japan, the valley of the St. Lawrence is only fourteen days' journey from Yokohama, the gate of the Orient. There is also steamer service to Australia, so that European travelers bound for the southern Pacific often prefer the Canadian route to the trip through the Suez Canal or around South Africa. Though still principally an agricultural and timber-growing country, Canada is now undertaking manufacturing on a large scale, and the output of her coal, iron, copper, and lead mines steadily increases.

This development of Canadian industries under the encouragement of protective tariffs and government bounties is closely connected with the growth of a feeling that Canada constitutes a nation by herself, in spite of her position as a member of the British Empire. The close trading relations which were once fostered between Canada and the United States by reciprocity treaties guaranteeing mutual interests have been hampered by the protective policy which the government at Washington has followed since the close of the Civil War. As a result, Canada has been driven to look more

Canadian
industrial
advance

Growth of
national
spirit in
Canada

and more to Great Britain as her industrial ally rather than to the neighboring republic. In the seventies Sir John Macdonald made the idea of a "national policy," or protection for Canadian interests, a current political issue, and since that time both the Conservative and Liberal parties have labored to make Canada an independent manufacturing nation. In the fostering of this "colonial nationalism," as it is aptly called, there has been found no more ardent advocate than the present premier, Sir Wilfred Laurier.

Bonds unit-
ing Canada
with the
United
States

On the other hand, there are many forces which inevitably tend to bring Canada into close relations with the United States, so that there are always many persons on both sides of the boundary who believe that the two countries may sometime be united. They use the same system of coinage (dollars and cents), and letters pass across the frontier without extra postage. The Canadians read the same books that gain popularity in the United States, and are said to enjoy the same plays and even to use the same slang. Thousands of emigrants cross from the western states into Canada every year, and, on the other hand, thousands of French Canadians are settling in New England.

THE AUSTRALASIAN COLONIES

British did
not have to
contend with
many natives
in Australasia

90. The Australasian colonies of Great Britain — Australia, Tasmania, New Zealand, and some of the minor islands — were practically unoccupied when the English colonists began to flock there in the nineteenth century. The aborigines of Australia and Tasmania were never very numerous or warlike. They belong to a very low grade of civilization and have never seriously opposed the invaders. It is true that the English found a much higher degree of intelligence, as well as a more warlike spirit, among the Maoris of New Zealand. These have from time to time offered the same kind of resistance that the North American Indians opposed to the early settlers. Although they have managed to retain possession of extensive areas of

land, their number, which is less than fifty thousand, is so small that their presence can hardly produce a race problem.

The English were therefore free, in these vast regions, to work out in their own way a democratic government suited to the conditions in which they found themselves. They have neither been forced into conflict with other European peoples, as in Canada, nor have they had to control alien races, as in India.

The English accordingly free to establish government in their own way

The continent of Australia, with the neighboring island of Tasmania, somewhat exceeds in extent the area of the United States, while New Zealand alone is somewhat larger than the island of Great Britain. Although a great part of Australia lies in the temperate zone, the northern region nearest the equator is parched in summer, and the whole central portion suffers from a scarcity of water, which makes vast areas of the interior permanently uninhabitable unless some means of irrigation on a large scale can be introduced. The eastern and southern coasts have always been the chief centers of colonization. Melbourne, in the extreme south, lies in a latitude corresponding to that of Washington, St. Louis, and San Francisco in the northern hemisphere. The country affords gold, silver, coal, tin, copper, and iron. Tasmania and New Zealand are more fortunate than Australia in the diversity of their scenery and the general fertility of their soil, while their climate is said to possess all the advantages of the mother country without her fog and smoke.

The extent and natural resources of Australasia

The English occupation of Australasia belongs to the nineteenth century. The Portuguese, in their eager hunt for the Spice Islands, may perhaps have come upon Australia, but it long remained an unknown portion of the globe, as shown by the rude outline of *Terra Australis* (or Southern Land) which appears on the maps of the Elizabethan age. In 1642 a Dutch seaman, Tasman, discovered the island which now bears his name (originally called Van Dieman's Land). He also sighted in the same year the islands to the east, which,

Early explorations in Australasia, — Captain Cook's voyages

in spite of their almost Alpine character, were named New Zealand, after the low-lying meadows at the mouth of the Rhine. The Dutch did not, however, occupy these lands, which were later brought to the attention of the English by the famous voyages of Captain Cook. He skirted around the entire coast of New Zealand in 1769-1770, and then sailed westward to Australia, reaching land at a point which, owing to its luxuriant foliage, he called Botany Bay. He took possession of the continent in the name of the English sovereign, and it was given the name of New South Wales, on account of its fancied resemblance to the Welsh shore line.

New South
Wales begins
as a convict
colony

In 1787 England determined to establish a convict colony at Botany Bay, as deportation was a punishment very commonly inflicted in those days for what would now seem to us petty offenses.¹ The bay formed an excellent harbor, and the town of Sydney which grew up on its shores became the chief city of New South Wales, the first of the six sister states which now form the Australian federation. For thirty years the colony remained a convict settlement under military government. Others than convicts, however, came in increasing numbers; live stock was imported from home, and sheep raising, now the principal industry of the region, was introduced about 1840. The stigma which attached to the origin of the colony was removed when the government stopped the transportation of criminals thither (1840).

Self-govern-
ment estab-
lished in
New South
Wales

The discovery of gold in 1851 produced an influx of prospectors similar to that which had peopled California two years earlier. In 1855 the colony, which had been granted more and more freedom by the mother country, was given a parliament composed of two houses, an upper chamber of members appointed by the king for life, and a lower one elected by popular vote. From that time on the colonists were left practically free to manage their own affairs.

¹ See above, pp. 206 *sqq.*

Tasmania, with its town of Hobart established in 1804, had also been used by the English as a place of exile for political offenders as well as for criminals. The beauties of the island, however, attracted free settlers in increasing numbers, and Tasmania was separated from New South Wales in 1825. Thirty years later, after the transportation of criminals had ceased, the island received a government similar to that of New South Wales.

Tasmania

The settlements which had grown up around the new town of Melbourne were in 1851 united into the colony of Victoria. In 1859 the region to the north of Sydney was organized into the colony of Queensland and given a government similar to that of the other states. Its development, however, has not been so rapid as that of Victoria or New South Wales, since a great portion of the interior is a desert that can only be utilized after extensive irrigation. A penal settlement established on the west coast, some two thousand miles from Sydney, has very slowly grown into the colony of West Australia. Lastly, South Australia, with its town of Adelaide, should be mentioned. This colony, lying between Victoria and West Australia, never had the misfortune of being used as a criminal station, and it has attracted a steady stream of immigration.

Victoria,
Queensland,
West Aus-
tralia, and
South
Australia

It was natural that in time the people of these colonies, speaking the same language and having the same institutions, should seek a closer union. The question of a federation was long discussed, and at last, in 1891, a general convention composed of delegates from all the states drafted a federal constitution, which was submitted to the people for their ratification. In 1900 the British Parliament passed an act constituting the Commonwealth of Australia on the basis of this draft. The six states — New South Wales, Tasmania, Victoria, Queensland, South Australia, and West Australia — were formed into a union similar to that of the United States. The king is represented by a governor general; the federal parliament is formed of two houses, a Senate, consisting of six senators from

The Aus-
tralian
Common-
wealth
formed by
union of six
colonies

each state, and a House of Representatives chosen in the same way as in the United States. This body has extensive power over commerce, railways, currency, banking, postal and telegraph service, marriage and divorce, and industrial arbitration.

The settle-
ment of New
Zealand

To the southeast of Australia, twelve hundred miles away, lie the islands of New Zealand, to which English pioneers began to go in the early part of the nineteenth century. In 1840 the English concluded a treaty with the native Maoris, by which the latter were assigned a definite reservation of lands on condition that they would recognize Queen Victoria as their sovereign. The English settlers established the city of Auckland on North Island, and twenty-five years later New Zealand became a separate colony with the seat of government at Wellington. Under the auspices of the New Zealand Company colonization was actively carried on, and before long the whites began to press in upon the reservations of the Maoris. This led to two revolts on the part of the natives (1860 and 1871), which were, however, speedily repressed and have not been repeated.

Social reform
in New
Zealand

New Zealand has recently become famous for its experiments in social reform. During the last decade of the nineteenth century the workingmen became very influential and have been able to carry through a large number of measures which they believe to be to their advantage. Special courts are established to settle disputes between employers and their workmen; an old-age pension law gives ninety dollars a year to men and women over sixty-five years of age having less than five dollars a week income. Various measures have been adopted for discouraging the creation of large estates, which are heavily taxed, while small farms pay but little. The right to vote is enjoyed by women as well as men.¹

The colony of Victoria has vied with New Zealand in respect to social reform. The government has attempted to stop

¹ In Australia women are also permitted to vote for members of the federal parliament and in the local elections of all the states except Victoria.

“sweating” in the poorly paid industries, and public boards composed of employers and workmen have been established for the purpose of fixing the minimum wages and standards of work, so that these matters are no longer arranged by private bargaining between individuals. The system of secret voting which originated in Australia — the so-called “Australian ballot” — is one of the reforms which has already spread beyond Australasia, and is in use both in England and in the United States.

Victoria attempts to maintain standard wages for workmen

GROWTH OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE IN AFRICA

91. The chief centers of British advance in Africa have been two, — the Cape of Good Hope at the extreme south and Egypt¹ in the north. The Cape Colony was permanently acquired, as we have seen, at the Congress of Vienna in 1814, some eight years after its actual seizure from the Dutch during the war with Napoleon. When this colony passed into the hands of the British it contained slightly over twenty-five thousand people of European descent, mainly Dutch, and it is from this original Dutch stock that the majority of the present white inhabitants are derived, although immigration from England set in after the fall of Napoleon. These Dutch settlers were a sturdy, resolute people, strongly attached to their customs, including their slave system, and though of peaceable spirit, unwilling to submit to interference. It was just these characteristics which the new rulers overlooked. Shortly after their occupation the British reconstructed the system of local government and the courts; they insisted on the use of the English language; and finally, in 1833, they abolished slavery, setting aside a considerable sum of money as compensation to the slave owners, a great deal of which, however, was secured by shrewd financiers because it was made payable in London.

Early conflict between British and Dutch in South Africa

¹ The circumstances which led England to interfere in Egyptian affairs will be considered at the close of Chapter XXX.

Many thousand Boers leave Cape Colony for the interior

Owing to these grievances, about ten thousand of the Boers¹ left the Cape during the years 1836 to 1838, and, pushing northeastward beyond the Orange River into the interior, partly inhabited by warlike savages, set up a new colony. During the succeeding years large numbers of the Boers pushed farther eastward and northward into the regions now known as Natal and the Transvaal. For a time they had their own way in these barren wildernesses, for the English at the Cape were too few in number, and the home government too little interested in the distant land, to follow them up and claim sovereignty over them.

The British seize Natal (1842) and the Orange River Colony (1848)

Natal, however, was on the seacoast, and the British had no desire to see a strong unfriendly state established there. Consequently they sent troops over to occupy Durban (then called Port Natal), which had formerly been the seat of some English settlers. These troops came into conflict with the Dutch there in 1842 and drove them out, — adding more bitterness to the ill will which the Boers already felt for the English. The conquerors cared little, however, for Dutch opinion, and six years later (in 1848) they seized the Orange River Colony, which the Boers had founded between the Orange and the Vaal rivers. They justified this act of aggression by claiming that the anarchic conditions there and the troubles with the natives constantly endangered the tranquillity of Cape Colony.

The Transvaal Colony founded and its independence recognized by the British, 1852

Once more a great Boer migration began, this time into the region beyond the Vaal where pioneers had already broken the way, and here the Transvaal Colony was founded. The British believed that the vast inland wilderness was good only for cattle raising and rude agriculture and was therefore not worth the trouble of annexation and defense. Accordingly, in 1852, by a treaty known as the Sand River Convention, they recognized the independence of the Boers in the Transvaal region, guaranteeing them the right "to manage their own

¹ This is the Dutch word for farmer and has come to be especially applied to the Dutch population of South Africa.

affairs and to govern themselves according to their own laws, without any interference on the part of the British government." This was followed, two years later, by the recognition of the freedom and independence of the Orange River Colony under the name of the Orange Free State, which preserved its liberty until the recent war, which brought it again under British sovereignty.

Independence of Orange Free State recognized, 1854

In the Transvaal the Dutch lived a rude wild life, having little government and desiring little. They were constantly embroiled with the natives, and as time went on the British began to complain, as they had previously of the Orange River Colony, that their disorders constituted a standing menace to the peace of the neighboring colonies. Whether or no there was any justification for this claim, Great Britain in 1877 annexed the Transvaal Republic, whose independence it had recognized twenty-five years before, and insisted on retaining it in spite of a great memorial from the Dutch inhabitants petitioning for the restoration of their freedom. The government thus imposed upon the Boers was extremely galling, and in 1880 they organized an insurrection and destroyed at Majuba Hill (1881) a small detachment of English troops.

The British annex the Transvaal Republic, 1877

At that time Gladstone was in office, and turning a deaf ear to the demands of the imperialists for vengeance, he determined to grant to the Dutch that independence for which they had fought. Consequently he concluded a convention with the Transvaal provisional government by which autonomy under the suzerainty of the queen of England was granted to the Boers, except that their foreign affairs were to be subject to British control. Regarding this measure not as an act of magnanimity on the part of the British government but as a concession wrung from it by force of arms, the Boers determined to secure complete independence, and succeeded in 1884 in obtaining a new convention recognizing the Transvaal as free and independent in all respects except the conclusion of treaties with foreign powers. They

But Gladstone grants Dutch independence again

thus regained, for all practical purposes, the freedom which they had enjoyed before the annexation of 1877.

The discovery of gold in the Transvaal

The very next year (1885) gold was discovered in the southern part of the Transvaal, and wild lands which the negroes had despised and from which the Boers could scarcely wring a scanty living now became exceedingly valuable. Thousands of miners, prospectors, speculators, and the customary rabble of the mining camp began to flow into the Transvaal, and within a short time the population had trebled. The Boers were now outnumbered by the newcomers, the *Uitlanders*, or foreigners, as they were called. The Dutch recoiled from handing over their country to a group of foreign miners and speculators. In order to retain their supremacy they put all sorts of obstacles in the way of the newcomers who wished to acquire citizenship and the right to vote, hoping by this policy to keep the government in their own hands.

The British in the Transvaal protest against the government as managed by the Dutch

It was now the turn of the *Uitlanders* (who were largely English) to protest. They declared that their energy and enterprise had transformed a poor and sparsely settled country into a relatively populous and prosperous one; that they had enriched the treasury of an almost bankrupt government; and that since they also had a stake in the country, they should be allowed a voice in making the laws and in the administration of justice. They maintained, moreover, that the Boer government was antiquated and corrupt, and that the *Uitlanders* were forced to pay taxes for being badly governed. They tried to effect a change in the Transvaal constitution, and, failing that, planned in 1895 an insurrection against the Boer authorities.

The Jameson raid, 1895

The conspiracy was encouraged by Cecil Rhodes, prime minister of Cape Colony and head of the British South Africa Company.¹ It is alleged that he was supported in this by those who were then in control of the home government.

¹ The British South Africa Company was formed in 1889 under the direction of Cecil Rhodes and was granted extensive powers in the region north of the Transvaal Republic, comparable to those enjoyed earlier in India by the East India Company.

Dr. Jameson, an agent of the company who was much interested in promoting some of Rhodes's great schemes, started for the interior of the Transvaal at the head of an armed band of the company's forces with the intention of coöperating with those who were preparing for an uprising at Johannesburg. The enterprise miscarried, however, and the insurgents were captured by the Boers.

This "Jameson raid," as it is called, only served to further embitter the Boers and afforded them a pretext for collecting large military supplies in self-defense. The president of the Transvaal Republic, Paul Kruger, was firmly opposed to all compromise with the Uitlanders. He had been associated with Boer history since the grand "Trek," or migration, of 1836, when, as a boy of ten, he had first learned to distrust and hate the British. He was practically master of the little oligarchy that controlled the republic, and he secured the adoption of measures against freedom of the press and of meeting to stop the agitation of political questions; he persistently disregarded the petitions of the Uitlanders, who outnumbered the Boers perhaps two to one, and entered into an offensive and defensive alliance with the Orange Free State to the south.

The British now claimed that the Boers were aiming at the extinction of their dominion in South Africa; the Boers, on the other hand, asserted that the British were planning the overthrow of the two Dutch republics. Claims and counter-claims on both sides served to create a complicated situation. Negotiations failed to bring a settlement, and in October, 1899, the Transvaal Republic issued a declaration of war against England, following it up by an invasion of Natal and Cape Colony, in which the burghers of the Orange Free State joined. At first victorious, the Boers were finally defeated, and the two republics were annexed to the British Empire as the Orange River Colony and the Transvaal Colony.¹

President Kruger refuses to conciliate the British

The Boer War results in annexation of the two Dutch republics to the British Empire

¹ The Transvaal Colony was given a constitution in 1906, and in the following year one was also granted to the Orange River Colony.

Progress in
Cape Colony

During this long struggle between Boer and Briton in the interior, the two races have prospered and lived happily side by side in Cape Colony and Natal. The boundaries of the former colony have been enlarged by many annexations until it now has an area about five times that of the state of New York. More than two thirds of the population is negro, but the European element is steadily increasing by immigration from the British Isles. Cabinet government was established in 1872, and the legislative power vested in two houses, both elected by popular vote. The principal towns are Cape Town, the capital, and Kimberley, the center of the great diamond fields from which toward a half a billion dollars' worth of diamonds have been taken.

The colony
of Natal

The self-governing colony of Natal originated with the expulsion of the Boers in 1842 and the annexation of the region to Cape Colony. Some years later it was again made a separate colony, and in 1893 it was given a cabinet government of its own. Here, as at the Cape, the negro population predominates, being about five times that of the European and Asiatic residents combined.

Other British
possessions
in Africa

In addition to these colonies Great Britain has three enormous provinces in southern Africa occupied almost entirely by negroes. North of the Cape, between German Southwest Africa and the former Boer republics, lies the Bechunaland protectorate, inhabited by peaceful native tribes engaged in agriculture and cattle raising. Beyond Bechunaland and the Transvaal is Rhodesia, which was acquired through the British South Africa Company by two annexations in 1888 and 1898 and brought under the protection of the British government. A railway from Cape Town has been completed through Bulawayo and across the Victoria Falls and is being rapidly pushed northward through British Central Africa, the third great native province, which was organized under British authority in 1891. This region brings the British inland possessions to the junction of German East Africa and the Congo Free State, which now

block further annexations to the northward which might otherwise have connected South Africa with the Nile valley.¹

IMPERIAL FEDERATION

92. Since their foundation the various English-speaking colonies have gone on their several ways, making laws for themselves, managing their own affairs, and levying duties on goods coming from the mother country itself as well as from foreign nations. They have enjoyed the protection of the British army and navy without any corresponding burden of taxation beyond voluntary subsidies and the occasional equipment of regiments. So complete had been their exemption from any real interference on the part of the Parliament at Westminster, that many statesmen of Gladstone's generation believed that in the fulness of time they were destined to form independent nations.

The English speaking colonies enjoy complete self-government

However, during the last quarter of the nineteenth century a movement in the direction of a firmer union began to take shape. The extension of telegraph, cable, railway, and steamship lines has made possible a much closer connection between the mother country and her most distant colonies than existed between Oregon and the capital of the United States before our great transcontinental railroads were built. To promote unity among the self-governing colonies of the empire, there was founded in 1884 an Imperial Federation League which

Closer union between Great Britain and colonies now advocated by imperialists

¹ In addition to its colonies in southern and central Africa and its control in Egypt (see below, pp. 363 *sqq.*), Great Britain owns British East Africa, acquired by the extension of a protectorate over the sultan of Zanzibar in 1891 and by subsequent treaties with France, Germany, Italy, and the Congo Free State which delimited the provinces of Uganda and the East African protectorate. The special importance of British East Africa lies in the fact that it enables Great Britain to control the head waters of the Nile and affords a protection for the Sudan and Egypt to the north. British Somaliland was secured on the Straits of Babel-Mandeb in 1884 in connection with the establishment of the English power in Egypt. Along the west coast Great Britain has five centers, Gambia, Sierra Leone, the Gold Coast, Lagos, and Nigeria, — the beginnings of which date back to the days of Drake and Hawkins, when the British were ravaging the coast for slaves to carry to the New World. See map, p. 356.

was succeeded by the present British Empire League established in 1895. The federationists in all parts of the empire have sought by conferences, pamphlets, books, and newspapers to arouse an imperial patriotism, which may in time lead Englishmen to merge their colonial loyalty into a loyalty to the great empire, just as the pride of the citizen of the United States in his particular state gives way before national patriotism.

Three proposals of the federationists

The practical program of the federationists includes three general proposals. (1) They advocate strengthening the political bonds between the colonies and the mother country by giving the colonies representation in Parliament, or by creating an imperial committee consisting of representatives from the colonies working in conjunction with the government of Great Britain. (2) They propose to establish a commercial union for the empire by introducing a general system of tariffs favoring British goods everywhere. (3) They advocate, and have partially carried into effect, a general scheme of defense for the whole empire.

Colonial conferences, 1887, 1897, 1902, 1907

To further the realization of some form of federation, periodical conferences of the premiers of the self-governing colonies have been held in London, beginning with the inaugural meeting in 1887, on the fiftieth anniversary of Queen Victoria's accession. The discussions have been prolonged, but the practical results meager. The conference of 1887 expressly excluded the question of imperial federation and considered principally naval defense. The conference of 1897, under the presidency of the Colonial Secretary, denounced any treaties that might hamper the commercial relations between Great Britain and the colonies, and that of 1902 approved giving preference to British goods, but it did not accept Mr. Chamberlain's proposition to establish an imperial council. The last conference, held in 1907 and composed of representatives of Canada, Transvaal, Cape Colony, Natal, Australia, New Zealand, and Newfoundland, made a quadrennial imperial conference a permanent institution.

Notwithstanding the extensive agitation and the periodical conferences, it can scarcely be said that the federation is within the field of practical politics. The colonies have protective tariffs ; Great Britain still adheres to the free-trade policy, and, judging by the election of 1906, seems as irrevocably attached to it as ever. So long as the mother country has no protective tariff which would enable her to favor the products of her own colonies, these can have only a slight material interest in a closer union. Moreover the colonies have their own problems which they must work out in their own way, and, however much the idea of one mighty federation may appeal to the imagination, they will probably long continue to cling to their "colonial nationalism."

Difficulties
in the way of
imperial
federation

Nevertheless the colonists are no less loyal to the mother country than the inhabitants of Great Britain itself. Though Queen Victoria during her long reign (1837-1901) exercised but little influence upon English politics except as adviser and moderator, she was regarded as the standard bearer of the empire. Representatives of all the colonies came to London in 1897 to take part in the diamond jubilee to celebrate the sixtieth anniversary of her coronation ; and she was as well beloved by Canadians, Afrikanders, and Australians as by the people of Oxfordshire or Surrey. Her death in 1901 was mourned by all the colonies, and the accession of her son, Edward VII, was greeted with fitting ceremonies throughout the empire. As a poet wrote on the eve of the Boer War, the call of the British lion is heard by its offspring in all climes :

Loyalty of
the British
colonies
to their
sovereign

The Lion stands by his shore alone
And sends to the bounds of Earth and Sea
First low notes of the thunder to be.
Then East and West, through the vastness grim,
The whelps of the Lion answer him.

TABLE OF BRITISH POSSESSIONS

IN EUROPE: The United Kingdom, Gibraltar, and Malta. Area, 121,500 square miles; population, 44,000,000.

IN ASIA: Aden, Perim, Sokotra, Kuria Muria Islands, Bahrein Islands, British Borneo, Ceylon, Cyprus, Hongkong, India and dependencies, Labuan, the Straits Settlements, the Federated Malay States, Weihaiwei. Area, 1,900,000 square miles; population, 301,000,000.

IN AFRICA: Ascension Island, Basutoland, Bechunaland Protectorate, British East Africa, Cape of Good Hope, Central African Protectorate, Zanzibar, Mauritius, Natal, Orange River Colony, Rhodesia, St. Helena, Tristan da Cunha, Seychelles, Somaliland, Transvaal Colony, Swaziland, West African Colonies of Nigeria, Northern Nigeria, Southern Nigeria, the Gold Coast, Lagos, Gambia, Sierra Leone. Area, 2,200,000 square miles; population, 34,000,000.

IN NORTH AND SOUTH AMERICA: Bermudas, Canada, Falkland Islands, British Guiana, British Honduras, Newfoundland and Labrador, the West Indies including Bahama, Barbados, Jamaica, Leeward Islands, Trinidad, and Windward Islands. Area, 4,000,000 square miles; population, 8,000,000.

IN AUSTRALASIA AND THE PACIFIC ISLANDS: The Commonwealth of Australia (including New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland, South Australia, West Australia, and Tasmania), New Zealand, New Guinea (British), Fiji Islands, Tonga or Friendly Islands, and other minor islands in the Pacific. Area, 3,200,000 square miles; population, 5,600,000.

REFERENCES

The Great Indian Mutiny: Extract from HUNTER, *A Brief History of the Indian Peoples*, in BEARD, *Introduction to the English Historians*, pp. 638-644; LEE, *Source Book of English History*, pp. 562-568.

British Advance in India: WOODWARD, *The Expansion of the British Empire*, pp. 312-330; LYALL, *Rise of British Dominion in India*, pp. 210-281.

The Foundation of New South Wales: WOODWARD, pp. 262-274; LEE, pp. 542-550.

The British in South Africa: WOODWARD, pp. 280-295; LEE, pp. 569-285.

Canada under British Rule: WOODWARD, pp. 249-261.

Constitution of the Australian Commonwealth: BEARD, pp. 645-662.

CHAPTER XXVIII

THE RUSSIAN EMPIRE IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY¹

THE REIGNS OF ALEXANDER I (1801-1825) AND NICHOLAS I (1825-1855)

93. During the past century Russia has been coming into ever closer relations with western Europe. Although still a backward country in many respects, she has been busily engaged for fifty years in modernizing herself; and the tremendous revolution in which she is now engaged is attracting the attention of the civilized world. The works of some of her writers are widely read in foreign lands, especially those of Turgenief and of Leo Tolstoi. The music of Rubinstein and Tschaikovski is as highly esteemed in London or New York as in St. Petersburg or Moscow. Even in the field of science such names as that of Mendeléef, the chemist, and of Metchnikof, the biologist, are well known to their fellow-workers in Germany, France, England, and America. It becomes, therefore, a matter of vital interest to follow the changes which are turning the tide of modern civilization into eastern Europe.

Relations between Russia and western Europe becoming more intimate

When, in 1815, Tsar Alexander I returned to St. Petersburg after the close of the Congress of Vienna, he could view his position and recent achievements with pride. Napoleon's attack upon him three years earlier had come to naught, and the French emperor's mighty army had melted away during its journey to Moscow and its subsequent hasty and tragic retreat. Alexander had participated in Napoleon's overthrow, had aided in restoring to France her old line of kings, and had

Participation of Alexander I in European affairs


¹ In the preparation of this chapter the writers owe much to the coöperation of their friend and colleague, Professor V. G. Simkhovitch, who has generously placed the resources of his knowledge of Russian history and conditions at their disposal.

succeeded in uniting the rulers of western Europe in that Holy Alliance which he had so much at heart. What was still more to the point, he had induced them to ratify his seizure of Finland and to permit him to add the kingdom of Poland to his possessions.


How the dukes of Moscow began to conquer European Russia

But his chief interests lay, of course, in his own vast empire. He was the undisputed and autocratic ruler of more than half of the whole continent of Europe, not to speak of the almost interminable reaches of northern Asia which lay beneath his scepter. Something has been said in an earlier chapter of the way in which the Russian monarchy originated.¹ Three centuries before Alexander's day the dukes of Moscow had been able to extend the bounds of their hitherto unimportant principality westward and far northward to the White Sea and the Arctic Ocean, so that by 1520, when the Protestant Revolt first began to agitate western Europe, they were ruling over the whole region which is now known as Great Russia. A large part of their lands lay so far to the north as to be practically uninhabitable. The fertile steppes to the south, which a thousand years earlier had furnished grain for the Roman Empire, had long been, and still were, overrun by various Tartar hordes, who pastured their flocks upon the wide prairies and led a wild, unsettled life. Their conquest was begun in earnest by Ivan the Terrible (d. 1584). His troops descended the Volga in boats, and after a difficult siege he took Kasan, the seat of the ruler of the whole region. Four years later he conquered the Khan of Astrakhan and thus brought the boundary of Russia to the shores of the Caspian Sea. In this way he almost doubled the extent of his empire and justified the new title of Tsar, which he had assumed upon his coronation. The Tartar Horde of the Crimea still occupied, however, the shores of the Black Sea, and the Tartars continued to make incursions into Russian territory until, two hundred years later, they yielded to Catherine the Great. Still, in spite of the dangers from these

¹ See above, Vol. I, pp. 50-599.



THE MATTHEWS-NORTHROP WORKS



NOTE:
 Finland, the Baltic Provinces, Poland and Caucasus are all, except Finland, integral portions of the Russian Empire, they have nevertheless been assigned a special color in the map on account of certain peculiarities in the relation of each to the Russian government. In Russia all Railroads are shown, but in Western Europe only the more important ones are indicated on the map.

Greenwich 50° 60° 70° 80° 90°

roving bands, settlers from Great Russia gradually colonized the southern districts, plowing up the prairies and making clearings in the forests, something as the frontiersmen have advanced across the United States.

There was no reason, however, why Ivan the Terrible should confine his ambitions to Europe. Geographically Russia is but the western portion of a vast plain reaching from the Baltic Sea to the Pacific Ocean. The Ural Mountains, which are regarded as the boundary between Europe and Asia, are after all a rather insignificant range compared with the Alps or the Pyrenees, and there is, moreover, a wide gap between their southern end and the Caspian Sea. Before the death of Ivan the conquest of Siberia (whose ruler had his capital at Sibir on the Irtysh River) was begun. The Russians founded Tobolsk in 1587 and soon had all western Siberia under their control. Fur traders, runaway serfs, and a variety of adventurous Russians pressed into the new country; Tomsk, near the Chinese boundary, was founded in 1604, shortly before England established her first successful colony in North America; and a generation later (1638) the Russians could look out over the Pacific from their new town of Okhotsk, four thousand miles east of Moscow.

It is unnecessary to follow in detail the expansion of European and Asiatic Russia. It will be remembered that Peter the Great won the Baltic provinces, and so provided Russia with a better seaport than she had previously possessed. Catharine the Great gained Lithuania in the partition of Poland; she also conquered the north shore of the Black Sea and a great district beyond the Ural River. Alexander himself added Finland and the grand duchy of Warsaw. In short, the Russian Empire under Alexander I embraced all that it includes to-day, except portions of the Caucasus and a region lying beyond the Caspian Sea in central Asia which have been acquired by his successors. Although the Tsar rules over one seventh of all the dry land upon our globe, Russia's desire for territory seems never to be

Ivan the Terrible begins the conquest of Siberia

Extent of the Russian Empire in the time of Alexander I

satisfied, and she is now recovering from a defeat at the hands of the Japanese, due to her anxiety to incorporate Korea and Manchuria into her huge dominion.

Heterogeneous character of the Russian Empire

It is clear that the rapid extension of Russian rule over so vast an area could not fail to bring within the empire the most various peoples, differing in customs, language, and religion, — Finns, Germans, Poles, Jews, Tartars, Armenians, Georgians, and Mongols.¹ The Russians themselves, it is true, have colonized the southern plains of European Russia and have spread even into Siberia. They now make up over three fifths of the whole population of the empire, and their language is everywhere taught in the schools and used by the officials.

Finland

The people of the grand duchy of Finland, speaking Swedish and Finnish, have constantly protested against their incorporation into Russia ; and the Poles, recalling the time when their kingdom far outshone the petty duchy of Moscow among the European powers, have twice risen in rebellion against the Tsar in the vain hope of making good their claim that the kingdom of Poland should form an independent nation with its own language and constitution.

Poland

Russia an agricultural country at the opening of the nineteenth century

In the time of Alexander I the Russians had not begun to flock to the cities, which were small and ill constructed compared with those of western Europe. The great mass of the population still lived in the country and more than half of them were serfs, as ignorant and wretched as those of France or England in the twelfth century. The problem of improving the condition of the peasant is one of the most serious that the Russian government has had to face, nor is it by any means solved, since millions of people in the country districts still live on the very verge of starvation, and a failure of the crops causes the death of hundreds of thousands.

¹ The Cossacks, or light cavalry, who constitute so conspicuous a feature of the Russian army, were originally lawless rovers on the southern and eastern frontiers, composed mainly of adventurous Russians with some admixture of other peoples. Certain districts are assigned to them by the government on the lower Don, near the Black Sea, the Urals, and elsewhere, in return for military service.

Alexander I had inherited, as "Autocrat of all the Russias," a despotic power over his subjects as absolute as that to which Louis XIV laid claim. He could make war and conclude peace at will, freely appoint or dismiss his ministers, order the arrest, imprisonment, exile, or execution of any one he chose, without consulting or giving an account to any living being. Even the Russian national Church was under his control, for Peter the Great had replaced the Patriarch by a small body of officials known as the Holy Directing Synod, at the head of which was the Procurator of the Holy Synod, the Tsar's special representative. There was no thought of any responsibility to the people, and the fearful tyranny which the Tsar's officials have been able to exercise will become apparent as we proceed.

Absolute powers of the Tsar

Alexander himself, in his earlier years, was an enthusiastic believer in freedom and constitutional government. In his youth his tutor, a Swiss liberal by the name of La Harpe, had introduced him to the writings of the reformers in western Europe, so that the young Tsar had a clear idea of all that the French Revolution meant, and earnestly desired to play the part of a liberal and enlightened monarch. He began by revoking the decrees of the previous reign, which had forbidden Russians to travel abroad and had prohibited the importation of books, lest they might introduce Jacobin ideas. In 1802 he created a ministry on the western model which enabled him to conduct the government more efficiently than hitherto and to fix the responsibility for acts done in his name. He then took up the question of giving Russia a constitution and even considered the abolition of serfdom; but both of these reforms encountered difficulties which might well have discouraged a more persistent person than Alexander, and his plans were never carried out. Three new universities were established, at St. Petersburg, Kharkof, and Kasan, and the government extended aid to scholars and men of letters, and forwarded the translation into Russian of the works of Montesquieu and Adam Smith.

Liberal measures of Alexander I during the first part of his reign

How Tsar Alexander became the enemy of revolution and of liberal ideas

The hopes of the small progressive party which was growing up in Russia under these favoring circumstances were destined, however, to be short-lived. After his return from the Congress of Vienna Alexander began to dismiss his liberal advisers. He became as apprehensive of revolution as his friend Metternich, and threw himself into the arms of the "Old-Russian" party, which was proud of Russia as she was and obstinately opposed the introduction of all western ideas. The Tsar was soon denouncing liberalism as a frightful illusion which threatened the whole social order. He lent his aid and encouragement to Metternich in suppressing the revolutionary tendencies in Germany, Spain, and Italy; and in his own empire he permitted his officials to do all they could to stamp out the ideas which he had himself formerly done so much to encourage. The censorship of the press put an end to the liberal periodicals which had sprung up. Professors in the universities began to be dismissed for teaching modern science, and at the University of Kasan it was proposed to make the instruction conform strictly with the supposed teachings of the Bible. The professors were to say no more of the discoveries of Copernicus, Galileo, and Newton, or of the ideas suggested by the great French naturalist Buffon. The medical school was ordered to give up all dissection as insulting to the dead, and the anatomical specimens in the museums were decently buried. In 1823 all Russian students were forbidden to attend German universities.

Origin of secret political societies in Russia before Alexander's death

The attraction of the new ideas was, however, too strong for the Tsar to prevent some of his more enlightened subjects from following eagerly the course of the revolutionary movements in western Europe and reading the new books dealing with scientific discoveries and questions of political and social reform, which continued to be published in spite of Metternich's precautions. Many officers in the Russian army had had opportunities during their sojourn in France to observe the advantageous effects of liberty, and were deeply impressed, on

their return to their own country, by its general backwardness, the tyranny of its government, the misery of the serfs, and the general opposition to progress. They began to organize secret societies for the purpose of hastening reform. Some of the revolutionists went so far as to recommend the complete abolition of monarchical government and the establishment of a republic, but the majority of liberals would have been entirely satisfied with less sweeping changes.

Alexander I died suddenly on December 1, 1825. His brother Constantine, who was his legal and natural successor, had secretly resigned his claims to the throne in favor of his younger brother Nicholas. But even Nicholas himself was unaware of this, so that for some days no one knew who was the rightful Tsar. The revolutionary societies seized this opportunity to organize a revolt known as the "December conspiracy." The leaders of the plot attempted to induce the army to refuse the customary oath of allegiance to Nicholas when he was proclaimed Tsar. They hoped to bring about various reforms, juster laws, the emancipation of the serfs, a constitutional government, — some of them even advocated the establishment of a republic. But the movement was badly organized, and a few charges of grapeshot brought the insurgents to terms. Nicholas forgave the great mass of those implicated, but hundreds of the "Decembrists," among them scions of the most distinguished families of Russia, were exiled to Siberia, and five of the most conspicuous leaders were sentenced to be hanged. They met their fate bravely. One of them acknowledged sadly that they had tried to reap the harvest of liberty before the seed had been sown. But he and his fellow-revolutionists had succeeded in sowing the seed, and thousands have since shown themselves ready to meet exile or death for the same cause of freedom.

Nicholas I never forgot the rebellion which inaugurated his reign, and he proved one of the most despotic of all the long list of autocratic rulers. His arbitrary measures speedily

The "Decem-
brist" revolt
of 1825

Polish
rebellion,
1830-1831

produced a revolt in Poland. The constitution which Alexander I had in his liberal days granted to the kingdom was violated. Russian troops were stationed there in great numbers, Russian officials forced their way into the government offices, and the petitions of the Polish diet were contemptuously ignored by the Tsar. Secret societies then began to promote a movement for the reëstablishment of the ancient Polish republic which Catharine II and her fellow-monarchs had destroyed. When the news of the July revolution in France reached Warsaw, crowds in the streets cheered the downfall of the Bourbons as the white flag was lowered over the French consulate. In November an uprising occurred in Warsaw; the insurgents secured control of the city, drove out the grand duke Constantine and the Russian officials, organized a provisional government, and appealed to the European powers for aid. Finding the Tsar inflexible in his refusal to grant them any concessions, the leaders of the insurrection proclaimed the independence of Poland, January 25, 1831.

Nicholas
crushes the
revolt and
deprives
Poland of its
constitution

Europe, however, made no response to Poland's appeal for assistance. The Tsar's armies were soon able to crush the rebellion, and when Poland lay prostrate at his feet, Nicholas gave no quarter. He revoked the constitution, abolished the diet, suppressed the national flag, and transferred forty-five thousand Polish families to the valley of the Don and the mountains of the Caucasus. To all intents and purposes Poland became henceforth merely a Russian province, governed, like the rest of the empire, from St. Petersburg.¹

Nicholas I's
belief that
autocracy
alone could
save Russia

Nicholas I sincerely believed that Russia could only be saved from the "decay" of religion and government which he believed to be taking place in western Europe by maintaining autocracy, for this alone was strong enough to make head against the destructive ideas which some of his subjects in

¹ Thirty years later, in 1863, the Poles made another desperate attempt to free themselves from the yoke of Russia, but without success. Napoleon III refused to assist them, and Bismarck did not hesitate to use his influence in the interest of the Tsar.

their blindness mistook for enlightenment. The Russian-Greek Church¹ and all its beliefs must be defended, and the Russian nation preserved as a separate and superior people who should maintain forever the noble beliefs and institutions of the past.² Certainly a great many of his advisers were well content with the system, and his army of officials were as loath to recommend reform as any band of corrupt politicians in the world.

Accordingly, in the name of Russian nationality, the Tsar adopted every measure to check the growth of liberalism. He limited to three hundred the number of students who might attend any one of the universities. Russian scholars were not permitted to go abroad without special permission from the government. The officials bestirred themselves to prevent in every way the ingress into Russia of western ideas. Books on religion and science were carefully examined by the police or the clergy; foreign works containing references to politics were either confiscated or the objectional pages were blotted out by the censors. When a Moscow magazine published an article declaring that "nine hundred years of Russia's existence were a blank in the history of the human mind and a warning to the rest of Europe," and that so long as she clung to the ideas of the orthodox Greek Church she could never hope to advance, the magazine was suppressed, its publisher exiled,

Stern efforts
of Nicholas
to check
liberalism

¹ The Russians were converted to Christianity by missionaries from Constantinople, the religious capital of the Eastern, or Greek Church, which had gradually drifted away from the Latin, or Roman Catholic, Church in the seventh and eighth centuries. For many centuries the Russian Church remained in close relations with the patriarch of Constantinople, but after that city fell into the hands of the infidel Turks it occurred to the Russian rulers that the Tsars must be the divinely appointed successors of the Eastern emperors. Old Rome, on the Tiber, and new Rome, on the Bosphorus, had both fallen on account of their sins. Russia thus became the "third Rome," and the Tsar, the head of all true Christians who accepted the only orthodox faith, that of the Greek Church. Under Peter the Great the Russian Church was brought completely under the control of the government.

² Nicholas introduced into the schools a catechism which recalls that of Napoleon I: "*Question.* What does religion teach us as to our duties to the Tsar? *Answer.* Worship, fidelity, the payment of taxes, service, love, and prayer,—the whole being comprised in the words worship and fidelity."

and the clear-headed author officially declared insane and put in charge of a physician. Travelers to and from Russia were subjected to close scrutiny, and their baggage was carefully examined for indications of revolutionary plots. The government officials did not hesitate freely to open private letters committed to the post, even when there was no reason to suspect their writers. It may be said that, except for a few short intervals of freedom, this whole system has been continued down to the present time.

The Tsar's
police system
and the
terrible
"Third
Section"

To maintain this despotic system Nicholas I reorganized a secret department of police which had originated in the time of Peter the Great as a special instrument for suppressing opposition to the Tsar. This "Third Section of His Majesty's Chancery," as it was called, working in conjunction with the ordinary police, with tireless vigilance spied out and arrested even the most harmless advocates of liberal reforms. "In every province, in every town, ay, even in every railway station, there are gendarmes who report directly to the local general or colonel; he, in his turn, is in communication with the chief of the imperial police, who is received in frequent audience by the Tsar and reports to him everything he thinks advisable. All the officials of the empire are under the surveillance of the imperial police, and it is the duty of the generals and colonels to keep a vigilant eye on every subject of the Tsar, even on provincial governors, ministers, and grand dukes."¹ So cruel were the methods used by the police to extort confessions that political offenders often regarded exile to the mines of Siberia as a form of deliverance.

THE FREEING OF THE SERFS AND THE GROWTH OF THE SPIRIT OF REVOLUTION

94. In 1854 the efforts of Russia to increase her influence in Turkey led to a war with France and England. The Russians

¹ Prince Kropotkin, *Memoirs of a Revolutionist*, p. 336.

were defeated, and their strong fortress of Sebastopol, in the Crimea, captured by the allies.¹ The disasters of the war and the exposure which they brought about of the inefficiency and corruption of the government officials filled every Russian patriot with the deepest chagrin. It was clear that Russia was a backward country which must be thoroughly reformed if it was to hold its own among the nations of Europe.

The Crimean War serves to reveal the weakness of Russia

Nicholas I died in the midst of the reverses of the Crimean War, leaving to his son, Alexander II, the responsibility of coming to terms with the enemy, and then, if possible, strengthening Russia by reducing the flagrant political corruption and bribery and improving the lot of the people at large. He did not succeed, however, in curing the greed and cruelty of his officials, nor have his successors been more fortunate in this respect than he. His sincere efforts to better the condition of the peasants likewise failed in the main. This was due to the influence of the members of the official class, who were commonly landowners and used their influence with the Tsar to dissuade him from doing anything for the peasants which would in any way serve to reduce the income of the landlords.

Accession of Alexander II, 1855

Nearly one half of the Tsar's subjects were serfs whose bondage and wretched lives seemed to present an insurmountable barrier to general progress and prosperity. The landlord commonly reserved a portion of his estate for himself and turned over to his serfs barely enough to enable them to keep body and soul together. They usually spent three days in the week cultivating their lord's fields. He was their judge as well as their master and could flog them at will. The serf was viewed as scarcely more than a beast of burden, and even the kindest landlord thought of him as a mere slave who had no business to have feelings like other human beings.

Situation of the Russian serfs

In his charming *Memoirs of a Revolutionist* Prince Kropotkin, who had abundant opportunity in his earlier days to see how the peasants were treated, gives the following illustration

Control of the lord over the serfs' marriages

¹ For the Crimean War, see below, p. 307.

of the attitude of the landlord. One landowner remarked to another, "Why is it that the number of souls on your estate increases so slowly? You probably do not look after their marriages." Thereupon the other went home and ordered a list of all the inhabitants of his village to be brought to him. "He picked out from it the names of the boys who had attained the age of eighteen and the girls just past sixteen, — those are the legal ages for marriage in Russia. Then he wrote, 'John to marry Anna, Paul to marry Parashka,' and so on with five couples. 'The five weddings,' he added, 'must take place in ten days, next Sunday but one.'

"A general cry of despair rose from the village. Women, young and old, wept in every house. Anna had hoped to marry Gregory; Paul's parents had already had a talk with the Fedótoffs about their girl, who would soon be of age. Moreover it was the season for plowing, not for weddings; and what wedding could be prepared in ten days? Dozens of peasants came to see the landowner; peasant women stood in groups at the back entrance of the estate with pieces of fine linen for the landowner's spouse, to secure her intervention. All in vain. The master had said that the weddings should take place at such a date, and so it must be."

From time to time the serfs, infuriated by the hard conditions imposed upon them, revolted against their lords. During the reign of Catharine the Great a general uprising had taken place which grew to the proportions of a civil war and was only put down with terrible bloodshed and cruelty. Under Nicholas I over five hundred riots had occurred, and these seemed to increase rather than decrease, notwithstanding the vigilance of the police and the severity of the government.

Alexander II, fearful lest the peasants should again attempt to win their liberty by force, decided that the government must undertake the difficult task of freeing forty millions of his subjects from serfdom. After much discussion he issued an

Peasant
revolts

Emancipa-
tion of the
serfs, March,
1861

emancipation proclamation, March 3, 1861,¹ on the eve of the great Civil War which was to put an end to negro slavery in the United States. In his anxiety to prevent any loss to the landowners, who constituted the ruling class in the Russian government, the Tsar did his work in a very half-hearted manner. It is true the government deprived the former lord of his right to force the peasants to work for him and pay him the old dues; he could no longer flog them or command them to marry against their will; but the peasants still remained bound to the land, for they were not permitted to leave their villages without a government pass. The landlords surrendered a portion of their estates to the peasants, but this did not become the property of individual owners, but was vested in the *village community* as a whole. The land assigned to each village was to be periodically redistributed among the various families of the community so that, aside from his hut and garden, no peasant could lay claim permanently to any particular plot of land as his own.²

The village community, or *Mir*

The government dealt very generously with the landlords, as might have been anticipated. It not only agreed that the peasants should be required to pay for such land as their former masters turned over to them, but commonly fixed the price at an amount far greater than the real value of the land. The government then arranged to advance the money to the landlords and to collect the amount due from the peasants in the form of an excessively high land tax. No peasant should be given a pass to leave his village if his taxes were in arrears, and the officers could flog him without mercy if he refused to meet the often intolerable burdens imposed upon him.

The emancipated serf forced to pay an excessive price for his land

¹ According to the Russian calendar the date is February 19, for Russia has never followed the example of the western nations and rectified her mode of indicating dates by adopting the Gregorian calendar.

² These village communities had long existed in Russia, since the lords had usually found it convenient to have the village redistribute the land from time to time among the serfs as the number of inhabitants changed.

The peasant
becomes
"the serf of
the state"

His new freedom seemed to the peasant little better than that enjoyed by a convict condemned to hard labor in the penitentiary. Indeed, he sometimes refused to be "freed" when he learned of the hard bargain which the government proposed to drive with him. There were hundreds of riots while the readjustments were taking place, which were sternly suppressed by the government. The peasant was still not at liberty to sell his land nor to leave the village without permission. He was relieved from the constant supervision of a tyrannical landlord, but found himself under the still more formidable eye of the Tsar's tax collectors. He became, in short, "the serf of the state." He was, moreover, forced by the government to pay for his land far more than it was worth. (Kropotkin tells us that his father's estate was appraised at more than three times its market value.) The result was that the government tax amounted usually to all that the community could earn by cultivating its lands, and very often to much more, — two, three, even six times the value of the whole produce. Moreover, the landlords did not always deem it to their advantage to sell much land to the peasant, and consequently the peasant communities had, after the emancipation of the serfs, a fifth less land than had previously been assigned them by their former masters. The only resource of the peasant was to supplement his income by day labor or by renting additional land from neighboring landlords at exorbitant rates.

Naturally, if the people in a given community increased, the size of the individual allotments inevitably decreased and with them the chances of earning a livelihood. At present, less than fifty years after the "freeing" of the serfs, the peasant has, on the average, scarcely half as much land as that originally assigned to him. Although he lived constantly on the verge of starvation, he fell far behind in the payment of his taxes, so that in 1904 the Tsar, in a moment of forced generosity, canceled the arrears, which the peasants could, in any case, never have paid.

Founding of
the *zemstvos*,
1864

While busied with the emancipation of the serfs, Alexander II was also preparing important reforms in the local governments, which were announced in 1864. Throughout a large portion of the empire district assemblies, called *zemstvos*, were created, consisting of representatives chosen by the landowners and the peasants of the district. These in turn sent representatives to a provincial *zemstvo*. The *zemstvos* were permitted to manage certain local affairs, such as roads, primary schools, hospitals, and sanitary matters. Although carefully watched by the central government, they gave the people some little share in the conduct of public affairs and served to rouse the hope that the Tsar would soon establish a national assembly. But when he was petitioned to do so he replied tartly, "The right of initiative in all matters of reform is indissolubly associated with the autocratic power intrusted to me by God." The Polish revolution and an attempt on his life in 1866 served to strengthen his determination to make no further concessions to liberal ideas, and the police again set to work with such vigor that the very mention of reform became dangerous.

Original
meaning of
nihilism

Under this despotic régime there developed among the more cultivated classes a spirit of opposition, known as *nihilism*.¹ This was not in its origin a frantic terrorism, as commonly supposed, but an intellectual and moral revolt against despotism in the State, bigotry in the Church, and all unreasonable traditions and unfounded prejudices. Absolute sincerity, Kropotkin assures us, was the basis of nihilism. "In the name of that sincerity the nihilist gave up, and asked others to give up, those superstitions, prejudices, habits, and customs which his own reason could not justify. He refused to bend before any authority except that of reason." In short, the nihilist would have agreed with Voltaire, Diderot, and the Encyclopædists in exalting reason as man's sole guide in this mysterious world.

¹ The term "nihilist" was first introduced in Russia by Turgenief in his novel, *Fathers and Children*. It was applied to the chief character on account of his denial of the authority of all tradition. See *Readings*, sect. 94.

Among the younger people of the educated and well-to-do classes many had become dissatisfied with the selfish life they were expected to lead, and longed to do something for humanity. Sons and daughters of wealthy parents abandoned their homes, put on the garb of artisans or peasants, and went among the working people with a view to spreading higher ideals among them and helping them to improve their condition. Clubs for the study of history and political economy were established, and the theories of constitutional and republican government, even of French and German socialism, became familiar to Russians.

The government officials regarded the reformers with the utmost suspicion and began to arrest the more active among them. The prisons were soon crowded and hundreds were banished to Siberia. The Tsar and his police seemed to be the avowed enemies of all progress, and any one who advanced a new idea was punished as if he had committed a murder. The peaceful preparation of the people for representative government could not go on so long as the "Third Section" was arresting men for forming debating clubs. It seemed to the more ardent reformers that there was no course open to them but to declare war on the government as a body of cruel, corrupt tyrants who would keep Russia in darkness forever merely in order that they might continue to fill their own pockets by grinding down the people. They argued that the wicked acts of the officials must be exposed, the government intimidated, and the eyes of the world opened to the horrors of the situation by conspicuous acts of violent retribution. So some of the reformers became *terrorists*, not because they were depraved men or loved bloodshed, but because they were convinced that there was no other way to save their beloved land from the fearful oppression under which it groaned.

In July, 1877, General Trepoff, the chief of the St. Petersburg police, was walking through a prison where a number of men and women were confined for having taken part in a political parade in Kasan. One young man refused to bow to

Origin of
terrorism

Brutal con-
duct of
General
Trepoff, 1877

the general, who thereupon struck him in the face. Upon his attempting to defend himself, Trepoff ordered the prisoner to be brutally beaten in view of the other political prisoners, who could see what went on from the windows of their cells. His companions showed their indignation by loudly cursing Trepoff and breaking up the furniture in their cells. The head of the police took his revenge by ordering the wholesale flogging of the prisoners, both men and women, who were beaten into insensibility, and some of them permanently injured. The matter became known beyond the prison walls and was investigated by an official, who reported that the prison authorities had been guilty of criminal brutality; but Trepoff quietly suppressed the report and nothing was done.

On January 28, following, a young woman by the name of Vera Zassulitch called on General Trepoff and fired a revolver at him. She explained that although she did not know the young man whom he had ordered to be flogged, she hoped to awaken the public conscience by killing the general. She had herself been arrested twelve years before, when a schoolgirl, for taking charge of some letters addressed to a man whom the police suspected. She had been thrown into prison and kept in solitary confinement for two years. Then, since nothing could be found against her, she was released, but immediately rearrested and imprisoned, then exiled to a little town where, however, she was not permitted by the police to remain long but was driven from place to place for ten years, although no one knew of what she was accused. These facts were all brought out at her trial for attempting to kill Trepoff. This aroused widespread interest, and although she pleaded guilty the jury acquitted her.¹ The attempt of the police to arrest

Vera Zassulitch
attempts to
kill Trepoff,
January, 1878

¹ Alexander II had, among his reforms, introduced the jury system, but "political" cases, where there were often no proofs but only suspicions, were usually tried by the government officials or special courts. The case of Vera Zassulitch created so much general sympathy that the government felt that it could not resort to a private trial, and so relied upon a jury which had been carefully selected with the expectation that it would condemn the woman.

her again was frustrated by the intervention of the spectators, and she escaped.

General Trepoff was soon dismissed on the ground, it is reported, that he had succeeded in accumulating a million and a half dollars by corruption; but the extermination of real or suspected revolutionists continued. In 1879 sixteen were hanged and scores sent to the dungeons of St. Petersburg or the mines of Siberia. The terrorists, on their part, retaliated by attacks on the Tsar and his government. A student tried to kill the Tsar as the head and representative of the whole tyrannical system. Other students experimented with explosives, with the result that the bomb became the chosen instrument of terrorism. Attempts were made to blow up a special train on which the Tsar was traveling, and, in another effort to kill him, the Winter Palace in St. Petersburg was wrecked by a revolutionist disguised as a carpenter.

Alexander II consents to permit the representatives of the people to give their opinion on proposed laws

In short, the efforts of the Tsar's officials to check the revolutionists proved vain, and Melikoff, to whom the Tsar had given almost dictatorial powers to suppress the agitation, finally saw that the government must make some concessions in order to pacify its enemies; so he advised Alexander II to grant a species of constitution in which he should agree to convoke an assembly elected by the people, and thereafter ask its opinion and counsel before making new and important laws. This would not, it was urged, materially reduce his autocratic powers, and he finally consented to make the experiment. But it was too late. On the afternoon that he gave his assent to the plan he was assassinated as he was driving to his palace (March, 1881).

Assassination of Alexander II, 1881

Terrorism rapidly declines after the death of Alexander II

While the body of the murdered Tsar was still lying in state, the executive committee of the revolutionists issued a warning to his son and successor, Alexander III, threatening him with the evils to come if he did not yield to their demand for representative government, freedom of speech and of the press, and the right to meet together for the discussion of

political questions.¹ The new Tsar was not, however, moved by the appeal, and the police redoubled their activity. The plans of Melikoff were repudiated, and the autocracy settled back into its usual despotic habits. The liberal-minded Russians had, moreover, been terribly shocked by the murder of a ruler who, in spite of his faults, had freed the serfs, reformed the government in various ways, and even proposed to summon a national assembly.

The terrorists realized that, for the time being, they had nothing to gain by further acts of violence, which would only serve to strengthen the government they were fighting. It was clear that the people at large were not yet ready for a revolution, so the reformers set to work to prepare the way for better things by secretly educating the masses and introducing them to western ideas. They passed from hand to hand revolutionary pamphlets which they succeeded in printing in spite of the police. Some of the leaders left Russia and conducted their publications in Switzerland, Paris, or London, whence they smuggled copies of their papers and pamphlets across the Russian boundary.

The reign of Alexander III (1881-1894) was therefore a period of quiet, during which little progress seemed to be made. The people suffered the oppression of the government officials without active opposition. Their occasional protests were answered by imprisonment, flogging, or exile, for Alexander III and his intimate advisers, especially the Procurator of the Holy Synod, Pobiedonostieff, believed quite as firmly and religiously in autocracy as Nicholas I had done. Freedom and liberalism, they agreed, could only serve to destroy a nation. The Tsar had a right to do anything except limit in any way his own power, and his first duty was to strangle democracy, Europeanism, and liberalism. It was a sin even to admire constitutional government. It was, they held, a good thing that the mass of Russians could not read, for that prevented the infection of

Belief of the reactionists that Russia must be kept "frozen"

¹ See *Readings*, sect. 94.

liberal ideas from spreading as rapidly as it otherwise would. Russia must be kept frozen so that it would not decay.¹

THE INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION IN RUSSIA

The industrial Revolution overtakes Russia

95. It became increasingly difficult, however, to keep Russia frozen, for during the last quarter of the nineteenth century the spread of democratic ideas had been hastened by the coming of the steam engine, the factory, and the locomotive, all of which served to unsettle the humdrum agricultural life which the great majority of the people had led for centuries. In spite of her mineral resources Russia had lagged far behind her western neighbors in the use of machinery. She had little capital and no adequate means of transportation across the vast stretches of country that separated her chief towns, and the governing classes had no taste for manufacturing enterprises.

Witte becomes the Colbert of Russia

The liberation of the serfs, with all its drawbacks, favored the growth of factories, for the peasants were sometimes permitted to leave their villages for the manufacturing centers which were gradually growing up. The appointment of Witte as minister of finance and commerce in 1891 promoted the rapid development of industry, for he held that agricultural countries, powerful as they might be, could never accumulate capital or encourage business enterprise, and were therefore dependent upon manufacturing nations. Like Colbert he undertook to strengthen his country by economic measures. He encouraged the investment of foreign capital in Russia, so that railroads and factories could be built and mines opened. When the Russians complained that they were in this way becoming dependent upon foreigners, Witte cited the example of Peter the Great who, like himself, had had to overcome the

¹ Professor V. G. Simkhovitch has carefully analyzed a work of a reactionary writer, Leontyeff, published in Moscow in 1885, in which these ideas find full expression. See the *International Quarterly*, October, 1904.

opposition of so-called patriots who wished to keep Russia isolated from the world.

A rapid development of Russian business enterprise followed the adoption of Witte's policy. The textile, mineral, and metallic industries have shown the most remarkable advance. The value of the products of these industries doubled between 1887 and 1897; and the number of people employed in them increased from 1,318,048 to 2,098,262. If Napoleon could come once more to Moscow, he would not recognize the city which met his gaze in 1812. It has now become the center of the Russian textile industries, and the sound of a thousand looms and forges announces the creation of a new industrial world. There are in Russia to-day twenty-five cities with a population of one hundred thousand or more, and two of them, — St. Petersburg and Moscow, — have over a million each.

Rapid growth
of Russian
industries,
1887-1897

Along with this industrial development has gone the construction of great railway lines built largely by the government with money borrowed from capitalists in western Europe. Some of the railroads have been constructed chiefly for political and military purposes, but others are designed to connect the great industrial centers. Railway building was first seriously undertaken in Russia after the disasters of the Crimean War, when the soldiers suffered cruel hardships in consequence of the difficulty of obtaining supplies. By 1878 upward of eight thousand miles had been built, connecting the capital with the frontiers of European Russia. In 1885 the railway advance toward the frontiers of India¹ was begun and

Railway
construction
in Russia

¹ The expansion of Russia to the southeast has been very rapid. In 1846 the southern boundary ran along the lower edge of the Aral Sea. In 1863 Russia, claiming that the Turkestan tribesmen pillaged caravans and harried her frontiers, sent forces which captured the cities of Turkestan, Chemkent, and Tashkent, and two years later organized the region into the new province of Russian Turkestan. Shortly afterward the Ameer of Bokhara declared war on the Tsar only to have the Russians occupy the ancient city of Samarkand (where Alexander the Great had halted on his eastward march) and later establish a protectorate over Bokhara which brought them to the borders of Afghanistan. In 1872 the Khan of Khiva was reduced to vassalage. During the following years (1873-1886) the regions to the south, about Merv, down to the borders of Persia and Afghanistan were

within a short time Afghanistan was reached and communication opened to the borders of China. Important lines have also been built in the region between the Black Sea and the Caspian.

The Trans-Siberian railroad

The greatest of all railway undertakings was the Trans-Siberian road, which was rendered necessary for the transportation of soldiers and military supplies to the eastern boundary of the empire. Those interested in its construction urged also that it would serve to develop the trade and industry of Siberia. The chief difficulty lay in raising the necessary capital, and a very large amount was necessary, since the corruption and dishonesty among the Russian officials and contractors is so great that the sum demanded was four or five times larger than would have been required had the work been honestly done.¹ The money was, however, obtained by heavy loans secured from French capitalists, and the crown prince turned the first sod at Vladivostok in May, 1891.

Communication was established between St. Petersburg and the Pacific in 1900, and a branch line southward to Port Arthur was soon finished.² One can now travel in comfort, with few changes of cars, from Havre to Vladivostok, via Paris, Cologne, Berlin, Warsaw, Moscow, Irkutsk on Lake Baikal, and Harbin, a distance of seventy-three hundred miles. The ticket from London to Nagasaki, Japan, is less than two hundred dollars, a little more than half the cost by the Suez Canal. The Russian peasant can travel, in less comfortable cars, from St. Petersburg to Irkutsk, a distance of nearly four thousand miles, for fifteen dollars.

gradually annexed. In 1876 the province of Kokand on the boundary of the Chinese Empire was seized and transformed into the province of Ferghana. By securing railway concessions and making loans to the Shah, the Russians have become powerful in Persia, and thus all along their southeastern frontiers they are struggling for predominance against British influence.

¹ The Manchurian railroad cost the Russian people \$115,000 per mile, while the average cost of an American track across the western plains was originally \$13,000 to \$15,000 a mile.

² See map below, p. 332.

The Industrial Revolution is gradually withdrawing peasants from the villages and transforming them into factory workers and city dwellers. They can be reached more easily than ever before by revolutionary appeals and the teachings of the socialists. Unions are being formed among the workmen, and during recent years many strikes and demonstrations have been organized. The government, alarmed by this new danger, has frequently adopted the policy of sending back the factory employees to the country in order to remove them from revolutionary influences, but the chief result of this has been to spread radical ideas more widely and rapidly than would otherwise have been possible.


Important effects of the Industrial Revolution

THE STRUGGLE FOR LIBERTY UNDER NICHOLAS II

96. When Nicholas II succeeded his father, Alexander III, in 1894,¹ he was but twenty-six years old and there was some reason to hope that he would face the problems of this new industrial Russia in a progressive spirit. He had had an opportunity in his travels to become somewhat familiar with the enlightened governments of western Europe, and one of his

Nicholas II speedily dispels the hopes of the liberals

¹ It may not be superfluous to bring together at this point the names of the Russian rulers in recent times, since their autocratic position has enabled them to play a far more important rôle in public affairs than western monarchs.



first acts was to order the imprisonment of the prefect of police of St. Petersburg for annoying the correspondents of foreign newspapers. The delegations of the zemstvos which came to present addresses of congratulation on his accession to the throne were therefore emboldened to suggest reforms for the empire, and one of them even hinted at a national parliament. Nicholas, however, quickly dispelled any illusions which his more liberal subjects entertained. He expressed his displeasure that the representatives of the zemstvos should fancy that they had any right to say a word about the central government, and informed his people that he was firmly resolved to maintain the old order unchanged. "Let it be understood by all," he declared, "that I shall employ all my powers in the best interests of the people, but the principle of autocracy will be sustained by me as firmly and unswervingly as it was by my never-to-be-forgotten father." Pobiedonostieff, the narrow-minded Procurator of the Holy Synod, and other of the trusted advisers of Alexander III were retained in office, and it was clear that Nicholas would do all he could to keep Russia frozen so as to avoid the decay which he, like his predecessors, believed to be overtaking western Europe.

Censorship
of the press

The censorship of the press was made stricter than ever, one decree alone adding two hundred books, including the works of Herbert Spencer, to the already long list of those which the government condemned.¹ The distinguished historian, Professor Milyoukov, was dismissed from the University of Moscow on the ground of his "generally noxious tendencies," and other teachers were warned not to talk about government.² From the year of the accession of Nicholas there was a steady

¹ Among the books which the government prohibits in public libraries are the Russian translation of Mill's *Political Economy*, Green's *History of the English People*, Bryce's *American Commonwealth*, and Fyffe's *Modern Europe*.

² One may judge of the sober, high-minded scholars upon whom the Russian autocracy believes it essential to make war by reading Professor Milyoukov's *Russia and its Crisis*, which is based on a series of lectures which he delivered in the United States during the year 1903-1904.

increase in the number of people tried for attacking the government or offending its feelings. From fifteen hundred in 1894, the number of persons involved in "political" cases reached a total in the single year, 1903, of no less than twelve thousand, over half of whom were deprived of the ordinary protection afforded by the regular courts and were haled before special tribunals which were supposed to be in full sympathy with the Tsar's despotism. In this way the bureaucracy¹ brought incalculable anxiety and suffering to thousands of innocent, law-abiding citizens while doing little to discourage the violent agitators, who were few in number.

Nowhere did the Tsar show his desire for absolute control more clearly than in his dealings with Finland. When Alexander I had annexed that country in 1809 he had permitted it to retain its own diet and pass its own laws, although it of course recognized the Tsar as its ruler under the title of Grand Duke. The Finns cherished their independence and have in recent times shown themselves one of the most progressive peoples of Europe. In 1899, however, Nicholas began a harsh and relentless *Russification* of Finland. He sent heartless officials, like von Plehve, to represent him and crush out all opposition to his changes. He placed the Finnish army under the Russian minister of war, deprived the diet of the right to control the lawmaking except in some minor and purely local matters, and undertook to substitute the Russian language so far as possible for the Finnish.

Finally, on June 17, 1904, the Russian governor of Finland was assassinated by the son of one of the senators, who then killed himself, leaving a letter in which he explained that he had acted alone and with the simple purpose of forcing on the Tsar's attention the atrocities of his officials. The new governor permitted three newspapers to be started once more

Attempt to
Russify
Finland
given up

¹ This word is commonly applied to governments in which the officials are not elected or controlled by the people and are free to interfere constantly in every one's private affairs. The term is derived from the French *bureau*, the office in which an official transacts his business.

and forbade the Russian officials to interfere in the elections. A year later the Tsar, under the influence of revolution at home and disaster abroad, consented to restore to Finland all her former rights.

Harsh policy
of von Plehve

We must now trace the history of the terrible struggle between the Russian people and their despotic government which began openly in 1904 and is still in progress. In 1902 an unpopular minister of the interior had been assassinated and the Tsar had appointed a still more unpopular man in his place, namely, von Plehve, who was notorious for his success in hunting down those who criticised the government and for the vigor with which he had carried on the Russification of Finland. He at once declared that the existing discontent was due entirely to a handful of evil-minded agitators whom the police would soon catch. He regarded Count Witte, then minister of finance, as a dangerous person, since he had appointed committees to look into the condition of the peasants. Von Plehve severely punished some members of these committees who had ventured to suggest much-needed reforms, and finally succeeded in forcing Witte to resign. He pushed forward the Russification of Poland as well as that of Finland and roused the hatred of the Armenians in the Caucasus by confiscating the property of their churches.

Massacres of
the Jews

Von Plehve joined hands with Pobiedonostieff, the Procurator of the Holy Synod, in the persecution of those among the Tsar's subjects who ventured to disagree with the doctrines of the Russian official Church to which every Russian was supposed to belong. The Jews suffered especially. There were massacres at Kishineff and elsewhere in 1903 which horrified the western world and drove hundreds of thousands of Jews to foreign lands, especially to the United States. There is good reason to believe that von Plehve actually arranged these massacres; he at least did nothing to prevent or discourage the atrocities which were permitted by the local government officials.

Von Plehve was mistaken, however, in his belief that all the trouble came from a handful of deluded fanatics. The twelve thousand persons brought before the courts in 1903 for political offenses were but a very small part of those who detested the cruel and corrupt government which von Plehve represented and defended. While political parties in the sense in which they exist in France or England were impossible in Russia so long as there was no parliament and the police continued to break up public assemblies and prosecute newspapers which dared to discuss political matters, nevertheless the reformers fell into more or less distinct groups and formed secret societies for advancing their ends. Of these groups the more important were the following.

The various political parties opposed to autocracy

There were, first, the professional men, the university professors, the enlightened merchants and manufacturers, and the public-spirited nobility. These were not organized into a distinct party, but have recently come to be known as the constitutional democrats. They hoped that a parliament elected by the people might be established to cooperate with the Tsar and his ministers in making the laws and imposing the taxes. They demanded that all Russians should enjoy those rights which the French had in 1789 included in their Declaration of the Rights of Man, — freedom of speech and of the press, the right to hold public meetings to discuss public questions, the abolition of the hideous police system, of arbitrary imprisonment and religious persecutions, and the gradual improvement of the condition of the peasants and workingmen through the passage of wise laws.

The liberals, or constitutional democrats

In the towns a socialistic party had been growing up which advocated the theories of Karl Marx.¹ It desired, and still desires, all the reforms advocated by the constitutional democrats just described, but looks forward to the time when the workingmen will become so numerous and powerful that they can seize the government offices and assume the management

The social democrats

¹ See below, pp. 396 *sqq.*

of lands, mines, and industries, which shall thereafter be used for the benefit of all rather than for the small class of rich men who now own them. This social democratic party believes that a constituent assembly similar to the French Convention of 1792 should be summoned, and that the representatives of the people should freely decide what form of government Russia needs and wishes. They advocate the abolition of the village communities as an outworn and cumbersome system which contributes to the misery of the peasant. Unlike the reformers next to be described, they do not believe in terrorism or in murderous attacks upon unpopular government officials.

The socialist
revolution-
ary party

The most conspicuous among the Russian agitators are those who belong to the socialist revolutionary party. This is the successor to the People's Will party which made war on the Tsar and his officials at the end of the reign of Alexander II. The social democrats have, in the main, adopted the doctrines and the policy of the German social democrats; the socialist revolutionary party is on the contrary a pure product of Russian conditions. It counts among its adherents many highly intelligent Russian patriots, who seek support among the peasants rather than among the workmen in the factories of the manufacturing towns. Like the social democratic party, it demands a democratic form of government and the ownership by the people of railroads, mines, and industries of national importance. It urges, too, that the landlords should be forced to surrender all their land to the peasants, but instead of abolishing the village communities, they would perpetuate them as an ancient and peculiar national institution of Russia which, if properly managed, will secure the greatest happiness and prosperity to the country people.

Terrorism ad-
vocated by the
socialist
revolutionary
party

The socialist revolutionary party is well organized and has been responsible for the chief acts of violence during the past five years. It maintains that it is right to make war upon the government which is oppressing them and extorting money

from the people to fill the pockets of dishonest officeholders. They select their victims from the most notoriously cruel among the officials, and after a victim has been killed they usually publish a list of the offenses which cost him his life. Lists of those condemned to death are also prepared, after careful consideration, by their executive committee. They do not practice, or in any way approve of, indiscriminate assassination, as is sometimes supposed.¹

The more von Plehve sought to stamp out all protest against the autocracy, the more its enemies increased, and at last in 1904 the revolution in which Russia is now involved may be said to have begun. On February 5th of that year a war opened with Japan, which was due to Russia's encroachments in Korea and her evident intention of permanently depriving China of Manchuria. The liberals attributed the conflict to bad management on the part of the Tsar's officials and declared it to be inhuman and contrary to the interests of the people. In March revolutionary manifestoes appeared, maintaining that the Japanese were quite justified in their claims and urging that no intelligent Russian should help on the war in any way, either by contributions or enlistment.

In June the venerable Count Tolstoi issued a remarkable address to the Tsar, that "unfortunate, entangled young man" who was seizing other people's land and sending men to be murdered in its defense. The Russian Church was, he declared, giving a religious sanction and praying for the success of a war waged "in support of those stupidities, robberies, and every kind of abomination perpetrated in China and Korea by wicked and ambitious men now sitting peacefully in their palaces and expecting new glory, advantage, and profit from the slaughter."

Meanwhile the Japanese were pressing back the Russians, destroying their vessels, and besieging their fortress of Port Arthur,

Great unpopularity of the war with Japan which began in February, 1904

Tolstoi's indictment of the Russian government

Russian reverses

¹ There are, of course, many other smaller political groups and secret societies working for various ends, — patriotic associations in Finland, Poland, and the Caucasus, the socialistic Jewish Union of Associated Workers, etc.

which they had cut off from any aid or supplies. The liberal-minded among the Russians regarded these disasters with a certain satisfaction. The reverses, they held, were due to the incompetence and corruption of the Tsar's officials and served to make plain how very badly autocracy really worked in practice.

Assassina-
tion of von
Plehve, July,
1904

Von Plehve continued, however, in spite of the rising indignation, to encourage the police to break up scientific and literary meetings, in which disapprobation of the government was pretty sure to be expressed, and to send men eminent in science and literature to prison or to Siberia, until, on July 28, 1904, a bomb was thrown under the minister's carriage by a former student in the University of Moscow and his career was brought to an abrupt close. The central committee of the Russian revolutionary socialists then issued an explanation and apology to "the citizens of the world" in which they explained that they were responsible for what they considered a righteous act in "executing" a man who was making war on all those who think, or are striving for the freedom of Russia. They disapproved absolutely of a policy of terrorism in free countries, "but in Russia, where, owing to the reign of despotism, no open political discussion is possible, where there is no redress against the irresponsibility of absolute power throughout the whole bureaucratic organization, we shall be obliged to right the violence of tyranny with the force of revolutionary right."

The govern-
ment shows
some liberal
tendencies
after von
Plehve's
death

The Tsar chose a popular man, Prince Sviatopolk Mirski, to succeed von Plehve; and to celebrate the birth of an heir to the throne Nicholas II abolished the fearful floggings which it had been customary to inflict on the peasants. He also remitted the arrears of taxation, which, as has been said, the peasants could never possibly have paid. Prince Mirski believed that the sympathy of the nation must be won. He accordingly pointed out certain changes which he declared to be necessary, and permitted the newspapers to say what they chose.

He also allowed the representatives of the zemstvos to meet in St. Petersburg in November to discuss reforms. They declared that the intolerable oppression of the government officials must be done away with by establishing fundamental laws which every one, from the Tsar himself to the poorest workman, must obey. Freedom of speech, of conscience, of the press, and of assembling to consider public matters were essential to the welfare of the nation. In view of the grave situation both at home and abroad they expressed the sincere hope that the Tsar would summon the representatives of the nation in order that he might be enabled, with their assistance, to "lead the country into a new path in which the State would develop in accordance with the principle of coöperation between it and the people."

The representatives of the zemstvos present a list of reforms, November 1904

Meanwhile disasters and revolt met the government on every hand. The Japanese continued to force back the Russians in Manchuria in a series of terrific conflicts south of Mukden. In one long battle on the Sha-ho River sixty thousand Russians perished. Their fleets in the East were annihilated, and on January 1, 1905, Port Arthur fell after the most terrible siege on record. The Russian marines mutinied, the reserve troops refused to go to the Far East and escaped to Austria or Germany when they were not driven into the railroad trains at the point of the bayonet. The crops failed and the starving peasants burned and sacked the houses and barns of the nobles, arguing that if the buildings were destroyed the owners could not come back and the Tsar's police could no longer make them their headquarters.

General disorder

The war had produced a stagnation of commerce and industry, and strikes became common. The socialists in Warsaw marched about with knives and revolvers denouncing the war. Students in Moscow and St. Petersburg shouted, "Down with autocracy!" "Stop the war!" It became known that the government officials had been stealing the money that should have gone to strengthen and equip the armies; rifles had been paid

for that had never been delivered, supplies bought which never reached the suffering soldiers, and — most scandalous of all — high Russian dignitaries had even appropriated the funds of the Red Cross Society for aiding the wounded. Russia certainly seemed to be completely thawed by the end of 1904 and, as the Procurator of the Holy Synod had feared, was dissolving into anarchy.

The Tsar
promises re-
forms, De-
cember, 1904

On December 26, 1904, the Tsar issued an imperial *ukase* vaguely promising reforms, which he declared were under consideration and would be put into effect as soon as possible. But he was evidently still under the influence of the conservatives and showed no inclination to give up any of his powers or to aid Prince Mirski to carry out his enlightened plans. His proclamation failed, therefore, to stop agitation.

"Red Sun-
day," Janu-
ary 22, 1905

On Sunday, January 22, a fearful event occurred. The workmen of St. Petersburg, led by a certain Father Gapon, had sent a petition to the Tsar and had informed him that on Sunday they would march to the palace humbly to pray him in person to consider their sufferings, since they had no faith in his officials or ministers. They warned him that his advisers were bringing the country to ruin, and that money was wrung from the impoverished masses to be spent they knew not how. They urged the Tsar to "throw down the wall that separates him from his people" by immediately convoking an assembly which should include representatives even of the working classes. When Sunday morning came, masses of men, women, and children, wholly unarmed, with Father Gapon at their head, attempted to approach the Winter Palace in the pathetic hope that the "Little Father," as they called the Tsar, would listen to their woes. Instead, the Cossacks tried to disperse them with their whips, and then the troops which guarded the palace shot and cut down hundreds, and wounded thousands in a conflict which continued all day. "Red Sunday" was, however, only the most impressive of many similar encounters between peaceful citizens and the Tsar's police and guards.

The day after "Red Sunday" all the leading lawyers and men of letters in St. Petersburg joined in the following declaration: "The public should understand that the government has declared war on the entire Russian people. There is no further doubt on this point. A government which is unable to hold intercourse with the people except with the assistance of sabers and rifles is self-condemned. We summon all the vital energies of Russian society to the assistance of the workmen who began the struggle for the common cause of the whole people. Let shame overwhelm the names of those who, in these days of great and fateful struggle, oppose the people and join the ranks of their hangmen."

Protest of
the men of
letters

The government replied by arresting a number of prominent writers, among them Maxim Gorky, the novelist; and General Trepoff, the younger, notorious for his brutality as head of the police of Moscow, was given full powers to restore order. War was now practically declared between the Russian people and the Tsar's government. But the crimes which the police and other government officials committed and encouraged far exceeded in number and atrocity the violent acts of the revolutionists, who were forced to confine themselves to protests, processions, strikes, and the occasional assassination of a particularly obnoxious representative of the Tsar. But they made free use of these weapons against autocracy. In February the Tsar's uncle, Grand Duke Sergius, was killed by a bomb thrown under his carriage; in May the governor of Baku was removed in the same manner, and other officials from time to time met a similar fate.

Conflict
between the
government
and the
revolutionists

In meeting the present crisis the conduct of the government, supported as it is by the State Church and the army, has been well-nigh incredible to foreigners. Its whole statesmanship has consisted in making promises which it appears to have had no intention of carrying out, and in imprisoning, torturing, exiling, or killing those whom it suspected of being its enemies. The authorities have ordered the Cossacks to disperse peaceful

Savage policy
of the
bureaucracy

processions with their whips or commanded the troops to fire into helpless, unarmed crowds. Government officials have deliberately organized massacres in the name of patriotism, religion, and order. They have supplied the Tartars with rifles to hunt down the Armenians in the Caucasus, who were regarded as revolutionists; and have organized the bands of roughs known as the "Black Hundreds" to represent the spirit of old Russia, and kill and maltreat those who favored reform and progress. The peasants, whom starvation drove to desperate measures, have been flogged and tortured by hundreds, and many of them have been so injured that they never recovered. In one village, where five men had been beaten to death, an outsider ventured to point out that the Tsar had abolished corporal punishment a year before. The officer in charge then ordered the Cossacks "to show that man whether corporal punishment has been abolished or not." Thereupon the unfortunate witness who had dared to protest was flogged into insensibility, and died subsequently on the way to a hospital.

It would be fruitless to enumerate the various reforms which the Tsar has announced during the past three years (1905-1907), since most of them are merely so many promises broken. Neither Nicholas II nor his ministers and officials have shown any inclination to carry out the good intentions which he is forced from time to time to express, hoping thereby to quiet his rebellious people without surrendering any of his tyrannical power. In March, 1905, he reaffirmed "the autocratic power of the Tsar," but exhorted his people to cooperate with him "in the great and sacred task of overcoming the stubborn foreign foe and of eradicating revolt at home."¹ He also declared that he had decided to convene the worthiest men whom the people might elect to confer with him in regard to

Illusory
promises of
Nicholas II

¹ In April, 1905, the disabilities imposed upon those Christians who did not accept the teachings of the Greek Orthodox Church were abolished, and the various sects, which had led a more or less precarious existence, were allowed to worship publicly, in their own way, to hold property, and to become officers in the army.

the laws that should be made. But nothing came of this. Protests, petitions, strikes, assassinations, and mutinies continued, and in June the Tsar appointed General Trepoff minister of police (a worthy successor to his father, whom Vera Zassulitch had tried to kill a generation before), with the expectation that he would check the growing agitation throughout the whole country.

But this expectation was not realized. An assembly of representatives of the zemstvos passed a series of resolutions in July denouncing the outrages perpetrated by the government on the lives and liberties of the people and declaring that an appeal should be made to the nation, since it had proved vain to appeal to the Tsar. The following month a congress of the Peasant Union met in Moscow. It demanded universal suffrage for both men and women over twenty years of age, free elementary education, and free public libraries. Finally the Tsar so far yielded to the pressure of public opinion that on August 19 he promised to summon a *Duma*, or council, which should meet not later than January, 1906. It was to represent all Russia, but to have no further power than that of giving to the still autocratic ruler advice in making the laws.

This was a bitter disappointment to even the most moderate liberals. It was pointed out that both the workingmen and the professional men were excluded by the regulations from voting. The city governments of both Moscow and St. Petersburg protested, and the professors in the various universities declared that they would suspend all their lectures until the people were granted their rights, for otherwise disorders among the students could not be avoided.¹ A more effective measure in bringing the Tsar and his advisers to terms was a

The Tsar finally promises to summon the Duma (August 19, 1905)

The great general strikes, October and November, 1905

¹ By the end of August the peace conference, which, at President Roosevelt's invitation, met at Portsmouth, New Hampshire, had arranged a peace between Russia and Japan (see below, p. 352), but the Russians were so preoccupied with the revolution in progress at home that the conclusion of peace failed to produce any perceptible effects.

great general strike in the interest of reform which began late in October. All the railroads stopped running; in all the great towns the shops, except those that dealt in provisions, were closed; gas and electricity were no longer furnished; the law courts ceased their duties, and even the apothecaries refused to prepare prescriptions until reforms should be granted.

The Tsar promises (October 29, 1905) that no law shall go into force without the Duma's assent

The situation soon became intolerable, and on October 29 the Tsar announced that he had ordered "the government" to grant the people freedom of conscience, speech, and association, and to permit the classes which had been excluded in his first edict to vote for members of the Duma. Lastly, he agreed "to establish an immutable rule that no law can come into force without the approval of the Duma, and that it shall be possible for those whom the people elect to enjoy a real supervision over the legality of the acts of the public officials." He also appointed as prime minister, Count Witte, the least unpopular of his officials. The announcement of this change in policy was greeted with shouts of joy in the streets of St. Petersburg, where surging crowds sang "God save the Tsar" far into the night.

Nevertheless the government continues its atrocious policy and anarchy reigns

The police and Cossacks continued to attack peaceful gatherings, and "Black Hundreds" were organized by the government authorities in Odessa, Tiflis, Riga, and scores of other towns to lead in massacres of the Jews. It was very easy to rouse the ignorant and fanatical masses to plunder and kill the representatives of a race they hated; and since the Jews were commonly revolutionists, the reactionary party could urge that the attacks upon them were good proof of the general hostility of the Russian people to the reforms advocated by the liberals. Count Witte, disregarding the Tsar's October proclamation, rigorously enforced all the former laws hampering the freedom of the press and prohibiting public meetings. He would, however, have admitted some liberals to his cabinet had any of them been willing to be associated with General Trepoff.

The general strike continued, in spite of the Tsar's fair promises of October 29, and even spread to the waiters and domestic servants. After a brief collapse it was renewed at the end of November when the postmen and telegraph operators went out, thus completely paralyzing the business of the country. The Tsar, confident in the loyalty of the army and its ability to maintain his authority, refused to make any further concessions,¹ and the strike had to be abandoned. But anarchy continued; the soldiers, sailors, and workmen of Sebastopol seized the town, and the government was obliged to send an army of twenty thousand troops to recapture it. At Moscow the revolutionists erected barricades and declared open war on the government. They fought with the troops for a week until the barricades were swept by artillery.

Revolts in
Sebastopol
and Moscow

In March, 1906, the Tsar issued a manifesto in which he explained how he proposed to convert his Council of the Empire into a sort of upper house which should coöperate with the Duma and form a parliament for Russia somewhat similar to those of western states. Half the members of the Council were to be appointed by the Tsar himself and half to be chosen by various bodies, e.g. the Synod of the Orthodox Church, the Academy of Sciences and the universities, the various bourses, or exchanges, and the nobility. All laws must be approved by both houses before being submitted to the Tsar.

The Tsar
converts the
Council of
the Empire
into an upper
house of
parliament

The elections for the Duma took place in March and April, and, in spite of the activity of the police, resulted in an overwhelming majority for the constitutional democrats. Witte, finding his position untenable, since he was an object of suspicion both to the inner circle who controlled the government and to the people at large, sadly resigned before the Duma met on May 10, 1906.

Witte resigns

¹ It is true that, by an imperial edict issued in November, the annual amount due the government from the peasants in payment for their lands was reduced to one half for the year 1906, and abolished altogether after January, 1907.

The Duma
received by
the Tsar,
May 10, 1906

The deputies to the Duma assembled in no humble frame of mind. They came exasperated by the disasters of the war and the humiliations of the army and fleet, for all of which they held the ministers and the bureaucracy responsible; they were resolved to demand an account of the public income and expenditures, to punish fraud, hunt down and chastise the guilty, dismiss the corrupt, and purify the whole administration. They were determined, in a word, to give Russia an enlightened, liberal, and righteous constitutional government. Like the members of the Estates General in 1789, they felt that they had the nation behind them. They listened stonily to the Tsar's remarks at the opening session, and it was clear from the first that they would not agree any better with their monarch than the French deputies had agreed with Louis XVI and his courtiers.

The Duma
freely dis-
cusses the
vices of
the Tsar's
government

The first motion made in the Duma related to the freeing of those who had sacrificed their liberty for their country. In its address to the Tsar the assembly laid stress on the necessity of universal suffrage, and the abandoning on the part of the government of all its tyrannical habits. It also urged that there was no hope of progress in regenerating the country so long as the upper house was under the Tsar's personal control and his ministers were in no way responsible to the Duma. It recommended that all the land belonging to the State or the members of the royal house, as well as that of the churches and monasteries, should be turned over to the peasants on long leases. One of its members showed how the Tsar's ministers and their friends had been enriching themselves through the so-called Peasant's Bank. The Duma also discussed the organization of massacres by the police, of which a terrible example occurred in the middle of June. A bill abolishing capital punishment altogether was ardently discussed and finally passed.

Neither the Council of the Empire nor the Tsar's ministers would coöperate with the Duma in any of these measures, and

on July 21 Nicholas II declared that he was "cruelly disappointed" that the deputies had not confined themselves to their proper duties and had commented upon many matters which belonged to him. He accordingly dissolved the Duma, as he had a perfect right to do, fixed March 5, 1907, as the date for the meeting of a new Duma, and appointed Stolypin premier, — an office he still holds (December, 1907).

The Tsar dissolves the Duma, July 21, 1906

The dissolution of the Duma created no general disturbance, but a number of the deputies retired to Viborg, in Finland, to talk over their grievances. Two hundred and thirty of them, belonging to the constitutional democratic and the labor parties, signed a manifesto in which they declared that the Tsar had hastily dissolved the Duma in the midst of its work; and they exhorted the people to give the government no more money or soldiers since the Tsar had no right to either without the consent of the Duma. Most of these ex-deputies were prosecuted for signing the manifesto and excluded from the coming Duma.

The protest of Viborg

The revolutionists made an unsuccessful attempt in August to blow up Premier Stolypin in his country house and continued to assassinate governors and police officials. The "Black Hundreds," on the other hand, went on massacring Jews and liberals while the government established courts-martial to insure the speedy trial and immediate execution of revolutionists. In the two months, September and October, 1906, these courts summarily condemned three hundred persons to be shot or hanged. During the whole year some nine thousand persons were killed or wounded for political reasons.

Atrocities and disorder continue

A terrible famine was afflicting the land at the end of the year and it was discovered that a member of the Tsar's ministry had been stealing the money appropriated to furnish grain to the dying peasants. An observer who had traveled eight hundred miles through the famine-stricken district reported that he did not find a single village where the peasants had food enough for themselves or their cattle. In some places the

Famine added to the other disasters

peasants were reduced to eating bark and the straw used for their thatch roofs.

Dissolution
of the village
communities,
November,
1906

In October a ukase permitted the peasants to leave their particular village community and join another, or to seek employment elsewhere. On November 25 the peasants were empowered to become owners of their allotments and all redemption dues were remitted. This constitutes a practical abolition of the system of ownership by village communities, but it is too soon to say whether the law will be really carried out and what will be its results if it is.

Second
Duma meets
March 5,
1907

In accordance with the Tsar's imperial promise the second Duma met on March 5, 1907. The government had declared ineligible a majority of the former Duma. It had excluded Milyoukov and all the other constitutional democrats that it could, and its efforts resulted in the election of a rather large conservative "right." But many socialists were returned, and the opponents of the government still had a large majority. The Duma promptly appointed a great number of committees to consider the financial situation, the reform of the criminal law, the condition of the peasants, and other pressing matters. It soon became apparent that the Tsar and his advisers were not prepared to submit to the control of the Duma. Early in June Stolypin ordered the assembly to give up sixteen of its members to the police and expel forty others on the ground that they were implicated in a plot to overthrow the Tsar. The Duma appointed a committee to consider the merits of the case, but the police hastened to arrest the alleged leaders in the conspiracy, and the Tsar immediately dissolved the assembly for refusing to surrender its accused members upon his demand.

The Tsar
dissolves the
second Duma
June, 1907

New election
regulations

In order that the third Duma should be more docile than the first two, the Tsar and his ministers issued, quite unconstitutionally, a new set of regulations for the coming elections. Poland was deprived of two thirds of its representatives, while those from the cities were so greatly reduced that only St. Petersburg, Moscow, Kiev, Odessa, Warsaw, Lodz, and Riga

could send any deputies at all. The influence of the peasants, whom the government has found almost as radical as the workmen of the towns, was also much diminished.

As a result of these unconstitutional measures the third Duma, which met on November 14, 1907, contained a much larger number of large landowners, retired government officials, priests and other conservative members than the former assemblies. Nevertheless, on November 26, by a vote of 246 to 112, it declared that the title, Autocrat, "is no longer justifiable in the Russian State and is incompatible with the system inaugurated by the manifesto issued by Emperor Nicholas on October 29, 1905."

The third Duma condemns the title, Autocrat, November 26, 1907

It is clear from what has been said that autocracy is dying very hard in Russia. The Tsar has established a parliament consisting of the Duma and the Council of the Empire. He has agreed that no law shall go into force without the assent of the representatives of the people. He, however, still retains the title of Autocrat, and his officials continue to violate all the principles of civil and political liberty and even the Tsar's own manifestoes, by abusing and oppressing the people and preventing them from discussing public questions.

Autocracy is dying hard

In spite of the famines and bad government the population of Russia is increasing very rapidly. There appear to have been about forty-five million inhabitants in the whole empire in 1815; now there are nearly one hundred and fifty millions, or more than a threefold increase.¹ While there are indications that there is a deterioration in the recruits examined for the army, which shows that the people are wretchedly underfed, it is possible that the breaking up of the village communities and the influence of the Duma may at last put the peasant in a position to support himself and his family in tolerable comfort.

General condition of the people

¹ The population in round numbers is distributed as follows:

European Russia,	108,000,000	Caucasus,	10,000,000
Poland,	11,000,000	Siberia,	6,500,000
Finland,	3,000,000	Central Asian Provinces,	9,000,000

REFERENCES

Russia in 1815 : SEIGNOBOS, *Political History of Europe since 1814*, pp. 578-581; SKRINE, *Expansion of Russia*, pp. 8-13; *Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. X, chap. xiii, pp. 413-439.

Alexander I and Domestic Reforms : SKRINE, pp. 15-85; RAMBAUD, *History of Russia*, Vol. II, pp. 383-399.

Despotism under Nicholas I : SKRINE, pp. 86-164; SEIGNOBOS, pp. 585-590.

The Emancipation of the Serfs : SEIGNOBOS, pp. 591-596; RAMBAUD, Vol. III, pp. 212-228; SKRINE, pp. 178-191.

Growth of Opposition to Absolutism : SEIGNOBOS, pp. 603-608; RAMBAUD, Vol. III, pp. 382-388; SKRINE, pp. 214-222, 265-270; ROSE, *The Development of European Nations*, Vol. I, pp. 344-376.

The Industrial Revolution in Russia : SKRINE, pp. 313-321.

Russia under Nicholas II : SKRINE, pp. 321-348.

CHAPTER XXIX

TURKEY AND THE EASTERN QUESTION

THE GREEK WAR OF INDEPENDENCE

97. It has been necessary in our narrative to refer now and again to the Sultan of Turkey, and especially to his troubles with his neighbors, Russia and Austria. Since the days of Louis XIV his power has been steadily declining and some serious wars have been fought among the European states over the disposal of the European portion of his dominions. The Turk, notwithstanding his long residence in southeastern Europe, has never accepted either the civilization of the West or the Christian religion in any of its forms. Consequently the Christian powers, especially Russia, have from time to time assumed the right to protect the Sultan's Christian subjects from the barbarities of his Mohammedan officials, and have made more or less futile attempts to force him to reform his government. In order to understand this "Eastern question," — which has involved the gradual expulsion of the Turks from Europe, the interminable quarrel over the Sultan's government and finances, and the formation of the new states of Servia, Roumania, Greece, and Bulgaria, — it is necessary to turn back, for the moment, to the origin of the Turkish Empire in Europe.

Although there had been an almost steady conflict between the Cross and the Crescent ever since the days of Mohammed, it was not until the fourteenth century that southeastern Europe was threatened by a Mohammedan invasion. Under Othman (died 1326) a Turkish tribe from western Asia established itself in Asia Minor, across the Bosphorus from Constantinople. From their leader they derived the name of Ottoman Turks,

European Turkey the source of many dissensions among the powers

The advance and decline of Turkish power in Europe

to distinguish them from the Seljuk Turks with whom the Crusaders had in earlier centuries come in contact. Under successive sultans the Ottoman Turks extended their territory eastward into Asia Minor, Syria, Arabia, and Egypt, while to the west they conquered the Balkan regions and Greece. In 1453 the capital of the Eastern Empire, Constantinople, fell into their hands, and for a hundred and fifty years thereafter they were a source of serious apprehension to the states of western Europe. Faithful Catholics were commanded by the Pope to send up a prayer each day as the noon bell rang, that God might deliver them from the on-coming infidel.

The Turks pushed up the valley of the Danube almost to the borders of the German Empire, and for nearly two centuries the republic of Venice and the House of Hapsburg were engaged in an almost continuous war with them. In 1683 they laid siege to Vienna, but were defeated by the Polish king, John Sobieski, who came to the relief of the Austrians. The following year, the Emperor, Poland, and Venice formed a Holy League, which for fifteen years waged an intermittent war against the infidels (in which Peter the Great joined) and which, by 1699, succeeded in forcing the Turks out of Hungary.

While Turkey ceased, thereafter, to be dangerously aggressive, she was able for several decades to resist the efforts of Russia and Austria to deprive her of further territory. In 1768 Catharine the Great became involved in a war with the Sultan and was able, as will be remembered, to destroy his fleet.¹ In 1774, however, the Tsarina agreed to restore most of the conquests she had made during the war, but managed to secure the Crimea and the region about the Sea of Azof, thus giving Russia a permanent foothold on the Black Sea. Moreover the Porte, as the Turkish government is commonly called, conceded to Russia the right to protect the Sultan's Christian subjects, most of whom were adherents of the Orthodox Greek Church, the State Church of Russia.²

¹ See above, Vol. I, p. 76.

² See above, p. 269, note.

Catharine the Great wins territory on the Black Sea

These and other provisions seemed to give the Russians an excuse for intervening in Turkish affairs, and offered an opportunity for fomenting discontent among the Sultan's Christian subjects. Europe began to suspect, rightly enough, that this was the first step on the part of Russia toward an expulsion of the Turk in her own interest. Alexander I was only too happy when, some years later, Napoleon suggested that the Tsar should add certain Turkish territories to his realms as an offset to the French annexation in other quarters. In 1812, just before Napoleon's march on Moscow, Alexander forced Turkey to cede to him Bessarabia on the Black Sea, which still remains the last of Russia's conquests toward the southwest.

Russian
influence in
Turkey

Shortly after the Congress of Vienna, the Servians, who had for a number of years been in revolt against the Turks, were able to establish their practical independence (1817), and Servia, with Belgrade as its capital, became a principality tributary to Turkey. This was the first of a series of states which have reëmerged, during the nineteenth century, from beneath the Mohammedan inundation.

Servia be-
comes a
tributary
principality,
1817

The next state to gain its independence was Greece, whose long conflict against Turkish despotism aroused throughout Europe the sympathy of all who appreciated the glories of ancient Greece. The inhabitants of the land of Plato, Aristotle, and Demosthenes were, it is true, scarcely to be regarded as descendants of the Greeks, and the language they spoke bore little resemblance to the ancient tongue. Two thousand years had brought in alien peoples who cared little or nothing for the perpetuation of the culture of their predecessors. At the opening of the nineteenth century, however, the national spirit once more awoke in Greece, and able writers made modern Greek a literary language and employed it in stirring appeals to the patriotism of their fellow-countrymen.

The national
spirit
awakens
in Greece

In 1821 an insurrection broke out in Morea, as the ancient Peloponnesus is now called. The revolutionists were supported by the clergy of the Greek Church, who proclaimed

The independence of Greece declared January, 1822

a savage war of extermination against the infidel. The movement spread through the peninsula; the atrocities of the Turk were rivaled by those of the Greeks, and thousands of Mohammedans — men, women, and children — were slaughtered. On January 27, 1822, the Greek National Assembly issued a proclamation of independence in which they declared, as descendants “of the wise and noble peoples of Hellas,” that they “found it no longer possible to suffer without cowardice and self-contempt the cruel yoke of the Ottoman power, which has weighed upon us for more than four centuries.”¹

Sympathy of western Europe for the cause of Greek independence

To Metternich all this seemed only an unforeseen illustration of the dangers of revolution, but the liberals throughout Europe enthusiastically sympathized with the Greek revolt, since it was carried on in the name of national liberty. Intellectual men in England, France, Germany, and the United States held meetings to express sympathy for the cause, while to the ardent Christian it seemed a righteous war against infidels and persecutors. Soldiers and supplies poured into Greece. The most famous, perhaps, of the volunteers was Lord Byron, who in 1824 sacrificed his life for the cause which his pen had already done much to promote. Indeed, the Greeks could scarcely have freed themselves had the European powers refused to intervene.

The powers intervene in the war for Grecian independence



It is needless to follow the long negotiations between the various European courts in connection with Greek affairs. In 1827 England, France, and Russia signed a treaty at London providing for a joint adjustment of the difficulty, on the ground that it was necessary to put an end to the sanguinary struggle which left Greece and the adjacent islands a prey “to all the disasters of anarchy, and daily causes fresh impediments to the commerce of Europe.” The Porte having refused to accept the mediation of the allies, their combined fleets destroyed that of the Sultan at Navarino in October, 1827. Thereupon the Porte declared a “holy war” on the

The Turks defeated at Navarino, 1827

¹ See *Readings*, sect. 97.

SOUTHEASTERN EUROPE 1907

Scale of Miles.
0 100 200 300 400





unbelievers, especially the Russians. But the latter were prepared to push the war with vigor, and they not only actively promoted the freedom of Greece, but forced the Sultan to grant practical independence to the Danubian principalities of Wallachia and Moldavia, which came thereby under Russian influence. Turkey was no longer able to oppose the wishes of the allies, and in 1832 Greece became an independent state, choosing for its king Prince Otto of Bavaria.

Wallachia
and Moldavia

Establish-
ment of the
kingdom of
Greece, 1832

THE CRIMEAN WAR (1854-1856)

98. The success of the powers in their intervention in behalf of Greek independence led the Tsar Nicholas I to hint to the English ambassador at St. Petersburg that the "Sick Man of the East," as he called the Sultan, was at the point of death and that arrangements should be made for the settlement of his estate. England, however, had no sympathy with any further partition of the Turkish dominions, since she opposed the expansion of Russia to the south, and believed that it was to her interest that Constantinople and the narrow Bosphorus and Dardanelles should remain in the hands of the Turks, thus preventing Russia from free access to the Mediterranean. A fresh excuse for interfering in Turkish affairs was, however, afforded the Tsar in 1853. Complaints reached him that Christian pilgrims were not permitted by the Turks (who had long been in possession of the Holy Land and Jerusalem) freely to visit the places made sacred by their associations with the life of Jesus. Russia seemed the natural protector of those, at least, who adhered to her own form of Christianity, and the Russian ambassador rudely demanded that the Porte should grant the Tsar a protectorate over all the Christians in Turkey.

The inter-
national con-
troversy over
the protec-
tion of
Christians
in Turkey

When news of this situation reached Paris Napoleon III, who had recently become emperor and was anxious to take a hand in European affairs, declared that France, in virtue of earlier treaties with the Porte, enjoyed the right to protect

France and
England
declare war
on Russia

Catholic Christians. He found an ally in England, whose ambassador accordingly advised the Sultan not to accede to Russia's demands. When the Tsar's troops marched into the Turkish dominions France and England came to the Sultan's assistance and declared war upon the Tsar in 1854.

The Crimean
War

The Crimean War which followed owes its name to the fact that the operations of the allies against Russia culminated in the long siege of Sebastopol, which lies in the southern part of the Crimean peninsula. Every victory won by the allies was dearly bought. The English soldiers suffered at first in consequence of the inefficiency of the home government in sending them the necessary supplies. The charge of the light brigade at Balaklava, which has been made famous by Tennyson's poem, and the engagement at Inkerman were small compensation for the immense losses and hardships endured by both the French and the English. Russia was, however, disheartened by the sufferings of her own soldiers, the inefficiency and corruption of her officials, and the final loss of the mighty fortress of Sebastopol. She saw, moreover, that her near neighbor, Austria, was about to join her enemies. The new Tsar Alexander II, therefore, consented in 1856 to the terms of a treaty drawn up at Paris.¹

Terms of
the Treaty
of Paris, 1856

This treaty recognized the independence of the Ottoman Empire and guaranteed its territorial integrity. The "Sublime Porte" was also included within the scope of the international law of Europe, from which it had hitherto been excluded as a barbarous government, and the other powers agreed not to interfere further with the domestic affairs of Turkey. The Sultan drew up a special decree in which he referred to "his generous intentions towards his Christian subjects" and promised religious liberty as well as reforms in the government. The Black Sea was declared neutral territory and its waters thrown open

The Black
Sea declared
neutral

¹ It will be remembered that Sardinia had joined the allies against Russia, and in this way forced the powers to admit it to the deliberations at Paris where Cavour seized the opportunity to plead the cause of Italy. See above, p. 95.

to merchant ships of all nations, but no war ships were to pass through the Bosphorus or Dardanelles. In short, Turkey was preserved and strengthened by the intervention of the powers as a bulwark against Russian encroachment into the Balkan peninsula, but nothing was really done to reform the Turkish administration or to make the lot of the Christian subjects more secure.

REVOLTS IN THE BALKAN PENINSULA

99. Some idea of the situation of the people under the Sultan's rule may be derived from the report of an English traveler (Mr. Arthur Evans) in 1875. In the Turkish provinces of Bosnia and Herzegovina he found that outside the large towns, where European consuls were present, neither the honor, property, nor lives of the Christians were safe, because the authorities were blind to any outrage committed by a Mohammedan. The Sultan's taxes fell principally on the peasants in the form of a tenth of their produce. It was a common custom for the collectors (who were often not Mohammedans but brutal Christians) to require the peasant to pay the tax in cash before the harvesting of the ripe crop, and if he could not meet the charges, the taxgatherer simply said, "Then your harvest shall rot on the ground till you pay it." When this oppression was resisted the most cruel punishments were meted out to the offenders. "In the heat of summer," runs the account, "men are stripped naked and tied to a tree, smeared over with honey or other sweet stuff and left to the tender mercies of the insect world. For winter extortion it is found convenient to bind people to stakes and leave them barefooted to be frost-bitten; or at other times they are shoved into a pigsty and cold water poured on them. A favorite plan is to drive a party of rayahs (peasants) up a tree or into a chamber and then smoke them with green wood. Instances are recorded of Bosnian peasants being buried up to their heads in earth and left to repent at leisure."

Terrible conditions in Bosnia and Herzegovina under Turkish rule

The
Bulgarian
atrocities
(1876)

In 1874 a failure of crops aggravated the intolerable conditions and an insurrection broke out in Bosnia and Herzegovina which set the whole Balkan peninsula aflame. For the Bulgarians around Philippopolis, incited to hopes of independence by the events in the states to the west, assassinated some of the Turkish officials and gave the Ottoman government a pretext for the most terrible atrocities in the history of Turkish rule in Europe. Thousands of troops and camp followers were poured into the revolted regions; sixty-five villages in the upper valley of the Maritza River were almost entirely destroyed; and in the flourishing town of Batak five thousand men, women, and children were subjected to the most horrible treatment and then butchered in cold blood.

Gladstone
pleads with
his country-
men to aid
the Balkan
Christians

While the European powers, in their usual fashion, were exchanging futile diplomatic notes on the situation, Servia and Montenegro declared war on the Sultan, and the Christians in the Balkan region made a frantic appeal to the West for immediate help. A good deal naturally depended on the position taken by England,—the stanch defender of Turkey. Gladstone, then leader of the Liberals, turned his main attention for some time to the Eastern question. In impassioned appeals to his fellow-countrymen he urged that the time had come to break the unholy alliance between England and “the unspeakable Turk.” Bosnia, Herzegovina, and Bulgaria should receive English help and protection and be delivered from “an intolerable burden of woe and shame.”

Beaconsfield
“bolsters
up” Turkey
against
Russia

But Gladstone's party was not in power, and Lord Beaconsfield was fearful that English encouragement to the Slavic rebels in the Sultan's dominions would only result in their becoming independent and allying themselves with England's enemy, Russia. The Suez Canal had now been constructed, and as it formed the gateway to India, Australia, and the East, England was opposed to any extension of Russian influence which might endanger freedom of navigation in eastern waters. The English, therefore, believed that in the interest of their trade

they must continue to resist any movement which might destroy the power of the Sultan, who was not likely to hamper their eastern commerce.

The negotiations of the powers having come to nothing, Russia determined, in 1877, to act alone. Her declaration of war was shortly followed by Russian victories, and in 1878 a Russian army entered Adrianople, — which was equivalent to an announcement to the world that Ottoman dominion in Europe had come to an end. England protested, but the Sultan was forced to sign the Treaty of San Stefano with the Tsar and to recognize the complete independence of Servia, Montenegro, and Roumania,¹ while Bulgaria was made independent except for the payment of tribute to the Sultan.

England expressed serious objections to this treaty and forced Tsar Alexander II to submit the whole matter to the consideration of a general European Congress at Berlin, where, after prolonged and stormy sessions, the powers agreed to many of the terms of the Treaty of San Stefano. The Tsar was permitted to annex a district to the east of the Black Sea including the towns of Batum and Kars. The provinces of Bosnia and Herzegovina were to be occupied and administered by Austria-Hungary.²

The territorial settlement at Berlin, like that at Vienna half a century before, disregarded many national aspirations. The Bulgarians were especially disappointed with the arrangement, for, instead of being all united in one state, as they had hoped, they were separated into three distinct divisions. The region between the Danube and the Balkans, with some slight additions, became the principality of Bulgaria, tributary to the Sultan. The region to the south was made a Turkish province, Eastern Roumelia, under a Christian governor general.

¹ In 1862 the so-called "Danubian Provinces" of Moldavia and Wallachia had formed a voluntary union under the name "Roumania." In 1866 the Roumanians chose for their ruler a German prince, Charles of Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen, who in 1881 was proclaimed King of Roumania as Carol I. See below, p. 316.

² See above, pp. 128-129.

Russia overwhelms the Sultan in a short war, 1877-1878

England forces a settlement of Turkish affairs in the Berlin Conference, 1878

The Bulgarians discontented with the Berlin Treaty

The third division, comprising a large portion of Macedonia and the region about Adrianople, was left under the direct administration of Turkish officials.

Union of
Bulgaria and
Eastern Rou-
melia, 1885

Under the terms of the treaty the inhabitants of the Bulgarian principality proceeded to frame a constitution and chose as their prince, Alexander of Battenberg. They adopted as their watchword, "Bulgaria for the Bulgarians," and took the first step toward the reunion of their race by a bloodless revolution in 1885 which joined Eastern Roumelia and Bulgaria.¹ Agitation to secure the third section of the country which the Bulgarians hope to annex has not yet produced any result beyond keeping up a constant state of friction with the Turks.

Russian
influences
disturb
Bulgarian
politics

This division of the Bulgarian people, as well as their subjection to the Sultan as a tributary state, exactly suited the designs of the Western powers, who feared that an independent Bulgaria might come under the influence of Russia and join her in destroying the vestiges of Turkish dominion in Europe. Russia has nevertheless endeavored to control Bulgaria. Finding the new prince, Alexander, acting as a patriotic Bulgarian and opposing her interventions, she supported a domestic conspiracy against him which resulted in his abdication in 1886. This bold stroke, however, proved of little permanent advantage to the Russians, for Alexander's successor, Ferdinand of Coburg, favored the policy of Stambuloff, president of the Bulgarian parliament, — an able statesman and a bitter enemy of the Tsar. It was not until the assassination of Stambuloff in 1895 that the Russian party again became dominant, and at present the Bulgarians look to their powerful northern neighbor for help in gaining the complete independence which they hope to secure whenever another general upheaval in the East takes place.

Progress of
the Bulgarian
principality

Notwithstanding her foreign troubles, Bulgaria has made steady progress in government and industry and is regarded as a rising power among the states of southeastern Europe.

¹ This clear violation of the Treaty of Berlin was sanctioned in 1886 when the powers recognized the Bulgarian prince as governor general of Eastern Roumelia.

The constitution of the principality is very democratic, — at least in form, — for all laws are made by a national assembly elected by popular vote, and the government is carried on by a responsible ministry. Although the people at large, of whom about three fourths are peasants, take little interest in political questions, the government is encouraging education by supporting schools and public libraries. Woolen and cotton manufactures are flourishing; iron, coal, and salt mines are being developed; railways connect Sofia, the capital, with Constantinople, on the one hand, and western Europe on the other; and every year thousands of ships trading with Asia and Europe enter and clear from the ports of Varna and Bourgas on the Black Sea.

Thus the Turkish Empire in Europe has shrunk to a narrow strip of territory, — less in extent than the state of Missouri, — extending from the Black Sea to the Adriatic, to which the name Macedonia is generally applied. This area is broken everywhere by mountain ranges and is inhabited by such a complicated mixture of races that it has been aptly called “a perfect ethnographic museum.” Along the coast line of the Ægean Sea and the borders of Greece the Greeks, numbering roughly three hundred thousand, predominate. To the north and east, over against Bulgaria and Eastern Roumelia, dwell Bulgarians who have not yet been incorporated into the principality of Bulgaria. In the north-central regions are the Serbs, who are not sharply marked off from the Bulgarians because the languages of the two peoples, though differing in Servia and Bulgaria, are somewhat blended in the Macedonian regions. Scattered through the central districts are the Macedonian “Rumans,” of old Thracian stock, but roughly latinized in language and civilization by the Roman colonists who settled in this country after the Roman conquest of Greece. In the west, bordering on the Adriatic, are the Albanians, a wild people, primitive in their civilization and lawless in their habits. Almost two thirds of them have accepted Mohammedanism, and they

Turkish
dominion in
Europe now
restricted
to the Mace-
donian region
inhabited by
Greeks, Bul-
garians, Ser-
vians, Rou-
manians, and
Albanians

are often used by the Sultan to overawe their Christian neighbors in the rest of Macedonia.

Disorders in
Macedonia

Clearly a population representing so many races, and varying in stages of culture from wild mountain outlaws to orderly industrial communities, would present grave problems even to a government which was entirely honest and efficient. As it is, Christian bandits carry off other Christians into the mountains and hold them for ransom; isolated uprisings often result in the assassination of the Mohammedan officials in the district; and constant friction between the two faiths makes orderly government impossible.

The Ottoman
government
despotic, cor-
rupt, and
inefficient

Moreover the whole situation is greatly complicated by the character of the Ottoman government. In the first place, it is thoroughly despotic and not controlled by any assembly representing the interests and wishes of its subjects. The Sultan appoints all the ministers who preside over the various departments of government, chief among whom is the Grand Vizier. This ministry, called the Porte, has a strong rival in the household officials of the Sultan's palace, who often sway him by personal influence against the advice of political experts. All the governors of the provinces into which the empire is divided and all judges and officials of high rank are appointed by the Sultan and his councilors.

In the second place, the Sultan's administration of the empire is undoubtedly inefficient and corrupt. In the words of Mr. Edwin Pears, long prominent among the Europeans in Turkey: "The higher officials have usually to buy their places, and in return they exact from those below them, and especially from the peasants, Turkish as well as Christian, all that they can get. Salaries are irregularly paid, justice is bought and sold. Trade is hampered until much of it is driven away from the country. Life and property are not secure. Tax farmers have to bribe to obtain their contracts and in return are allowed to exact double or more from the agriculturalist than they are lawfully entitled to receive."

Finally the Ottoman officials in European Turkey are alien in faith and nationality to the bulk of the population, and thus arouse racial and religious prejudices in addition to the natural dislike for oppressive government officials. The Koran commands them to regard "the people of the book," as they call the Christians, as distinctly inferior, and therefore they despise the Christian peasants and have no hesitancy in robbing and maltreating them. Despotic, corrupt, foreign, and burdensome, the Turkish government in Macedonia is bound to excite opposition and disorder, in which it cannot be denied that many of the Christians delight to share. Lingered only by the sufferance of the powers, it seems inevitably doomed to extinction.

The Moham-
medans re-
gard their
Christian
subjects as
inferior

THE INDEPENDENT BALKAN STATES

100. Unhappy as are the Macedonian peoples still under direct rule of the Sultan, it can scarcely be said that the success of the independent states—Greece, Servia, Roumania, and Montenegro—is such as to encourage greatly those who advocate self-government for the minor nations in the Balkan regions. Shortly after winning their independence the Greeks revolted against their newly chosen sovereign because he attempted to rule arbitrarily, and in 1862 they expelled him from his kingdom and chose in his stead the present ruler, George I, son of the former king of Denmark.¹ In the mountain regions bands of brigands were long so powerful as to defy the police and make traveling dangerous. The fertile soil of the valleys is badly tilled by an ignorant peasantry overburdened with taxes, and the persistent efforts of the government to educate the people still leaves about one third of the population illiterate.

Develop-
ment of
Greece since
independence

Notwithstanding adverse circumstances, the Greeks are ambitious to become a great and enlightened nation, and they

¹ After the expulsion of Otto the Greeks drew up their present constitution (1864), which provides for a parliament of one chamber elected by popular vote.

Efforts to bring all Greeks within the kingdom have so far failed

have driven themselves almost into bankruptcy in the construction of canals, railways, and roads, and in the maintenance of a large army. They regard themselves as morally bound to free, as soon as possible, their fellow Greeks still under Ottoman rule in Macedonia, Asia Minor, Crete, and the other islands in the eastern Mediterranean, and in 1897 they declared war on Turkey in the hope of accomplishing their long-cherished designs. Though sadly worsted in this war, they have not ceased to encourage agitation in Crete, but Great Britain, France, Russia, and Italy guard it in the name of the Sultan.¹

Revolutions in Servia

Nowhere in the Balkan regions has the experiment of self-government been less successful than in the kingdom of Servia, which was declared independent in 1878 after about sixty years of practical exemption from Turkish authority. Its ruler, who, in 1882, assumed the title of King Milan I, proved to be both despotic and immoral, and the radicals among his subjects forced him to call a national assembly, which drew up a new constitution in 1889. Angered at this interference, Milan abdicated, declaring that he would not be a puppet king. His son, Alexander, proved even less acceptable to the nation, for he suspended the new constitution, and recalled his father from exile. In 1903 King Alexander was assassinated by some discontented army officers, and the Servians then chose for their ruler Peter Karageorgevitch, the grandson of Kara George, or "Black George," who in the early part of the nineteenth century had led the struggle for independence and become a national hero.

Roumania troubled with agrarian disorders

Although the Roumanian kingdom has undergone no palace revolutions like the neighboring Servia, it has suffered from political agitations and agrarian disorders. In spite of two subsequent modifications, the constitution drawn up in 1866 is so arranged as to exclude the great majority of the people

¹ After two years of civil war in Crete the powers gave the king of Greece the right to nominate the Cretan governor, or high commissioner as he is called, and in February, 1907, a new constitution was drawn up for Crete.

from voting. At the elections of 1905 there were less than one hundred thousand voters out of a population of nearly six millions, and this state of affairs rouses the constant protests of a rapidly growing radical party. Even more serious, however, than the political agitation, is the unrest among the peasants who compose the vast majority of the nation. They claim that ever since the emancipation of the serfs, in 1864, they have been the victims of grasping money lenders and tyrannical landlords, and in 1907 they broke out into an open revolt which required a large army to suppress it.

The petty principality of Montenegro, smaller in area than the state of Connecticut and with a population of about two hundred and thirty thousand, has caused Europe more trouble than its size warrants, but since it became independent in 1878 it has ceased to be of any particular interest. Until 1905 it was governed by an absolute prince, but he was at last forced to adopt the fashion of western Europe and establish constitutional government with a parliament elected by popular vote.

Montenegro
secures con-
stitutional
government,
1905

REFERENCES

The Turkish Empire in 1814: SEIGNOBOS, *Political History of Europe since 1814*, pp. 616-619.

The Establishment of Grecian Independence: SEIGNOBOS, pp. 619-621, 648-652; PHILLIPS, *Modern History, 1815-1899*, pp. 145-167.

The Crimean War: SEIGNOBOS, pp. 789-793; SKRINE, *Expansion of Russia*, pp. 154-178; FYFFE, *History of Modern Europe*, pp. 824-865; RAMBAUD, *History of Russia*, Vol. III, pp. 85-206; KENDALL, *Source Book of English History*, pp. 427-434.

The Eastern Question: ROSE, *Development of European Nations*, Vol. I, pp. 184-224.

The Russo-Turkish War and the Settlement of 1878: SEIGNOBOS, pp. 823-827; SKRINE, pp. 245-264; FYFFE, pp. 1020-1052; PHILLIPS, pp. 486-523; RAMBAUD, Vol. III, pp. 325-381; ROSE, Vol. I, pp. 225-298.

Roumania: SEIGNOBOS, pp. 640-648.

Servia, Montenegro, and Bulgaria: SEIGNOBOS, pp. 657-669; ROSE, Vol. I, pp. 299-343.

CHAPTER XXX

THE EXPANSION OF EUROPE IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

THE GROWTH OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE AND COMPETITION : IMPERIALISM

England the leading industrial nation of the world in 1815

101. During the first half of the nineteenth century, England stood easily at the head of all the nations of the world in the output of her mines and factories and the vast extent of her commerce. She had laid the foundations for this supremacy during the eighteenth century, when she gained the control of India and Canada and certain important islands, and in the early part of the nineteenth century, when she secured her interests in southern Africa, Australia, and New Zealand. This expansion enabled her to reap the full advantage of her new machinery, which had so marvelously increased her power of production. No invading armies had harried her fields, burned her shipping, or sacked her towns. Indeed, the wars from which the Continent suffered, usually served to increase rather than lessen England's prosperity, owing to the demand they caused for the products of her looms and foundries.

Under these circumstances the annual trade of Great Britain, including exports and imports, rose from about one hundred and thirty-five million dollars in 1798 to over five hundred millions in 1850. She was already supreme on the seas in Napoleon's time, and her mercantile marine steadily increased in order to distribute the goods which she produced to all parts of the earth.

The other nations were far behind her in all these sources of commercial strength. Napoleon's efforts to render the Continent independent of England and her colonies had failed ;

there was not a single steam engine in France in 1812, and it was not until after Napoleon's fall that France set herself seriously to compete with England by the introduction of machinery. Germany was less favorably situated than France, since it had for years been the main theater of long and devastating wars. It was not a united nation, but a collection of practically independent states which were divided, previous to the development of the *Zollverein*, by high tariff duties, and embarrassed by a great variety of coinage. Italy and Austria suffered from similar disadvantages.

Backwardness of France and Germany compared with England

The United States of America, now so formidable in every market of the world, had in 1815 a small and scattered population. Its interests were almost exclusively agricultural, and although its ships enjoyed a considerable carrying trade on the high seas, its people lacked the capital necessary to develop the immense natural resources of the country and thereby become a serious menace to the manufacturers of the old world.

The United States an agricultural country in 1815

In considering the development of commerce and industry since 1815 it is necessary to distinguish between the manufacturing which is carried on within a country to meet its own demands, and the production of commodities destined to be sold at a profit to other countries. For example, the cotton manufacturers of Manchester or the cutlery makers of Sheffield might conceivably content themselves with supplying the English demand; or, on the other hand, they might devote their attention principally to meeting the needs of South Africa, Australia, or China. During the Middle Ages, although there was some commerce, most production was carried on for domestic consumption. Gradually, however, international trade has taken on larger and larger proportions and has now become one of the most striking characteristics of our present civilization. The introduction of machinery in England naturally led her manufacturers to lay more and more stress upon foreign trade, since they could readily produce a great deal more than

All of the great nations now rivals for foreign trade

they could sell at home. The progress of industry on the Continent and in the United States has produced exactly the same result, and the nations of the earth have now become rivals in their eagerness to secure as large a share of the world's markets as possible.

Early experi-
ments in
steam
navigation

Closely connected with this prodigious expansion of commerce has been the development of the means of transportation and communication. The discovery that steam could be used to carry goods cheaply and speedily to all parts of the world has made it possible for the manufacturer to widen his market indefinitely, and has, in fact, made the world one great market place. The problem of applying steam to navigation had occupied inventors long before Fulton made his celebrated experiment on the Hudson River in 1807. Toward the close of the seventeenth century it was suggested that a piston engine could be used to drive wheels for the propulsion of vessels, and in 1707 steam was actually applied to propel a small model boat on the Fulda River in Germany. During the eighteenth century a number of inventors in England and America turned their attention to the development of this idea. In 1736 Jonathan Hull took out a patent in England for the application of steam in propelling ships, and some years later two Americans made several demonstrations of the practicability of steam navigation.

Fulton makes
the steambot
a practical
success

The honor of making the steamship a success commercially belongs, however, to Robert Fulton. In the spring of 1807 he launched his *Clermont* at New York, and in the autumn of that year the "new water monster" made its famous trip to Albany. Transoceanic navigation began in 1819 with the voyage of the steamer *Savannah* from Savannah to St. Petersburg via Great Britain. The trip to Liverpool was made in twenty-five days, sails being used to help the engine.

Within a quarter of a century steamships began to replace the old and uncertain sailing vessels, and to-day they compose

two thirds of the net tonnage of the world's merchant marine.¹ In 1840 the great Cunard Steamship Company inaugurated its transatlantic service, and since that time there has been a steady development in the number of navigation companies, as well as of steam vessels and their capacity for speed and freight. The *Great Western*, which startled the world in 1838 by steaming from Bristol to New York in fifteen days and ten hours, was a ship of 1378 tons, 212 feet long, and had an indicated horse power of 1260, with a daily consumption of 36 tons of coal. The *Lusitania*, launched in 1907, has a gross tonnage of 32,500 tons, engines of 68,000 horse power, is 785 feet long, and carries a supply of over 5000 tons of coal for its journey across the Atlantic, which lasts less than five days.

Steady increase in the size and speed of ocean vessels

So highly developed were the marine engines at the end of the nineteenth century that "a small cake of coal which would pass through a ring the size of a shilling, when burned in the compound engine of a modern steamboat, would drive a ton of food and its proportion of the ship two miles on its way from a foreign port." According to another calculation, half a sheet of note paper will develop sufficient power, when burned in connection with a triple-expansion engine, to carry a ton a mile in an Atlantic steamer. So it has come about that the cost of carrying a year's supply of breadstuff for an English workingman's family from Minneapolis to Liverpool is less than his average wage for one day. The turbine engine, in which the power of the steam is more advantageously applied than in the older piston engine, is being introduced in the newer ships such as the huge *Lusitania* and the *Mauretania*. These engines promise greater speed and economy than the type they are displacing.

Remarkable advance in the construction of ocean ships

It is now possible to make the journey from Southampton to New York, three thousand miles, in six days or less, with

¹ Yet, contrary to common opinion, there is a steady increase in the number of sailing vessels used. They are easily manned, require no coal, and, where high speed is not important, promise to hold their own on the high seas for many generations.

The oceans
now marked
with commer-
cial routes

almost the regularity of an express train. Japan may be reached from Vancouver in less than thirteen days and from San Francisco, via Honolulu, a distance of five thousand five hundred miles, in less than seventeen days. A commercial map of the world shows that the globe is now crossed in every direction by definite routes which are followed by innumerable freight and passenger steamers passing regularly from one port to another.¹

The Suez
Canal com-
pleted in
1869

The East and the West have been brought much nearer together by the piercing of the Isthmus of Suez, which formerly barred the way from the Mediterranean Sea to the Indian Ocean. In ancient times a canal connected the easternmost mouth of the Nile with the Red Sea, but it had been permitted to fill up with sand, so that when Bonaparte was ordered by the French Directory to consider its reconstruction, he and his engineers found few traces of it. The advantages of a canal had long been fully realized before the great French engineer, Ferdinand de Lesseps, gained permission from the ruler of Egypt to organize a company to undertake the work. The line of the ancient canal was abandoned, and the great trench was dug in an almost straight line from Port Said, on the Mediterranean, southward for a hundred miles to Suez on the Red Sea. After ten years of work the canal was opened to traffic in November, 1869.

In 1884 a new International Commission of Engineers was appointed, which decided to enlarge the canal so as to enable steamers of greater size to pass through it. It is now used by an ever-increasing number of vessels; in 1905 over five thousand took advantage of it, thus avoiding the detour of thousands of miles involved in rounding the Cape of Good Hope. An agreement among all the leading European powers provides that the canal shall be open at all times for war ships as well as merchantmen, but no act of war shall be permitted in its neighborhood.

¹ For a few of the trade routes, see map above, p. 234.

The Isthmus of Panama offers an obstacle to trade which has for years been the object of discussion and negotiations. In 1872 President Grant appointed a commission to consider the construction of a canal, but nothing was done until 1881 when de Lesseps, encouraged by the flattering success of his first venture, succeeded in organizing the Panama Canal Company in France and work was actually begun. But the efforts to obtain the necessary funds for completing the costly enterprise led to widespread bribery of members of the French Parliament, which was disclosed in 1892. This scandal was followed by the dissolution of the French company. In 1902 the Congress of the United States authorized the President to purchase for forty million dollars the property in which the French investors had sunk so much money. Arrangements with the republic of Colombia for the construction of the canal by the United States having come to naught, the state of Panama, through which the line of the proposed canal passes, seceded from Colombia in 1903, and its independence was immediately recognized by President Roosevelt. A treaty in regard to the canal zone was then duly concluded with the new republic, and after some delays the work of the French company was resumed by the United States and is now progressing rapidly.

Proposed
Panama
Canal

Just as the gigantic modern steamship has taken the place of the schooner and clipper for the rapid trade of the world, so, on land, the merchandise which used to be dragged by means of horses and oxen or carried in slow canal boats is being transported in long trains of capacious cars, each of which holds as much as fifteen or twenty large wagons. The story of the locomotive, like that of the spinning machine or steam engine, is the history of many experiments and their final combination by a successful inventor. Wooden tracks had been extensively used in the eighteenth century for horse-car lines, and in 1801 Parliament authorized the construction of such a railway from Wandsworth to Croydon,— a distance

The begin-
nings of
steam loco-
motion on
land

of nine miles. Many years before a French inventor had demonstrated the possibility of using steam for locomotion by constructing a road wagon driven by a small engine. Other inventors were at work on the problem and thus smoothed the way for the triumph of George Stephenson.

George
Stephenson
(1781-1848)
and the de-
velopment of
railways in
England

This distinguished inventor, the son of a poor English miner, although deprived through poverty of an education, taught himself how to read and write. He began work at the mines early in life, and being impressed with the difficulties of hauling the heavy wagons of coal and iron ore, he determined to apply to this purpose the steam engine which Watt had brought to such a degree of perfection.¹ In 1814 he built a small locomotive, known as "Puffing Billy," which was used at the mines, and in 1825, with the authorization of Parliament, he opened between Stockton and Darlington, in the northern part of England, a line for the conveyance of passengers and freight. About this time a road was being projected between Liverpool and Manchester, and in an open competition, in which five locomotives were entered, Stephenson's "Rocket" was chosen for the new railroad, which was formally opened in 1830. This famous engine weighed about seven tons and ran at an average speed of thirteen miles an hour, — a small affair when compared with the giant locomotive of our day weighing a hundred tons and running fifty miles an hour.² Within fifteen years trains were running regularly between Liverpool, Manchester, Birmingham, and London, and at the close of the century Great Britain had twenty-two thousand miles of railway, carrying over a billion passengers annually.

Many Ger-
man railways
owned by the
government

The first railway was opened in Germany in 1835, but the development of the system was greatly hindered by the territorial divisions which then existed. It was in the great state

¹ See above, pp. 41 *sqq.*

² It will be noted that this is the "average" speed on regular runs. For short distances the "Rocket" made thirty-five miles an hour, while the modern locomotive, as is well known, sometimes runs over a hundred miles an hour.

of Prussia that construction went on with the greatest rapidity, largely under government ownership and control. Some of the lines were built directly by the government and others were later purchased by it. This policy has been continued, and at present by far the greater part of the German railways are owned by the imperial or by state governments, only something over three thousand miles out of over thirty-four thousand miles being in private hands. In Austria-Hungary, also, the majority of the lines are owned or operated by the government.

The first railway in France was built in 1828, but owing to the timidity of investors the development was slow. Five years later the government took up the project of connecting Paris and the principal cities by railway lines, and after prolonged debates it guaranteed in 1840 the interest on the investment required in the construction of a line from the capital to Orleans. Two years later the government agreed to furnish about one half of the capital necessary to build a vast railway system throughout France, leaving the work of construction and operation largely in the hands of private companies. As a result of this intervention on the part of the State, there are three types of railways in France: those which have been largely financed by the government but are operated by private companies; those which are entirely private; and those owned and operated by the State. When Louis Philippe ascended the throne of France in 1830 there were only thirty miles of railway in the country; in 1860 there were four thousand miles; and in 1904 over twenty-four thousand miles. Of the total mileage only about one twelfth now belongs to the government, but according to the terms of the franchises all the French railways will eventually revert to the State.

Not only is Europe bound together by a network of nearly two hundred thousand miles of railway, but railway construction is rapidly advancing in Africa and Asia, preparing cheap outlets for the products of western mills and mines. As we

The French government aids in the construction of railways

Railway construction in Africa and Asia

have seen, the Trans-Siberian road has connected Europe overland with the Pacific,¹ and Russia has also pushed lines southward toward Persia and Afghanistan; British India has almost thirty thousand miles, and China about three thousand miles of railways. Even Africa has fifteen thousand miles, most of which is in Egypt, Algeria, Tunis, and the British possessions. Before long, trains from Cairo to the Cape will rush through the jungle lands which were first penetrated by the white man in Queen Victoria's reign.

Develop-
ment of rapid
means of
communica-
tion, — the
penny post

Quite as essential to the world market as railway and steamship lines are the easy and inexpensive means of communication afforded by the post, telephone, telegraph, and cable. The English "penny post" is now so commonplace as no longer to excite wonder, but to men of Frederick the Great's time it would have seemed impossible. Until 1839 in England the postage on an ordinary letter was a shilling for a short distance. In that year a reform measure long advocated by Rowland Hill was carried, establishing a uniform penny post throughout Great Britain.

The result of reducing the rate of postage for letters to this nominal sum exceeded all expectations in vastly increasing the frequency with which people wrote to one another, and to-day the British post office, including the telegraph department, employs two hundred thousand persons, and handles two billion letters a year. Other European countries have followed the example of Great Britain in reducing postage, and now the world is moving rapidly in the direction of a universal two-cent rate. Already a letter can be carried from Basutoland in South Africa to Montreal, Canada, for two cents in less time than it took news to cross the Atlantic when Queen Victoria came to the throne.

Telegraphs
and cables

No less wonderful is the development of the telegraph system. Great Britain now has over fifty thousand miles of line owned and operated by the government, transmitting nearly

¹ See above, p. 282.

ninety million messages annually. France has about one hundred thousand miles of line, over which fifty million messages annually pass; and Russia has twice the French mileage of wire, carrying twice the annual number of messages. Moreover, distant and obscure places in Africa and Asia are being brought into touch with one another and with Europe. China has now fifteen thousand miles, connecting all the important cities of the empire and affording direct overland communication between Peking and Paris. The wonderful network is spreading into Africa,— the French, German, and British possessions being already well equipped. In October, 1907, Marconi established regular communication across the Atlantic by means of the wireless system of telegraphy discovered some years before.

Wireless telegraphy

The Industrial Revolution which enables Europe to produce far more goods than it could sell in its own markets, and the rapid transportation which permits producers to distribute their commodities over the whole surface of the globe, have combined to produce the modern competition for foreign markets. The European nations have secured the control of practically all the territory occupied by defenseless peoples in Africa and Asia, and have introduced western ideas of business into China and Japan, where steamships now ply the navigable rivers, and railroads are being rapidly built.

The Industrial Revolution favors growth of foreign trade

The process of colonization and of westernizing the oriental peoples has been further hastened by the anxiety of capitalists to find advantageous investments for their surplus wealth. The profits of industry pile up so rapidly that stock companies are everywhere formed to develop railroads and mines in backward countries. Great Britain alone is said to have about ten billion dollars invested abroad; one fifth of Russian industrial enterprises are financed by foreigners, who are also to a considerable extent constructing the railroads in China. The Germans supply the money for large banking concerns in Brazil, Buenos Ayres, and Valparaiso, which in turn stimulate industry and the construction of railways.

Necessity for investments stimulates imperialism

Influence of
manufac-
turers and
capitalists on
foreign poli-
cies of
governments

Nature of
modern
imperialism

These two powerful forces — factories seeking markets and capital seeking investment — are shaping the foreign and commercial policies of every important European country. They alone explain why the great industrial nations are embarking on what has been termed a policy of *imperialism*, which means a policy of adding distant territories for the purpose of controlling their products, getting the trade with the natives, and investing money in the development of natural resources. Sometimes this imperialism takes the form of outright annexation, such as the acquisition of the Philippines by the United States, or of Togoland by Germany. Again it assumes the form of a “protectorate,” which is a declaration on the part of a nation to the effect that, “This is our particular piece of land; we are not intending to take all the responsibility of governing it just now; but we want other nations to keep out, for we may annex it sooner or later.” Sometimes imperialism goes no farther than the securing of concessions in undeveloped countries, such as foreigners have obtained in China or citizens of the United States in Mexico; but such concessions are a fruitful source of annexations, especially when the interests of investors are not thoroughly protected by the government that grants them franchises. So one is enabled, by understanding clearly the needs and methods of modern business, to follow intelligently the process by which European powers are revolutionizing the ancient civilizations of China and Japan and taking possession of the continent of Africa.

The mission-
aries prepare
the way for
imperialism

The way for imperialism had been smoothed by the missionaries. There have always been ardent Christians ready to obey the command, “Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature” (Mark xvi. 15). No sooner was a new country brought to the attention of Europeans than missionaries flocked thither with the traders and soldiers. When America was discovered and the sea route opened to the East, the Franciscan and Dominican friars braved every danger to bring the gospel to them that sat in darkness. They were

reënforced about 1540 by the powerful Jesuit order.¹ Francis Xavier began his famous missionary career in 1542, first visiting India, then Japan, and dying within sight of the shores of China, yearning to penetrate that mysterious land. The activities of his fellow-Jesuits in Canada and the Mississippi Valley and in South America have been mentioned earlier.

In 1622 the great missionary board of the Roman Catholic Church was given its final organization and the name it still retains, — *Congregatio de propaganda Fide*. It has its headquarters at Rome and is composed of twenty-nine cardinals and their assistants. In its colleges and schools missionaries are trained for their work and taught the requisite languages. Its printing office issues the necessary books and tracts. Of the various Catholic associations which have been formed to assist it in its work the most important is the Society for the Propagation of the Faith, which, since its formation at Lyons in 1822, has contributed over seventy million dollars to the cause. The Roman Catholic Church now reckons nearly four million adherents in Turkey, Persia, Arabia, India, Siam, Indo-China, Malaysia, the Chinese Empire, Korea, Japan, Africa, and Polynesia.

Roman Catholic missions

For a long time after the Protestant Revolt the reformed churches showed little ardor in foreign missions, although as early as 1556 Calvin's city of Geneva sent men to preach the gospel in Brazil. The Dutch undertook to Christianize the East Indies in 1602, and their rivals, the English, also did something to promote missions. Among the earliest Protestant missionary associations was the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, founded in 1695 and conducted under the auspices of the Church of England. In the eighteenth century the Moravians and Methodists continued the efforts to convert the heathen, and in 1792 William Carey, a cobbler and Baptist minister, formed the Baptist Missionary Union.

Protestant missions

¹ See above, Vol. I, pp. 143 *sqq.*

The United States entered the field in 1810, when the American Board of Foreign Missions was organized. As time went on, practically all the Protestant denominations established each its board of foreign missions, and the United States has rivaled Europe in the distinction and energy of the missionaries it has sent out and in the generous support its people have given them. About the middle of the nineteenth century the various boards began to hold conferences with the object of rendering their work more efficient by coöperation and by dividing up the fields among the various boards. Bible societies have been engaged in translating the Scriptures into every known language and scattering copies of them broadcast. It is estimated that Protestants contribute about twenty million dollars a year to foreign missions. This sum serves to support some fourteen or fifteen thousand missionaries, who have gathered into their churches a million and a half converts.

Important
effects of
missions in
spreading
European
culture

Missionaries have usually been the first to bring regions remote from Europe into contact with western civilization. They have not alone spread the knowledge of the Christian religion and its high standards of morality, but have carried with them modern scientific ideas and modern inventions. They have reduced to writing the languages of peoples previously ignorant of the existence of an alphabet. They have conquered cruel superstitions, extirpated human sacrifices and cannibalism, and done much to make the lot of woman more tolerable. Their physicians have introduced rational methods of treating the sick, and their schools have given an education to millions who without them would have been left in complete barbarism. Finally they have encouraged thousands of Japanese, Chinese, and representatives of other peoples to visit Europe and America, and thus prepare themselves to become apostles of western ideas among their fellows. The explorations and investigations carried on by the missionaries have served vastly to increase the general knowledge of the world and its inhabitants. Their maps and their scientific

reports on language and customs have in many instances proved of the highest value.¹ They have also created a demand for western commodities and opened the way for trade.

In some instances the missionaries have doubtless shown too little appreciation of the ancient culture of India, China, and Japan. They have rudely denounced the cherished traditions and the rooted prejudices of the peoples to whom they came. Even the most prudent and sagacious among them could hardly have avoided arousing the hostility of those whose most revered institutions they felt it their duty to attack. So it has come about that the missionaries have often been badly treated, have undergone great hardships, and even been murdered by infuriated mobs. This has led to the armed interference of their respective governments, and has more than once, as we shall see, served as an excuse for annexations and the formation of protectorates and spheres of influence. Some illustrations of the rôle of the missionaries will be found in the following sections. We shall turn first to the development of Europe's interest in China.

How missions have led to the extension of European control in Asia and Africa

RELATIONS OF EUROPE WITH CHINA

102. The first expeditions of the Portuguese around the Cape of Good Hope, the rivalry between them and the Dutch and English for the trade with India and the Spice Islands, and the final victory of the English over their French competitors in Hindustan have all been described above. It was inevitable that the vast and highly civilized Chinese Empire should attract the attention of the adventurous traders, and a Chinese report informs us that "During the reign of Ching-tih (1506) foreigners from the West called Falanki,² who said that

The Portuguese and Dutch visit Canton

¹ To cite a single instance, the United States government published in 1900 a wonderful atlas of the Philippine Islands prepared by the Jesuits.


² Probably the Chinese got from the Mohammedans the idea of calling the western peoples "Franks," the old name given them during the Crusades. Previous to the opening of the nineteenth century the Chinese knew little or nothing of Europe, and Europe very little of them. The Romans called China,

they had tribute, suddenly entered the Canton River and by their tremendously loud guns shook the place far and near. This was reported at court; and an order was returned to drive them away and stop their trade. About this time the Hollanders, who in ancient times inhabited a wild territory and had no relations with China, came to Macao in two or three large ships. Their clothes and their hair were red, their bodies tall, their eyes were blue and were sunk deep into their heads. Their feet were one cubit and two-tenths long, and their strange appearance frightened the people."

Haughty
demeanor of
the Chinese
places obsta-
cles in the
way of trade

All the early attempts to establish business relations with China encountered serious obstacles. The haughty demeanor of the officials, who regarded the merchants as representatives of barbarous races, the widespread corruption among the governing class, and the humiliating demands of Chinese ceremonies, were enough to discourage the most enterprising. When, in 1655, the Dutch sent two envoys to the Chinese emperor, they were only received on condition that they would prostrate themselves before his throne and strike their heads nine times on the earth as evidence of their inferiority. In the eyes of the Chinese they were only tribute bearers to the "Son of Heaven." Foreigners were frankly told that China did not need their goods, since she produced all that was necessary; that merchants must comply with regulations established by officials, and that threats and entreaties would be alike unavailing.

Serica, "Silk Land," and two or three of the emperors, including Marcus Aurelius, sent embassies thither with presents to the ruling monarch. Missionaries from Persia made an early attempt to introduce Christianity into China in the eighth century. These attempts were renewed by the Franciscans and Dominicans in the thirteenth century, and the Venetian traveler Marco Polo became the trusted official of the Mongol emperor of China, Kublai Khan (1260-1294), who made him governor of Yang Chow, near Nanking, on the Yangtze River. For half a century the Florentines and Genoese were able to carry on some trade with China, but the fall of the Mongol dynasty (which Genghis Khan had established in 1213) and the accession of the Chinese Ming line of rulers (1368) brought relations with Europe to an end until the arrival of the Portuguese early in the sixteenth century.





In the eighteenth century Canton remained the only port in which foreign commerce was regularly permitted. Here all communications between the foreign merchants and their governments, on the one hand, and the Chinese government or local traders, on the other, were made through the *Hong*, a small band of Chinese traders who received all the goods from abroad and arranged the prices of both imports and exports. The foreign settlement at Canton is still confined to the so-called "Compound," a district set apart from the great Chinese city.

Chinese trade with foreigners limited to Canton

The Portuguese had doggedly clung to their factories at Macao, where, as early as 1537, they had rented a trifling bit of land from the Chinese. The English and Dutch traders would now and then take refuge there when troubles occurred at Canton. The English made repeated attempts to get into direct communication with the government at Peking, but the emperor insisted that the "barbarians" should keep away from his capital in the north and confine their operations to Canton. After the close of the Napoleonic wars, England sent Lord Amherst, in 1816, to visit Peking and if possible secure from the emperor himself the removal of the grievances which English merchants suffered from the viceroy and other local Chinese officials with whom they had been forced to deal in Canton. But Lord Amherst refused to perform the "kowtow," or obeisance, required of "foreign devils," and was hustled south to Canton. When Lord Napier was appointed Superintendent of Trade in China in 1833 the Canton authorities refused to recognize him, and denounced him as "a lawless foreign slave" and "a dog barbarian of a foreign nation" for venturing to violate the law by arriving at Canton by night. The English must, they declared, continue to deal with the *hong*, and not attempt to negotiate with the central government.

Futile efforts of the English to open direct negotiations with the Chinese emperor at Peking

Although the Chinese traders of Canton and the local mandarins¹ profited by the commerce with the Europeans, the

Extent of China

¹ "Mandarin" is the name given by Europeans to the Chinese officials; it is not a Chinese word.

Chinese government still refused to treat foreign nations as equals. China seemed to its own people infinitely superior in its extent and ancient civilization to the lands of the West, of which they knew very little and whose customs they detested and were in no way tempted to imitate. And there was much to encourage this complacent attitude. China proper (excluding its vast dependencies of Mongolia, Manchuria, Eastern Turkestan, and Tibet) is equal in area to nearly three times the combined extent of Great Britain, France, and Germany; it would cover the whole of the United States east of the Rocky Mountains except Texas. A distance of twelve hundred miles separates Canton and Peking, and it is nearly as far from Shanghai to the borders of Tibet. China reckons its population as more than four hundred millions,¹ and can trace back its uninterrupted civilization to a period long antedating the development of Greek culture.²

The opium trade causes war between England and China

The commercial relations which the English had repeatedly sought to secure peacefully were finally established as the result of a conflict known as the "Opium War." Opium is said to have been introduced into China by the Arabs in the thirteenth century. It is derived from the seed capsule of a certain species of poppy which is raised in India (India still exports opium to a greater value than wheat), and England had, by the opening of the nineteenth century, practically monopolized the business. The Chinese had long regarded the trade in that dangerous commodity with disfavor. An edict of 1796 asserted that it caused the greatest injury to both the minds and manners of men and prohibited its importation. Moreover its purchase by the Chinese tended to drain the

¹ Mr. Rockhill, the American minister at Peking, after careful investigation believes that the official census exaggerates the population of China, which he estimates as less than two hundred and seventy millions.

² There are a large number of interesting books on China: Giles, *China and the Chinese*, forms a good introduction. The recent political history, so far as Europeans are concerned, is clearly explained by Douglas in his *Europe and the Far East*.

country of its supply of silver. But in spite of the laws, Chinese officials and the British merchants kept up a lively trade in the forbidden drug at an enormous profit, and the imports amounted in 1837 to about seventeen million dollars.

The Chinese government resolved to take a determined stand, and an imperial commissioner, Lin, was sent to Canton for the purpose of suppressing the traffic. He seized and burned twenty thousand chests of opium which the dealers had on hand, and practically expelled the foreign merchants from Canton. These measures and Lin's attempt to force the British merchants to agree to give up the opium traffic led to violence, and the Chinese fleet sent out to enforce his orders was fired upon by British battle ships.

While the British government did not formally declare war, Canton was blockaded in 1840 by Admiral Bremer. Amoy, Ningpo, Shanghai, and even Nanking were taken by the British, and the Chinese were easily overwhelmed by the men of war from the West. In August, 1842, the Chinese, who had been forced to sue for peace, agreed, in the Treaty of Nanking, to pay a heavy indemnity, to treat British officials thenceforward as the equals of Chinese mandarins of the same rank, to cede to the British the island of Hongkong (which lies at the mouth of the Canton River), and to open to foreign commerce the ports of Amoy, Fuchau, Ningpo, and Shanghai (which lie along the coast between Canton and the mouth of the Yangtze River) on the same terms as Canton. The opium question was left unsettled.

This triumph of the British was the signal for other powers to open relations with China. It was clear that the Chinese were now likely to be in a different frame of mind in regard to foreigners than formerly. American merchants had a warehouse in Canton as early as 1801, but after the Opium War, in 1844, Caleb Cushing negotiated a commercial treaty with the Chinese emperor, which extended commercial privileges to the United States. In the same year France also secured similar concessions.

Commissioner Lin attempts to stop the traffic in opium, 1839

England forces the Chinese in the Treaty of Nanking, 1842, to open four new ports to English commerce

The United States takes advantage of the success of the British

China gradually forced to open additional trading posts

Five ports were now open to foreign trade, and Belgium, Prussia, the Netherlands, and Portugal also participated in the new commercial advantages. Chinese hostility to foreigners remained, however, as strong as ever; frequent riots occurred, foreigners were maltreated, and even the emperor, Hien Fung, believed it his patriotic duty to prevent all foreign advance. The same year in which the Crimean War came to an end, Napoleon III united with England in a joint embassy to the Chinese emperor, which was backed up by an armed force. Negotiations having proved fruitless, the allies took possession of Canton and established a provisional government there. The request of England, France, Russia, and the United States that the emperor appoint a Chinese minister to negotiate in regard to international questions was refused, whereupon French and English ships proceeded northward along the coast, battered down the forts which guarded the mouth of the river on which Tientsin lies, and in 1858 reached that city. Thus foreign operations were transferred to a region dangerously near the imperial city of Peking.

Treaty of Tientsin, 1860

The emperor, whose beautiful summer palace had been looted and destroyed by the allies, and who was now threatened in his capital, offered to negotiate; but hostilities broke out again, and not till 1860 were matters adjusted. The emperor agreed to pay an indemnity to the British and French for the expense to which they had been put in invading his empire, and Tientsin was declared an open port. Since that time other ports have been opened to European trade and now there are over forty points where foreign merchants may conduct operations, although Canton and Shanghai are still the most important. Some towns inland have also been opened and now offer advantages for extending commerce far beyond the sea-coast, to which foreign merchants were confined for three centuries and a half.¹

¹ The occupation of China's former dependency of Anam, including Cochin-China and Tonkin, has been described above, p. 179.

China's troubles did not come entirely from without, for a terrible rebellion was in progress during the fifties. Ever since the days when Louis XIV began his reign, China had been governed by a foreign race, the Tartar Manchus, who had succeeded in putting one of their leaders on the throne in 1644. Some of the Manchu sovereigns have shown themselves very enlightened, especially K'angshi, whose reign of sixty years roughly corresponds in time and character with that of Louis XIV. He received the affable Jesuit missionaries who visited his court, and studied astronomy, physics, mathematics, and medicine with them. Under his auspices an encyclopedia of no less than five thousand and twenty volumes was prepared, embracing all the lore of the Chinese. He permitted the Christians to build a church in Peking and even contributed to the expenses. Under Emperor K'ienlung (1736-1795), who emulated the enlightened policy of K'angshi, the dynasty reached its height.

The Manchu
dynasty

Under his successors the prestige of the Manchu emperors waned and the reverses of the first war with England and the humiliating Treaty of Nanking suggested to a certain Hung the possibility of a successful revolution. The Taipings, as Hung's followers called themselves, took the great city of Nanking in 1853 and put twenty-five thousand of the hated Tartars, to which race the Manchus belong, to death,— man, woman, and child, in order that “not a root should be left to sprout from.” The Chinese government made little progress in suppressing the rebellion so long as the weak and dissolute Emperor Hien Fung lived. But he became “a guest in Heaven” in 1861 and the real power in China has since been in the hands of Tzu-hsi, his favorite concubine, the famous “Dowager Empress,” still one of the foremost rulers of the world.¹ Her minister, Li Hung

The Taiping
rebellion

The Dowager
Empress
Tzu-hsi

¹ The ambitious Tzu hsi arranged that her little son, Tung-chih, should succeed to the throne, and in this way became practically regent for many years. On his death in 1875 she secured the succession of his cousin, the present emperor, Kuang-hsü, as he was renamed, that is, “Succession to Glory.” His mother was a sister of the powerful Dowager Empress, who, as aunt of the little emperor (born in 1872), continued to reign in his stead. See below, p. 348.

Chang, set to work to put down the rebellion. He arranged with an American named Ward to raise a foreign corps to aid the Chinese government. Ward captured several towns held by the Taipings, but was killed while leading an attack. He was soon succeeded by Major Charles Gordon, an Englishman destined to become famous in Africa.¹ With Gordon's help Li Hung Chang recaptured the towns, including Nanking, which had fallen into the hands of the rebels, and brought to an end a civil war which had lasted twelve years and cost millions of lives.

"Chinese"
Gordon

HOW JAPAN BECAME A WORLD POWER

The position
and extent of
the empire
of Japan

103. To the northeast of China lies a long group of islands which, if they lay off the eastern coast of North America, would extend from Maine to Georgia. This archipelago, comprising four main islands and some four thousand smaller ones, constitutes the Japanese Empire. Fifty years ago Japan was still almost completely isolated from the rest of the world; but now, through a series of extraordinary events, she has become one of the most conspicuous members of the family of nations. American newspapers deal as fully with her foreign policy as with that of France or Germany; we are familiar with the portraits of her statesmen and warriors, and her exquisite art has many enthusiastic admirers in England and America. Her people, who are somewhat more numerous than the inhabitants of the British Isles, resemble the Chinese in appearance, and owe to China the beginnings of their culture and their art, for it was Buddhist missionaries from Korea who, in the sixth century, first aroused Japan from its previous barbarism.²

¹ See below, p. 365.

² The Japanese language has nothing in common with the Chinese, for instead of using characters to represent whole words and ideas, it is built up much like a European language and can be written by means of signs representing syllables. Nevertheless the Japanese are accustomed to use the Chinese characters in their books and even in their newspapers, the less familiar characters being sometimes accompanied by a translation into Japanese.





Little is known of the early Mikados (emperors) of Japan, and during the twelfth century the *shogun*, or commander in chief of the empire, was able to bring the sovereign powers into his own hands (somewhat as the mayor of the palace had done in the Frankish kingdom), while the emperor began to live in retirement in his capital of Kyoto. Conditions in Japan resembled those in western Europe during the same period. Scattered about the country were the castles of powerful feudal lords (the *daimios*), who continued, until the nineteenth century, to enjoy powers similar to the vassals of the mediæval European kings.

The feudal period in Japan

Rumors of the existence of Japan reached Europe through the Venetian traveler, Marco Polo, at the end of the thirteenth century. Both Columbus and John Cabot imagined that they had reached the famed island of Cipango when they sighted land, but the Portuguese navigator Pinto appears to have been the first European to reach Japan, in the year 1542. Some years later the great Jesuit missionary, Francis Xavier, accompanied by some Japanese who had been converted to Christianity at Goa, made the first attempt to preach the Christian faith in the island. Spanish missionaries from Manila carried on the work, and it is reported that within thirty years two hundred Christian churches had been erected, and fifty thousand converts made.

Brief period of intercourse with Europeans in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century

The arrogance of the bishops, however, led the Japanese government to issue an edict, in 1586, forbidding the Japanese to accept Christianity, and ten years later some twenty thousand converts are said to have been put to death. It is true that one of the shoguns of the time declared that there were already thirty-five religious sects in Japan, and that a new one would make little difference; but the missionaries were accused of conspiring against the government and early in the seventeenth century there was another terrible massacre. For a time the shoguns favored the few Dutch and English merchants who came to their shores and permitted factories

Persecution of Christian missionaries and expulsion of foreigners

to be opened at Yedo and elsewhere, but the quarrels between the Dutch and English and the constant drain of silver paid out for foreign merchandise led the Japanese to impose restrictions on foreigners, so that in the time of Louis XIV all of them had departed, except a few Dutch on the island of Deshima. From that time on, for nearly two hundred years, Japan remained a nation apart, with practically no intercourse with foreigners.

Commodore Perry opens negotiations with the shogun in 1853

In 1853 Commodore Perry visited Yokohama with a message from the United States government to the "Sovereign of Japan," asking that arrangements be made to protect the property and persons of Americans wrecked on the coasts, and that the right be extended to Americans to dispose of their cargoes at one or more ports. Supposing that the shogun was the ruler of Japan, Commodore Perry presented his demands to him. These led to a long and earnest discussion in the shogun's council, as to whether foreigners should be admitted or not, but their demands were finally conceded, and two ports were opened to American and English ships.

Foreigners attacked in the name of the Mikado

The Mikado, however, awoke from his long lethargy to declare that the shogun had no right to conclude a treaty or to admit foreigners to the sacred soil of Japan. Nevertheless the foreigners went on negotiating with the shogun, and within the next few years several of the European powers had arranged to trade at the ports of Hakodate, Yokohama, Nagasaki, and a little later at Kobe. Attacks, however, were made upon foreigners in the name of the emperor. An Englishman by the name of Richardson was killed in 1862 on the great high road between Yedo and Kyoto, by the retainers of the powerful daimio of Satsuma, whereupon the English bombarded Kagoshima, the stronghold of the Satsuma clan.

This produced an extraordinary change of heart in this leading clan, one of the most powerful in Japan, for they saw that the foreigners were much more powerful than the Japanese, and that Japan would suffer as China had done unless she

acquainted herself with foreign science and inventions. The next year English ships bombarded Shimonoseki, on account of the refusal of its feudal ruler to permit them to pass freely through the Inland Sea. This produced an effect similar to the bombardment of Kagoshima, and public opinion in Japan gradually changed in favor of the admission of foreigners.

In January, 1867, the present Mikado, Mutsuhito, then fifteen years of age, ascended the throne. He named the era which opened with his advent, *Meiji*, that is "enlightened rule," and his reign has well justified the name. In March, 1868, he invited Sir Harry Parkes, representative of Great Britain, as well as the representatives of France and the Netherlands, to Kyoto. He was deeply chagrined by an attack made upon the retinue of Sir Harry Parkes and publicly declared that any one who committed any act of violence toward foreigners would be acting in opposition to his Majesty's express orders, for he would be guilty of the "heinous offense of causing the national dignity and good faith to suffer in the eyes of the treaty powers, to whom his Majesty feels that he is bound by relations of friendship." With this episode the period of resistance to the foreigners, their trade and their religion, may be said to have closed.

Meanwhile a great revolution was taking place in Japan; the power of the shogun was rapidly declining, and in October, 1867, he was forced to resign his office. This left the Mikado not only the nominal but the real ruler of Japan. He emerged from his ancient seclusion in the sacred city of Kyoto, and removed the capital to Yedo, which was given the new name of Tokyo, or "northern capital." The feudal princes, who had, in general, sided with the Mikado against the shogun, now agreed peacefully to surrender their titles and prerogatives in the interests of their country, and in July, 1871, feudalism was formally abolished throughout the empire. Serfdom was also done away with and the army and navy reformed in accordance with western models.

Two leading clans become convinced that they have much to learn from the western nations

The present Mikado orders his people to cease maltreating Europeans, 1868

Revolution in Japan. Disappearance of the shogunate and of feudalism

The Industrial Revolution in Japan

Since that date the modernizing of Japan has progressed with incredible rapidity. Although the Japanese still continue to carry on their ancient industries, kneeling on their straw mats, with a few simple implements and no machinery, western industries have been introduced side by side with the older arts. Students were sent abroad to investigate the most recent achievements in science, a university was established at Tokyo, and the system of education completely revolutionized. There was not a steam mill in the islands when Commodore Perry cast anchor there; now there are over eighty great cotton factories, with a hundred thousand employees. Since the railroad between Tokyo and the neighboring port of Yokohama was opened in 1872, nearly five thousand miles of railways have been constructed, and the Japanese, who are very fond of travel, can go readily from one end to the other of their archipelago. Great towns have sprung up. Tokyo has nearly two million inhabitants, and the manufacturing city of Osaka toward a million. The total population of the islands is now about forty-six millions, more than one half that of the United States, but crowded into an area of less than one hundred and fifty thousand square miles.

Constitutional government established in Japan, 1890

With this industrial progress came inevitably a demand for representative government, and as early as 1877 petitions for a constitution were laid before the emperor. Four years later he announced that a parliament would be established in 1890, and a commission was sent to Europe to study constitutional government there. In 1889 a constitution was completed which vested the powers of government in the Mikado and a parliament of two houses.

Japan now one of the most powerful nations in the world's affairs.

Less than half a century ago Japan still clung to her ancient ways, undisturbed by western influences, and led a life apart in her secluded group of islands in the Pacific. Her chief danger lay in the aggressions of the European powers, who might at any time treat her as they were treating China. But Japan was aroused to the danger in time. Guided by a

liberal-minded monarch and by a group of statesmen of extraordinary ability and unsurpassed probity and patriotism, she reformed her whole system of government and, arming herself with every means of defense suggested by modern science, she has shown herself able to hold her own in two great conflicts with other powers seemingly greatly her superiors in strength.

WAR BETWEEN JAPAN AND CHINA AND ITS RESULTS

104. After carrying out the various reforms mentioned above, Japan found herself confronted, like the western nations, with the necessity of extending her trade and securing foreign markets. Her merchants and her ships became the rivals of the Europeans in the neighboring seas, where her commerce has increased far more rapidly than that of the western nations.

Japan seeks
an outlet
for her
products

On the opposite side of the Sea of Japan lies Korea, a kingdom which has become well known throughout the world on account of the two bloody wars to which the question of its possession has given rise. In the sixteenth century the Japanese had invaded the peninsula, which at that time had not been claimed by China. Japan was able to hold it for a time, but later the Koreans, with the aid of the Chinese, reestablished their independence, and thereafter both China and Japan regarded themselves as rival suzerains of the Korean kingdom. When Japanese trade developed, the question of control in Korea became an important one, and in 1894 it led to war between the two countries. But the Chinese, with their ancient weapons and organization, were no match for the Japanese, who had eagerly adopted every device of western warfare, and in a short time the Chinese armies had been driven from Korea and the campaign was transferred to the neighboring Manchuria, where the Japanese took Port Arthur. China then called upon the western powers for assistance, but they did not take action until Japan, in the Treaty of Shimonoseki, had forced China's representative, Li Hung Chang, to

The Chino-
Japanese
War over
Korea,
1894-1895

recognize the complete independence of Korea (which practically meant opening it up to the Japanese) and to cede to Japan Port Arthur, the Liaotung peninsula on which it lies, and the island of Formosa.

Russia,
France, and
Germany
drive Japan
from the
mainland

Russia, France, and Germany had watched the course of events with jealous eyes, and now intervened to prevent Japan from securing a foothold on the mainland. Russia was the real leader in this intervention, for she coveted just the region which had been ceded to Japan. Japan was exhausted by the war with China and at that time had no adequate navy. Therefore the Mikado withdrew from Manchuria, on the ground that their majesties, the emperors of Russia and Germany, and the republic of France had united in a recommendation to his government not to occupy the newly acquired territory, for the reason that this "would be detrimental to the lasting peace of the Orient."

Russia
thereupon
gains valu-
able conces-
sions in
China

The result of this compromise was to throw China into the arms of Russia, which proceeded to take every advantage of the situation. China had been forced to pay a heavy indemnity to Japan in lieu of the cession of the Liaotung peninsula; and when the Chinese government attempted to borrow a large sum from England to meet this obligation, Russia interfered and herself loaned China eighty million dollars without security. In this way China became dependent upon her as a creditor. A Russo-Chinese bank was established late in the same year (1895), which proved to be an efficient agent of the Russian government. On the pretext of providing for the great debt, the bank was to receive taxes, coin money, pay interest on public bonds, and construct railway and telegraph lines. The Russians were permitted by the Chinese emperor to build a railroad across his territory, which would enable them to reach Vladivostok by a direct line from Irkutsk. Moreover, in order to guard the railway line, Russian soldiers were to be introduced freely into Manchuria. It is clear that these arrangements gave Russia a great advantage over the other European powers, since

she controlled the Chinese government through its debt and occupied Manchuria with her soldiers.

Meanwhile the Germans found an excuse for strengthening themselves in the same region. A German missionary having been murdered in the province of Shantung, which lies opposite Korea, a German squadron appeared in Kiauchau Bay, in November, 1897, landed a force of marines, and raised the German flag. As a compensation for the murder of the missionary, Germany demanded a long lease of Kiauchau, with the right to build railways in the region and work mines. The treaty which was concluded also provided that "If at any time the Chinese should form plans for the development of Shantung, for the execution of which foreign capital is necessary, the Chinese government, or such Chinese as may be interested in the scheme, shall, in the first instance, apply to German capitalists." This is an excellent example of the anxiety already alluded to of the European nations to find outlets for their surplus capital. Since acquiring Kiauchau the Germans have built harbors, constructed forts, military barracks, machine shops, etc. In short, a model German town has been constructed on the Chinese coast, which, with its defenses, constitutes a fine base for further extension of Germany's sphere of influence.

Germany
seizes territory in the
Shantung
peninsula

At first the Tsar hoped to balk the plans of Germany, but decided, instead, to secure additional advantages for himself. Accordingly Port Arthur and the waters adjacent to the Liaotung peninsula upon which it lies were leased to Russia, in March, 1898, for a period of twenty-five years, subject to renewal by mutual consent. Port Arthur was to be open only to Chinese and Russian vessels, and Russia immediately began to build fortifications which were believed to render the town impregnable. A railway was constructed to Harbin, connecting Port Arthur with Vladivostok and the Trans-Siberian Railway. This at last gave Russia a port on the Pacific which, unlike Vladivostok, was free from ice the year round.

Russia
leases Port
Arthur

The British lease Weihaiwei and conclude a treaty of alliance with Japan

Great Britain, learning of the negotiations, sent a fleet northward from Hongkong to the Gulf of Pechili, and induced China to lease to her Weihaiwei, which lay just between the recent acquisitions of Germany and Russia. England, moreover, believed it to be for her interest to be on good terms with Japan, and in 1902 an offensive and defensive alliance was concluded between the two powers, binding each to assist the other in case a third party joined in a conflict in which either was involved. For example, England must, under the provisions, aid Japan in a war with Russia, should France or Germany intervene.

THE BOXER RISING. THE RUSSO-JAPANESE WAR

The Europeans begin to develop the natural resources of China

105. The foreigners were by no means content with establishing trading posts in China; they longed to develop the neglected natural resources of the empire, to open up communication by railroads and steamships, and to "westernize" the Orientals, in order that business might be carried on more easily with them, and new opportunities be found for profitable investment.

Railroads built in China

The first railroad in China was built by British promoters in 1876, from Shanghai to Wu-Sung, a point some fifteen miles to the north of that city. The Chinese, however, were horrified by this innovation, which they felt to be a desecration of the graves of their ancestors. Yielding to popular prejudice, the government purchased the railroad, only to destroy it and throw the locomotives into the river. Nevertheless, five years later, the Chinese themselves, with the aid of British capital, began the construction of an imperial railroad system which now embraces about six hundred miles. In 1895 other foreigners beside the Russians were once more permitted to undertake the construction of railway lines, and there are now some three thousand miles of road open for traffic. The capital of Peking is connected with Hankau on the Yangtze River



LI HUNG CHANG



by a line running southward, and this line is being continued to Canton. From Peking a line runs northeast to Mukden, where it connects with the Trans-Siberian system. The French and Germans are also interested in opening up the regions within their spheres of influence, and the British are planning to push into the interior of China a line running northward from Rangoon through Mandalay. In short, some ten thousand miles of railway are now projected, and doubtless within half a century China will be covered with a network of lines which cannot fail to do much to revolutionize her ancient habits and civilization.

In 1898 the internal water ways of China were opened to foreign ships. Several lines of well-equipped steamships now ply on the Canton River and follow the waters of the Yangtze River for a thousand miles inland. Over fourteen thousand miles of telegraph lines are in operation, affording overland connection with Europe. The imperial post, organized in 1897, has branches throughout the empire.

Steamships,
post, and
telegraph

It was inevitable that intercourse with European nations should affect the whole policy and ideals of the Chinese government. In 1889 a decree was issued establishing an annual audience in which the emperor might show his "desire to treat with honor all the foreign ministers resident in Peking." A few years later the cumbersome ancient ceremonial was abolished and foreigners were received in a manner which indicated the recognition of their equality with Chinese of the same rank. In 1898, when Prince Henry of Prussia visited Peking, he was cordially greeted by the emperor, who shook hands with him in western fashion and conversed with him on a familiar footing.

China begins
a great series
of reforms

In the same year a series of decrees was issued with the object of reforming the army on models offered by those nations that had given so many proofs of their military superiority. New schools and colleges were planned with a view of starting the country on the road to progress. Chinese students were

sent to Europe to study foreign methods of government, agricultural schools were built, patent and copyright laws were introduced, and a department of mines and railroads was established, in order that China might no longer be obliged to leave these matters entirely in the hands of foreigners. Journalists were even encouraged to write on political questions.

The conservatives oppose reforms in China

These abrupt reforms aroused the superstitious horror of the conservative party. They found a sympathetic leader in the Dowager Empress, who had been regent during the early years of the emperor's reign. She succeeded in regaining her influence and in putting an end, for the time being, to the distasteful reforms. The Europeans, both missionaries and business men, nevertheless continued their activities, and the conservatives believed it necessary, therefore, to organize a great movement to drive out the "foreign devils," who had been, in their eyes, steadily undermining the ancient traditions of China.

The "Boxers"

Among those hostile to the foreigner none were more conspicuous than the secret society of the "Boxers," or, as they appear to have called themselves, the "Order of the Patriotic Harmonious Fists." They were quite willing to coöperate with the Dowager Empress in carrying out her designs against foreign influence. Claiming to be invulnerable and to exercise certain magical powers, they easily won over the mass of the population and roused them against the Christian invaders. They proclaimed that the western nations were "lacerating China like tigers"; that the railways were built through the graveyards, and that the misfortunes of the times were due to the displeasure of their ancestors, whose memory was desecrated by the locomotives. They urged, moreover, that the new machinery was throwing workmen out of employment, and summoned every patriotic Chinaman to rise in defense of his country.

The party in favor of meeting the "Christian Peril" by violence rapidly increased. The Boxers, who were arming and

drilling, knew very well that neither the Chinese officials nor the imperial troops would interfere with them. Missionaries and traders were murdered in the provinces, and although the government at Peking always declared that it was doing all it could to suppress disorder, the representatives of foreign nations in the capital became thoroughly alarmed. On June 20, 1900, the Boxers, supported by the troops, killed the German ambassador, Baron von Ketteler, while on his way to the palace to expostulate with the government. The Europeans were then besieged in the several legations and in the Catholic cathedral, but, for some reason which is not clear, the Chinese did not murder them all, as they might easily have done.

The Peking
insurrection
of 1900

The powers determined upon immediate intervention, and in August a relief expedition, made up of Japanese, Russian, British, American, French, and German troops, fought its way from Tientsin to Peking, and brought relief to the imprisoned foreigners. The Chinese court left Peking, and the royal palace was desecrated and pillaged by the European troops, whose scandalous conduct disgraced the western world. Negotiations were now opened, and the aged Li Hung Chang rendered his last services by concluding an agreement in which China made certain reparations, including the payment of an indemnity of three hundred and twenty million dollars, and a promise to repress all anti-foreign societies.

The powers
intervene
and settle
affairs in
China

Although the Dowager Empress still retained her power, the work of reform was again undertaken. The army is being reorganized, and students are again being sent abroad in considerable numbers to investigate western methods of industry and government. By one of the most momentous decrees in the intellectual history of the world, the ancient classical system of education, which had for centuries been deemed an essential preparation for public office, was abolished in 1905. Students preparing for the government service will no longer be examined upon Confucius and be asked to write essays on such subjects as "How the moonlight sleeps on the lake"; for the new

The Chinese
reform move-
ment
renewed

examination questions deal with the history of the West, with Metternich and Bismarck, and with such grave questions as the relation of capital to labor and the methods of stimulating modern industry. Even the Dowager Empress has been obliged to yield to the progressive party, and in October, 1907, she went so far as to announce that China should prepare herself for the introduction of representative government and of a parliament.

China is gradually introducing western machinery, and her vast coal mines are being opened up, often by foreigners, but under strict regulations which secure Chinese interests. Indeed, it is quite possible that China may one day become the great coal-producing country of the world. With a population three or four times as large as that of the United States and with unlimited natural resources still unworked, with a modern government and an adequate system of education, the power of China among the world's nations a hundred years hence can scarcely be imagined.¹

Scarcely had the troubles due to the Boxer rising been adjusted when a new war cloud appeared in the East. The interest of Japan in finding markets has already been mentioned. The occupation of Manchuria and Port Arthur by the Russians seriously threatened Japanese extension in that direction; and when Russia secured from Korea a lumber cession in the Yalu valley and sent Cossacks to build forts in that region, Japan, which regarded Korea as lying within her sphere of influence, could hardly fail to protest. Russia had agreed repeatedly to withdraw from Manchuria, but had always failed to keep her promises when the time came. She had, moreover, guaranteed the integrity of Korea, upon whose territory she was now encroaching. Accordingly, in the summer of 1903, Japan opened negotiations with the Tsar's government

¹ In October, 1907, a decree abolishing the Tartar garrisons, which have, since the accession of the present Manchu dynasty, existed in many towns, prepares the way for the extinction of the race jealousy between the Chinese and their conquerors.

with the object of inducing it to explain its purposes in Manchuria and Korea. Russia delayed and refused to commit herself. The Japanese, losing patience, broke off diplomatic relations on February 5, 1904, and opened hostilities.

Japan was well prepared for war and was, moreover, within easy reach of the field of conflict. The Russian government, on the contrary, was rotten to the core and was already engaged in a terrible struggle with the Russian nation.¹ The eastern boundary of European Russia lay three thousand miles from Port Arthur and the Yalu River, and the only means of communication was the single line of badly constructed railroad that stretched across Siberia to the Pacific.

Japan far better prepared for war than Russia

Three days after the war opened the Japanese fleet surprised the Russian battle ships lying off Port Arthur, sank four of them, and drove the rest into the harbor, where they succeeded, in the main, in keeping them "bottled up." A second fleet which had been stationed at Vladivostok was defeated early in May, thus giving Japan control of the seas. At the same time the Russians were driven back from the Yalu, and the Japanese under General Oku landed on the Liaotung peninsula, cut off Port Arthur from communication with Russia, and captured the town of Dalny, which they made their naval headquarters. General Oku then began pushing the Russians northward toward Mukden, while General Nogi was left to besiege Port Arthur. For months the world watched in suspense the heroic attacks which the Japanese, at deadly cost to themselves, made upon the Russian fortress. Meanwhile fighting continued to the north along the line of the railroad. In October the Japanese were victorious in a fearful battle which raged south of Mukden for days, thus putting an end to General Kuropatkin's designs for relieving Port Arthur. As winter came on, the Japanese redoubled their efforts and the fortress at last surrendered, on January 1, 1905, after a siege of seven months, the horrors of which are perhaps without a parallel.

Early reverses of the Russians on the seas

Siege of Port Arthur

¹ See above, pp. 289-297.

Mukden captured by the Japanese, March, 1905

During the winter the Russians naturally suffered far more than the Japanese, whose whole conduct of the war affords one of the most extraordinary examples on record of military organization and efficiency. By means of an ingenious system of telephones they kept every division of the army in direct communication with the war office in Tokyo, and by the strictest discipline they saved their troops from disease and the wounded from contagion in the hospitals. Late in February fighting again began, and for three weeks the Russians struggled against the combined Japanese armies; but on March 9 they deserted Mukden and moved northward, after forty thousand of them had been killed and over a hundred thousand wounded.

Togo destroys the Russian fleet in the Straits of Korea, May 27, 1905

On learning of the destruction of the fleets in the Pacific the Russian government determined to dispatch its Baltic squadron to the Orient. After some strange adventures, which aroused both the amusement and the disgust of those who were following the war,¹ the fleet arrived in May in the Straits of Korea, where Admiral Togo was waiting for it. In a few hours he sank twenty-two of the Russian vessels and captured six. The Tsar's fleet was practically annihilated, with terrible loss of life, while the Japanese came out of the conflict almost unscathed.

The Treaty of Portsmouth, 1905

Lest the war should drag on indefinitely, President Roosevelt, acting under the provisions of the Hague Convention,² took measures which brought about a peace. After consulting the representatives of Japan and Russia at Washington and ascertaining the attitude of the neutral powers, he dispatched notes to the Tsar and Mikado, urging them to open negotiations. This invitation was accepted, and on August 9 the first session of the conference was held at Portsmouth, New Hampshire. On September 5 the Treaty of Portsmouth was signed. This recognized the Japanese influence as paramount

¹ As the squadron was passing through the North Sea the Russians fired upon a fishing fleet off Dogger Bank, and alleged later that they mistook the poor fishermen for Japanese. This is but one of numerous examples of the incompetence which was shown by the Russians throughout the war.

² See below, p. 370.

in Korea, which, however, was to remain independent.¹ Both the Japanese and Russians were to evacuate Manchuria; the Japanese were, however, given the rights in the Liaotung peninsula and Port Arthur which Russia had formerly enjoyed. Lastly, the southern part of the Russian island of Sakhalin was ceded to Japan.

Thus this great conflict produced by the friction of the powers in the East was brought to an end, but there seems to be no hope that similar wars can be avoided in the future, for it would appear that the process of "opening up" China is bound to continue at an ever-increasing rate, with manifold possibilities of rivalry and violence. England and Japan, it is true, have renewed their treaty of alliance and announced their intention to maintain peace and the "open door," — that is, the right of all nations to participate in trade with China. But even if the European powers can agree among themselves, China may develop a strong and efficient government and a highly disciplined army, and may undertake with more and more success to resist the continued encroachments of those who have established themselves on her borders.

No final settlement yet reached in the Far East

OCCUPATION OF AFRICA BY THE EUROPEAN POWERS

106. The vast continent of Africa, the northeastern corner of which was the seat of perhaps the first highly civilized people, was the last of the great divisions of the earth's surface to be explored and appropriated by the European nations. The lower valley of the Nile and the coasts which bound the Mediterranean on the south were well known to the ancients, and were included in the Roman Empire, but the upper reaches of that great river and the main body of the continent to the south of the Desert of Sahara, were practically unknown

The ancients knew little of the main body of the African continent

¹ The Japanese have not left Korea independent. They immediately took control of the administration, and in the summer of 1907 forced the Korean emperor most unwillingly to abdicate. Korea may therefore be regarded as practically annexed to Japan.

to them, and they had no suspicions that the land extended for five thousand miles to the south of Carthage.

How the
Moham-
medans
conquered
northern
Africa

Shortly after the death of Mohammed in 632, his followers began the conquest of Egypt and northern Africa, and in less than a hundred years they had subdued all the region which had formerly been ruled from Rome. From Cape Guardafui on the extreme east, to Cape Verde, lying on the Atlantic, nearly five thousand miles to the west, they introduced their civilization and religion, so that to-day in the towns of Tunis and Morocco one sees many things to remind him of the conditions in Palestine or Arabia. The Mohammedans built up a flourishing trade with the interior; they traversed the deserts and opened caravan routes through the sandy wastes; they pushed their trading settlements down the east coast as far as a point opposite Madagascar; they made maps of that portion of the continent with which they had become familiar, and described its climate and appearance. The knowledge which the Mohammedans had acquired naturally spread into Spain, which long formed a part of their dominions, and it appears probable that the Portuguese also, who began to explore the west coast of Africa in the fifteenth century, received such information as they possessed from the Moors.

The Portu-
guese in
Africa

The Portuguese discovered the mouth of the mighty Congo River in 1482, and Diaz rounded the Cape of Good Hope in 1486. Twelve years later Vasco da Gama, as we know, succeeded in sailing around the southern point of the continent and up nearly to the equator on its eastern coast, where he came in contact with the Mohammedan merchants, who had long been trafficking with the ports of India. He was therefore encouraged to strike boldly across the Indian Ocean and reached Calicut in safety. Although the Portuguese became chiefly interested in the trade with India and the Spice Islands far to the east, they established trading posts in Africa at the mouths of the Senegal and Gambia rivers, and to the south of the Congo, besides colonizing Madeira and the Cape Verde

Islands. Moreover, Vasco da Gama had taken possession, in the name of the king of Portugal, of the island of Mozambique.

In spite of this auspicious beginning Africa remained "the dark continent" for more than three centuries after this first settlement. This was largely due to its singular physical characteristics. No other large division of the earth's surface is so rounded and so little indented as Africa. It has very few good harbors, and there is a long series of lofty mountain ranges, extending almost completely around the outer edge of the continent, which effectively separate the coast from the high table-land which occupies the whole interior. The great South African plateau averages three thousand feet in altitude. There are few navigable rivers, for most of the streams are broken by cataracts as they flow down from the plateau into the sea. The interior is also protected from invasion by deserts, — the vast Sahara on the north, a well-nigh rainless and riverless region, while to the south, above the Cape of Good Hope, there is another great tract which is nearly rainless. Except on the northern margin there were no large towns, and the torrid regions which form so great a part of Africa were occupied mainly by savage tribes.

Inhospitable
character of
Africa

It early occurred to the Europeans that the uncivilized African people could at any rate be utilized to supply the slave market. Lisbon became the first center of a form of trade which seems inhuman and horrible to us now, but which in the fifteenth century was sanctioned by a Papal Bull. Christians of that day argued that the slave trader gave the heathen black man an opportunity to save his soul, even though his body became the property of those who brought him the light of the Gospel.

The slave
trade

Some London merchants as early as 1553 dispatched ships to trade along the coast of Guinea. The Portuguese did what they could to resist the newcomers, but one of the English adventurers brought back a cargo of 400 pounds of gold, 36 hundredweight of pepper, and 250 ivory tusks, thereby

The English
active in the
slave trade


demonstrating to his countrymen the importance of the trade with Africa. During Elizabeth's reign the English came to recognize that the chief value of Africa lay in the supply of slaves which it afforded. In 1562 the famous Captain Hawkins captured three hundred negroes on the Guinea coast and, with the aid of the Lord, as he firmly believed, was able to reach the West Indies and dispose of his living cargo in Hispaniola, thus opening the traffic with America, which, in addition to all the cruelty and misery that it involved, gave rise in the nineteenth century to the horrors of the American Civil War, and transmitted to the United States of to-day the serious race problem which still remains unsolved. It is estimated that in the latter part of the eighteenth century English ships carried away from Africa over fifty thousand slaves a year. The wealth of Liverpool so largely flowed from this business that a celebrated actor, when hissed by an audience in that city, taunted its citizens with dwelling in a town the very stones of which were cemented by the blood of African slaves.

The Dutch
in Africa


The Dutch naturally entered into competition with the English and Portuguese in Africa, as they had in the trade of the Indies. They expelled the Portuguese from their most important strongholds on the west and east coasts, and established their control on the Gold Coast by building forts in close proximity to the English settlements. As a halfway station on the route to India, the Dutch established a post at the Cape of Good Hope in 1652. The colony did not grow rapidly, however, and its population scarcely reached ten thousand at the opening of the nineteenth century.

The French
on the
Senegal

Just before the accession of Louis XIV the French founded a station, St. Louis, at the mouth of the Senegal River, which was destined to become in recent times an important basis for the extension of their power in northwest Africa. They were able to work their way inland and open up relations with the natives, — naturally with the main aim of securing their share of the slave trade.



Cape Town
 C. of Good Hope



Alexandria
 Cairo
 EGYPT
 (Tributary of Turkey
 under British Control)

Anglo-Egyptian Sudan
 Khartoum
 Fashoda
 Darfur

British East Africa
 Stanleyville
 Victoria Nyanza
 German East Africa
 Mombasa
 Zanzibar
 Dar-es-Salaam

Rhodesia
 Bulawayo
 Portuguese East Africa
 Beira
 Sofala
 Mozambique

Delagoa Bay
 Lourenço Marques
 Natal
 Durban
 Port Elizabeth

ASIA

ARABIA

ABYSSINIA

INDIAN OCEAN

INDIA

Arabian Sea

Seychelles Is.
 (To Gr.Br.)
 Amirante Is.
 (To Gr.Br.)

Comoro Is.
 (To Fr.)
 Mayotte

MADAGASCAR
 (To France)

Reunion I.
 (Fr.)
 Mauritius I.
 (To Gr.Br.)
 Rodriguez I.
 (To Gr.Br.)

Comparative Area
 PENN.
 45,216 Square Miles.

40 Longitude 50 East from 60 Greenwich 70

M. N. ENB. BUFFALO



Notwithstanding these various enterprises, no serious attempts had been made by any of the European powers to colonize any portion of Africa before the close of the Napoleonic wars in 1815. Indeed, the suppression of the slave trade had discouraged further activity for a time,¹ for this traffic had been more profitable than the combined trade in gold, ivory, gum, and other African commodities.

The situation in 1815

The situation in 1815 may be summed up as follows: In northern Africa the Sultan of Turkey was the nominal suzerain of Egypt and the so-called Barbary States, that is, Tripoli, Tunis, and Algeria. Morocco was, however, an independent state, as it still is, under the Sultan of Morocco. France maintained her foothold around the mouth of the Senegal River; the most important Portuguese possessions were in Lower Guinea and on the east coast opposite the island of Madagascar; the British held some minor posts along the west coast, and had wrested Cape Colony from the Dutch during the Napoleonic wars. The heart of Africa was still unknown; no European power contemplated laying claim to the arid waste of the Sahara Desert, and the more attractive regions of the upper Nile were ruled by semicivilized Mohammedan chiefs.

For fifty years after the Congress of Vienna the advance of European powers in Africa was very slow indeed. England and France were, it is true, gradually extending their sphere of influence, and explorers were tracing the rivers and mountain chains of the interior. France, as has been explained, conquered Algiers during this period,² and formally annexed it in 1848. The Dutch Boers, disgusted with English rule, had migrated to the north, and laid the foundations of the Transvaal and Orange River colonies.³

Advance of France and England in Africa during the first half of the nineteenth century

The latter half of the nineteenth century was, however, a time of active exploration in Africa. It is impossible here even

¹ See Vol. I, pp. 354-355.

² See above, p. 176.

³ See above, pp. 251-277.

Explorations
of Living-
stone and
others

to name all those who braved the torrid heat, the swamps and fevers, and the danger from savages and wild beasts. Under the auspices of the Royal Geographical Society of England a search was begun for the mysterious sources of the Nile, and a lake lying just south of the equator was discovered in 1858 and named Victoria Nyanza. In 1864 Sir Samuel Baker discovered another lake, Albert Nyanza, to the northwest, and explored its connections with the Nile River. Livingstone had visited Bechuanaland twenty years before, and pushed up the valley of the Zambesi River, tracing it nearly to its source. In 1866 he explored the regions about the lakes of Nyassa and Tanganyika, and reached a point on the upper Congo. This expedition attracted general attention throughout the civilized world. His long absence roused the fear that he was, perhaps, the prisoner of some savage tribe, and on his return to Lake Tanganyika he was met by Henry Stanley, another explorer, who was to rival him in fame, and who had been sent out by the New York *Herald* to search for him. Livingstone, who was both missionary and explorer, continued his work until his death in 1873.

Stanley's
discoveries

Two years later Lieutenant Cameron, at the head of an English expedition which had also been organized with the hope of finding Livingstone, on learning of his death started from Zanzibar on the Indian Ocean and struggled through the heart of Africa, until he caught sight of the Atlantic Ocean at Benguela, south of the Congo River. The same year Stanley set out upon an expedition which is regarded as the most important in the annals of African exploration. After visiting Lakes Victoria Nyanza and Tanganyika, he journeyed across the country to the river Lualaba, and followed its course until he proved that it was only the headwaters of the Congo, down which he found his way to the Atlantic. Meanwhile other explorers, French and German, as well as English, were constantly adding to the knowledge of a hitherto unknown continent.

Stanley's famous journey through the heart of "Darkest Africa" naturally aroused the intense interest of all the European powers, and within ten years after his triumphant return to Marseilles in 1878, the entire surface of Africa had been divided up among the powers, or marked out into "spheres of influence." A generation ago a map of Africa was for the most part indefinite and conjectural, except along the coast. To-day its natural features have been largely determined, and it is traversed by boundary lines almost as carefully drawn as those which separate the various European countries. The manner in which the English, French, and Germans have asserted their claims in Africa has been briefly explained in preceding chapters.¹

Rapid partition of Africa

The whole of the northwestern shoulder of the continent, from the mouth of the Congo to Tunis, belongs, with some exceptions, to France. It must be remembered, however, that a very considerable portion of the French claim is nothing but a desert, totally useless in its present state. On the east coast of Africa France controls French Somaliland, and her port of Jibuti, which lies at the mouth of the Red Sea, gives her somewhat the same advantages that Aden affords the English. The French also hold the island of Madagascar.

French possessions

Between 1884 and 1890 Germany acquired four considerable areas of African territory, which include together nearly a million square miles: Togoland, Kamerun, German Southwest Africa, and German East Africa. The Germans have made heroic efforts to develop these regions by building railways and schools, and expending enormous sums in other ways, but the wars with the natives and the slight commerce which has been established, leave the experiment one of doubtful value.

German possessions

Wedged in between German East Africa and the French Congo is the vast Congo Free State, the history of which began with a conference held in Brussels in 1876 under the auspices of the king of Belgium. Representatives of most of

The Congo Free State

¹ England's African policy is described above, pp. 251 *sqq.*; that of France, pp. 175 *sqq.*; that of Germany, pp. 143 *sqq.* and 148; that of Italy, pp. 102 *sq.*

the European countries were invited to attend, with a view to considering the best methods of opening up the region and of stopping the slave trade which was carried on by the Moham-medans in the interior. The result was the organization of an international African Association with its center at Brussels. The enterprise was, however, in reality the personal affair of King Leopold, who supplied from his own purse a large portion of the funds which were used by Stanley in exploring the Congo basin, establishing posts, and negotiating hundreds of treaties with the petty native chiefs.

The activity of the African Association aroused the apprehensions of the European powers interested in Africa, especially England and Portugal, and a congress was called at Berlin to consider the situation. This met in November, 1884, and every European state except Switzerland sent delegates, as did the United States. The congress recognized the right of the African Association to the vast expanse drained by the Congo River, and declared the new territory a neutral and international state, which should be open to the trade of all nations.

The following year King Leopold announced to the world that he had assumed sovereignty over the Congo Free State, and that he proposed to unite it in a personal union with Belgium. He has gradually filled the government offices with Belgians and established customs lines with a view to raising revenue.

Within the last few years the Belgians have been charged with practicing atrocious cruelties on the natives. There is reason to think that the hideous reports published in the newspapers have been much exaggerated, but there is little doubt that the natives, as commonly happens in such cases, have suffered seriously at the hands of the European invader. King Leopold claimed ownership over the vacant land, and in this way roused the hatred of the peoples who have been used to roam freely in every direction. By a system of "apprenticeship" many of the blacks have been reduced to

Alleged
cruel treat-
ment of the
natives in the
Congo Free
State

the condition of slaves. Labor is hard to secure, for the natives are accustomed to a free life in the jungle, and do not relish driving spikes on railways or draining swamps for Belgian capitalists. The government therefore required native chiefs to furnish a certain number of workmen, and on their failure to supply the demand it has been customary to burn their villages. The government also required the natives to furnish a certain quantity of rubber each year; failure to comply with these demands has also brought summary punishment upon them.

The British government took care to report the conduct of the Belgian officials to the world, and it has aroused loud protests in Europe and America; but those who know most about African conditions suspect that the English had a selfish interest in exaggerating the horrors of the situation, with the hope of ultimately extending their own control over the Congo regions. King Leopold and his agents stoutly maintained that they had been misrepresented, and claimed that their rubber business did not kill so many natives as the whisky which is such an important source of revenue to other nations, especially Great Britain. Whatever truth there may be in these alleged exposures, they led the Belgian ministry to take up the question of the Congo, and they recommended that Belgium assume the complete ownership and control of the Free State, but as yet (December, 1907) the parliament has not ratified the plan.

The Portuguese still control remnants of the possessions to which they laid claim when South Africa was first brought to the attention of Europe, namely, Guinea, Angola, and East Africa. Italy has the colony of Eritrea on the coast of the Red Sea, and Italian Somaliland to the south of Cape Guardafui. Spain's two colonies, one on the Straits of Gibraltar, the other on the Gulf of Guinea, only serve to remind her of the vast colonial empire which she has lost.

Morocco still remains nominally independent of European control, but bids fair to become an object of contention among

African possessions of Portugal, Italy, and Spain

Morocco

them. Its population, which is a curious mixture of Berbers, Tuaregs, Arabs, and negroes, has not materially changed its civilization during the past thousand years. The fierce tribesmen often defy the rule of their sultan at Fez. A bandit leader, Raisuli, seized an English envoy to the sultan, Sir Harry McLean, during the summer of 1907, and still¹ holds him a prisoner. This is but one of many instances which illustrate the inability of the sultan of Morocco to control his subjects and protect foreigners.

The conference at Algeciras

Europeans, especially the French, have, in spite of many difficulties, gradually been developing relations with Morocco. They carry on a trade in almonds, gum, and the famous Moroccan goatskin, and have also lent money to the sultan. The necessity of coming to an agreement in regard to their dealings with Morocco led to a conference of the powers at Algeciras, Spain (just across the bay from Gibraltar) in 1906. Their representatives agreed on the formation of a police force under French and Spanish officers, and the organization of a state bank, which should be controlled by the powers.

The French begin military operations in Morocco

In the summer of 1907 a number of foreigners were killed by the fanatical natives at Casablanca. The French brought up their war ships which proceeded to bombard the town, and several encounters took place between their troops and the Moroccans. This may prove the first step towards the occupation of Morocco by France. Her control of the neighboring Algeria makes the annexation of Morocco particularly tempting to her.

Mehemet Ali establishes himself and his successors as rulers of Egypt

In order to complete our survey of Africa, it is necessary to consider the singular circumstances which have served to bring Egypt under the control of the British. This ancient center of civilization had, as we have seen, been conquered by the Arabs in the seventh century. Eight hundred years later it was overrun by the Ottoman Turks, and in 1517 was organized as a province of the Turkish Empire. With the decline of

¹ December, 1907.

the Sultan's power the country fell under the domination of the Beys, the leaders of a curious military band known as the Mamelukes; and it was against these that Bonaparte fought in 1798. Shortly after Nelson and the English had frustrated Bonaparte's attempt to bring Egypt under French rule, a military adventurer from Albania, Mehemet Ali, compelled the Sultan to recognize him as governor of Egypt in 1805. A few years later he brought about a massacre of the Mamelukes and began a series of reforms. He created an army and a fleet, and not only brought all Egypt under his sway, but established himself at Khartum where he could control the Sudan,¹ or region of the upper Nile. Before his death in 1849 he had induced the Sultan to recognize his heirs as rightful rulers of Egypt.

The importance of Egypt for the western powers was greatly increased by the construction of the Suez Canal begun in 1859,² for both Port Said on the Mediterranean and Suez on the Red Sea are Egyptian ports. The Egyptian ruler, Ismail I, who came to the throne in 1863, had his head turned by the vast wealth which he believed that the canal would bring him, and by the extraordinary prosperity which Egypt was enjoying during the Civil War in America, owing to the enhanced price of Egyptian cotton in the European markets due to the interruption of the American supply. With the consent of the Sultan, he assumed the title of Khedive, and began a career of reckless extravagance and dissipation. European money lenders encouraged his high living, until in 1876 he had involved his country in debt to the amount of nearly four hundred and fifty million dollars. In order to meet his financial embarrassments, he sold a great block of his Suez Canal shares to the British government for some twenty million dollars, or about a seventh of their present value.

The Khedive
Ismail I
(1863-1879)
becomes
hopelessly
involved in
debt

¹ The term Sudan (see map) was applied by the Mohammedans to the whole region south of the Sahara Desert, but as now used it commonly means Anglo-Egyptian Sudan only.

² See above, p. 322.

English and French commissioners take charge of the Khedive's finances (1879-1882)

This sacrifice brought no appreciable relief, and the Khedive's creditors in England and France began to grow nervous. Those who held Egyptian securities thereupon entered into negotiations with the British and French governments. In order to secure control of the Egyptian finances, agents were sent to Egypt who induced the Khedive to establish a new department of the government to deal with the public debt; this was put in charge of two controllers general appointed respectively by England and France. All sources of income which were devoted to the payment of the debt were turned over to these commissioners; indeed, from 1879 to 1882 the whole financial system of the country was practically in their hands.

Arabi's revolt, 1882

This foreign intervention naturally aroused discontent. The country was overtaxed; appropriations for public improvements were reduced; and the old hatred of Moslem for Christian was again awakened. Some discontented army officials, headed by a certain Arabi, took advantage of this dissatisfaction to organize a mutiny. They forced the Khedive to summon a national assembly with the hope that they could in this way get control of the government. When Great Britain and France protested against this interference with existing arrangements, the cry of "Egypt for the Egyptians" rang through the country. Christians were attacked in the streets, and Arabi's party began to fortify Alexandria as an act of defiance to the powers.

The English put down the revolt

A British fleet was, however, lying in the harbor, and its commander ordered the work of fortification to be stopped. Finding that his commands were not obeyed, he bombarded the city, silenced the forts, and drove out Arabi. Additional British forces were immediately sent to Egypt; they landed at Port Said and after a great victory at Tel-el-Kebir, a point lying between Port Said and Cairo, they captured the city of Cairo and forced Arabi to surrender, thus putting an end to the revolt.

England was now in a peculiar position. France had declined to join in suppressing the rebellion, and England's actions were viewed with suspicion by the other powers, who suspected that she planned to annex Egypt. The English government announced, however, that the occupation of Egypt would be only temporary, and would continue only until a stable government was established and the finances put upon a proper basis.

England assumes "temporary" control of Egypt

France now withdrew from the joint control over the Khedive's treasury, and an English financial adviser was substituted for the former controllers general. In September, 1882, the Khedive disbanded his whole army and intrusted the organization of a new army to a British officer, who was given the title of Sirdar. The army now has a full strength of some sixteen thousand men and includes over a hundred British officers. Since the rebellion of 1882 an English army of occupation of about five thousand men has remained in Egypt, for whose maintenance the English government contributes half a million dollars annually.

Trouble, however, soon arose in the Sudan, where a revolt against the Khedive's government was organized under the leadership of Mohammed Ahmed, who claimed to be the Messiah, and found great numbers of fanatical followers who called him El Mahdi, "the leader." General Gordon,—the same officer who had helped Li Hung Chang put down the Taiping rebellion in China,¹—was in charge of the British garrison at Khartum. Here he was besieged by the followers of the Mahdi in 1885, and after a memorable defense fell a victim to their fury, thus adding a tragic page to the military history of the British Empire. This disaster was avenged twelve years later, when in 1897–1898 the Sudan was reconquered and the city of Khartum taken by the British under General Kitchener.

The Mahdi and the death of Gordon

During the occupation of Egypt by the English the progress of the country has been unquestioned; industry and commerce

Results of the English occupation of Egypt

¹ See above, p. 338.-

are growing steadily, public works have been constructed, and financial order has been reëstablished under the supervision of the English agent, whose word is law. There is no reason to think that the present protectorate will not last indefinitely, and it may sometime be transformed into the avowed annexation of Egypt by Great Britain.

Decline of
Spain as a
colonial
power

In striking contrast to the other powers of Europe — Great Britain, France, Germany, and even Italy — stands Spain, who could once boast that the sun never set on her empire. After losing her colonies on the American continents she made no compensating gains in other parts of the world and at the close of the nineteenth century received the final blow in a war with the United States.

The Spanish-
American
War, 1898

The cause of this war was the chronic disturbance which existed in Cuba under Spanish government and which led the United States to decide upon the expulsion of Spain from the western hemisphere. In 1895 the last of many Cuban insurrections broke out and sympathy was immediately manifested in the United States. Both political parties during the presidential campaign of 1896 declared in favor of the Cubans, and with the inauguration of McKinley a policy of intervention was adopted. The American government demanded the recall of General Weyler — whose cruelty had become notorious — and a reform in the treatment of prisoners of war. In February, 1898, the battle ship *Maine* was mysteriously blown up in the harbor of Havana where it had been sent in American interests. Although the cause of this disaster could not be discovered, the United States, maintaining that the conditions in Cuba were intolerable, declared war on Spain in April.

Spain loses
her remain-
ing colonies

The war was brief, for the American forces were everywhere victorious. Cuba and Porto Rico were lost to Spain, and by the capture of the city of Manila in May, the Philippine Islands also fell to the United States. Peace was reëstablished in August and representatives were shortly sent to Paris to arrange the final terms. Cuba was declared independent; Porto

Rico, with the adjoining islands of Vieques and Culebra, and the Philippines were ceded to the United States.¹ The following year the Caroline and Pelew islands were transferred to Germany, and thus the territory of Spain was reduced to the Spanish peninsula, the Balearic and Canary islands, and her small holdings in Africa.

INFLUENCES FAVORING UNIVERSAL PEACE

107. In winning and defending world-wide empires the countries of Europe have been compelled to maintain large military and naval forces in addition to those necessary for actual national defense. Colonies and protectorates inhabited by subject races require the presence of European soldiers; and the protection of merchant vessels on the high seas and in foreign ports demands large navies. Consequently imperial ambitions and patriotic pride have led to a steady increase in the armies and navies of Europe.

Necessity
of great
armies and
navies

The cost of maintaining these great military establishments is greatly enhanced by the continued invention of new and ever more formidable instruments of destruction which speedily render old equipment obsolete and compel every country to keep abreast of the nation most advanced in the science of warfare. The old flintlock rifle loaded at the muzzle gave way to the minie rifle charged with a cartridge and fired by a percussion cap; the minie rifle was in turn supplanted by the breechloader; then came the rapid-fire repeating rifle, with a range of a mile. The ancient muzzle-loading cannon, with its short and uncertain range, has been gradually improved, and in its place we now have the enormous breech-loading Krupp guns carrying balls weighing five hundred pounds for ten miles or more with wonderful accuracy. New explosives of terrible power — nitroglycerin, melinite, and lyddite — make

Enhanced
cost of mili-
tary estab-
lishments
due to new
inventions

¹ Spain also ceded to the United States the island of Guam in the Ladrone Archipelago.

gunpowder seem like a child's plaything, and smokeless powder, by keeping the field clear, makes range finding more deadly than ever. Moreover, new instruments, such as the war balloon, armored trains, automobiles, wireless telegraphy, and search lights, greatly facilitate military operations.

Revolution
in marine
warfare

Sea fighting has undergone a revolution no less complete and rapid. Within fifty years the wooden man of war has disappeared before armored vessels, which are rapidly developing in speed, tonnage, and fighting capacity. Even the battle ship of fifteen years ago is giving way before vessels of the *Dreadnought* type. The ineffectiveness of the ordinary cannon against the steel battle ship has led to the use of torpedoes of terrible explosive power; and these in turn to the invention of torpedo destroyers. The new and dangerous factor of the submarine mine has been added, while the submarine vessel may soon considerably modify the present mode of naval warfare.

Huge modern
standing
armies

Indeed, there seems to be no end to the rivalry of nations in the invention of costly instruments of war. Millions and billions have been expended in ships and guns which have become obsolete without ever being brought into action. France to-day, in time of peace, has an army of over six hundred thousand men and spends nearly two hundred million dollars annually for war purposes, — an establishment which rivals that maintained by Napoleon when at war with all Europe. Germany also supports a standing army of over six hundred thousand men. England spends over three hundred million dollars a year for the army and navy, — five times as much as for education.

How the
preparations
for war may
favor peace

Nevertheless it may be said that this marvelous military development has contributed something to the movement toward peace in Europe. The enormous number of men that would speedily be called into action and hurried to the front in express trains, the countless millions that a general European war with these costly instruments would involve, the terrible loss of life and property that it would bring, — all this

has tended to make statesmen shrink from risking the possibilities of war. Moreover, the cost of maintaining armies on even a peace footing is so great, the strong protest of workingmen and socialists against warfare — anti-militarism as it is called — is so determined, the financial interests involved are so influential, and the effects of international conflicts on industry and trade are so disastrous, that a movement for the peaceful settlement of international disputes and the reduction of armaments has developed in every civilized nation.

There are also other forces working in the direction of international good feeling. Missionaries carry to every corner of the world western ideas and customs as well as the Christian faith; they have also done much toward acquainting the West with the other faiths and social institutions. Scholars from Japan, China, Baroda, Cambodia, and Zululand now come to European universities to learn the latest advances in science and theories of government. Traders of every race mingle in the market places of Europe and America. Ideas are thus exchanged, national prejudices lessened, and men of different races are led to see their common interest in peaceful intercourse.

How the world is being brought together

Moreover, a special effort has been made to make the inventions, science, art, and enterprise of each nation known to the whole world through international expositions. National exhibitions were held in England and France in the eighteenth century, but it was not until 1851 that England, under the encouragement of Albert Edward, prince consort of Queen Victoria, inaugurated an international exposition in the great Crystal Palace, a wonderful structure which long attracted the attention of visitors to London. There were more than seventeen thousand exhibitors, from many nations, and over six million visitors. This example has been followed by New York, Paris, Vienna, Philadelphia, Chicago, St. Louis, Jamestown, and even in the Japanese manufacturing city of Osaka. The Paris Exposition of 1900 was attended by over fifty million

Universal expositions

visitors, and many international congresses were held in connection with it.

While these peaceful influences may be overestimated, it is certain that people who are constantly mingling in the advance of science, invention, and commerce become less and less inclined to warlike pursuits. The advantages of peace make more and more obvious the desirability of rendering it permanent.

For centuries humanitarians have protested against war and the cost of military establishments. William Penn drew up a scheme "For the establishment of an European Dyet, Parliament or Estates"; and the French philosophers of the eighteenth century made eloquent pleas for universal peace. But it was left to the present Tsar, Nicholas II, to propose in 1898 a great conference of the powers at the Hague to discuss the subject of reducing the excessive armaments. Unlike the Congress of Vienna or Berlin, this Peace Conference of 1899 did not meet to bring a war to a close; it came together in a time of European peace to consider how the existing peace might be maintained and military expenditures reduced.

The Hague Conference did nothing, however, toward diminishing the armaments of the powers beyond expressing an opinion that a restriction of the present military burden was extremely desirable and recommending the nations to "examine the possibility of an agreement as to the limitation of armed forces by land and sea." The powers, however, agreed to recognize the right of any nation to offer its services to countries at war with one another for the purpose of mediation. They further recommended parties unable to come to agreement by negotiation to submit matters "involving neither honor nor vital interests" to the investigation of an impartial International Commission of Inquiry, to be constituted by an arrangement between the parties to the controversy.

Finally, the powers agreed upon the establishment of a Permanent Court of Arbitration to which disputants could submit issues on which they were at variance. This great court consists

The Tsar
calls a peace
conference,
1898

The results
of the first
Peace Con-
ference at
the Hague
in 1899

Disarma-
ment

Mediation

Commis-
sions of
inquiry

The Perma-
nent Court of
Arbitration

of persons (not more than four from each country) selected by the respective nations from among their citizens "of recognized competence in international law, enjoying the highest moral reputation, and disposed to accept the duties of arbitrators." From this long list of eminent personages any powers engaged in a controversy may choose a number to form a tribunal for their special case. The close of the first Hague Conference was shortly followed by a large number of treaties between the powers of the world, agreeing to submit to arbitration all questions "which affect neither the national independence nor honor," but it was generally admitted that the conference had done little or nothing toward providing a way to settle those vital issues which actually give rise to great wars.

Nevertheless the outcome of the experiment encouraged the friends of international peace to believe that more practical agreements might be reached which would mitigate, if not prevent, the evils of war. Accordingly, President Roosevelt in 1904 proposed a second conference, but yielded the honor of issuing the call to Nicholas II, who the following year again sent invitations to over fifty nations to participate in the consideration of certain important questions, including the peaceful settlement of international disputes and the regulation of warfare on land and sea. The conference opened at the Hague on June 15, 1907, with the representatives of forty-seven states in attendance, and adjourned on October 18. The proposal of the United States for a permanent international court to which certain matters must be referred was defeated. The pressing question of disarmament was dismissed by a resolution declaring "It is highly desirable that the governments should resume the serious study of the question of limiting armaments." In fact, the conference confined its attention to drawing up treaties regulating the actual conduct of war, the laying of submarine mines, the treatment of prisoners, the bombardment of towns, and the rights of neutrals in time of war. In other words, no steps were taken to reduce military and naval

The second
Hague Con-
ference, 1907

expenses or to advance compulsory arbitration, but a serious effort was made to obtain more general agreement on the rules of war itself.

REFERENCES

Development of the Modern Railway System: THURSTON, *A History of the Growth of the Steam Engine*, pp. 144-220; SAMUELSON, *The Civilization of Our Day*, pp. 103-113.

Development of Steam Navigation: THURSTON, pp. 221-302; SAMUELSON, pp. 91-103.

Telegraph and Post: SAMUELSON, pp. 114-138.

The Commercial Basis of Imperialism: Extract from HOBSON, *Imperialism*, in BEARD, *Introduction to the English Historians*, pp. 623-636; REINSCH, *World Politics*, pp. 3-80.

The Opening of China: DOUGLAS, *Europe and the Far East*, pp. 41-90; REINSCH, pp. 85-195.

Development of Chinese Industries: DOUGLAS, pp. 256-284.

The Opening of Japan: DOUGLAS, pp. 144-168.

The Revolution in Japan: DOUGLAS, pp. 169-209.

The Chino-Japanese War and Intervention by the Powers: DOUGLAS, pp. 304-322.

The Boxer Movement in China and its Repression: DOUGLAS, pp. 323-360.

Causes of the Russo-Japanese Conflict: DOUGLAS, pp. 409-424; ASAKAWA, *The Russo-Japanese Conflict*, pp. 1-64.

Britain in Egypt and the Sudan: ROSE, *The Development of the European Nations*, Vol. II, pp. 143-227.

The Partition of Africa: ROSE, Vol. II, pp. 228-268.

The Congo Free State: ROSE, Vol. II, pp. 269-298.

International Arbitration: FOSTER, *Arbitration and the Hague Court*.

CHAPTER XXXI

SOME OF THE GREAT PROBLEMS OF TO-DAY

THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF MODERN GOVERNMENTS

108. In the preceding thirty chapters we have tried to bridge the gap which separates the Europe of Louis XIV from the world of to-day. We have seen how, in the eighteenth century, the European monarchs light-heartedly made war upon one another in the hope of adding a bit of territory to their realms, or of seating a relative or friend on a vacant throne. Such enterprises were encouraged by the division of Germany and Italy into small states which could be used as counters in this royal game of war and diplomacy. But nevertheless in the eighteenth century European history was already broadening out. The whole eastern half of the continent was brought into relation with the West by Peter the Great and Catharine, and merchants and traders were forcing the problem of colonial expansion upon their several governments. England succeeded in driving France from India and America and in laying the foundation of that empire, unprecedented in extent, over which she rules to-day. Portugal and the Netherlands, once so conspicuous upon the seas, had lost their importance, and the grasp of Spain upon the New World was relaxing.

Review of
the preceding
chapters

We next considered the condition of the people over whom the monarchs of the eighteenth century reigned,— the serfs, the townspeople with their guilds, the nobility, the clergy, and the religious orders. We noted the unlimited authority of the kings and the extraordinary prerogatives and privileges enjoyed by the Roman Catholic clergy. The origin of the Anglican Church and of the many Protestant sects in England

was explained. We next showed how the growing interest in natural science served to wean men from their reverence for the past and to open up vistas of progress; how the French philosophers, Voltaire, Diderot, Rousseau, and many others, attacked existing institutions, and how the so-called enlightened despots who listened to them undertook a few timid reforms, mainly with a view of increasing their own power. But when at last, in 1789, the king of France was forced to call together representatives of his people to help him fill an empty treasury, they seized the opportunity to limit his powers, abolish the old abuses, and proclaim a program of reform which was destined to be accepted in turn by all the European nations.

The wars which began in 1792 led to the establishment of a temporary republic in France, but a military genius, the like of which the world had never before seen, soon brought not only France but a great part of western Europe under his control. He found it to his interest to introduce many of the reforms of the French Revolution in the countries which he conquered and, by his partial consolidation of Germany and the consequent extinction of the Holy Roman Empire, he prepared the way for the creation later of one of the most powerful European states of to-day.

Since the Congress of Vienna, which readjusted the map of Europe after Napoleon's downfall, a number of very important changes have occurred. Both Germany and Italy have been consolidated and have taken their places among the great powers. The Turk has been steadily pushed back, and a group of states unknown in the eighteenth century has come into existence in the Balkan peninsula. Everywhere the monarchs have lost their former absolute powers and have more or less gracefully submitted to the limitations imposed by a constitution. Even the Tsar, while still calling himself "Autocrat of all the Russias," has promised to submit new laws and the provisions of his yearly budget to a parliament, upon which he and his police, however, keep a very sharp eye.

Alongside these important changes an Industrial Revolution has been in progress, the influence of which upon the lives of the people at large has been incalculably greater than all that armies and legislative assemblies have accomplished. It has not only given rise to the most serious problems which face Europe to-day but has heralded in imperialism. During the latter half of the nineteenth century the European powers, especially England, France, Germany, and Russia, have been busy opening up the vast Chinese Empire and other Asiatic countries to European influences, and in this way the whole continent of Asia has, in a certain sense, been drawn into the current of European history. Africa, the borders alone of which were known in 1850, has, during the past thirty years, been explored and apportioned out among the European powers. It will inevitably continue for many years to be completely dominated by them. These are perhaps the most striking features of our study of the past two hundred years.

While it is impossible to forecast the future, it is clear that certain problems now before the world are likely to engage the thoughts of intelligent and public-spirited men and women for a long time to come. Even if all of us cannot contribute directly to their solution, we should regard it as our duty to grasp the main difficulties and dangers which Europe and the world at large now face, and to follow intelligently the discussion that goes on about them. It is the purpose of this concluding chapter to suggest a few of the chief issues which will, in all probability, agitate coming generations as well as our own.

Among the most important questions which have been discussed in newspapers, books, and public assemblies since the opening of the French Revolution are those connected with government. They may, perhaps, be reduced to three: (1) Who shall control the government? (2) How far shall the government be forbidden to interfere with the independence of individual citizens in the conduct of their own affairs?

Purpose of
this concluding
chapter

Three chief
political
questions:
Who shall
control the
government?
What shall
government
not do?
What shall
it do?

(3) What, on the other hand, shall be the responsibilities of the government in protecting the members of society, preventing them from injuring one another, and in promoting the general welfare?

General acceptance in Europe of the principle of democracy

Rousseau, it will be remembered, declared in his popular little treatise, *The Social Contract*, that the will of the people should be law, and this great principle of democratic government was embodied in the first French constitution. It is now practically adopted in all the states of Europe with the exception of Turkey and Russia, and the latter country, as we have seen, appears to be on the verge of modifying its ancient system of despotism.


Question of the extension of the right to vote


But even if the will of the people, instead of the will of a single ruler who claims to receive his power from God, is recognized as the basis of government, the question remains, Who among the people shall be permitted to have a vote in the choice of representatives, and how shall these representatives and government officials be forced to observe the people's will?


Tendency to extend the franchise to all adult males

There has been a growing tendency to extend the franchise to every adult male who is not insane, or a pauper, or a convict. In some countries, notably in Hungary and some of the German states, there is a considerable property qualification which excludes a large portion of the men from voting; and in Italy many are excluded by the requirement that all voters must be able to read and write. Prussia,¹ by classifying the voters according to their wealth, has given the rich more influence than they would otherwise have. Belgium has also given added weight to wealth and intelligence by granting an additional vote to those citizens who possess a certain amount of property or special educational qualifications. Belgium also *requires* every qualified person to vote under pain of a fine, and this practice has been introduced into Austria by the recent election law of 1906.

¹ See above, p. 89.







To many the practice of excluding women from voting has long seemed both unjust and inexpedient.¹ The women appear to have as much at stake in the government as the men. Like the men they are interested in the payment of the taxes, in whether their sons shall serve in the army, in labor laws, sanitation, and education. Those who advocate woman's suffrage urge that the women are very commonly quite as well educated and as well qualified to cast their votes intelligently as the greater part, at least, of the men. These arguments have not fallen on deaf ears, and in Australia and New Zealand women have been granted the ballot. Under certain restrictions they vote on local questions in England, Sweden, Norway, Belgium, and other countries. In 1906 they were put on an absolute equality with the male voters in the progressive grand duchy of Finland. The present prime minister of England has recently declared himself in favor of a limited woman's suffrage.

Woman's
suffrage

In addition to the right to vote, which is being gradually extended to all adults, the people have sought to control their governments in several other ways. The written constitution serves to prevent the king or president, the parliament, and the government officials from exercising a despotic power. All European countries with the exception of England (where the traditions of constitutional government are nevertheless very strong) and Turkey now have written constitutions.

Written
constitutions

The system of responsible ministers, which originated in England,² has found its way into almost all western European countries with the exception of Prussia and the German Empire.³ This enables the cabinet to appeal directly to the people, who are given an opportunity, in a new election of members of the lower house, to approve or condemn a certain policy.

Ministries
responsible to
the lower
house and
the people

¹ See *Readings*, sect. 108, for extracts from the famous work of John Stuart Mill, *The Subjection of Women*.

² See above, pp. 193 *sqq.*

³ In December, 1907, the chancellor of the German Empire, however, announced that henceforth he would consider himself responsible to the majority in the Reichstag.

Right of
initiative

The most democratic system in Europe is to be found in the little federation of Switzerland, where the citizens have not only the right to vote for members of parliament, but may directly control their action after they have been elected. If fifty thousand voters agree in desiring a particular law, they may propose it, require its submission to the people at large, and, in case of its ratification, see that it is put in force, even though the members of the federal parliament may not favor it. This is the so-called *right of initiative*.

The
referendum

The initiative is supplemented by the better-known *referendum*. This is a system which permits thirty thousand voters to join in demanding the annulment or revision of a law which has been passed by the federal parliament. The question must then be submitted to the people, who may approve or reject the proposition.¹

The rights of
man as for-
mulated by
the first
French
Assembly

The members of the French National Assembly, who were the first to furnish a definite program and model for constitutional reform in Europe, were particularly impressed with the things that government had no business to do. This was but natural when one considers the despotic powers of the French kings, and the abuses which were so conspicuous in the eighteenth century. Consequently the Assembly declared that man had certain natural, sacred, and inalienable rights which the government was bound to respect. All men were born free and equal, and every one had a right to his personal liberty (so long as he did not violate the law of the state), to the enjoyment of his property, and to protection against oppression. Liberty, they declared, consisted in the right to do anything which injured no one else. Government was to make no distinctions among those admitted to office except such as were based upon virtue and ability. It was not to excuse any one from paying his due share of the taxes. Every one who committed a crime was

¹ The referendum has attracted a good deal of attention and has been introduced in some of the United States, — Oregon, South Dakota, and Oklahoma, — and in some other states, — New York, for instance, — when certain questions of taxation arise.

to be punished, regardless of his wealth or rank. Liberty was insured to every one to come and go as he pleased, and no one was to be arrested or imprisoned except in the manner prescribed by law. The government was to hinder no man by establishing a censorship, from speaking, writing, or printing his thoughts. The government should not prevent public assemblies so long as they did not lead to disorder. Every one should be permitted to observe that form of religion which he preferred.¹

It was impossible to secure these rights immediately, even in France; both there and elsewhere during the nineteenth century there has been a long struggle to free the individual from the various forms of interference which all the governments of Europe, outside of England, had practiced before the French Revolution.

Two further rights which were not emphasized by the French Assembly have become more and more general. The first of these is that of the individual not only to move about his own country at will and engage in any occupation which his means and his talents will permit, but to leave his country altogether and take up his abode in any part of the globe. The European governments, in general, permit their citizens to expatriate themselves and to become citizens of other lands. Conversely, there is a willingness to receive citizens of other countries and to grant them rights of citizenship.

Right to move about from one country to another

The first French constitution, which had so much to say of the rights of man, said nothing of the rights of woman. In the eighteenth century she was still regarded in the eyes of the law as in every way inferior to man. Nature had destined her to the bearing and the care of children, and to the conduct of the household. In England, down to the year 1870, the law fulfilled to the letter the command of the apostle Peter, "Ye wives,

Former subjugation of women

¹ England, Spain, Portugal, Denmark, Norway, and Russia still maintain State churches; Belgium and the Netherlands grant subsidies for the support of Protestant, Roman Catholic, and Jewish worship, but aside from Russia these states are precluded by their constitutions or laws from acts of religious intolerance.

be in subjection to your husbands." A married woman could enjoy no property rights, her personal possessions — clothes, jewels, and the like — belonged to her husband, and her lands were administered by him. Indeed a wife was, in a sense, her husband's serf; she could not make a valid contract, she could not sue or be sued, her husband could lawfully beat her for disobedience, and if she injured another person or his property, her husband was held for damages, just as if his ox had escaped and committed a depredation. In other countries the conditions were similar.

Rights granted to women during the nineteenth century

It was left for the nineteenth century gradually to free women from a great part of these disabilities, so that they may now make contracts, hold property, and engage in business on their own account. The Industrial Revolution, by opening up new employments to them, has given them a certain kind of independence of man which they never before enjoyed. They now often hold public positions, such as those of sanitary officers, factory inspectors, government clerks, and especially teachers. During the last twenty-five years the universities of Switzerland, Germany, and France have been gradually opened to women as well as to men, while special colleges and technical schools established for their particular benefit are becoming more and more common. It is this change, of course, which is leading to the gradual granting to women of the right to vote.

The modern responsibilities of government

It has, however, become clearer and clearer that the functions of government cannot be confined to merely observing the "imprescriptible" rights of its citizens, maintaining the peace, and repelling the attacks of foreign powers. New responsibilities are constantly being laid upon the governments, both central and local.

Popular education required in democratic countries

For example, governments now recognize that the common people are intelligent creatures worthy and capable of indefinite intellectual improvement. In past centuries rulers regarded their subjects principally as taxpayers, laborers, and soldiers;

but education has now been declared an indispensable part of the advancement of public welfare,—the avowed aim of all modern governments. The success of democratic experiments depends upon the intelligence of the average citizen; the competition for markets requires skilled workmen and managers; and the widening interests of mankind demand the means of acquiring knowledge.

The recognition of these facts has induced almost all the European governments to establish elementary schools, technical institutes, and universities, and to compel even the poorest child to acquire at least the rudiments of knowledge. In England the government appropriates over seventy-five million dollars a year for elementary education alone, and France spends almost fifty million dollars. Illiteracy, once regarded as the natural and inevitable state of the people, has now become a national disgrace which all countries are laboring to remove. Their success may be measured by the decline of illiteracy in the armies. It was the exceptional soldier, in the eighteenth century, who could read and write; now it is the exceptional one who cannot. Less than one per cent of the recruits for the German army are illiterate, and only one in twenty in France cannot read and write.

Modern governments establish schools

The work of the schools is reinforced by the newspapers and magazines. The invention of the steam printing machine and the mechanical typesetter has reduced the cost of the newspaper from ten or twenty cents a copy to from one to three cents. Editions of ten thousand copies, considered enormous at the opening of the nineteenth century, have grown into editions of hundreds of thousands scattered broadcast throughout the land by the express train. The telegraph gathers the news every moment from the four corners of the earth; the conduct of rulers and statesmen, the schemes of reformers, the current political issues are the subject of hourly criticism and discussion, and public opinion can thus be aroused as never before in the history of mankind.

Growth of the popular press

The Industrial Revolution forces the European governments to assume certain responsibilities

The modern responsibilities of government have been largely increased by the Industrial Revolution, by the development of transportation, and by the necessity of meeting the demands of scientific sanitation. The chief results of the Industrial Revolution were pointed out in a previous chapter.¹ The use of machinery led to the establishment of large factories built and controlled by capitalists who hired workmen to run the machinery. It became necessary for the government to interfere in England and elsewhere to protect the workingman from the dangers to which he was exposed in mills and mines, and to prevent the employment of women and children to the detriment of their health and morals. The manner in which England has met this problem has been described in some detail.²

Problem of dividing the fruits of industry among those concerned in production

The Industrial Revolution also raised the question of what proportion of the profits should go to those who actually make the goods, what should fall to the capitalist who furnishes the necessary funds, and what to the manager by whose ability a successful business is properly run and so rendered profitable. This is the great problem of capital and labor, which is one of the most serious questions before the world at the present day.

The government can hardly avoid interfering in the relations of capital and labor

It might seem that the government had no reason to interfere in this matter, but it can hardly avoid interfering even if it does not wish to do so. It must lay down the rules under which business corporations are formed, determine the manner in which taxes shall be imposed, and inheritances divided, and in this way it is bound to affect the distribution of wealth. To take a simple example,—any government might, quite naturally, impose an income tax from which the workingmen, on account of their very small incomes, were exempt. It might also tax inheritances, so that on the death of a capitalist the government would take a considerable part of the wealth he had accumulated. Should the government then use the revenue thus gained for the public good, it would in that way turn it back indirectly to the workingman who had helped produce

¹ See above, pp. 44 *sqq.*

² See above, pp. 208 *sqq.*

it. Such measures do not, however, seem to the labor leaders an adequate solution of the problem, and far more radical changes are suggested by those who advocate a single tax, and by the socialists.¹

The government can, moreover, hardly fail to intervene in the case of strikes, when the workingmen agree to stop work with the view of forcing their employers to pay them higher wages, or grant them shorter hours or other more favorable conditions. When a strike involves the lighting of the city, or the supply of coal for a country, or the running of the railroads, or the operations of the telegraph, the question becomes one of vital public importance. Strikes

There is a growing feeling, too, that the government cannot wholly neglect the unemployed, a class which may be largely increased at a given time by some industrial change or depression; and as we have seen in previous chapters, Germany has made provision through compulsory insurance,² for enforced idleness through sickness or old age. France has recently (1905) enacted a law providing that every French citizen without resources and incapable of earning a livelihood should be entitled to State aid, and in 1906 a system of old-age pensions was established. State insurance for the working classes

The distress of able-bodied workers who cannot find employment offers a more serious problem. It will be remembered that in the Revolution of 1848 in France, the right of man to employment was boldly proclaimed. Hitherto only a few experiments have been made by European governments in furnishing employment to those in need of it. In 1901 the city of Ghent established a system of voluntary insurance for those who dreaded being thrown out of employment, and its success has led to similar arrangements in seven of the chief cities of Belgium. In some German towns, notably Cologne and Leipzig, experiments of the same kind have been made. In 1905 the English Parliament passed an act providing for Problem of the unemployed

¹ See below, pp. 393 *sqq.*

² See above, pp. 141 *sq.*

distress committees in London and other cities to investigate the conditions of labor and establish relief works in case voluntary contributions for their maintenance could be secured. The government thus assumes no financial responsibility, but its action indicates a tendency to recognize its obligation in this matter.

The Industrial Revolution promotes the growth of cities

There is no more extraordinary result of the Industrial Revolution than the rapid development of great cities and the creation of vast manufacturing centers. At the time of the Norman Conquest nine tenths of the people of England lived in villages, and there were no towns with over eight or ten thousand inhabitants. In the middle of the eighteenth century one half of the people still lived in the country, and the population of London did not exceed half a million. To-day eight Englishmen out of every ten live in towns of over ten thousand inhabitants, and greater London has a population of seven millions. In France one third of the population is urban, and in Germany more than one half of the people dwell in towns of two thousand inhabitants and more.

In the eighteenth century no city on the continent could boast of a million inhabitants. Paris to-day has almost three millions,—four times the number it had at the opening of the French Revolution. Berlin, with its two million inhabitants, is twenty times as large as Frederick the Great's capital. St. Petersburg, with its one million three hundred thousand people, has tripled in numbers since the accession of Nicholas I.

Chief results due to the growth of cities

The effects of this great concentration of population are numerous. Three may be especially mentioned. First, cities are naturally the centers of active intellectual life. It is in them that the newspapers and periodicals are published, and their inhabitants are generally more alive to current issues than the people in the country. The cities consequently exercise a much greater influence upon the policy of the government than the country. In the second place, the crowding of people into cities has raised many new problems; for example, protection

from contagious diseases and from the horrors of overcrowding in habitations unfit for human beings, the adequate supply of pure water, of gas and electricity, of street-car lines and telephones, the proper paving, lighting, and cleaning of the streets, and the disposal of garbage and sewage. Thirdly, the growth of the cities, and the problems to which this growth has given rise, have rendered the city governments in many ways more important to the individual citizen than the central government.

Much is now written on the proper organization of the cities and the functions which they ought to undertake. Should they operate their own street railways and lighting plants in the same way that they ordinarily undertake to furnish water for their citizens? Should they furnish playgrounds, public baths, and libraries, as well as schools? It is clear to every one that our cities have grown up for the most part in a haphazard fashion, with little or no forethought, and that they might be far more comfortable and beautiful than they are. It is also clear that those who obtain franchises for street railways may reap vast fortunes by the growth of the city, and still make very inadequate provisions for the public. The questions of municipal control and municipal ownership are therefore very important.

Municipal
ownership

Many who do not believe in socialism favor widening the range of control and ownership by the municipalities. The socialists naturally advocate this policy, and throughout Europe, and especially in Great Britain, there is an increasing number of cities which own and operate waterworks, street railways, gas and electric lighting plants, and other public "utilities." They are even going further and undertaking many enterprises for economic, moral, and artistic improvement which were formerly regarded as of purely private concern. All the cities have established free parks and other means of recreation for the people, and many of them — notably Manchester, Glasgow, and Leeds — provide special playgrounds for the children.

Examples
of municipal
ownership

About one half of the British cities furnish free concerts in the parks during the summer time, and others, such as Manchester and Glasgow, give concerts during the winter at a nominal admission fee. Nearly every German city has its own theater, and many have public halls, with orchestras and conductors supplied at public expense.

The housing
of the poor

The wretched and overcrowded homes of the working people in the towns have long been the subject of discussion and investigation, and many of the great European cities are undertaking to improve these conditions by constructing and managing model tenements at moderate rentals. Within the last twenty-five years London has spent toward ten million dollars in rehousing the poorer inhabitants, without very satisfactory results, owing to the fact that wherever a crowded area was rebuilt only a portion of the former inhabitants could be accommodated.

Profiting by these experiences, the city is now undertaking the largest municipal dwelling-house scheme in the world; land has been secured at Tottenham, about six miles outside the city, and a model town for nearly fifty thousand people will be constructed. In 1903 alone Liverpool built over two thousand tenements and apartments to rent at moderate sums. German cities have attempted to deal with this pressing problem by acquiring land in the suburbs in order to prevent speculation and high rents, with a result that all the large towns own extensive areas of building land. German municipal authorities also exercise a rigid control over the architecture and sanitation of private buildings.

THE WAR ON POVERTY

The per-
sistence of
poverty

109. In spite of the wonderful advances in invention and science and of all the attempts of the various governments to improve the condition of the working classes, a large part of the population of even the most civilized countries spend their

lives in poverty, ignorance, and wretchedness, due principally to low wages, uncertain employment, and overcrowding in the great cities. Unhappily the continental governments have never undertaken a survey of the wages, expenditures, and homes of the people, but scientific investigations made in England by private persons have revealed a misery and degradation which is almost incredible.

Mr. Charles Booth, a wealthy member of a steamship corporation, feeling that there was no accurate information available in regard to the condition of the working people of London, undertook a house-to-house canvass at his own expense. With a large corps of helpers he set about ascertaining the "numerical relations which poverty, misery, and depravity bear to regular earnings and comparative comfort," and in 1889 he published the first two volumes of his work entitled *The Life and Labor of the People of London*, of which sixteen volumes have now appeared. In the district of East London, embracing a population of nearly a million, he found that more than one third of the people belonged to families with incomes of a guinea (about \$5.15) or less a week; that forty-two per cent of the families earned from about \$5.50 to \$7.50 a week; and that only about thirteen per cent had more than \$7.50 a week to live on. His studies further revealed terrible overcrowding in squalid tenements which were badly lighted, poorly equipped with water and sanitary arrangements, and reeking with disease. He reached the startling conclusion that throughout the vast city of London nearly one third of the people were in poverty, that is, they lived on wages too low to provide the necessaries for a decent physical existence, to say nothing of comforts or luxuries.

It might at first sight seem that the poverty of London is exceptionally great, but Mr. Rowntree, in an equally careful survey, has proved that in the city of York, with its population of less than eighty thousand inhabitants, toward one third of the people are also, as in London, in dire poverty. He has

Booth's
survey of
London

Indications
that the
poverty in
London is
not excep-
tional

shown, too, that the physical development of the children, the prevalence of disease, and the death rate corresponded with the rate of wages; in short, that health, happiness, and well-being increased as wages increased. There is reason to believe that conditions are essentially the same in many other English towns as well as on the Continent, although this has not as yet been demonstrated by scientific investigations.

Possibility of
abolishing
poverty

Formerly it was generally assumed that poverty was inevitable and that little could be done to remedy it, since there was not enough wealth in any given community to make everybody comfortable, but the progress of practical inventions and of scientific discovery has roused the hope in the minds of many that if industries were reorganized in a way to avoid waste and to promote efficiency, if the idle were set at work and precautions taken to distribute the wealth in such a way that a few could not, as now, appropriate vast fortunes, there might sometime be a sufficiency for all who were willing to do their part, so that all could live in comfort and bring up their children in healthful surroundings, thus greatly reducing vice and disease. As the kindly Pope Leo XIII well said, "There can be no question that some remedy must be found, and that quickly, for the misery and wretchedness which press so heavily at this moment on a large majority of the very poor."

War on
poverty
declared

Impressed with the terrible conditions which now prevail, and filled with the hope that they may be remedied so far as they are attributable to our bungling, unjust, and unintelligent methods, many high-minded men in all lands have declared war on poverty. They are organizing their forces and summoning the nations to face valiantly the common enemy. While there is as yet no general agreement as to the tactics to be pursued, it should be the duty of every one to follow intelligently the opening of the campaign and the course of the conflict, which must needs be long and fatiguing. We will now turn to some of the plans which have been suggested and the skirmishes which have already begun.

One of the most natural resources of the laboring classes is the formation of associations designed to advance their interests. Among these the *trade union* is the most conspicuous, and such unions have now been formed in every industrial center of Europe. Their main purposes have been to reduce the hours of labor and at the same time to increase, if possible, the wages and improve the conditions under which the work is carried on. The unions have sought to secure their demands by negotiations with the employers, and if necessary by strikes, which have unfortunately often been accompanied by violence and intimidation. The question of the attitude which the government should assume towards trade unions is a difficult one, particularly when a strike causes inconvenience to a large number of consumers and leads to rioting and disorder.

Trade unions

In England at the opening of the nineteenth century all unions of workingmen were forbidden. If employees stopped work in a body, they were punished as criminals guilty of conspiracy, and they were often arrested and imprisoned for merely meeting peacefully to consider their grievances even when there was no strike or difficulty with their employers. The workingmen were, however, able, under the leadership of Francis Place, a London tailor, to induce Parliament to pass an act in 1824 legalizing unions, and granting them the right to "withhold labor from the market by concerted action," although still leaving many restrictions on the right of the workingman to strike.

Attitude of the English government toward unions

It was not until after 1850, however, that trade unionism got a firm hold on British industries: first, by the organization of local unions of workingmen in the various trades, such as the machinists, the iron and steel workers, the miners, the bricklayers, the spinners; then by a national amalgamation of the local unions; and finally by a general federation of all the trades and the organization of a trades congress. In the seventies this powerful organization was able to force Parliament to repeal many of the old laws limiting the action of organized

Parliament repeals many laws restricting the unions, 1872-1876

labor, and to give to the trade unions the right of bringing their influence to bear upon nonunion workingmen, without being liable, as they formerly had been, to prosecution under the conspiracy laws.

English unions become socialistic and influential in Parliament

In spite, however, of their excellent organization, the unions have found it impossible materially to improve the condition of the vast mass of ill-paid laborers, who are often out of employment, and their leaders have during the last twenty years been advocating socialism as the only satisfactory solution. They have also determined to take a hand in politics and send some of their representatives to Parliament in place of the landlords, lawyers, and manufacturers who have hitherto controlled the House of Commons. By active agitation the unions have secured over fifty members in Parliament, and at the first session of the present Parliament in 1906 their influence was seen in the enactment of a law relieving unions from financial liability during the progress of strikes.¹

German unions

In none of the continental countries are trade unions so strong or so well organized as in England, but almost everywhere they take an active part in politics. In Germany the unions have been divided from the beginning on important questions. On the one hand, there are the Hirsch-Duncker unions, — so called from their founders, — which do not contemplate any radical changes in the present system of industry; they claim that the interests of employers and workingmen are identical, and lay stress on arbitration of disputes and the mutual advantages of harmony. On the other hand, there are the socialist unions, which embrace about two thirds of all the organized workingmen in Germany.

Unions in France

In France, as in England, trade unions have been compelled to struggle against repressive legislation, and they have been divided, as in Germany, on political questions. After the guilds were abolished in 1789, a law was passed forbidding all associations of workingmen, and this principle, embodied in the

¹ See below, p. 401.

Criminal Code of Napoleon, was accepted by the third republic until 1884 when the labor leaders, after many appeals to the Chamber of Deputies, secured an act allowing them to form unions without previously obtaining the approval of the police. Under this law the unions have grown rapidly and now number over six hundred thousand members, but they are still divided on political issues. The Central Federation at Paris shows a tendency to reject even schemes of a socialistic nature in favor of more violent and independent action on behalf of the working class.

While workingmen have been engaged in the endeavor to secure fewer hours and higher wages from their employers through collective bargaining, they have also sought to improve their condition by coöperation in the purchase and manufacture of articles of consumption in order to divide among themselves the profits which usually go to factory owners and merchants. As is well known, the competitive system is a wasteful one in many ways. Hundreds of traveling salesmen and innumerable costly devices of advertising are employed in extolling the respective merits of articles which are often of equal value to the consumer, and all this expense is added, of course, to the price of the articles. Moreover, it often happens that between the manufacturer, or producer, and the consumer several "middlemen" reap profits for which they do not always render an equivalent service.

Waste due to competition

The existence of this waste and the profit of middlemen have induced workingmen to form associations to purchase or make products for their own use to be sold to them directly. Great Britain leads all the nations of the world in the number and success of its coöperative societies. The present coöperative movement in England originated in 1844 at Rochdale where twenty-eight weavers, imbued with the theories of Robert Owen,¹ resolved to coöperate in the purchase of food and clothing and thus secure for themselves the profit which had

Coöperative movement in Great Britain

¹ See below, p. 395.

previously gone to the private trader, or middleman. The plan is very simple: the association, of which any one may become a member on payment of a nominal fee, is really a large company, which owns buildings and grounds, employs buyers and clerks, and conducts a general merchandise business; the profits of the enterprise are distributed among the various members of the association according to the amount purchased per month by each.

The small beginnings at Rochdale were so successful that other stores sprang up in neighboring towns; at the present time there are more than fifteen hundred societies — with a combined membership of over two million — doing a business of three hundred million dollars annually and distributing profits to the amount of nearly fifty million dollars. These local societies are federated in great wholesale societies — one in England and another in Scotland — which do a large portion of the wholesale buying and manufacturing for the “stores” scattered throughout the United Kingdom. This enormous enterprise, called by Lord Rosebery “a state within a state,” is carried on by officers elected by the members, thus demonstrating the capacity of the British working classes for self-government and business management. The coöperative societies, unlike the trade unions, have steadily abstained from politics, generally refusing even to aid the Labor Representation Committee, whose object is to increase the number of labor men in Parliament.

Coöperation
on the
Continent

In coöperation, as in trade unionism, the continental workmen have not shown the ability of their English fellow-workmen for organization and independent action. Coöperative shopkeeping first became popular in France during the early sixties, and there are now about eighteen hundred societies, but their combined business is only about one tenth that of the British coöperators. The largest association, which is in Paris, has a membership of eighteen thousand, but there are few societies with more than one thousand members.

In Germany there are nearly two thousand societies with a membership of a million, but the sales are not more than one fifth those of the British societies. The Belgian societies are distinguished for their close affiliations with the socialist party, to the support of which a considerable portion of the profits is devoted.

Notwithstanding all that has been done for the relief of poverty and the protection of the workingman, both by the governments and by the workingmen themselves,—factory legislation, old-age pensions, the establishment of protective unions, and the formation of coöperative societies,—misery and wretchedness seem scarcely to have been reduced, and an ever-increasing number of persons have come to the conclusion that our whole method of production is at fault. They advocate, therefore, some form of *socialism*, a word that has a good many different meanings and is very commonly misrepresented, and even misunderstood.

Socialism a vague term

Poverty is, of course, as old as civilization, and from the fifth century before Christ, when Plato wrote his work on *The Republic*, down to our own days, when writers like Edward Bellamy and H. G. Wells have tried to picture for us an ideal future, men have dreamed of a civilization without poverty, idleness, or ugliness.¹

Precursors of socialism

It will be remembered that during the French Revolution Babœuf declared that reform had only begun, and that the only cure for poverty was the transfer of private property to the State, which should manage it for the good of all. But he made few converts, and his plans came to naught.²

Early socialists

The Napoleonic wars and the restoration of the monarchy did not, however, extinguish interest in social reform, and a

Saint-Simon, 1760-1825

¹ Among these dreamers may be mentioned Sir Thomas More, who, in the time of Henry VIII, wrote the famous little book called *Utopia*, or "the land of nowhere," where everything was arranged as it should be and where men lived together in brotherly love and prosperity. Since his day those who advocate any fundamental revolution in society have commonly been called "Utopians."

² See above, pp. 55 *seq.*

number of writers began to seriously consider various methods of abolishing poverty. Among these Saint-Simon, Fourier, and Robert Owen assume a leading place. The first is commonly regarded as the founder of French socialism. He was the heir to a great name and a considerable fortune and received his education from some of the leading scholars of his day; after demonstrating his love of liberty by participating in the American War of Independence, he devoted himself to the study of means of improving the social order. He came to the conclusion that the government should organize and manage industry through associations which would secure to each worker a reward proportionate to his services to the State. In his book entitled *The New Christianity*, he argued that it was the great mission of the Church to teach the brotherhood of man and to fight poverty and distress. After his death a small school of followers continued to propagate his doctrine.

Fourier,
1772-1837

While Saint-Simon was elaborating his plan for the regeneration of society, another Frenchman, Charles Fourier (b. 1772), was advocating a different remedy for poverty. He did not believe that the central government could possibly manage properly the great business enterprises necessary to human welfare, so he urged the formation of groups of families into what he called "phalanxes," which should each contain about two thousand members. Each group was to own buildings and all the needful implements for the production of the necessities of life. The total product was to be divided up in the following manner: capital was to receive four twelfths, labor five twelfths, and the talent necessary for the proper management of the phalanxes and all their enterprises was to receive three twelfths. Fourier believed that in this way universal harmony would be produced. His profound confidence in his theory is illustrated by the fact that for years he was at his house at twelve o'clock to confer with any philanthropist who felt inclined to furnish the money to start the first phalanx. The awaited visitor never came, but nevertheless Fourier's theories won many

sympathizers, especially in the United States, among men of no less insight than Horace Greeley, Charles A. Dana, and George William Curtis. The experiment of actually founding a species of phalanx was made in Massachusetts by the Brook Farm Colony, of which several distinguished Americans were members for a time.

In England the first great exponent of socialism was Robert Owen,¹ a successful manufacturer and a generous friend of the poor. Like Fourier, he believed that he had found the secret of the regeneration of mankind in the formation of coöperative groups which should own and use for their own benefit all the means of production necessary for their common life. He wrote innumerable works and tracts and preached his doctrine with untiring zeal; he even appealed to the crowned heads of Europe to take up his plan, and came to the United States to defend it before the House of Representatives. Several of his proposed colonies were actually founded in Great Britain, and also in the United States (for example, at New Harmony, Indiana), but they failed for a variety of reasons. Nevertheless, Owen's writings and labors influenced the working classes in England, and it is to his inspiration that the great coöperative enterprises mentioned above are largely due. It is probable, too, that we owe to Owen the word "socialism."

Robert Owen

All these theorists had much in common. They were deeply moved by the misery which they saw about them, they boldly condemned the system of society in which they lived, and proposed a revolution which should remedy its evils. They did not, however, reckon with the great complexity of human nature or the respect for tradition which always stands in the way of change. They assumed that it would only be necessary to present a reasonable and beautiful theory of harmony and plenty in order to induce men to found a new social order. They all appealed to the upper classes for aid in realizing their schemes, and made no attempt to organize the great mass of

The utopian
socialists
regarded by
modern
socialists as
unpractical

¹ See above, p. 211.

workingmen into political parties for the purpose of getting control of the government and forcing it to forward their plans. The modern socialists look back upon these men as unpractical "utopians" who often had good ideas, but were, after all, mere dreamers.

Socialistic
movements
in 1848

In a previous chapter we showed how socialism was taken up in France before the Revolution of 1848 by revolutionary leaders of the working classes.¹ Louis Blanc even succeeded in the first days of the second republic in gaining a momentary recognition, but was able to accomplish nothing, owing to the slight support which he enjoyed. In England some of the Chartists aimed at socialistic reforms, and in the insurrection at Berlin in 1848 the workingmen ventured to advocate some socialistic changes, but nowhere did the movement produce any immediate results.

The *Communist Manifesto*


Nevertheless, it was on the eve of the Revolution of 1848 in Europe that two young Germans, Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, formulated the principles of a new socialism in a proclamation known as the *Communist Manifesto*,² which was destined to become the creed of the greatest international political movement the world has ever seen.

Karl Marx,
1818-1883


The first of these young men may be regarded as the founder of international socialism, although there is no doubt that he owed a great deal to the labors of his colleague. Karl Marx was born in 1818 in Treves, reared in an enlightened home, and educated at the University of Bonn. He had early decided upon the career of a university professor, but the boldness of his speech and his radical tendencies barred his way and consequently he entered journalism. His attacks on the Prussian government led to the suppression of his paper in 1843, and the close surveillance of the police caused him to migrate to Paris. He was, however, expelled from France by

¹ See above, pp. 55 *sq.* and 59 *sqq.*

² The word "communistic" has now given way to "socialistic," which is generally used in the same sense that "communitic" was in 1848.



KARL MARX



Guizot, and after some wanderings he finally settled in London, where he studied and wrote until his death in 1883.

Throughout his life Marx wrote voluminously on history, philosophy, and current politics, and for a time he was a correspondent of the New York *Tribune* when it was under the management of Horace Greeley. His fundamental views on political economy were brought together in a large work of three volumes entitled *Das Kapital* ("Capital"), the first part of which appeared in 1867, but which was left unfinished at his death. This work is so widely circulated among socialist leaders that it is sometimes called "the workingman's Bible," although it contains very few pages indeed that would enlighten a person seeking the cardinal doctrines of modern socialism which Marx laid down.¹ These are to be found throughout his scattered writings and especially in the *Communist Manifesto* mentioned above.

Marx differs fundamentally from the utopian theorists, — Saint-Simon, Fourier, and Owen, — in repudiating the idea that socialism can be introduced by voluntary agreements among kindly disposed persons. He claims that the new order cannot be established artificially, but will nevertheless come, as an inevitable result of the Industrial Revolution which created capitalists and workingmen and introduced intense competition. "The history of all hitherto existing society," he says, "is the history of class struggles. Freeman and slave, patrician and plebeian, lord and serf, guildmaster and journeyman, in a word, oppressor and oppressed, have stood in constant antagonism to one another and carried on an uninterrupted warfare, now secret, now open, which has in every case ended either in the revolutionary reconstruction of society at large or in the common ruin of the contending classes. . . . The modern society that has sprung from the ruins of feudal

¹ The first volume of an English translation appeared in 1886, the second in 1906, while the third is still (1907) in preparation. *Das Kapital* has been translated into all of the continental languages.

Bourgeoisie
vs. pro-
letariat

society has not done away with class antagonisms. It has but established new classes, new conditions of oppression, new forms of struggle in place of the old ones. Our epoch, — the epoch of the bourgeoisie, — possesses, however, this distinctive feature: it has simplified the class antagonisms. Society is more and more splitting up into two great hostile camps, into two great classes directly opposed to each other, bourgeoisie and proletariat.”¹

Central idea
of socialism

In this present struggle, Marx believed, the working class would win by uniting to overthrow the capitalist class, *not, however, by dividing up the property*, — which would even to a socialist seem sheer folly, — but by transferring ownership to the state or nation as a whole, which should operate the means of production for the direct profit of the whole people.

The manner
in which
Marx be-
lieved social-
ism would be
brought
about

The very development of modern industry, Marx contended, favors the establishment of socialism. Wealth and industries are concentrating in the control of great companies, trusts, and corporations, which are managed from a central office and carried on by salaried employees and manual laborers, while the capitalist, he declared, is becoming only a stockholder, an idle drone drawing dividends earned for him by other men. Hence, argued Marx, the capitalist has become a mere owner of property, as useless as the feudal lords in the eighteenth century who neither fought in the armies nor protected the peasants around their castles as their ancestors had done, but crowded about the court of the king, where they lived magnificently on revenues collected by their stewards from the poor people who tilled their estates. Marx therefore predicted that in time the capitalist's right of ownership will be abolished, and that the salaried employees of the great corporations will become the salaried clerks of the government when it takes over all the industries for the common good; thus socialism will be established.

¹ That is, the great mass of the people as distinguished from the capitalistic class, or “bourgeoisie.”

It seems to the socialist that labor, in the broadest sense of the word, is the source of all wealth, whether this consists in houses, railroads, shoes and stockings, flour and potatoes, books, pictures, schools, libraries, newspapers, chemical laboratories, telephones. It was labor, they argue, which produced the capital necessary to establish the factories or railroads, and it is labor which keeps up the stream of goods of all kinds and directs man's energies into new and profitable fields. Every one who contributes in any way to the welfare of mankind should have his share in the general output, whether he be a simple day laborer or an engineer, manager, inventor, designer, teacher, author, editor, or artist.

Socialists maintain that "labor" is the source of all wealth and is therefore entitled to the whole product

But as industry is now organized, the socialist holds, those who happen to have money to invest in machines, farms, and mines often derive a very large revenue from them without taking any part in the work. Consequently the socialists would turn over all of the means of production to the State, just as the roads, the waterworks, the telegraphs and telephones, and the postal system are now frequently in the hands of the government. Private ownership would then be confined to personal effects and articles of consumption, — food, clothing, furniture, pictures, and books. This, they believe, would free the poor from the "exploitation" of the rich capitalists who now too often control the newspapers and the lawmaking in their own interests and are able to arrange everything to increase their personal share in the wealth produced. The extinction of the capitalist is to the socialist the only method of relieving the people as a whole from poverty and oppression.

Socialists would abolish private ownership of the means of production

To those who raise a cry against the injustice of this plan Marx replies: "You are horrified at our intention to do away with private property. But in your existing form of society private property is already done away with for nine tenths of the people; its existence for the few is solely due to its non-existence in the hands of those nine tenths. You reproach us, therefore, for proposing to abolish a form of property which

Reply of Marx to those who cry out against the abolition of private property

can only exist because it is denied to the immense majority of society." So long, he urges, as the fundamental vice remains, the well-meaning efforts of "economists, philanthropists, humanitarians, improvers of the condition of the working class, organizers of charity, members of societies for the prevention of cruelty to animals, temperance agitators, and hole-in-the-corner reformers of every kind" must prove vain or insignificant.

Glorious
picture of a
socialistic
future

In the name of "true democracy and human welfare" Marx and his followers summon the proletariat of every land, who, they urge, have nothing now to lose except their chains, to unite and make the world their own. They hold up before the workingman a picture of a time to come when the idle will be set to labor, and no one will become rich at the cost of his neighbor, when every one will have an opportunity to develop for the benefit of society the best that is in him. Poverty will then disappear, and all men, organized into a great army for the conquest of Nature, will emancipate themselves from hunger and disease and live together in harmony and brotherly love.¹

Socialistic
parties de-
velop in
England

We have seen how socialistic parties have developed in Germany, France, Italy, Austria, Russia, and elsewhere, and are playing a very active part in political campaigns. England, although it was the first to feel the Industrial Revolution, has been the last important country to give birth to a real socialistic party.² In 1883 the Social Democratic Federation was formed to promote the teachings of Marx. This is

¹ Another remedy for poverty was offered by Henry George in his famous work, *Progress and Poverty*, in which he contended that the increase in the value of lands in the cities is due not to the labors of the owners but to the growth of population and industries near by. He therefore argued that all increase in the value of land not due to improvements should be taken in the form of a land tax known as the "single tax." This he held would give the government an ample revenue and abolish poverty besides.

² The "Christian socialism," which Charles Kingsley and others began to preach in the forties, did not advocate the government ownership of the means of production but placed its hopes in "copartnership" workshops, owned and managed by the workingmen.

very active in spite of the small number of its members. It would gladly see the abolition of the monarchy and of the House of Lords, and it refuses to coöperate with either the Liberal or Conservative party. Since 1893 there has come into existence, under the leadership of Keir Hardie, a more moderate socialistic body, known as the Independent Labor party. Its adherents reject Marx's notion of an inevitable class conflict.

The well-known Fabian Society,¹ of which Sidney and Beatrice Webb, George Bernard Shaw, and H. G. Wells have been distinguished members, originated in the early eighties for the purpose of doing away with the waste and misery which our present industrial system entails. The Fabians reject many of the doctrines of Marx, but at the same time they advocate the municipal or national ownership of land and industrial capital. They do not form a political party, but rely upon bringing about better things by writing and lecturing and thus leading people to realize the possibility of reform.

The Fabian Society

In 1901 a Labor Representation Committee was formed in order to secure the united action of the many trade unions and the Independent Labor party. This committee in 1905 pledged itself to work for the chief objects of socialism. When a general election to Parliament occurred in 1906 they were ready to carry on a determined campaign, and the committee, with the aid of the Social Democrats and the Independent Labor party, succeeded in returning no less than fifty labor representatives to the House of Commons. A large number of these are avowed socialists.

Labor representatives returned to Parliament in 1906

It was natural that socialists in the various European countries should endeavor to form a general international association, since they oppose war between nations and believe that all workingmen should combine against the common enemy, the capitalist. In 1864 the International Association of Workingmen was organized at a congress convened in London. It

The International Association of Workingmen

¹ So called from the policy of the Roman dictator Fabius, "who gained his end by going slowly," — *qui cunctando restituit rem.*

held its first meeting in Geneva in 1866 and passed a series of resolutions embodying the ideas of Marx, who had been one of the most active among its organizers. From year to year the "International" grew more and more socialistic, and in spite of the small number of its members it thoroughly frightened the European governments. But in 1876 it collapsed, and since then socialists have turned their whole attention to developing the strength of their cause in their own countries. Nevertheless they continue to maintain a general bureau at Brussels and to hold periodical international congresses.

Objections advanced by the opponents of socialism

It is urged that no government could possibly conduct a socialistic state with economy and efficiency

Quite naturally the socialist movement, aiming at such revolutionary changes in modern society, has roused powerful opposition. Many who freely acknowledge the poverty which exists believe that, whatever advantages socialism may have in theory, it would be impossible to gain these advantages in practice because the government could not manage such huge business concerns honestly and economically. A tendency toward "general incompetence, laziness, dishonesty, and wastefulness," it is argued, "are natural whenever individuals cannot be closely watched and sharply controlled, and losses due to this cause are greater in proportion to the magnitude of the interests managed. In the socialistic hierarchy of State employees, from the highest executives and managers to the humblest unskilled laborers, when every administrator would be managing not his own but the collective wealth, and every laborer and group of laborers (who are also voters) would have his ability and honesty watched not by the sharp eye of the intensely interested private owner, but by the shadowy gaze of official inspectors and by a still more shadowy public opinion, these tendencies would have still greater chance of working without correction or punishment, with the inevitable consequence of a greatly diminished total production. Would not each group and each individual in each group be constantly complaining of every other group and every other individual in his group?"¹

¹ Simonson, *A Plain Examination of Socialism*, p. 126.

Most thoughtful opponents of socialism are agreed that it would prove very difficult if not wholly impossible for the government to distribute the wealth produced among those who participated in its production. They argue that wages are now determined by competition and that each worker gets substantially what his services are worth to the community; but if all wealth produced in a year were at the disposal of the government, on what basis would it be distributed among the inventors, teachers, manual laborers, farmers, and other workers? If all shared equally, — the brilliant and the dull, the inventor and the most unskilled laborer, the idler and the industrious, — it is maintained that individual skill and energy, which now promote progress, would be destroyed. On the other hand, if incomes are to be unequal in the socialist state, on what rules shall the shares be apportioned? "It is absolutely impossible," contends Schäffle, "to ascertain how much of the value of the common product each individual has produced, especially as, even in the socialist state, this would be a result not only of personal labor but also of the means of production belonging in common to the whole of society and of the help afforded by nature. . . . The leading promise of social democracy that each laborer will receive the full value of what he produces is therefore practically and theoretically untenable."¹

Alleged impossibility of distributing wealth according to the deserts of all who contribute to the general welfare

The owners of property naturally resist socialism as an attack on their rights and subversive of the institution of private ownership which has been approved by centuries of human experience. They also contend that most fortunes have been accumulated by industry, thrift, and self-denial, and that any attempt to reduce them would be essentially unjust. "It is not my fault," urges an opponent of socialism, "that some one wants to use my wealth. I am not responsible for his existence or for his necessity; and he has no more right by nature to the use of my property without my consent than I have to the use of his labor. No man has any natural claim on another

Private property defended as a natural right

¹ The *Quintessence of Socialism*, p. 122.

person or on his wealth, whether that wealth be capital for production or wealth merely for personal consumption. To deny that I have any right to ask interest or rent for the use of my property is to deny my right to my property.¹

Competition declared to be inherent in the very nature of things

It is also urged that it is contrary to the very nature of things that competition and the struggle of classes should cease, as the socialist dreams, and that men should live together in harmonious coöperation. Nature has decreed a perpetual struggle of man with man, and in the contest might wins and becomes right; the weak lose and are crowded to the wall; the inferior sink in the conflict, and no laws of man can correct the inequalities which nature has created. "There is no social justice because Nature herself is not just. Injustice and inequality are with us from the cradle. From the cradle to the grave, . . . the inequality of Nature follows man step by step. This appears under a thousand forms, — natural inequality, the chances of birth and inheritance, physical advantages or disadvantages, intellectual disparities, and the inequalities of destiny." The very idea of the socialists that this struggle might cease "is one of those chimerical conceptions that are completely contradicted by facts. Indeed its realization is very far from being a desirable thing. Without the conflict of individuals, races, and classes — in a word, without universal conflict — man would never have emerged from savagery at all, and would never have attained to civilization."²

Leo XIII condemns socialism

Although the socialist party has often declared that religion is a private matter, it has at the same time proclaimed itself in favor of many measures which have aroused the opposition of the clergy, especially of the Catholic Church. Furthermore its members have often denounced the clergy as defenders, in the past, of nobles, kings, and class privileges everywhere. Pope Leo XIII in spite of his keen appreciation of the existing evils felt it incumbent upon him to condemn socialism in no

¹ Simonson, *op. cit.*, p. 83.

² In Le Bon, *The Psychology of Socialism*, p. 331.

uncertain terms as a secular movement attempting reforms without the aid of religious truths. He also asserted that the socialist's "proposals are so clearly futile for all practical purposes that if they were carried out the workingman himself would be the first to suffer. Moreover they are emphatically unjust because they would rob the lawful possessor, bring the State into a sphere which is not its own, and cause complete confusion in the community."

Whether this mutual hostility of poor and rich will deepen in Europe and bring on a new social conflict, or whether there will be concessions on both sides resulting in gradual reform, the future alone can determine. It is clear in any case that the evils of our present organization are being more and more generally understood, and there is hope that many shocking inequalities may gradually be done away with. "Who can gauge the far-reaching influence of even the science we have, in ordering and quickening the imagination of men, in enhancing and assuring their powers? Common men feel secure in enterprises it needed men of genius to conceive in former times. And there is a literature — for all our faults we do write more widely, deeply, disinterestedly, more freely and frankly than any set of writers ever did before — reaching incalculable masses of readers, and embodying an amount of common consciousness and purpose beyond all precedent. Consider only how nowadays the problems that were once inaccessible thoughts of statesmen may be envisaged by common men!"¹

Growth of enlightenment may hasten the solution of the problem

PROGRESS AND EFFECTS OF NATURAL SCIENCE

110. In a previous chapter (IX) the extraordinary advance of natural science in the eighteenth century was briefly described. Through careful observation and experimentation, and the invention of scientific instruments like the microscope and telescope, and by laborious watching, musing, and calculating,

Great importance of scientific research on the lives of men

¹ H. G. Wells, *The Future in America*, p. 256.

men of science — Newton, Linnæus, Buffon, Lavoisier, and hundreds of others — laid the foundations of our modern sciences, astronomy, botany, zoölogy, chemistry, physics. Their researches greatly increased man's knowledge of himself, of the animals and plants about him, of the minerals and gases which he had hitherto so ill understood, of the earth itself, and of the universe in which it revolves. These scientific discoveries have not served merely to gratify a noble curiosity, they have deeply affected the lives even of those who never heard of oxygen and hydrogen or the laws of motion. Scarcely any human interest has escaped the direct influence of natural science, for it has not only begotten a spirit of reform, but is supplying the means for infinitely improving our human lot by bettering the conditions in which we live.

Some examples of scientific advance during the nineteenth century

Great as were the achievements of the eighteenth century, those of the nineteenth were still more startling. In order to appreciate this we have only to recollect that the representatives of the European powers who met together at Vienna after Napoleon's fall had not only never dreamed of telegraphs, telephones, electric lights, and electric cars, which are everyday necessities to us, but they knew nothing of ocean steamships or railways, of photography, anæsthetics, or antiseptics. Such humble comforts as matches, kerosene oil, illuminating gas, and our innumerable India-rubber articles were still unheard of. Sewing machines, typewriters, and lawn mowers would have appeared to them wholly mysterious contrivances whose uses they could not have guessed. Probably none of them had ever heard of the atomic theory; certainly not of the cellular theory, the conservation of energy, evolution, the germ theory of disease, — all these which every college boy and girl now finds in the text-books would have been perfectly strange to Stein or Alexander I.

The progress of science in the twentieth century bids fair, with our ever more refined means of research, to solve many another deep mystery and add enormously to man's power and

resources. Yet, so far, each new discovery has suggested problems hitherto unsuspected. The universe is far more complicated than it was once believed to be, and there seems, therefore, to be no end to profitable research. It should be the aim of every student of modern history to follow the development of science and to observe the ways in which it is constantly changing our habits and our views of man, his origin and destiny. It will be possible here to do no more than suggest some of the more astonishing results of the scientific research which has been carried on with ever-increasing ardor, both in Europe and America during the past hundred years.

Possibility of scientific progress appears almost limitless

To begin with the earth itself, practically every one in Europe fifty years ago believed that it had existed but five or six thousand years, and that during the successive days of a single week God had created it and all the creatures upon it and had set the sun and moon in the firmament to light it. For this conception of creation the geologist, zoölogist, paleontologist, anthropologist, physicist, and astronomer have been substituting another, according to which all things have come to their present estate through a gradual process extending through millions, perhaps billions, of years.

Former conception of creation and of the age of the earth

The earth is now commonly believed to have once been a gaseous ball which gradually cooled until its surface became hardened into the crust upon which we live.¹ Geologists do not agree as to the age of the earth in its present state, and there appears to be no means of definitely settling the question. They infer, however, that it must have required from a hundred to a thousand millions of years for the so-called sedimentary rocks to be laid down in the beds of ancient seas

The tremendous period during which life has probably existed on the earth

¹ Some distinguished scientists hold that there are weighty reasons for supposing that this crust is not more than thirty or forty miles thick, and that the volcanoes are openings which reach down to the molten and gaseous interior. Other geologists, however, either believe that the globe is solid, or humbly confess that we can form no satisfactory conclusions as to its interior, since we have no means of determining the condition of matter under such a tremendous pressure. Recently the theory has been advanced that the earth was gradually built of particles previously flying about in space, and was never a molten mass.

and oceans. Many of these rocks contain fossils which indicate that plants and animals have existed on the earth from the very remote periods when some of these older strata were formed. Accordingly it seems possible that for at least a hundred million years the earth has had its seas and its dry land, differing little in temperature from the green globe familiar to us.

Even if we reduce this period by one half, it is impossible to form more than a faint idea of the time during which plants and the lower forms of animals have probably existed on the earth. Let us imagine a record having been kept during the past fifty million years, in which but a single page should be devoted to the chief changes occurring during each successive five thousand years. This mighty journal would now amount to ten volumes of a thousand pages each; and scarcely more than the last page, Volume X, page 1000, would be assigned to the whole recorded history of the world from the earliest Assyrian and Egyptian inscriptions to the present day.

As for the starry universe of which our sun and his little following of planets form an infinitesimal part — that seems to our poor minds to have existed always and to be boundless in extent. Nevertheless the revelations of the spectroscope and the samples of substances which reach the earth in the form of meteoric dust and stones indicate that heavenly bodies are composed of the same chemical constituents with which we are familiar, — hydrogen, oxygen, nitrogen, carbon, sodium, iron, and so forth.

As early as 1795 the Scotch geologist, James Hutton, published his conclusion that the earth had gradually assumed its present form by slow natural processes; and he roused a storm of protest by declaring that he found “no traces of a beginning and no prospect of an end.” In 1830 Sir Charles Lyell published his famous *Principles of Geology*, in which he explained at great length the manner in which the gradual contraction of the globe, the action of the rain and the frost,

Lyell's
*Principles
of Geology*
first appears
in 1830

had, through countless æons, and without any great general convulsions or cataclysms, formed the mountains and valleys and laid down the strata of limestone, clay, and sandstone. He showed, in short, that the surface of the earth was the result of familiar causes, most of which can still be seen in operation. The work of more recent geologists has tended to substantiate Lyell's views.

And just as the earth itself has slowly changed through the operation of natural forces, so plants and animals appear to have assumed their present forms gradually. Buffon, a French naturalist who was busy upon a vast *Natural History* at the time that Diderot's *Encyclopædia* was in the course of publication, pointed out that all mammals closely resemble each other in their structure, unlike as they may appear to the casual observer. If a horse be compared point by point to a man, "our wonder," he declares, "is excited rather by the resemblances than by the differences between them." As he noted the family resemblances between one species and another he admitted that it looked as if Nature might, if sufficient time were allowed, "have evolved all organized forms from one original type."

In other passages Buffon forecast the great theory of evolution, and in the opening decade of the nineteenth century his fellow-countryman, Lamarck, published a work in which he boldly maintained that the whole animal world has been gradually developed. He was half a century in advance of his times in this conviction, although the causes of development which he assigned would not seem at all adequate to modern zoölogists. Nevertheless other investigators were impressed by the same facts which had led Buffon and Lamarck to their conclusions, and in 1852 Herbert Spencer, in one of his very earliest works, gave many strong and seemingly unanswerable arguments to support the idea that the whole visible universe — the earth, the plants and animals, even man himself and all his ideas and institutions — had slowly developed by a natural process.

Buffon, 1707-1778, discovers signs of a gradual evolution of vegetable and animal life

Idea of evolution adopted by a very few advanced thinkers in the first half of the nineteenth century


Darwin's
theory of
natural
selection

Seven years later (1859) Charles Darwin's *The Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection* — the result of years of the most patient study of plants and animals — finally brought the whole theory of evolution to the attention of the world at large. Darwin maintained that the various species of animals and plants — all the different kinds of monkeys, sparrows, and whales, of maple trees, blackberries, and violets — were not descendants from original separate and individual species created in a certain form which they had always kept, but that these species as they exist in the world to-day were the result of many changes and modifications which have taken place during the millions of years in which plants and animals have lived upon the earth.¹

The nature
of "the strug-
gle for ex-
istence"

Darwin pointed out that if any animal or plant were left free to multiply it would speedily fill the earth. For instance, a single pair of robin redbreasts, or sparrows, if allowed to live and breed unmolested, would under favorable circumstances increase to more than twenty millions in ten years. Consequently since the number of plants and animals shows no actual general increase, it is clear that by far the greater portion of the eggs of birds and fishes, the seeds of plants, and the young of mammals are destroyed before they develop. Heat and cold, rain and drought, are largely responsible for this, but organisms also kill one another in a thousand different ways, often by merely crowding out one another and consuming all the available food. There is thus a perpetual struggle for existence among all organisms, whether of the same or different species, and few only can possibly survive, — one in five, or in ten, or in a thousand, or, in some cases, in a million.

¹ In the introduction to his book he says: "Although much remains obscure, I can entertain no doubt, after the most deliberate and dispassionate judgment of which I am capable, that the view which most naturalists till recently entertained, and which I formerly entertained, — namely, that each species has been independently created, — is erroneous. I am fully convinced that species are not immutable, but that those belonging to what are called the same genera are lineal descendants of some other and generally extinct species."



CHARLES DARWIN



“Then comes the question, Why do some live rather than others? If all the individuals of each species were exactly alike in every respect, we could only say that it is a matter of chance, but they are not alike. We find that they vary in many different ways. Some are stronger, some swifter, some hardier in constitution, some more cunning. An obscure color may render concealment more easy for some; keener sight may enable others to discover prey or escape from an enemy better than their fellows. Among plants the smallest differences may be useful or the reverse. The earliest and strongest shoots may escape the slugs; their greater vigor may enable them to flower and seed earlier in wet autumn; plants best armed with spines or hair may escape being devoured; those whose flowers are most conspicuous may be soonest fertilized by insects. We cannot doubt that, on the whole, any beneficial variation will give the possessor of it a greater probability of living through the tremendous ordeal they have to undergo. There may be something left to chance, but on the whole *the fittest will survive.*”¹

Variation
and the
survival of
the fittest

Darwin's theory was, in short, that species did not endure unchanged, but, owing to the constant variations, those best fitted to survive escaped destruction in the constant struggle for existence and transmitted their advantageous characteristics to their offspring. This idea that all plants and animals, and even man himself, had *developed* instead of being created in their present form, and that man belonged, physically, to the “primates,” the group of animals which includes the apes, shocked a great many people, and the subject began to be discussed with no little heat and sometimes with much indignation by men of science, theologians, and the cultivated public in general.

Among those who enthusiastically welcomed Darwin's book were Spencer, Alfred Wallace (who had reached the same conclusion before he knew of Darwin's work), Huxley, and the

¹ Alfred Wallace, *Darwinism*, chap. i.

Theory of evolution finds defenders and is now accepted by most scientists

American botanist, Asa Gray, all of whom devoted their gifted pens to the defense and explanation of the new ideas. Evolution, although far more disturbing to the older ideas of the world than the discovery of Copernicus that the earth revolves around the sun, made its way far more rapidly into general acceptance, and to-day a large majority of zoölogists, botanists, geologists, and biologists, and indeed a great part of those who have received a scientific training, accept the general theory of evolution as confidently as that of universal gravitation, or the fact that water is composed of oxygen and hydrogen.¹

Evolution may be viewed as raising the dignity of man

The opponents of the theory of evolution have slowly decreased in numbers. At first the clergy, both Protestant and Catholic, could find no words too harsh to apply to the patient and careful Darwin, who seemed to them to contradict the express word of God and to rob man of all his dignity. Darwinism was denounced as "an attempt to dethrone God." Pius IX declared Darwin's theory to be the result of his natural depravity and an absurd attempt to degrade man to the level of the unreasoning brutes. But as time went on many religious leaders, especially among the Protestants, became reconciled to the new view. For on further thought it seemed to them to furnish a more exalted notion of God's purposes and methods than that formerly universally entertained, and instead of degrading man by putting him on a level with the brutes, they came to feel that he still remains as before the goal toward which all Nature's work through the ages is directed.

The atomic theory

While the zoölogist, the botanist, and the geologist were elaborating the theory of evolution, the chemists, physicists,

¹ Many investigators feel, however, that Darwin's explanation of evolution is, as he himself freely admitted, only a partial one and quite inadequate to account for the existing forms of animals and plants. Recently the Dutch naturalist, De Vries, has proved that the marked variations known as "sports" or freaks of nature, may sometimes be perpetuated from generation to generation. These sudden developments are known as "mutations." They would seem to indicate that the species we know, including perhaps man himself, have come into existence more rapidly than would be possible in the slow process of ordinary variation and natural selection. For summary of recent discussions, see Kellogg, *Darwinism Today* (1907).

and astronomers were busy with the problems suggested by matter and energy, — heat, light, electricity, the nature and history of the sun and stars. Early in the nineteenth century an Englishman, Dalton, suggested that all matter acted as if it consisted of *atoms* of the various elements, which combined with one another to form the molecules, or little particles of the innumerable compound substances. For example, an atom of carbon combined with two atoms of oxygen to form the gas commonly called carbonic acid. Moreover as twelve parts by weight of carbon always combined with thirty-two parts of oxygen, it might be inferred that the carbon atom weighed twelve units and each of the two oxygen atoms sixteen. This formed the basis of the atomic theory which, after being very carefully worked out by a great many celebrated investigators, has become the foundation of modern chemistry.

The chemist has been able to analyze the most complex substances and discover just what enters into the make-up of a plant or the body of an animal. He has even succeeded in properly combining (“synthesizing”) atoms in the proper proportions so as to reproduce artificially substances which had previously been produced only by plants or in the bodies of animals; among these are alcohol, indigo, madder, and certain perfumes. The chemist has given us our aniline dyes and many useful new drugs; he has been able greatly to improve and facilitate the production of steel. The Bessemer process is estimated to have added to the world’s wealth no less than two billion dollars annually. The chemist, since he knows just what a plant needs in its make-up, can, after analyzing a soil, supply those chemicals which are needed to produce a particular crop. He is able to determine whether water is pure or not. He is becoming ever more necessary to the manufacturer, mine owner, and agriculturist, besides standing guard over the public health.

Great importance of the chemist to-day

During the nineteenth century the nature of heat and light was at last explained. Light and radiant heat are transmitted

Nature of light

by minute waves produced in the *ether*, a something which it is assumed must everywhere exist, for without some medium the light would not reach us from the sun and stars.

Fundamental importance of electricity

Electricity, of which very little was known in the eighteenth century, has now been promoted to the most important place in the physical universe. It appears to be the chemical affinity or cement between the atoms of a molecule which serves to hold them together. Light is believed to be nothing more than electric forces traveling through the ether from a source of electrical disturbance, namely, the luminous body. Matter itself may ultimately be proved to be nothing more than electricity. The practical applications of electricity during the past thirty years are the most startling and best known of scientific achievements.

How the atom has recently been shown to be very complex

The chemist was long satisfied with his idea of an atom as the smallest particle of matter of whose existence there was any indication. He gradually added to the list of different kinds of atoms and has now named some eighty elements, each of which has its special atomic weight, hydrogen being the lightest. The physicist has, however, discovered a method of breaking up the atom into bits which are only a thousandth part of the mass of a hydrogen atom. Moreover these inconceivably minute particles act as if they were pure negative electricity wholly free from matter. The atom is shown in this way, and by the use of the spectroscope, to be a tremendously complex affair. The "electrons" which compose it appear to revolve within the atom in somewhat the same way that the planets revolve about the sun.

Radio-activity suggests that the elements are not permanent and immutable

As early as the seventeenth century the chemists reached the conclusion that the attempts of the alchemists to change one metal into another were futile, since each element had its particular nature, which so long as it was unmixed with other substances remained forever the same. Within the last ten years even this idea has been modified by the strange conduct of the so-called radio-active bodies, of which radium is the most

striking. This new substance was extracted with the utmost difficulty from a mineral, pitchblende, by Professor Curie of Paris and his distinguished wife and fellow-worker, Madame Curie. Although a ton of pitchblende yielded only the seventh part of a grain of radium in an impure state,¹ and although there are as yet perhaps only a hundred or so grains in the world, this minute quantity has served by its extraordinary properties to indicate that an atom can change its character and become a different substance. So it may be that all matter, as well as all life, has been gradually evolved.

Radium

Radium gives out heat enough in an hour to raise its own weight of water from the freezing to the boiling point, yet it wastes away so gradually that it has been estimated that it would require well-nigh fifteen hundred years to lose half its weight. This extraordinary display of energy must be due to something within the atom itself and not to the breaking up of the molecule, which is called chemical change and of which we take advantage when we burn coal or explode gasoline vapor in order to run our engines. Some optimistic spirits have begun to dream of a time when the energy of the atoms may be utilized to take the place of the relatively weak chemical processes upon which we now rely. But as yet no means has been discovered of hastening, retarding, or in any way controlling the operations which go on within the atoms of radium and other radio-active substances.

Great energy within the atom

In the world of plants and animals the discoveries have been quite as astonishing as in the realm of matter and electricity. About 1838 two German naturalists, Schleidan and Schwann, one of whom had been studying plants and the other animals, compared their observations and reached the conclusion that all living things were composed of minute bodies which they named *cells*. The cells are composed of a gelat-

The cell theory

¹ The Associated Press reports, November 23, 1907, that experiments made by the Vienna Imperial Academy of Sciences promise greatly to cheapen radium. Some forty-six grains have been extracted from a ton of pitchblende, thus reducing the estimated cost of an ounce from three million dollars to one million dollars.

Protoplasm

inous substance to which the name of *protoplasm* was given by the botanist von Mohl in 1846. All life was shown to have its beginning in this protoplasm, and the old theory that very simple organisms might be generated spontaneously from dead matter was shown to be a mistake. As Virchow, the famous German physiologist, expressed it, only a cell can produce another cell,—*omnis cellula a cellula*. The cell corresponds, in a way, to the molecules which form inanimate substances.

Intricate structure of the higher animals

Many very low organisms, like the bacteria, consist of a single cell. The human body, on the other hand, is estimated to contain over twenty-six billions of cells, that is, of minute masses of protoplasm, each of which is due to the division of a previous cell, and all of which sprang from a single original cell, called the ovum, or egg. "All these cells are not alike, however, but just as in a social community one group of individuals devotes itself to the performance of one of the duties requisite to the well-being of the community and another group devotes itself to the performance of another duty, so too, in the body, one group of cells takes upon itself one special function and another, another."¹

Importance of modern biology

The cell theory underlies the study of biology and is shedding a flood of light upon the manner in which the original egg develops and gradually gives rise to all the tissues and organs of the body. It has helped to explain many diseases and in some cases to suggest remedies, or at least rational methods of treatment. Indeed it is most important for our happiness and efficiency, as Dr. Osler well says, that the leaves of the tree of knowledge are serving for the healing of the nations. The human body and the minute structure of its tissues in health and disease, the functions of its various organs and their relations to one another, digestion, assimilation, circulation, and secretion, the extraordinary activities of the blood corpuscles, the nerves and their head and master, the brain,—all these subjects and many others have been studied

¹ McMurrich, *The Development of the Human Body*, 1907, p. 2.

in the ever-increasing number of laboratories and well-equipped hospitals which have been founded during the past century.

Embryology has served to explain many things, and the doctrine of evolution has led to the recognition that "so far as his body is concerned, man is kindred to the brutes; that his diseases, within certain limitations, are identical with similar diseases of the lower animals, that his anatomy and physiology are, in essence, the same as the anatomy and physiology of the lower animals, even the very lowest, and that many of his diseases can be best studied in the lower animals, because upon them we can make exact experiments which would be impossible in man."¹ It is clear enough, in the light of our present knowledge, that the physicians of the eighteenth century relied upon drugs and other treatment which were often far worse than nothing.

How a study of animals throws light on man's body and its diseases

In 1796 Edward Jenner first ventured to try vaccination and thus found a means of prevention for one of the most terrible diseases of his time. With the precautions which experience has taught, his discovery would doubtless rid the world of smallpox altogether if vaccination could be enforced as it has been, for instance, in the German army. But there are always great numbers of negligent persons as well as some actual opponents of vaccination who will combine to give the disease, happily much diminished in prevalence, a long lease of life.

Vaccination, 1796

Just fifty years after Jenner's first epoch-making experiment, Dr. Warren performed, in the Massachusetts General Hospital in Boston, the first serious operation upon a patient who had been rendered unconscious by the use of an anæsthetic, namely, ether. The following year chloroform began to be used for the same purpose in Edinburgh. Before the discovery of anæsthetics few could be induced to undergo the terrible experiences of an operation; even the most unsympathetic surgeon could not bring himself to take the necessary time and care as the agonized victim lay under his knife. Now operations can

Discovery of anæsthetics, 1846-1847

¹ Dr. W. W. Keen, in *The Progress of the Century*, 1901, p. 223.

be prolonged, if necessary, for an hour or more with no additional pain to the patient. During the five years before Dr. Warren performed his famous operation but thirty-seven persons on the average consented annually to undergo an operation in the Massachusetts General Hospital. Fifty years later thirty-seven hundred went through the ordeal in the same hospital in a single year.

Joseph Lister
advocates
antiseptic
surgery

But even after a means was discovered of rendering patients insensible and operations could be undertaken with freedom and deliberation, the cases which ended fatally continued to be very numerous by reason of the blood poisoning, erysipelas, or gangrene which were likely to set in. To open the head, chest, or abdomen was pretty sure to mean death. Joseph Lister, an English professor of surgery, finally hit upon the remedy. By observing the most scrupulous cleanliness in everything connected with his operations and using certain antiseptics, he greatly reduced the number of cases which went wrong. The exact reason for his success was not, however, understood in the early sixties when his work first began to attract attention ; but a new branch of science was just being born which was to reveal not only the cause of infection in wounds but to explain a number of the worst diseases which afflict mankind. Medicine must have remained a blundering and incomplete science had bacteriology not opened up hitherto undreamed-of possibilities in the treatment and prevention of disease.

Bacteriology

Bacteria
named in
1863

As early as 1675 the microscope had revealed minute organisms (*animalculæ*) in putrefying meat, milk, and cheese, and a hundred years later Pleincz of Vienna declared that he was firmly convinced that both disease and the decomposition of animal matter were due to these minute creatures. But a hundred years elapsed before a Frenchman claimed (in 1863) that the virulent ulcer called anthrax was due to little rod-shaped bodies which he named *bacteria*.

Pasteur, a French chemist, turned his attention to this wonderful field of research, and made many important discoveries

beside the treatment for hydrophobia with which his name is most commonly associated. He proved that bacteria were very common in the air, and that it was they that gave rise to what had previously been mistaken for spontaneous generation. He was sent by the government to the south of France to study the disease of the silkworm, the ravages of which were impoverishing the country. He found the bodies and eggs of the silkworms full of bacteria and suggested the proper remedy. His study of fermentation enabled him to prevent great losses also among the wine growers.

Researches
of Pasteur
1822-1895,

Koch of Berlin discovered the "bacillus" of tuberculosis, which produces the most common, perhaps, of all diseases, consumption of the lungs. A similar cause had just been suggested for suppuration and inflammation, and thus it was shown that the precautions taken by Lister had done nothing more than keep away or destroy the bacteria which did the mischief. Other workers have found the germs which cause pneumonia, diphtheria, lockjaw, the bubonic plague, etc.

Germ
theory of
disease

These bacteria are minute plants, rodlike, beadlike, or spiral in shape, which multiply by dividing into two parts, or by forming a germ or spore. They are very tiny. Four thousand of the *larger* kinds put end to end would extend only an inch, whereas the smaller are but one four-hundred-thousandth of an inch in length, and it is possible that some diseases are due to those too small to be seen under the most powerful microscopic lenses. They would do little harm were it not for their tremendous powers of multiplication. Under favorable circumstances the offspring of a single bacillus dividing itself into two every hour would amount to seventeen millions at the end of twenty-four hours. It has been calculated that if the proper conditions could be maintained a little rodlike bacterium which would measure only about a thousandth of an inch in length would, in less than five days, form a mass which would completely fill all the oceans on the earth's surface to the depth of a mile. They are well-nigh everywhere, in air, water,

Nature of
bacteria

milk, on the bodies of men and animals, and in the earth. Many kinds are harmless, and some even appear to be absolutely necessary for the growth of certain most useful plants. Only a few species cause infectious diseases.

Struggle
against
disease-
producing
bacteria

It would, at first sight, seem hopeless to attempt to avoid bacteria, since they are so minute and so numerous, but experience has shown that they can be fended off in surgical cases by a scrupulous sterilization of everything that enters into the operation. That typhoid fever is due ordinarily to impure water or milk, that tuberculosis is spread mainly through the dried sputum of those afflicted with it, that the germs of yellow fever and malaria¹ are transmitted by the mosquito, — all suggest obvious means of precaution, which will greatly reduce the chances of spreading the diseases. Moreover remedies are being discovered in addition to these preventive measures. Pasteur found that animals could be rendered immune to hydrophobia by injections of the virus of the disease. So-called *antitoxins* (counter poisons) have been discovered for diphtheria and lockjaw, but none has yet been found for tuberculosis or pneumonia.

Metschnikoff
and his
phagocytes

The Russian Metschnikoff demonstrated that the white blood corpuscles keep up a constant warfare on the bacteria which find their way into the body, and devour them. Hence he called the white blood corpuscles *phagocytes*, i.e. the cells which eat. Methods of helping the phagocytes to increase and to make a good fight against the noxious bacteria are now occupying the attention of scientists. So the enemies of mankind are one by one being hunted down, and the means of warding them off or of rendering our bodies able to cope with them are being invented.

Necessity of
increasing
attention to
natural
science

It is clear, however, that two things are essential if the struggle against disease, and suffering, and inconvenience of all kinds is to make the progress that the achievements of the past would warrant us in hoping. Far more money must be appropriated

¹ Malaria is not caused by bacteria, nor is the terrible sleeping sickness in Africa, but both are due to minute animal organisms.

by states or given by rich individuals than hitherto in order that an army of investigators with their laboratories and the necessary delicate and costly apparatus may be maintained. In the second place, our schools, colleges, and universities must give even more attention than they now give to spreading a knowledge of natural science and of its uses. A famous English scientist has recommended not only that many more institutions be established in which nature searching shall be the chief aim, but that a political party should be formed which should make a proper scientific training a test question in all elections. No candidate for Parliament would receive the votes of the party "unless he were either himself educated in the knowledge of Nature or promised his support exclusively to ministers who would insist on the utilization of nature-knowledge in the administration of the great departments of State, and would take active measures of a financial character to develop with far greater rapidity and certainty than is at present the case, that inquiry into and control of Nature which is indispensable in human welfare and progress."¹

Recently (1906) a popular newspaper in France asked its readers to give a list of notable Frenchmen in recent times in the order of their greatness. Pasteur came first in the estimation of his countrymen, — Napoleon Bonaparte, fourth. It may well be that men of science, not kings, or warriors, or even statesmen are to be the heroes of the future. Perhaps during the twentieth century the progress of science and its practical applications will be recognized as the most vital element in the history of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Our histories will have to be rewritten. Diderot's *Encyclopædia* will receive more space than the wars of Frederick the Great, and the names of Lyell, Darwin, Lister, Koch, and Curie will take their place alongside those of Metternich, Cavour, and Bismarck.

Possibility of a new kind of history in which kings and warriors will give place to men of science

¹ E. Ray Lankester, *The Kingdom of Man*, pp. 60-61, note.

REFERENCES

- Condition of the Working Classes :** SAMUELSON, *The Civilization of Our Day*, pp. 139-153, 159-181.
- Education in the Nineteenth Century :** SAMUELSON, pp. 252-300.
- Karl Marx and Socialism :** KIRKUP, *History of Socialism*, pp. 130-167; SPARGO, *Socialism*, pp. 46-181.
- Ferdinand Lassalle :** KIRKUP, pp. 73-122.
- Recent Progress of Socialism :** KIRKUP, pp. 311-349.
- The Theory of Evolution :** ALFRED WALLACE, in *The Progress of the Century*, pp. 3-29.
- Advance in Physics :** MENDENHALL, in *The Progress of the Century*, pp. 308-328.
- Development of Medicine :** OSLER, in *The Progress of the Century*, pp. 173-214.
- Bacteriology and the Progress of Surgery :** KEEN, in *The Progress of the Century*, pp. 232-261.

APPENDIX I

RULERS OF THE CHIEF EUROPEAN STATES SINCE THE AGE OF LOUIS XIV

One of the chief conclusions reached in these volumes is that kings have, during the nineteenth century, come to be held in ever-diminishing esteem; and it must be confessed that their names are now of relatively slight importance. Nevertheless they are often referred to in historical works, and we may atone for some seeming slights to royalty in our pages by giving a convenient list of all the rulers down to December, 1907, whose names are likely to be met with. The countries are given in alphabetical order.

AUSTRIA-HUNGARY (see Holy Roman Empire)

BELGIUM

Leopold I, 1831-1865

Leopold II, 1865-

DENMARK (including Norway until 1814)

Frederick III, 1648-1670

Frederick VI (regent, 1784-1808), 1808-1839

Christian V, 1670-1699

Christian VIII, 1839-1848

Frederick IV, 1699-1730

Frederick VII, 1848-1863

Christian VI, 1730-1746

Christian IX, 1863-1906

Frederick V, 1746-1766

Frederick VIII, 1906-

Christian VII, 1766-178

FRANCE

Louis XIV, 1643-1715

The Consulate, 1799-1804
(Napoleon as First Consul)

Louis XV, 1715-1774

The First Empire, 1804-1815
(Napoleon I, Emperor of
the French)

Louis XVI, 1774-1792

The Convention, 1792-1795

The Directory, 1795-1799

FRANCE (*continued*)

Louis XVIII, 1814-1824	Adolphe Thiers, President, 1871-1873
Charles X, 1824-1830	Marshal MacMahon, 1873- 1879
Louis Philippe, 1830-1848	F. J. P. Jules Grévy, 1879- 1887
The Second Republic, 1848-1852	F. Sadi Carnot, 1887-1894
(Louis Napoleon, President)	Casimir Perier, 1894-1895
The Second Empire, 1852-1870	Félix Faure, 1895-1899
(Napoleon III, Emperor of the French)	Émile Loubet, 1899-1906
The Third Republic	Armand Fallières, 1906-
Government of National Defense, 1870-1871	

GERMAN EMPIRE

William I, 1871-1888	William II, 1888-
Frederick III, March-June, 1888	

GREAT BRITAIN

Charles II, 1660-1685	George II, 1727-1760
James II, 1685-1688	George III, 1760-1820
William and Mary, 1689- 1694	George IV, 1820-1830
William III, 1694-1702	William IV, 1830-1837
Anne, 1702-1714	Victoria, 1837-1901
George I, 1714-1727	Edward VII, 1901-

GREECE

Otto I, 1833-1862	George I, 1863-
-------------------	-----------------

HOLY ROMAN EMPIRE AND AUSTRIA-HUNGARY

Leopold I, 1658-1705	(Maria Theresa, Austro-Hun- garian ruler, 1740-1780)
Joseph I, 1705-1711	Francis I, 1745-1765
Charles VI, 1711-1740	Joseph II, 1765-1790
(Charles VII of Bavaria, 1742-1745)	Leopold II, 1790-1792

HOLY ROMAN EMPIRE AND AUSTRIA-HUNGARY (*continued*)

Francis II as Holy Roman Emperor, 1792-1806	Ferdinand I, 1835-1848
As Austrian Emperor, Francis I, 1806-1835	Francis Joseph, 1848-

ITALY

Victor Emmanuel II, 1849-1878 (King of Italy from 1861)	Humbert, 1878-1900 Victor Emmanuel III, 1900-
--	--

MONTENEGRO

Nicholas I, 1860-

NETHERLANDS

William I, 1815-1840	William III, 1849-1890
William II, 1840-1849	Wilhelmina, 1890-

NORWAY

Same rulers as Denmark, 1523-1814	Same rulers as Sweden, 1814-1905
Christian Frederick, 1814	Haakon VII, 1905-

POLAND

John Sobieski, 1674-1696	Frederick Augustus of Saxony (restored), 1709-1733
Frederick Augustus of Saxony, 1697-1704	Frederick Augustus II, 1734-1763
Stanislas Leszcynski, 1704-1709	Stanislas II, 1764-1795

THE POPES

Clement IX, 1667-1669	Innocent XII, 1691-1700
Clement X, 1670-1676	Clement XI, 1700-1721
Innocent XI, 1676-1689	Innocent XIII, 1721-1724
Alexander VIII, 1689-1691	Benedict XIII, 1724-1730

THE POPES (*continued*)

Clement XII, 1730-1740	Leo XII, 1823-1829
Benedict XIV, 1740-1758	Pius VIII, 1829-1830
Clement XIII, 1758-1769	Gregory XVI, 1831-1846
Clement XIV, 1769-1774	Pius IX, 1846-1878
Pius VI, 1775-1799	Leo XIII, 1878-1903
Pius VII, 1800-1823	Pius X, 1903-

PORTUGAL

Alfonso VI, 1656-1683	Peter IV (Dom Pedro), 1826
Peter II, 1683-1706	Maria II, 1826-1828
John V, 1706-1750	Dom Miguel, 1828-1833
Joseph Emmanuel, 1750- 1777	Maria II (restored), 1833- 1853
Maria I and Peter III, 1777-1786	Peter V, 1853-1861
Maria alone, 1786-1816	Luis I, 1861-1889
John (regent, 1791-1816), 1816-1826	Dom Carlos, 1889-

PRUSSIA

Frederick William, the Great Elector, 1640- 1688	Frederick William II, 1786- 1797
Frederick III, Elector, 1688-1701	Frederick William III, 1797- 1840
King Frederick I, 1701- 1713	Frederick William IV, 1840- 1861
Frederick William I, 1713- 1740	William I, 1861-1888
Frederick II, the Great, 1740-1786	Frederick III, 1888
	William II, 1888-

ROUMANIA

Carol I (as king), 1881-

RUSSIA

- | | |
|--|-------------------------------|
| Alexis, 1645-1676 | Ivan VI, 1740-1741 |
| Feodor Alexievitch, 1676-
1682 | Elizabeth, 1741-1761 |
| Ivan V and Peter the
Great, 1682-1689 | Peter III, January-July, 1762 |
| Peter the Great alone,
1689-1725 | Catharine II, 1762-1796 |
| Catharine I, 1725-1727 | Paul, 1796-1801 |
| Peter II, 1727-1730 | Alexander I, 1801-1825 |
| Anna Ivanovna, 1730-1740 | Nicholas I, 1825-1855 |
| | Alexander II, 1855-1881 |
| | Alexander III, 1881-1894 |
| | Nicholas II, 1894- |

SERVIA

- | | |
|--------------------------------|----------------------|
| Milan (as king), 1882-
1889 | Alexander, 1889-1903 |
| | Peter, 1903- |

SPAIN

- | | |
|--|--|
| Charles II, 1665-1700 | Isabella II, 1833-1868 |
| Philip V, 1700-1746 | Revolutionary Government,
1868-1870 |
| Ferdinand VI, 1746-1759 | Amadeo of Savoy, 1870-1873 |
| Charles III, 1759-1788 | Republic, 1873-1874 |
| Charles IV, 1788-1808 | Alfonso XII, 1874-1885 |
| Ferdinand VII, 1808 | Maria (pro tem.), 1885-1886 |
| Joseph Bonaparte, 1808-
1813 | Alfonso XIII, 1886- |
| Ferdinand VII (restored),
1813-1833 | |

SWEDEN

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Charles X, 1654-1660 | Gustavus IV, 1792-1809 |
| Charles XI, 1660-1697 | Charles XIII, 1809-1818 |
| Charles XII, 1697-1718 | Charles (John) XIV, 1818-
1844 |
| Ulrica Eleanora, 1718-1720 | Oscar I, 1844-1859 |
| Frederick I, 1720-1751 | Charles XV, 1859-1872 |
| Adolphus Frederick, 1751-
1771 | Oscar II, 1872-1907 |
| Gustavus III, 1771-1792 | Gustavus V, 1907- |

TURKEY

Mohammed IV, 1649-1687	Abdul Hamid I, 1774-1789
Solyman II, 1687-1691	Selim III, 1789-1807
Achmet II, 1691-1695	Mustapha IV, 1807-1808
Mustapha II, 1695-1703	Mahmoud II, 1808-1839
Achmet III, 1703-1730	Abdul Medjid, 1839-1861
Mahmoud I, 1730-1754	Abdul Aziz, 1861-1876
Othman III, 1754-1757	Amurath V (Murad), 1876
Mustapha III, 1757-1774	Abdul Hamid II, 1876-

APPENDIX II

LIST OF BOOKS¹

- ANDREWS, *Historical Development of Modern Europe* (G. P. Putnam's Sons, \$2.75).
- ASAKAWA, *The Russo-Japanese Conflict* (Houghton, Mifflin & Co., \$2.00).
- BAIN, *Charles XII and the Collapse of the Swedish Empire* [Heroes of the Nation Series] (G. P. Putnam's Sons, \$1.50).
- BEARD, *Introduction to the English Historians* (The Macmillan Company, \$1.60).
- BODLEY, *The Church in France* (A. Constable & Co., London).
- BODLEY, *France* (The Macmillan Company, \$2.50).
- BRIGHT, *Maria Theresa* (The Macmillan Company, 75 cents).
- BURY, *Catherine II* [Foreign Statesmen Series] (The Macmillan Company, 75 cents).
- Cambridge Modern History*, Volume VIII [The French Revolution] (The Macmillan Company, \$4.00).
- Cambridge Modern History*, Volume IX [Napoleon] (The Macmillan Company, \$4.00).
- Cambridge Modern History*, Volume X [The Restoration] (The Macmillan Company, \$4.00).
- CARLYLE, *Frederick the Great*.
- CESARESCO, *Cavour* [Foreign Statesmen Series] (The Macmillan Company, 75 cents).
- CHEYNEY, *Industrial and Social History of England* (The Macmillan Company, \$1.40).
- CHEYNEY, *Short History of England* (Ginn & Company, \$1.40).

¹ The works here enumerated are those referred to in the notes throughout the volume. They would form a valuable and inexpensive collection for use in a high school. The prices given are in most instances subject to a discount, often as high as twenty-five per cent.

- COLBY, *Selections from the Sources of English History* (Longmans, Green & Co., \$1.50).
- COUBERTIN, *The Evolution of France under the Third Republic* [Translated by Isabel F. Hapgood] (T. Y. Crowell & Co., \$3.00).
- DAY, *History of Commerce* (Longmans, Green & Co., \$2.00).
- DAWSON, *Bismarck and State Socialism* (Charles Scribner's Sons, \$1.00).
- DAWSON, *German Socialism and Ferdinand Lasalle* (Charles Scribner's Sons, \$1.00).
- DOUGLAS, *Europe and the Far East* (The Macmillan Company, \$2.00).
- FOSTER, *Arbitration and the Hague Court* (Houghton, Mifflin & Co., \$1.00).
- FOURNIER, *Napoleon I* (Henry Holt & Co., \$2.00).
- FYFFE, *History of Modern Europe* (Henry Holt & Co., \$2.75).
- GREEN, *Short History of the English People*, Revised Edition (Harper & Bros., \$1.20).
- HART, *Formation of the Union* [Epochs of American History Series] (Longmans, Green & Co., \$1.25).
- HASSALL, *Balance of Power* [European History, 1715-1789] (The Macmillan Company, \$1.60).
- HENDERSON, *Short History of Germany*, 2 volumes (The Macmillan Company, \$4.00).
- HIRST, *Adam Smith* [English Men of Letters Series] (The Macmillan Company, 75 cents).
- HOBSON, *Evolution of Modern Capitalism* (Charles Scribner's Sons, \$1.50).
- HOWARD, *Preliminaries of the Revolution* [American Nation Series] (Harper & Bros., \$2.00).
- HUNTER, *A Brief History of the Indian Peoples* (Oxford University Press, 90 cents).
- JOHNSTON, SIR HARRY, *A History of the Colonization of Africa by Alien Races* (The Macmillan Company, \$1.50).
- JOHNSTON, R. M., *Napoleon* (A. S. Barnes & Co., \$1.00).
- JOHNSTON AND SPENCER, *Ireland's Story* (Houghton, Mifflin & Co., \$1.40).
- KENDALL, *Source Book of English History* (The Macmillan Company, 80 cents).

- KIRKUP, *History of Socialism* (The Macmillan Company, \$2.00).
- KITCHIN, *History of France*, 3 volumes (Oxford University Press, \$2.60 a volume).
- LECKY, *History of England in the Eighteenth Century*, 7 volumes (D. Appleton & Co., \$7.00).
- LEE, *Source Book of English History* (Henry Holt & Co., \$2.00).
- LEGER, *History of Austro-Hungary* (G. P. Putnam's Sons).
- LOWELL, A. L., *Governments and Parties in Continental Europe*, 2 volumes (Houghton, Mifflin & Co., \$5.00).
- LOWELL, E. J., *The Eve of the French Revolution* (Houghton, Mifflin & Co., \$2.00).
- LYALL, *Rise of British Dominion in India* (Charles Scribner's Sons, \$1.50).
- LYALL, *Warren Hastings* [English Men of Action Series] (The Macmillan Company, 75 cents).
- MATHEWS, *The French Revolution* (Longmans, Green & Co., \$1.25).
- MAY, *Constitutional History of England*, 3 volumes (Longmans, Green & Co., \$4.50).
- MORFILL, *Poland* (G. P. Putnam's Sons, \$1.50).
- MORLEY, *Diderot and the Encyclopedists*, 2 volumes (The Macmillan Company, \$1.50 a volume).
- MORLEY, *Rousseau*, 2 volumes (The Macmillan Company, \$1.50 per volume).
- MORLEY, *Voltaire* (The Macmillan Company, \$1.50).
- MORLEY, *Walpole* [English Statesmen Series] (The Macmillan Company, 75 cents).
- MÜLLER, *Political History of Recent Times* (American Book Company, \$2.00).
- PERKINS, *France under Louis XV*, 2 volumes (Houghton, Mifflin & Co., \$4.00).
- PERKINS, *France under the Regency* (Houghton, Mifflin & Co., \$2.00).
- PERKINS, *Richelieu* (G. P. Putnam's Sons, \$1.50).
- PHILLIPS, *European History, 1815-1899* (The Macmillan Company, \$1.50).
- RAMBAUD, *History of Russia*, 3 volumes (D. Estes & Co., \$6.00).

- REINSCH, *Colonial Administration* (The Macmillan Company, \$1.25).
- REINSCH, *Colonial Government* (The Macmillan Company, \$1.25).
- REINSCH, *World Politics at End of Nineteenth Century* (The Macmillan Company, \$1.25).
- ROSE, *Development of Modern European Nations*, 2 volumes (G. P. Putnam's Sons, \$2.00).
- ROSE, *The Life of Napoleon I*, two volumes in one (The Macmillan Company, \$3.00).
- ROSE, *Rise of Democracy in England* (Stone, \$1.25).
- SABATIER, PAUL, *Disestablishment in France* (F. Fisher Unwin & Co., London).
- SAMUELSON, *The Civilization of Our Day* (Sampson Low, Marston & Co., London, 1886).
- SAY, *Turgot* [Great French Writers Series] (A. C. McClurg & Co., 75 cents).
- SEIGNOBOS, *Political History of Europe since 1814* (Henry Holt & Co., \$3.00).
- SKRINE, *Expansion of Russia* (The Macmillan Company, \$1.50).
- SOREL, *Montesquieu* [Great French Writers Series] (A. C. McClurg & Co., 75 cents).
- SPARGO, *Socialism* (The Macmillan Company, \$1.25).
- Statesman's Year-Book, The* [1907] (The Macmillan Company, \$3.00).
- STEPHENS, *European History, 1789-1815* (The Macmillan Company, \$1.40).
- STEPHENS, *History of the French Revolution*, 2 volumes (Charles Scribner's Sons, \$5.00).
- STILLMAN, *The Union of Italy* (The Macmillan Company, \$1.60).
- TERRY, *A History of England* (Scott, Foresman & Co., \$2.00).
- THURSTON, *A History of the Growth of the Steam Engine* (D. Appleton & Co., \$2.50).
- THWAITES, *The Colonies* [Epochs of American History Series] (Longmans, Green & Co., \$1.25).
- THWAITES, *France in America* [American Nation Series] (Harper & Bros., \$2.00).
- TRAILL, *William III* (The Macmillan Company, 75 cents).

- TUTTLE, *History of Prussia to the Accession of Frederick the Great*, 4 volumes (Houghton, Mifflin & Co., Volumes I-III, \$2.25 each; Volume IV, \$1.50).
- TYLER, *England in America* [American Nation Series] (Harper & Bros., \$2.00).
- WAKEMAN, *European History, 1598-1715* (The Macmillan Company, \$1.40).
- WALLACE, A. R., AND OTHERS, *Progress of the Century* (Harper & Bros., \$2.50).
- WILSON, *Clive* [English Men of Action Series] (The Macmillan Company, 75 cents).
- WOODWARD, *The Expansion of the British Empire* (The Macmillan Company, \$1.00).



INDEX

This index may be supplemented by the analytical Table of Contents at the opening of each volume and by the side notes. The page references to Volume II are preceded by 2; all other references are to Volume I.

- Absentee landlords, 2, 227.
 Abyssinia, 2, 103.
 Academies of science, 12, 164.
 Accident insurance, in Germany, 2, 141.
 Acre, siege of, 295.
 Act of Union, 2, 225.
 Adrianople, 2, 311.
 Afghanistan, 2, 281 note.
 Africa, 2, 353 *sqq.*
 Aix-la-Chapelle, Treaty of (1668), 18; Peace of (1748), 67; Congress of, 361.
 Albanians, 2, 313.
 Albert Edward, 2, 369.
 Albert Nyanza, 2, 358.
 Alchemy, 159 *sq.*
 Alexander of Battenberg, 2, 312.
 Alexander of Servia, 2, 316.
 Alexander I, 317, 334, 358; 2, 261 *sqq.*
 Alexander II, 2, 278, 308, 311.
 Alexander III, 2, 278 *sqq.*
 Alexandria, 2, 364.
 Alfonso XII, 2, 120 and note.
 Alfonso XIII, 2, 120 note.
 Algeciras, 2, 145 note 1, 362.
 Algeria, 2, 175 *sq.*, 357.
 Alsace, 22; 2, 122 and note, 154.
 Amadeus, 2, 120 and note.
 Amboyna, 88.
 Amherst, Lord, 2, 333.
 Amiens, Treaty of, 304; rupture of, 316.
 Amoy, 2, 335.
 Anæsthetics, 2, 417.
 Anam, 2, 179.
 Ancien régime, 204 *sqq.*
 Anglican Church, 150 *sqq.*, 2, 203 *sqq.*; in Ireland, 2, 229.
 Angra Pequena, 2, 144.
 Anne, Queen, 42 *sq.*
 Anti-clericalism, 2, 167.
 Antiseptic surgery, 2, 418.
 Antitoxins, 2, 420.
 Apprenticeship, 129.
 Arabi, 2, 364.
 Arbitration, international, 2, 370 *sq.*
 Arcole, 290.
 Arkwright, 2, 36.
 Army, the German, 337; 2, 112, 368.
 Artois, count of, 250; 2, 3. *See* Charles X.
 Aspern, 331.
 Assignats, 244, 281, 309.
 Associations, law, 2, 168 *sq.*
 Astrology, 159, 161.
 Astronomy, 162.
 Atomic theory, 2, 412 *sq.*
 Augsburg, League of, 30, 32.
 August 4-5, night of, 237.
 Aurangzeb, 94.
Ausgleich, 2, 123.
 Austerlitz, 318.
 Austria, possessions of, in the eighteenth century, 25; under Maria Theresa, 61 *sqq.*; under Joseph II, 188 *sqq.*; at war with France, 258 *sqq.*, 286 *sqq.*, 302 *sqq.*, 317 *sqq.*, 331, 339; in the Vienna settlement, 342-362 *passim*; and the Revolution of 1848, 2, 72 *sqq.*; and the conflict with Germany, 2, 113 *sqq.*; since 1866, 2, 123 *sqq.*
 Austrian Succession, 61 *sqq.*
 Australasia, 2, 246 *sqq.*
 Australia, 2, 247; commonwealth of, 2, 249.

- Austro-Hungarian Union, **2**,
 123 *sqq.*
Auto-da-fé, 192.
- Baber, 93.
 Babœuf, **2**, 55 *sq.*
 Bacon, Francis, 163, 166 note.
 Bacon, Roger, 158 *sq.*
 Bacteriology, **2**, 418 *sqq.*
 Baden, 307, 319; **2**, 17, 79, 118,
 121 *sq.*
 Baker, Sir Samuel, **2**, 358.
 Balaklava, **2**, 308.
 Balance of power, 48.
 Balboa, 102.
 Balkan peninsula, **2**, 309 *sqq.*
 Ballot act, **2**, 192.
 Baltic provinces, 55.
 Baluchistan, **2**, 307 note.
 Banda, 88.
 Baptists, 153.
 Baroda, **2**, 235.
 Basel, Treaty of, 287.
 Bastille, 234 *sqq.*
 Batak, **2**, 310.
 Batavian republic, 287, 301.
 Bavaria, 63 *sqq.*, 305 *sqq.*; **2**, 16,
 118, 121 *sq.*
 Beaconsfield, **2**, 310. *See* Disraeli.
 Beauharnais, Madame Josephine,
 288.
 Beccaria, 177 *sq.*
 Bechunaland, **2**, 256.
 Belgium, 347 note; **2**, 11 *sq.*, 73,
 376.
 Bengal, 88, 91.
 Berlin, Congress of, **2**, 129, 311,
 360.
 Berlin Decree, 323.
 Bernadotte, 339, 349.
 Bessarabia, **2**, 305.
 Biology, **2**, 416.
 Bismarck, **2**, 112 *sqq.*, 121, 134 *sqq.*
 Black Hole of Calcutta, 96.
 Black Hundreds, **2**, 294, 299.
 Blanc, Louis, **2**, 56 *sqq.*
 Blenheim, 42.
Bloc, the, **2**, 166.
 Blockade, the Continental, 316,
 323 *sqq.*
 Blücher, 338, 340.
 Board of Foreign Missions, **2**, 330.
 Boers, 353; **2**, 352, 357.
 Boer War, **2**, 255.
 Bohemia, 65; **2**, 75.
 Bokhara, **2**, 281 note.
 Bolivia, **2**, 22.
 Bombay, 89, 98.
 Bonaparte, Jerome, 322.
 Bonaparte, Joseph, 320, 329; **2**, 17.
 Bonaparte, Louis, 320. *See* Napo-
 leon III.
 Bonaparte, Napoleon, 273, 285 *sqq.*
 See Napoleon I.
 Bonapartists, **2**, 4.
 Booth, Charles, **2**, 387.
 Bordeaux, 271; **2**, 152.
 Borneo, 84, 90 note.
 Borodino, 335.
 Bosnia, **2**, 128, 309.
 Boston, 119.
 Boulanger, **2**, 163.
 Boulogne, 316.
 Bourbon, origin of House of, 36
 note.
 Bourgoyne, 120.
 Boxer uprising, **2**, 148, 348.
 Boyle, 160.
 Braddock, 68.
 Brahmins, 93.
 Brandenburg, 26, 55 *sqq.*
 Brazil, 102; **2**, 27.
 Bremer, Admiral, **2**, 335.
 Briand, **2**, 172.
 Bright, John, **2**, 215, 229.
 Brissot, 258.
 British Central Africa, **2**, 256.
 British East Africa, **2**, 257 note.
 Brumaire, the Eighteenth, 296.
 Brunswick, manifesto of the duke
 of, 261.
 Buenos Ayres, **2**, 27.
 Buffon, **2**, 409.
 Bulgaria, **2**, 310 *sqq.*
 Bundesrath, **2**, 117 *sq.*, 130 *sq.*
 Bunyan, John, 153.
 Burke, 99.
 Burma, **2**, 236.
 Buxar, battle of, 97.
 Byng, Admiral, 47 note.
 Byron, Lord, **2**, 306.
 Cabinet, 198 *sq.*; **2**, 193 *sqq.*
 Cabot, 106.

- Cabral, 102.
Cahiers, 320 *sq.*
 Cairo, 295; **2**, 364.
 Calcutta, Black Hole of, 96.
 Calendar, reform in the French,
 264 note.
 Calico, **2**, 37 *sq.*
 Calicut, 82, 84.
 Calonne, 222 *sqq.*, 250.
 Calvin, 150, 152 note.
 Cambodia, **2**, 179.
 Cameron, lieutenant, **2**, 358.
 Camp Formio, 291.
 Canada, 107 *sq.*, 111 *sqq.*; **2**,
 242 *sqq.*
 Canning, **2**, 26.
 Cape Colony, 353; **2**, 251 *sqq.*
 Capital and labor, **2**, 382.
 Capitalist, origin of the, **2**, 47.
 Carbonari, **2**, 23.
 Carey, William, **2**, 329.
 Carlists, **2**, 119 note, 120 note.
 Carlsbad, Resolutions of, **2**, 16.
Carmagnole, 263.
 Carnot, 272.
 Carol I, **2**, 311 note.
 Caroline Islands, **2**, 145, 367.
 Cartier, 107.
 Cartwright, **2**, 37.
 Castes, in India, 93.
 Castlereagh, 344, 359.
 Catechism, the imperial, in France,
 327; in Russia, **2**, 269 note.
 Catharine II, 74 *sqq.*, 187 *sq.*, 268,
 304.
 Catholic Church, 135 *sqq.* *See*
 Church.
 Catholic Emancipation, **2**, 205,
 226.
 Catholics, in England, 155; **2**,
 204 *sq.*; in Ireland, **2**, 222 *sqq.*;
 in America, 153 and note. *See*
 Church.
 Cavaignac, **2**, 63.
 Cavour, **2**, 93 *sqq.*, 308 note.
 Celebes, 85, 90 note.
 Cell theory, **2**, 415.
 Censorship of the press, 149, 216;
 2, 284.
 Center, the, **2**, 137.
 Ceylon, 353.
 Chamberlain, **2**, 217.
 Chambord, count of, **2**, 157 *sqq.*
 Champlain, 107.
 Champs de Mars, 253.
 Chancellor, the German, **2**, 132.
 Charles I, of England, 30 note.
 Charles II, of England, 20, 30 and
 note, 89.
 Charles II, of Spain, 16 *sq.*, 39 *sq.*
 Charles III, of Spain, 190 *sq.*
 Charles IV, of Spain, 329 note.
 Charles V, Emperor, 15 note.
 Charles VI, Emperor, 44.
 Charles VII, Emperor, 65.
 Charles X, of France, **2**, 5 *sqq.* *See*
 Artois, count of.
 Charles XII, of Sweden, 54 *sq.*
 Charles Albert, of Bavaria, 65.
 Charles Albert, of Sardinia, **2**,
 84 *sq.*
 Charles Edward, 68 note.
 Charter, the French constitu-
 tional, **2**, 10.
 Chartism, **2**, 73, 187 *sqq.*
 Chateaux, burning of, 237.
 Chemistry, 160 *sq.*; **2**, 413.
 Child labor, **2**, 48, 209 *sq.*
 Chili, **2**, 22.
 China, 81; **2**, 331 *sqq.*, 346 *sqq.*
 Chino-Japanese war, **2**, 343 *sqq.*
Christinos, **2**, 119 note.
 Church, in the eighteenth century,
 135 *sqq.*; in Austria, 189, **2**,
 126; in England, 150 *sqq.*, **2**,
 203 *sqq.*; in France, 208, 234 *sqq.*
 and note, **2**, 166 *sqq.*; in Italy,
 2, 20, 99 *sqq.*; in Spain, **2**, 379
 note.
 Church and State, problems of,
 138 *sqq.*
 Circumnavigation of the earth,
 103.
 Cisalpine republic, 291.
 Cities, growth of, 127 *sqq.*; **2**,
 46 *sq.*, 384.
 Civil Constitution of the Clergy,
 244 *sqq.*
 Clement XIV, 194.
 Clergy. *See* Church.
Clermont, The, **2**, 320.
 Cleves, 55.
 Clive, 95.
 Cobbett, **2**, 185.

- Cobden, **2**, 215.
 Cochín China, **2**, 175, 179.
 Code Napoleon, 313.
 Codes of Germany, **2**, 134.
 Colbert, 10 *sqq.*, 91.
 Cologne, elector of, 24.
 Colombia, **2**, 27, 323.
 Colonial conference, **2**, 258.
 Columbus, 101 *sqq.*
 Commerce, expansion of, **2**, 49, 318 *sqq.*
 "Committee of the Eight," 346.
 Committee of Public Safety, 269, 273 *sqq.*
 Common Prayer, Book of, 150.
 Commons, House of. *See* Parliament.
 Commune, 236, 263; of 1871, **2**, 154 *sqq.*
 "Communist Manifesto," **2**, 396 *sqq.*
 Concordat of 1801, 311; **2**, 2, 169.
 Confederation, the German, **2**, 12 *sqq.*, 115 *sq.*
 Confederation of the Rhine, 319, 338 *sq.*
 Congo, French, **2**, 177.
 Congo Free State, **2**, 359 *sqq.*
Congregatio de propaganda fide, **2**, 329.
 Congress, Continental, 120.
 Connecticut, 109.
 Conservatives in England, **2**, 197.
 Constantinople, fall of, **2**, 304.
 Constitution, the Austro-Hungarian, **2**, 123 *sqq.*; the English, 195 *sqq.*, **2**, 193 *sqq.*; the French, of 1791, 242 *sq.*; of the Year III, 281 *sq.*; of 1814, **2**, 2; of 1848, **2**, 63; of 1875, **2**, 160; the German, **2**, 115 *sqq.*, 130 *sqq.*; the Italian, **2**, 100 *sqq.*; Spanish, **2**, 18, 22 *sq.*, 120 note. *See also* Belgium, Greece, and other minor countries.
 Constitutional democrats, in Russia, **2**, 287.
 Consulate, 296 *sqq.*
 Continental Blockade, 323 *sqq.*
 Convention, the, 264 *sqq.*
 Cook, Captain, **2**, 247.
 Coöperative movement, **2**, 391 *sqq.*
 Copernicus, 162.
 Cordeliers, 252.
 Corn laws, **2**, 215 *sq.*
 Corneille, 11.
 Cornwallis, Lord, 99 note, 121.
 Corsica, 285.
 Cortes, 103.
 Corvée, 220.
 Crete, **2**, 316 note.
 Criminal law in England, 178; **2**, 206 *sqq.*
 Croats (Croats), 63; **2**, 125. *See* Austria.
 Cromwell, 30 note, 89.
 Crown Point, 114.
 Cuba, 35; **2**, 366.
 Culloden, battle of, 68 note.
 Curie, **2**, 415.
 Cushing, Caleb, **2**, 335.
 Customs lines, in France, 206; in Spain, 330; in Germany, **2**, 109. *See* Zollverein.
 Custozza, **2**, 85.
 Czechs, **2**, 74 *sq.*, 125 and note. *See* Austria.
 D'Alembert, 173.
 Dalhousie, **2**, 237.
 Danton, 252 *sq.*, 263, 270, 275.
 Darwin, **2**, 410 *sqq.*
 Dauphiny, 228.
 D'Azeglio, **2**, 86.
 Decembrist revolt, **2**, 267.
 Declaration of Right, the English, 32.
 Declaration of the Rights of Man, 238 *sqq.*
 Deists, 168.
 De Launay, 235.
 De Lesseps, **2**, 322 *sq.*
 Delegations, Austro-Hungarian, **2**, 124.
 Delhi, **2**, 239.
 Denmark, 349; **2**, 14, 113 *sqq.*, 115 note.
 Departments, French, origin of, 238.
 Derby, Lord, **2**, 191.
 Desaix, 303.
 Desmoulins, 234, 252 *sq.*, 275 *sq.*
 De Soto, 104.
 Despotism, enlightened, 184 *sqq.*
 De Vries, **2**, 412.
 D'Herbois, Collot, 273.

- Diaz, 82.
 Diderot, 172 *sq.*
 Diet, the imperial, 24.
 Diplomatic revolution, 69.
 Directory, 282, 288 *sqq.*, 298.
 Disarmament, 2, 370 *sqq.*
 Disraeli, 2, 190 *sq.* See Beaconsfield.
 Dissenters, 155; 2, 203 *sqq.*
 Distaff, 2, 32.
 Diu, 84, 90 note.
 Divine right, 6.
 Division of labor, 2, 45.
 Division of powers, 176.
 Dogger Bank affair, 2, 352 note.
 Domestic system, 2, 44.
 Don Carlos, 2, 119 and note.
 Dowager empress of China, 2, 348 *sqq.*
 Drake, 38, 106.
 Drenthe, 19 note 2.
 Dresden, 338.
 Dreyfus, 2, 161 *sqq.*
 Dual monarchy, 2, 123 *sqq.*
 Duma, 2, 295 *sqq.*
 Dumouriez, 259, 265, 268.
 Dunkirk, 272.
 Dupleix, 94 *sq.*
 Durham, Lord, 2, 244.
 Dutch, the, 85 *sqq.*, 109; 2, 251, 356.
 East India Company, the English, 86, 89, 97 *sqq.*, 2, 240; the French, 91.
 Eastern Roumelia, 2, 311 *sq.*
 Ecclesiastical electors, 27.
 Ecuador, 2, 22.
 Education, in England, 2, 218 *sqq.*; in France, 2, 167 *sq.*; in Italy, 2, 105.
 Edward VII, 2, 259.
 Egypt, 294 *sq.*; 2, 362 *sqq.*
 Elba, 340.
 Elders, Council of, 281, 296.
 Elector, the Great, 56 *sq.*
 Electors of the Empire, 24 *sqq.*
 Electricity, 2, 414.
 Elizabeth of Parma, 44, 66.
 Elizabeth of Russia, 70 *sq.*
 Embargo act, 325.
 Embryology, 2, 417.
 Emigration, Italian, 2, 105 *sqq.*;
 Irish, 2, 227 *sq.*
 Émigrés, 250, 257.
 Encyclopædia, the, 172 *sqq.*
 Engels, 2, 396.
 Enghien, duke of, 317.
 England, the Revolution of 1688 in, 30; and the War of the Spanish Succession, 36 *sqq.*; and the struggle for India, 86 *sqq.*; in the conflict for North America, 105 *sqq.*; the Church in, 150 *sqq.*; government of, in the eighteenth century, 195 *sqq.*; at war with France, 267-341 *passim*; Industrial Revolution in, 30-49; political reforms in, 2, 181-200; social reforms in, 201-232; expansion of, in the nineteenth century, 2, 233-260; in Egypt, 2, 362 *sqq.*
 Eritrea, 2, 103.
 Established Church, 150 *sqq.*
 Estates General, 7 *sq.*, 228 *sqq.*
 Esterhazy, 2, 164.
 Esthonia, 55.
 Evolution, 2, 409 *sqq.*
 Expatriation, right of, 2, 379.
 Expositions, international, 2, 369.
 Fabian Society, 2, 401.
 Factories, in India, 88.
 Factory reform in England, 2, 208 *sqq.*
 Factory system, 2, 44 *sqq.*
 Fashoda, 2, 177.
 Febronius, 146 *sq.*, 191.
 February Revolution, 2, 58 *sqq.*
 Fenians, 2, 228 *sq.*
 Ferdinand of Coburg, 2, 312.
 Ferdinand VII, 2, 17 *sqq.*
 Feudalism, 122 *sqq.*, 189 *sq.*, 238, 336; 2, 341.
 Finland, 2, 264, 285.
 Five Hundred, Council of, 281, 296.
 Florida, 104, 121.
 Fly-shuttle, 2, 34.
 Formosa, 2, 344.
 Fort Duquesne, 69, 114.
 Fort St. George, 88.
 Fourier, 2, 394 *sq.*
 Fox, Charles J., 267 note

- Fox, George, 153.
 France, under Louis XIV, 4 *sqq.* ;
 in wars of Frederick the Great,
 66 *sqq.* ; in the contest for India,
 91 *sqq.* ; in the struggle for North
 America, 107 *sqq.* ; on the eve
 of the Revolution, 203-223 ; the
 Revolution in, 224-248 ; the first
 Republic of, 249-283 ; under
 Napoleon, 284-341 ; after the
 Congress of Vienna, 2, 1 *sqq.* ;
 the Industrial Revolution in,
 49 *sqq.* ; the Revolution of 1848
 in, 2, 53 *sqq.* ; under Napoleon
 III, 2, 66 *sqq.* ; and the war with
 Prussia, 2, 118 *sqq.* ; under the
 Third Republic, 2, 151-180.
 Franche Comté, 15 *sq.*, 18, 22.
 Francis II, 302, 320, 333 note.
 Francis Joseph, 2, 83.
 Franco-Prussian War, 2, 121 *sq.*
 Frankfurt National Assembly, 2,
 79 *sq.*, 86 *sq.*
 Frankfort, diet of, 2, 14 ; Treaty
 of, 2, 153.
 Frederick III, 2, 145 note 2.
 Frederick the Great, 74 *sqq.*, 184
sqq.
 Frederick William, Elector of
 Brandenburg, 26.
 Frederick William I, 58 *sq.*
 Frederick William II, 265.
 Frederick William III, 317, 338.
 Frederick William IV, 2, 79, 87 *sq.*
 Free cities, 26 *sq.*, 305 *sq.* ; 2, 14.
 Free trade in England, 2, 213 *sqq.*
 French and Indian War, 113 *sqq.*
 Friesland, 19 note 2.
 Fuchau, 2, 335.
 Fulton, 2, 320.

 Galileo, 162, 166.
 Gallican liberties, 146.
 Gambetta, 2, 151.
 Ganges, 92.
 Gapon, Father, 2, 292.
 Garibaldi, 2, 97 *sq.*
 Gaudet, 258.
 Gelderland, 19 note 2.
 Genghis Khan, 51.
 Genoa, 46, 348.
 Geology, 2, 407 *sqq.*

 George I, 48.
 George II, 64.
 George III, 70, 199, 266, 302.
 George, Henry, 2, 400 note.
 Georgia, 110.
 Germ theory, 2, 419.
 German East Africa, 2, 145.
 German Southwest Africa, 2, 144.
 Germany, in 1815, 2, 12-17 ; the
 Revolution of 1848 in, 86-89 ;
 formation of the Empire, 2, 109-
 123 ; since 1871, 130-150. *See*
 Holy Roman Empire and Prus-
 sia, Baden, Bavaria, and Wür-
 temberg.
 Ghent, Peace of, 339 note.
 Gibraltar, 43, 353.
 Gioberti, 2, 92 and note.
 Giolitti, 2, 107.
 Girondists, 256, 269 *sqq.*
 Gladstone, 2, 190 *sqq.*, 229 *sqq.*,
 231, 253.
 Goa, 84, 86 and note.
 Good Hope, 82, 353.
 Gordon, Major Charles, 2, 338,
 365.
 Grand Alliance, 41.
 Grand Vizier, 2, 314.
 Gravitation, universal, 163.
 Great Britain. *See* England.
 Great Russia, 2, 262.
 Great Western, the, 2, 321.
 Greece, 2, 305 *sqq.*, 315 *sq.*
 Greek Church, 51 ; 2, 269 note.
 Greenwich Observatory, 164.
 Groningen, 19 note 2.
 Guam, 2, 367 note.
 Guilds, 129 *sqq.*, 219 *sq.*
 Guillotin, 274 note.
 Guizot, 2, 57 *sq.*
 Gwalior, 2, 235.

 Haakon VII, 350 note.
Habeas Corpus, 196.
 Hague Convention, 2, 352.
 Hague Conference, 2, 370 *sqq.*
 Hanover, 48 and note 3, 321 *sq.* ;
 2, 116.
 Hanoverian line, 48 *sq.*
 Hapsburg. *See* Austria.
 Hardenberg, 336, 344 ; 2, 13.
 Hardie, Keir, 2, 401.

- Hargreaves, **2**, 34 *sq.*
 Hastings, Warren, 98 *sq.*
 Hawkins, Captain, 38 ; **2**, 356.
 Hébert, 276.
 Heligoland, 353 note.
 Helvetic Republic, 300.
 Henry, Colonel, **2**, 164.
 Henry IV, 5.
 Henry V, **2**, 158.
 Herzegovina, **2**, 128, 309.
 Hesse, **2**, 17.
 Hesse-Cassel, **2**, 116.
 Hien Fung, **2**, 336.
 Hindus, 93.
 Hindustan, 92 *sq.*
 History, nature of, 1 *sqq.*
 Hohenlinden, 303.
 Hohenzollern, origin of House of,
 55.
 Holland, 19 *sqq.*, 320, 332.
 Holy Alliance, 357 *sqq.*
 Holy Roman Empire, 23 *sqq.*, 307,
 319 *sqq.*
 Home Rule, **2**, 230 *sqq.*
 Hong, the, **2**, 333.
 Hongkong, **2**, 335.
 Housing the poor, **2**, 386.
 Hubertsburg, Peace of, 71.
 Hudson, Henry, 109.
 Huguenots, 28 *sq.*, 58.
 Hull, Jonathan, **2**, 320.
 Humbert I, **2**, 106.
 Hungary. *See* Austria.
 Hunting rights, 210.
 Imperial Federation, **2**, 257 *sqq.*
 Imperialism, **2**, 318 *sqq.*
 Indemnity of French nobles, **2**, 6.
 Independence, Declaration of, 120.
 Independent Labor Party, **2**, 401.
 Independents, the, 151.
 "Index," the, 149.
 India, 80 *sqq.* ; **2**, 233 *sqq.*
 Industrial Revolution, **2**, 30 *sqq.*,
 109, 241, 280.
 Initiative, the, **2**, 378.
 Inkerman, **2**, 308.
 Inquisition, 191 *sq.*, 330 ; **2**, 18.
Institutes of Christian Religion, 151.
 Insurance, working class, **2**, 383.
 International Association of Work-
 ingmen, **2**, 401 *sq.*
 Interpellation, **2**, 175.
 Intolerance, 148 *sq.*
 Ionian Islands, 353 note.
 Ireland, **2**, 220 *sqq.*
 Iron working, **2**, 43 *sq.*
 Isabella, **2**, 119, 120 and note.
 Ismail I, **2**, 363.
 Italy, in the eighteenth century,
 46, 288 *sqq.* ; after 1815, **2**, 17 *sqq.* ;
 and the Revolution of 1848, 77,
 84 *sqq.* ; unity of established, **2**,
 90-108. *See also* Sardinia, Pied-
 mont, Tuscany, Naples, and
 Rome.
 Ivan the Terrible, 52 ; **2**, 262 *sq.*
 Jacobins, 255 *sqq.*, 278.
 Jacobites, 198.
 James II, 30 *sq.*
 Jameson's raid, **2**, 255.
 Jamestown, 109.
 Jansenists, 193 note.
 Japan, **2**, 338 *sqq.*
 Java, 84, 90 note.
 Jefferson, 325.
 Jehangir, 87.
 Jellachich, **2**, 83.
 Jemappes, 266.
 Jena, 321.
 Jenkins's ear, war of, 66.
 Jenner, **2**, 417.
 Jesuits, 143 *sqq.*, 192 *sqq.* ; **2**, 135,
 166.
 Jews, in Poland, 72 ; in Russia, **2**,
 286, 296, 299.
 John VI, **2**, 27.
 Joliet, 108.
 Joseph II, 188 *sqq.*
 Josephine, 286, 332.
 Jourdan, 272, 288, 291, 301.
Journal des Savants, 12, 164.
 July monarchy, **2**, 54.
 July ordinances, **2**, 6.
 June days, the terrible, **2**, 62.
 Kamerun, **2**, 144.
 K'angshi, **2**, 337.
Kapital, Das, **2**, 397 and note.
 Karageorgevitch, **2**, 316.
 Kaunitz, 69.
 Kay, **2**, 34.
 Ketteler, Baron von, **2**, 349.

- Khiva, **2**, 281 note.
 Kiauchau, **2**, 148, 345.
 Kingship, origin and powers of, 134 *sq.*
 Kingsley, Charles, **2**, 400 note.
 Kitchener, General, **2**, 365.
 Koch, **2**, 419.
 Kokand, **2**, 282 note.
 Königgrätz, **2**, 116.
 Korea, **2**, 343 *sqq.*, 350 *sqq.*, 353 note.
 Kosciusko, 286.
 Kossuth, **2**, 76 *sq.*, 84.
 Kotzebue, **2**, 15.
 Kropotkin, **2**, 271.
 Kruger, **2**, 255.
 Kulturkampf, **2**, 134 *sqq.*
 Kuropatkin, General, **2**, 351.
 Labor Representation Committee, **2**, 401.
 Labor unions. *See* Trade unions.
 Lafayette, 121, 247, 272; **2**, 9.
 La Harpe, **2**, 265.
 Laibach, Congress of, **2**, 24.
 Laissez faire, 180 *sq.*
 Lally, Count, 95.
 Lamarck, **2**, 409.
 Land question, in Ireland, **2**, 229 *sqq.*
 Laos, **2**, 179.
 La Salle, 108 *sq.*
 Lassalle, Ferdinand, **2**, 137 *sq.*
 Laurier, Sir Wilfred, **2**, 246.
 Lavoisier, 161.
 Ledru-Rollin, **2**, 63.
 Legion of Honor, 327.
 Legislative Assembly, 242, 246, 253, 263.
 Legitimists, **2**, 54, 157 *sqq.*
 Leipzig, battle of, 339.
 Leo XIII, **2**, 137, 167, 388, 404.
 Leoben, truce of, 291.
 Leopold of Hohenzollern, **2**, 120 *sq.*
 Leopold I, of Belgium, **2**, 12.
 Leopold II, of Belgium, **2**, 250, 253, 360 *sq.*
 Leopold II, Emperor, 250, 254.
 Leszcynski, Stanislas, 45, 74.
Lettre de cachet, 196, 293.
 Leuthen, battle of, 70.
 Liaotung peninsula, **2**, 344.
 Liberal Unionists, **2**, 231.
 Liberals in England, **2**, 197.
Liberum veto, 73, 76, 78.
 Light, nature of, **2**, 413.
 Li Hung Chang, **2**, 338, 343, 349.
 Lister, Joseph, **2**, 418.
 Lithuania, 72.
 Livingstone, **2**, 357 *sq.*
 Livonia, 55.
 Local government in England, **2**, 198 *sqq.*
 Locke, John, 168 and note.
 Locomotive, **2**, 323 *sq.*
 Lombardo-Venetia, 348; **2**, 20 *sq.*, 78 *sq.*, 85, 96.
 Lombardy, 348; **2**, 96.
 Lorraine, 45; **2**, 122 and note, 154.
 Louis XIII, 5.
 Louis XIV, 6 *sqq.*, 39 *sqq.*
 Louis XV, 45 *sqq.*, 71.
 Louis XVI, 120, 217 *sqq.*, 251, 266 *sqq.*
 Louis XVII, 272, 344 note.
 Louis XVIII, **2**, 1 *sq.*, 25.
 Louis Napoleon, **2**, 63 *sqq.* *See* Napoleon III.
 Louis Philippe, **2**, 8 *sqq.*, 53 *sqq.*
 Louisiana, 108, 116, 304.
 Low Church, 151.
 Lucknow, **2**, 239.
 Lüderitz, **2**, 144.
 Lunéville, Treaty of, 304 *sqq.*
 Lusitania, **2**, 321.
 Lützen, 338.
 Luxemburg, grand duchy of, **2**, 12 note, 14.
 Luxemburg commission, **2**, 60 *sq.*
 Lyell, Sir Charles, **2**, 408.
 Lyons, **2**, 271, 273.
 Macao, 86 note.
 Macedonia, **2**, 312 *sqq.*
 Mack, 318.
 MacMahon, **2**, 158 *sqq.*
 Madagascar, **2**, 178.
 Madras, 88, 96, 98.
 Magellan, 103.
 Magyars, **2**, 74, 83, 128.
 Mahratta Confederacy, **2**, 234 *sq.*
Maine, the, **2**, 366.
 Majuba Hill, **2**, 253.

- Malay Archipelago, 84.
 Malta, 353 note.
 Mamelukes, **2**, 363.
 Manchu dynasty, **2**, 337.
 Manchuria, **2**, 343 *sqq.*
 Manor, 122 *sqq.*
 Mantua, 289 *sqq.*
 Manufacture, modern. *See* Industrial Revolution.
 Marat, 237 note, 241, 252 *sq.*
 Marco Polo, 81; **2**, 332 note.
 Marconi, **2**, 327.
 Marengo, 303.
 Maria da Gloria, **2**, 27.
 Maria Louisa, 332.
 Maria Theresa, 61 *sqq.*
 Marie Antoinette, 218, 240 *sq.*, 275.
 Mark, 55.
 Marlborough, 42.
 Marquette, 108.
Marseillaise, the, 261 *sq.* and note.
 Marseilles, 271.
 Marx, Karl, **2**, 137, 172, 396 *sqq.*
 Maryland, 110.
 Massachusetts, 109.
 Mauritius, 353 note.
 Maximilian, **2**, 119 note.
 Maximum, law of the, 281.
 May laws, **2**, 136.
 Mayence, 265.
Mayflower, the, 109.
 Mazarin, 5 *sq.*
 Mazzini, **2**, 85, 91 *sq.*
 Medici, the, 45.
 Medicine. *See* Science.
 Meerut, **2**, 239.
 Mehemet Ali, **2**, 362 *sq.*
 Melikoff, **2**, 278.
 Mercantilism, 180.
 Methodists, 154.
 Metschnikoff, **2**, 420.
 Metric system, 280.
 Metternich, 339, 359 *sqq.*; **2**, 24 *sqq.*, 72 *sqq.*
 Metz, **2**, 121, 151.
 Mexico, 103; **2**, 22, 27, 118 note.
 Microscope, 163.
 Miguel, **2**, 27.
 Mikado, **2**, 339 *sqq.*
 Milan, 35, 46, 288 *sq.*
 Milan I, **2**, 316.
 Milan Decree, 324.
 Military expenditures, **2**, 367 *sq.*
 Millerand, **2**, 174.
 Ministerial responsibility, **2**, 377.
Mir, **2**, 273.
 Mirabeau, 233, 241 *sq.*, 251.
 Missionaries, 144 *sq.*; **2**, 328 *sqq.*
 Mississippi, 108.
 Modena, 46, 291, 348 and note; **2**, 96.
 Mogul, the Great, 94, 96; **2**, 240.
 Mohammedans, **2**, 303 *sqq.*, 354.
 Moldavia, **2**, 307, 311 note.
 Molière, 11.
 Moluccas, 84.
 Monastic orders: in Austria, 189; in France, 243 note; **2**, 5, 168; in Germany, **2**, 135 *sq.*; in Italy, **2**, 20, 94; in Spain, 330. *See* Jesuits.
Moniteur, 255.
 Monroe Doctrine, **2**, 26 *sq.*
 Montcalm, 114.
 Montenegro, **2**, 310 *sq.*, 317.
 Montesquieu, 175 *sq.*
 Moravians, **2**, 81.
 More, Sir Thomas, **2**, 393 note.
 Moreau, 288, 291, 303.
 Morocco, **2**, 145 note, 362 *sq.*
 Moscow, 335.
 Mountain, the, 370.
 Mukden, **2**, 351.
 Municipal ownership, **2**, 385 *sq.*
 Municipal reform in England, **2**, 198 *sq.*
 Murat, 348 note.
 Mutation theory, **2**, 412 note.
 Mutiny in India, **2**, 237 *sqq.*
 Mutsuhito, **2**, 341 *sqq.*
 Nachtigal, **2**, 144.
 Nanking, Treaty of, **2**, 335.
 Nantes, Edict of, 28 *sq.*
 Napier, Lord, **2**, 333.
 Naples, 35, 45, 288, 320, 348 and note; **2**, 20, 23, 78 note, 97 *sq.*
 Napoleon I, 313 *sqq.* *See* Bonaparte, Napoleon.
 Napoleon II, **2**, 4 and note.
 Napoleon III, **2**, 69 *sqq.*, 95 *sqq.*, 118 *sqq.*, 151, 307, 336.
Napoleonic Ideas, **2**, 64.

- Nasmyth, **2**, 44 note.
 Nassau, **2**, 116.
 Natal, **2**, 252 *sqq.*
 National Assembly (1789), 232 *sqq.*
 National Guard, 236.
 Nationality, spirit of, 355 *sqq.*
 Natural law, 165.
 Navarino, **2**, 306.
 Navigation Act, 89, 118.
 Necker, 222, 234.
 Neerwinden, 268.
 Nelson, 295, 325.
 Nepal, **2**, 236.
 Netherlands, Austrian, 15 note, 43, 190, 265, 346.
 Netherlands, Dutch, 15 note, 19 *sqq.*, 267, 287, 344, 346; **2**, 73.
 Netherlands, Spanish, 15, 43.
 New Brunswick, **2**, 244.
 New Guinea, **2**, 145.
 New Jersey, 109.
 New South Wales, **2**, 248 *sq.*
 New Zealand, **2**, 247 *sq.*, 250 *sq.*
 Newcomen, **2**, 40 *sq.*
 Newfoundland, 43; **2**, 245.
 Newspapers, 254.
 Newton, 163.
 Nice, 11; **2**, 95.
 Nicholas I, **2**, 268 *sqq.*, 307.
 Nicholas II, **2**, 283 *sqq.*, 370.
 Nihilism, **2**, 275.
 Nile, battle of, 295.
 Nimwegen, Peace of, 21.
 Ningpo, **2**, 335.
 Noailles, viscount of, 237.
 Nobility, 131 *sqq.*, 209 *sq.*
 Nogi, General, **2**, 351.
 Nonjuring clergy, 246, 257.
North Briton, 200.
 North Carolina, 109.
 North German Confederation, **2**, 115 *sq.*
 Norway, 350 and note.
 Notables, Assembly of, 224 *sq.*
 Nova Scotia, 43, 110; **2**, 244.
 Novara, **2**, 85.
 Overijssel, 19 note.
 Obock, **2**, 178 note.
 O'Connell, **2**, 226, 231.
 Oglethorpe, 110.
 Okhotsk, **2**, 263.
 Oku, General, **2**, 351.
 Old-age pensions in Germany, **2**, 141.
 Old Catholics, **2**, 135.
 Old Sarum, **2**, 182.
 O'Neill's insurrection, **2**, 222.
 Ontario, **2**, 242, 244.
 Opium war, **2**, 334.
 Orange, House of, 19 *sqq.*
 Orange River Colony, **2**, 252 *sq.*
 Organic articles, 312 note.
Organisation of Labor, The, **2**, 56.
 Orleanists, **2**, 157 *sqq.*
 Oscar II, 350 note.
 Ottoman Turks, **2**, 303.
 Oudenarde, battle of, 42.
 Oudh, **2**, 237.
 Owen, Robert, **2**, 211, 395.
 Paine, Thomas, **2**, 184.
 Palatinate, 32 *sq.*
 Pale, the, **2**, 221.
 Panama Canal, **2**, 323.
 Pan-Slavism, **2**, 81.
 Papal States, 332, 348; **2**, 20, 100 *sq.*
 Parkes, Sir Harry, **2**, 341.
 Paris, count of, **2**, 163.
 Paris, siege of, **2**, 122, 152.
 Paris, Treaty of (1763), 71, 116; (1856), **2**, 308.
 Parlement of Paris, 226 *sq.*
 Parlements, in France, 214 *sq.*, 227 *sq.*
 Parliament, in England, 195 *sqq.*, 200; **2**, 181 *sqq.* See Constitution.
 Parma, 288, 307; **2**, 96.
 Parnell, **2**, 230.
 Parthenopian Republic, 301.
 Parties: in England, **2**, 197 *sq.*; in France, **2**, 3, 172 *sqq.*; in Italy, **2**, 103; in Russia, **2**, 287 *sq.*
 Pasteur, **2**, 418 *sq.*
 Paul, Tsar, 299 and note, 317 note.
 Peel, Sir Robert, **2**, 216.
 Peerage, in England, 133.
 Peking, **2**, 336, 349.
 Pelew Islands, **2**, 367.
 Penn, William, 110.
 Pennsylvania, 110.

- Penny post, **2**, 326.
 Perry, Commodore, **2**, 340.
 Persia, **2**, 281 note.
 Peru, 103.
 Peter the Great, 52 *sqq.*
 Peterloo massacre, **2**, 185.
 Philip V, 39 *sqq.*, 65.
 Philippines, 103 *sq.*; **2**, 366 *sq.*
 Philopopolis, **2**, 310.
 Pichegru, 287.
 Piedmont, 46, 301, 307; **2**, 19 *sq.*,
 85, 94.
Pilgrim's Progress, 153.
 Pillnitz, Declaration of, 254.
 Pinto, **2**, 339.
 Pinzon, 102.
 Piquart, **2**, 164.
 Pitt (Lord Chatham), 267; **2**, 184.
 Pitt, The Younger, 201; **2**, 184.
 Pius VI, 189.
 Pius IX, **2**, 84, 92, 100, 137, 166,
 412.
 Pius X, **2**, 107.
 Pizarro, 103.
 Plassey, battle of, 96 *sq.*
 Plebiscite, 297.
 Plehve, **2**, 286 *sqq.*
 Plymouth colony, 151.
 Pobiedonosheff, **2**, 279.
 Poland, 45, 72 *sqq.*, 268, 286, 322,
 351 *sq.*; **2**, 264, 267 *sq.*
 Polish Succession, War of, 61.
 Political economy, 179 *sqq.*
 Pondicherry, 91, 94, 96 note.
 Poniatowski, 77.
 Poonah, **2**, 235.
 Pope, powers of, 137 *sqq.*; position
 of, in Italy, **2**, 101.
 Pope, Alexander, 167.
 Port Arthur, **2**, 343 *sqq.*, 351.
 Port Royal, 107, 110.
 Porte, the, **2**, 304.
 Porto Bello, 44.
 Porto Rico, 35; **2**, 366.
 Portsmouth, Treaty of, **2**, 352 *sq.*
 Portugal, 83 *sqq.*, 328 *sq.*; **2**, 27 *sq.*,
 354.
 Poverty, **2**, 386 *sqq.*
 Poyning's laws, **2**, 221.
 Pragmatic Sanction, 61, 68.
 Prefect, 297.
 Presbyterianism, 152.
 Press, freedom of, 156; **2**, 201 *sq.*,
 162.
 Pressburg, Treaty of, 319.
 Printing, **2**, 46.
 Prison reform, **2**, 208.
 Procurator of the Holy Synod, **2**,
 265.
Progress and Poverty, **2**, 400 note.
 Protective tariff in Germany, **2**,
 142 *sqq.*
 Protestantism, 142 *sq.*; in France,
 148.
 Protoplasm, **2**, 416.
 Prussia, 26, 55 *sqq.*, 72, 185 *sqq.*, 260,
 265, 287, 317, 321 *sq.*, 336 *sqq.*,
 334 *sqq.*; **2**, 79, 88 *sq.*, 109 *sqq.*
 Public schools, **2**, 381. *See* Educa-
 tion.
 Pultowa, 54.
 Punjab, **2**, 236.
 Puritanism, 151 *sqq.*
 Pyramids, battle of, 295.
 Quadrilateral, 284.
 Quadruple alliance, 360 *sq.*
 Quakers, 153.
 Quebec, 107, 114; **2**, 242, 244.
 Quebec Act, **2**, 242.
 Queen Anne's War, 42.
 Queensland, **2**, 249.
 Radetzky, **2**, 84.
 Radio-activity, **2**, 414.
 Radium, **2**, 415.
 Railways, **2**, 323 *sqq.*
 Rajputs, 93.
 Ramillies, battle of, 42.
 Reason, worship of, 276.
 Referendum, the, **2**, 378.
 Reform Bills, in England, **2**,
 186 *sqq.*, 190 *sqq.*, 192.
Reichsdeputationshauptschluss, 306.
 Reichstadt, duke of, **2**, 4 note.
 Reichstag, **2**, 131 *sq.*
 Reign of Terror, 264 *sqq.*
 Religious toleration in England,
2, 203.
 Renaissance, 158 note.
 Reunion, chambers of, 22 *sqq.*
 Revolutionary Tribunal, 274.
 Rhode Island, 109.
 Rhodes, Cecil, **2**, 254 and note.

- Rhodesia, **2**, 256.
 Richelieu, 5.
 Robespierre, 270, 276 *sqq.*
 Roe, Sir Thomas, 87.
 Roland, Madame, 258.
 Romagna, **2**, 96.
 Roman Republic, 299; **2**, 85.
 Rome, union with Italy, **2**, 100.
 Romilly, Sir Samuel, **2**, 207.
 Roosevelt, **2**, 323, 352.
 Rossbach, battle of, 70.
 Rotten boroughs, 197; **2**, 181 *sqq.*
 Roumania, **2**, 128, 311 and note, 316 *sq.*
 Roumelia, Eastern, **2**, 311 *sq.*
 Rousseau, 176 *sq.*
 Rowntree, **2**, 387.
 Rumans, **2**, 313.
 Russell, Lord John, **2**, 186, 190.
 Russia, made a European power under Peter the Great, 50-55; and the partition of Poland, 71 *sqq.*; at war with France, 299-341 *passim*; in the Vienna settlement, 343-362 *passim*; in the nineteenth century, 261-302; and the Crimean War, **2**, 307 *sqq.*
 Russo-Japanese War, **2**, 350 *sqq.*
 Ruthenians, **2**, 81.
 Ryswick, Treaty of, 33.
- Sadowa, **2**, 116.
 St. Bernard, Bonaparte's crossing of the, 302.
 St. Helena, 341.
 Saint-Just, 270, 276 *sqq.*
 St. Lucia, 353 note.
 St. Petersburg, foundation of, 54.
 Saint-Simon, memoirs of, 11.
 Saint-Simon, **2**, 393.
 Salisbury, Lord, **2**, 217.
 Salt tax in France, 207 *sq.*
 San Stefano, **2**, 311.
 Sand River Convention, **2**, 252.
Sans-culottes, 260.
 Sardinia, 35, 44, 46, 64, 288, 348; **2**, 19 *sq.*, 92 *sq.*, 308 note.
 Savoy, 11, 46, 344; **2**, 95.
 Saxony, 24, 63, 338, 351 *sq.*; **2**, 79, 116, 131 note.
 Scharnhorst, 337.
 Schleidan, **2**, 415.
- Schleswig-Holstein, **2**, 113.
 Schmoller, **2**, 139.
 Schwann, **2**, 415.
 Schwartzberg, **2**, 87.
 Science, in the eighteenth century, 157 *sqq.*; in the nineteenth century, **2**, 405 *sqq.*
 Scotland, **2**, 47 note.
 Sebastopol, **2**, 308.
 Second French Republic, **2**, 57 *sqq.*
 Sedan, **2**, 121, 151.
 Senegal, **2**, 175, 177.
 Separation law, **2**, 170 *sqq.*
 Separatists, 151.
 Sepoys, 94; **2**, 239.
 September massacres, 265.
 Serbs, **2**, 313.
 Serfdom, 122 *sqq.*, 211, 337; **2**, 264 *sqq.* See Feudalism.
 Servia, **2**, 305, 310 *sq.*, 316.
 Seven Years' War, 68 *sq.*
 Sévigné, Madame de, 11, 29.
 Shanghai, **2**, 335.
 Shantung peninsula, **2**, 148, 345.
 Shimonoseki, **2**, 343.
 Shogun, **2**, 339 *sqq.*
 Siberia, **2**, 263.
 Sicily, 35, 45; **2**, 97 *sq.* See Naples.
 Sickness insurance in Germany, **2**, 141.
 Sieyès, 229, 232.
 Silesia, 63 *sqq.*
 Sindh, **2**, 236 *sq.*
 Single tax, **2**, 400 note.
 Six Acts, **2**, 185.
 Slave trade, 354 and note; **2**, 355 *sq.*
 Slavonia, **2**, 128.
 Slovenes, 63.
 Smith, Adam, 181 *sq.*; **2**, 214.
 Sobieski, John, **2**, 304.
Social Contract, The, 177.
 Social-democrats, in Germany, **2**, 138 *sqq.*; in Russia, **2**, 287.
 Social Democratic Federation, **2**, 400 *sq.*
 Socialism, **2**, 393 *sqq.*; in Austria, **2**, 127; in England, **2**, 400 *sq.*; in France, **2**, 173; in Germany, **2**, 137 *sqq.*, 147 *sqq.*; in Italy, **2**, 107; in Russia, **2**, 287 *sqq.*
 Society for Promotion of Christian Knowledge, **2**, 329.

- Solomon Islands, **2**, 145.
 Somaliland, British, **2**, 257 and note; French, **2**, 178 note; Italian, **2**, 103.
Sonderbund, **2**, 73 note.
 South Africa, **2**, 251 *sqq.*
 South Carolina, 109.
 South Hesse, **2**, 118, 122.
 Spain, 15, 34 *sqq.*, 70, 194, 329 *sqq.*; **2**, 17 *sqq.*, 119 and note, 120 and note, 336.
 Spanish America, **2**, 21 *sqq.*
 Spanish-American War, **2**, 366.
 Spanish Main, 38 note.
 Spanish succession, 34 *sqq.*
 Speech, freedom of, **2**, 203.
 Spencer, Herbert, **2**, 409.
 Spice Islands, 84.
 Spice trade, 84 and note.
 Spinning, **2**, 32 *sqq.*
Spirit of Laws, The, 175 *sq.*
 Stadholder, 20, 67 note.
 Stambuloff, **2**, 312.
 Stamp Act, 117.
 Stanley, Henry M., **2**, 358 *sq.*
 State socialism, **2**, 137 *sqq.*
 Steam engine, **2**, 39 *sqq.*
 Steamship, **2**, 320 *sqq.*
 Stein, 336, 344; **2**, 13.
 Stephenson, George, **2**, 324.
 Stockach, 301.
 Stolypin, **2**, 299.
 Strassburg, 22; **2**, 151.
 Strikes, **2**, 383.
 Struggle for existence, **2**, 410.
 Sublime Porte, **2**, 308.
 Subprefect, 297.
 Suez Canal, **2**, 322.
 Suffrage, **2**, 376 *sqq.* See Reform Bills and Constitution.
 Sumatra, 84, 90 note.
 Surajah Dowlah, 96 *sq.*
 Surat, 87, 89.
 Survival of the fittest, **2**, 411.
 Suvaroff, 301.
 Sweden, 54 *sq.*, 349 *sq.*, 350 note.
 Switzerland, 300, 349; **2**, 73 and note, 378.
 Sydney, **2**, 248.
 Syllabus of 1864, **2**, 166.
 Syria, Bonaparte in, 295.
 Taiping rebellion, **2**, 337.
 Talleyrand, 314, 345, 351.
 Tartars, 51.
 Tasmania, **2**, 247, 249.
 Taxation in France, 206 *sqq.*
 Telegraphs, **2**, 326 *sq.*
 Ten-hour bill, **2**, 212 *sq.*
 Tennis-Court Oath, 232.
 Terrorism, **2**, 276, 278.
 Test Act, 155; **2**, 204.
 Teutonic Order, **56**, 72.
Thermidor, 278.
 Thiers, **2**, 57, 152 *sqq.*
 Third Estate, 210 *sq.*, 230.
 Third Section, the, **2**, 270, 276.
 Thirty-Nine Articles, 150.
 Thugut, 301.
 Ticonderoga, 114.
 Tientsin, Treaty of, **2**, 336.
 Tilsit, Treaty of, 322 *sqq.*
 Timbuctu, **2**, 177.
 Tithes, 136; in England, **2**, 205 *sq.*; in Ireland, **2**, 228; in France, 238.
 Tobago, 353 note.
 Tobolsk, **2**, 263.
 Togo, Admiral, **2**, 352.
 Togoland, **2**, 144.
 Toleration, Act of, 155; **2**, 203.
 Tomsk, **2**, 263.
 Tonkin, **2**, 179.
 Tories, 197; **2**, 197.
 Torres Vedras, 334.
 Torture, 178.
 Toulon, 272 *sq.*
 Trade laws, 118 *sq.*
 Trade unions, **2**, 162, 389 *sq.*
 Trafalgar, 323.
 Trans-Siberian railway, **2**, 282, 344 *sq.*
 Transvaal, **2**, 252 *sqq.*
 Treaty ports, **2**, 335 *sq.*
 Trent, Council of, 142.
 Trepoff, **2**, 276 *sqq.*
 Treves, elector of, 24.
 Triple alliance, **2**, 103.
 Troppau, Congress of, **2**, 24.
Tugendbund, 337.
 Tuileries, 241, 260, 262; **2**, 203.
 Tunis, **2**, 176 *sq.*
 Turbine, **2**, 321.
 Turgot, 181, 218 *sqq.*
 Turkestan, **2**, 281 note.

- Turkey, 25 *sq.*, 76; **2**, 303 *sqq.*
 Tuscany, 45, 46, 288, 348; **2**, 96.
 Tzu-hsi, Empress, **2**, 337 and note.
- Uitlanders, **2**, 254.
 Ulm, 318.
 Ultramontanism, 145 *sq.*
 Ultra-royalists, **2**, 3.
 Unemployed problem, **2**, 383.
 United Netherlands, 19 *sq.* See
 Netherlands, Dutch.
 United States, 123, 325; **2**, 366.
Utopia, **2**, 393 note.
 Utopian socialists, **2**, 395.
 Utrecht, Peace of, 42 *sqq.*
- Vaccination, **2**, 417.
 Valenciennes, 272.
 Valmy, 265.
 Varennes, flight to, 251.
 Vasco da Gama, 82.
 Vendée, La, 271, 273.
 Vendemiaire, 282.
 Venetia, 46, 291, 348; **2**, 20, 79,
 85, 96, 99 *sq.*
 Venetia. See Venice.
 Venezuela, **2**, 22.
 Venice, 348; **2**, 99 *sq.*
 Vergniaud, 258, 263.
 Verona, Congress of, **2**, 25 *sq.*
 Verrazano, 107.
 Viborg, manifesto of, **2**, 299.
 Victor Emmanuel I, **2**, 19.
 Victor Emmanuel II, **2**, 85, 92 *sq.*
 Victor Emmanuel III, **2**, 106.
 Victoria, Queen, **2**, 145 note 2,
 240, 259.
 Victoria colony, **2**, 249.
 Victoria Nyanza, **2**, 358.
 Vienna, Treaty of, 331; Congress
 of, 344 *sqq.*
 Virchow, **2**, 416.
 Voltaire, 60 *sq.*, 168 *sqq.*
- Wagner, **2**, 139.
 Wagram, 331.
 Wallace, Alfred, **2**, 411.
 Wallachia, **2**, 307, 331 note.
 Walpole, 66, 198 *sq.*
 Wandewash, 95.
 War of 1812, 339 note.
 Warfare, modern, **2**, 367 *sq.*
 Warsaw, grand duchy of, 322.
- Wartburg, celebration of, **2**, 15.
 Washington, 120 *sq.*
 Waterloo, 340.
 Watt, **2**, 40 *sqq.*
 Wattignies, 272.
Wealth of Nations, *The*, 181.
 Weaving, **2**, 33 *sq.*
 Weihaiwei, **2**, 346.
 Wellington, 334, 339 *sq.*; **2**, 186.
 Wells, H. G., **2**, 393, 405 note.
 Wesley, Charles, 154.
 Wesley, John, 154.
 West Australia, **2**, 249.
 Westminster Confession, 152.
 Westphalia, kingdom of, 322.
 Whigs, 197; **2**, 197.
 White flag, **2**, 159.
 Whitefield, 154.
 Whitney, Eli, **2**, 38.
 Wilhelmina, **2**, 12.
 Wilkes, John, 200.
 William I, **2**, 111 *sqq.*, 121.
 William II, of Germany, **2**, 145 *sqq.*
 William II, of the Netherlands, **2**,
 12 note.
 William III, of the Netherlands,
 2, 12 note.
 William III (Prince of Orange),
 20 *sq.*, 30 *sqq.*, 41 *sq.*; **2**, 223.
 William IV, **2**, 186.
 Windischgrätz, **2**, 82.
 Witte, **2**, 280 *sq.*, 296 *sq.*
 Wolfe, General, 114.
 Woman's suffrage, **2**, 377.
 Woman's rights, **2**, 380.
 Working class, origin of, **2**, 47.
 Workshops, the national, **2**, 59 *sqq.*
 Wurmser, 290.
 Württemberg, 307, 319; **2**, 17,
 121 *sq.*
- Xavier, **2**, 329, 339.
- Yorck, 338.
 Yorktown, 121.
 Young, Arthur, 211.
 Young Italy, **2**, 91 *sq.*
- Zassulitch, **2**, 277 and note.
 Zeeland, 19 note 2.
 Zemstvos, **2**, 275.
 Zola, **2**, 165.
 Zollverein, **2**, 110.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

THE DEVELOPMENT OF MODERN EUROPE

An Introduction to the Study of Current History

By JAMES HARVEY ROBINSON, Professor of History in Columbia University, and Charles A. Beard, Adjunct Professor of Politics in Columbia University

VOLUME I. The Eighteenth Century: The French Revolution and the Napoleonic Period. 12mo. Cloth. 362 pages. With illustrations and maps. List price, \$1.50; mailing price, \$1.60

VOLUME II. Europe since the Congress of Vienna. 12mo. Cloth. 448 pages. With illustrations and maps. List price, \$1.60; mailing price, \$1.75

THESE volumes will meet the demand for a history of recent times which shall explain the social and economic as well as the political development of our own age, and shall also prepare the student to understand the great problems of the world in which he finds himself.

Their aim is to correct the general disregard of recent history, — to enable the student to catch up with his own times so that he may peruse with intelligence the news given in the morning paper.

Much less space is devoted to purely political and military events than has been commonly assigned to them in histories of the nineteenth century. On the other hand, the more fundamental economic matters — the Industrial Revolution, commerce and the colonies, the internal reforms of the European states, etc. — have been generously treated.

The necessarily succinct outline of events which fills the books can be considerably amplified and enlivened by "Readings in Modern European History" from the same authors, which follows the narrative chapter by chapter, and furnishes examples of the stuff of which history is made.

GINN & COMPANY PUBLISHERS

A SHORT HISTORY OF ENGLAND

By EDWARD P. CHEYNEY

Professor of European History in the University of Pennsylvania

12mo. Cloth. xvi + 695 pages. With maps and illustrations. List price, \$1.40; mailing price, \$1.55

THIS short history of England is about midway in length between the shorter school histories and the longer works which are of value chiefly to advanced students or as books of reference. It is admirably adapted for use in colleges and in high schools that offer a rather complete course in English history.

The early period is treated in some detail in the belief that it will be comparatively easy to make clear the later story of the events in the national life, if the foundation is well laid in a knowledge of what kind of country England is, who the English people were, and what were their fundamental customs in language, government, religion, and economic organization.

A BOOK OF READINGS IN ENGLISH HISTORY

By EDWARD P. CHEYNEY

Professor of European History in the University of Pennsylvania

12mo. Cloth. 781 pages. List price, \$1.80; mailing price, \$1.95

THESSE readings are intended to accompany the compiler's "Short History of England" for further study and illustration of the subject. It corresponds chapter by chapter, and in most cases subject by subject, to that text-book, and is of about the same length.

A new and careful search has been made through a great part of the source material of English history for that which is most truly illustrative, typical, and interesting. Generally speaking, contemporary narratives, extracts from diaries, letters, anecdotes, and similar personal records have been chosen rather than statutes, proclamations, and such official documents.

GINN AND COMPANY PUBLISHERS





D
209
R63
1907
v.2



Robinson, James Harvey
The development of modern
Europe

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY



