Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2008 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/fromwaterlootoma00orsi

FROM WATERLOO TO THE MARNE

FROM WATERLOO TO THE MARNE

History of the World during the past Century
1815-1914

by

COUNT PIETRO ORSI

ABRIDGED TRANSLATION

LONDON: 48 PALL MALL
W. COLLINS SONS & CO. LTD
GLASGOW MELBOURNE AUCKLAND

Copyright 1921

I DEDICATE THIS BOOK

TO THE

MEMORY OF MY ADORED SON,

GUSTAVO,

Lieutenant of Italian Mountain Artillery, who fell on May 25, 1916, in the heroic defence of Coni Zugna, in the Trentino. He had from the beginning of the war been fighting in the front line of battle, and this book was written while thinking of him. I dedicate it to him, who by his lofty idealism, serene courage, expert technical skill, and sanguine optimism, became the very soul of his battery. He gave his score of years to his fatherland, 'happy in the fulfilment of his duty as an Italian and as a soldier.'[1]

Among the many acts of valour performed by him, the Decree, which awarded to him the Silver Medal, records the following episode of May 15, at the Colletto d'Albaredo, near Rovereto.

'In order to ensure the safety of the armament and ammunition, which the mules had not been able to carry away from the first line of guns, he remained with a few men for a whole night in a zone immediately adjacent to the enemy lines, which had already been abandoned by our troops. On the following morning he rejoined his battery, bringing with him in safety almost the whole of the *matériel*.'

[1] Quotation from one of his own letters.

AUTHOR'S PREFACE

To-day, more than in any other period, it is necessary that contemporary History should be widely studied. In this age of ours, in which the nations themselves indicate to their Governments the paths which the latter must follow, how many disastrous mistakes may yet be avoided by following the direction dictated by public opinion! In order to give accurate advice concerning the future of one's own country, one must first make an attentive study of the manner in which its existing social system has been formed, and since, to-day, the life of individual nations no longer is developed, as formerly, in isolation and the greater part of the world is moved by the same currents of thought, passions, and interests, each national outlook must survey the events which occur simultaneously over the whole surface of the globe.

This book prepared by me corresponds with this design, since it is not composed of isolated histories of various countries, as is usually the case with books of general history, but it presents the contemporaneous development of the whole of Humanity. Only by this method can an exact knowledge of the history of the last century be acquired, and with it an acquaintance with the political and social problems which have become a part of the life of the various countries.

The immense spectacle of the Path traversed by Humanity in the last hundred years fills our souls with a firmly-based faith in Progress, and aids us to endure with fortitude the agonising experience of to-day : since we have before our eyes the clear vision of a new and brighter future.

Pietro Orsi.

CONTENTS

CHAP.		PAGE
I.	OLD GOVERNMENTS AND NEW PEOPLES	1
II.	THE FIRST BREACHES AND THE WORK OF REPARATION	30
III.	FIRST PHASE OF THE EASTERN QUESTION	47
IV.	PROGRESS OF LIBERAL IDEAS	61
V.	REFORMS AND REVOLUTIONS	117
VI.	THE TRIUMPH OF REACTION	155
VII.	PERIOD OF PREPARATION	171
VIII.	TRIUMPH OF NATIONAL AND LIBERAL IDEAS.—CREATION OF THE KINGDOM OF ITALY	205
IX.	FROM THE WAR OF SECESSION IN AMERICA TO THE WAR OF 1866 IN EUROPE	221
X.	COMPLETION OF ITALIAN AND GERMAN UNITY	237
XI.	GERMANY BEGINS TO DOMINATE EUROPEAN LIFE	253
XII.	FROM THE EASTERN QUESTION TO THE TRIPLE ALLIANCE	266
XIII.	COLONIAL EXPANSION	280
XIV.	THE TRIPLE AND THE DUAL ALLIANCES	295
XV.	WORLD-POLITICS	313
XVI.	UNSTABLE EQUILIBRIUM	335
XVII.	TOWARDS UNIVERSAL CONFLAGRATION	352

CHAPTER I

OLD GOVERNMENTS AND NEW PEOPLES

Old Governments and New Peoples: Waterloo: The Holy Alliance: Characteristics of the Restorations—The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland: Journalism: The Last Years of King George III.: England's Height of Power: George IV.: The Trial of the Queen: France under Louis XVIII.: Conflicting Parties in the State: Assassination of the Duke de Berry: Triumph of Reaction: Spain and the Constitution of 1812*: Ferdinand VII. and the Establishment of Absolutism.—The War of Independence of the Spanish-American Colonies.—Condition of Portugal and Brazil under the House of Braganza: The Kingdom of Sardinia under the House of Savoy: The Province of Lombardo-Veneto under Austria: Duchies of Parma and Modena: The Grand Duchy of Tuscany: The Pontifical State and the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies.—The Empire of Austria: The Kingdom of Prussia and the Germanic Confederation.—The Swiss Confederation.—The Kingdom of the Low Countries.—The Kingdom of Denmark.—Sweden and Norway.—Finland and Poland.—Conditions of the Russian Empire under Alexander I.—The Respective Forces of the Two Tendencies, Liberal and Reactionary, throughout the whole of Europe.*

The 18th of June, 1815, is a date which will remain eternally memorable in history: on the evening of that day the rising moon illuminated the rout of one of the most glorious armies of the world. The victors of a hundred battles, the heroes of Marengo and Austerlitz, Jena and Wagram, were now flying on the plains of Waterloo, before Wellington's English veterans and Blücher's Prussian Grenadiers; and with them, irresistibly carried away by the stream of flight, fled the Genius of War—Napoleon himself.

The monarchs of a time-worn Europe thus succeeded in sweeping from their path the great 'son of the Revolution': in exiling him to a desolate and wild island, which immense ocean spaces separated from the rest of the world, they dropped the curtain on the drama which had opened at Paris, twenty-six years before, with a glorious fanfare of Liberty.

How many convulsions had taken place in those twenty-six years! How many wars! What suffering! but in the

midst of so many tragedies, a wind of change had circulated through the world, and strong currents of passion and hope had swayed the hearts of men.

France, in the folds of her tri-coloured banner, had borne across Europe the seeds of new ideas, and the people had aspired for the first time after autonomy and liberty: they had begun to form a clear conception of nationality: so much so, that the monarchs, who had for so many years fought vainly against Napoleon, had begun to accept and flatter the vague aspirations of their peoples: only when they vaunted that they were buttressing the very principles of the Revolution were they able to enter France, and thus put an end to that war which they themselves had initiated against the new ideas.

. . . . . .

Never, perhaps, in any other historical epoch, had a more favourable occasion presented itself, to human wisdom, of directing political life according to the dictates of reason: the map of Europe was to be almost entirely re-made: it would, therefore, have been easy to satisfy to some extent the sentiment of nationality which had been awakened. So far as political liberties were concerned, the desire of repose after so many storms was strong in every heart: this longing induced a great moderation in the demands of the various peoples, which might have been easily satisfied.

But the conquering sovereigns quickly drowned in oblivion the promises which they had made to the peoples in the years 1813-1814, in order to excite them to insurrection and war against France: profiting by the general desire for peace and tranquillity, they no longer dreamed of giving the smallest satisfaction to those sentiments of nationality and liberty which they themselves had encouraged in the moment of danger. And, just as at the Congress of Vienna, the booty had been divided with no thought of the consent of the peoples concerned, so now each individual Government set itself to fight against the principle of National Sovereignty which had sprung from the Revolution.

The reactionary direction thus given to political life is usually known by the name of the Holy Alliance from a treaty concluded by the sovereigns during their sojourn in

France in the autumn of 1815. In reality this treaty had originally been inspired by lofty and noble sentiments. The Czar, Alexander I., who was animated by a genuine mysticism, proposed to the sovereigns of Austria and Prussia, that they should regulate their relations with their subjects according to the precepts of the Christian religion—'precepts of justice, love, and peace.'

This mystical invitation proceeding from the sovereign who represented the orthodox religion, was accepted by the other two monarchs—Protestant and Catholic. Thus the three Allies signed on September 26, 1815, that singular treaty by which they vowed to remain united by bonds of true and indissoluble fraternity—mutually to aid and assist each other—to behave towards their own peoples as fathers of families, and to consider them all as belonging to one and the same brotherhood—the Christian nation. This is the only treaty which has ever been signed with the personal signatures of the sovereigns, that is to say without those of their ministers. But in reality by this treaty they simply tightened a personal bond between themselves, and made a perfectly platonic manifestation of praiseworthy sentiments.

But when examination was made of the direction which these courts wished to give to the political life of Europe—when the uniformity of these sovereigns in combating every liberal idea was noted—then this alliance, concluded by such noble words of clemency and peace—called 'Holy' because it was covered by the mask of religion—was considered and in fact became a league against the new ideas which had made progress in the world since the Revolution.

Lethargy, quiescence, and the repression of every liberal idea were to be the dominant characteristics of the new life of Europe. The statesman who best represented this system was Prince Metternich, the Grand Chancellor of Austria, either from his own personal tendencies, or because the State directed by him stood for the most emphatic contradiction of the principles diffused by the French Revolution. His policy had a period of triumph by reason of the profound necessity for peace felt by Europe after the storms and convulsions of the Napoleonic period: but under this

deceptive quiet were developing the new forces of the revolutionary spirit of the peoples.

. . . . . .

On the fall of Napoleon, the greater part of the ancient kingdoms of Europe were restored and re-consigned to their former sovereigns. These latter believed that in those twenty years—to themselves for ever memorable—their good subjects had slept even as they themselves, and they prepared without more ado to reinstate the ancient order of things. The characteristic of the Governments of the eighteenth century had been Absolute Monarchy, buttressed by the aristocracy and the clergy: and this system became the special feature of almost all the Governments of the Restoration. Indeed, the new absolutism was still stronger than that of the eighteenth century, since the sovereigns who had been restored preserved the bureaucratic system inaugurated by Napoleon—a régime which depended everywhere on the centralisation of power. In addition, they conserved intact those French institutions which tended to increase royal prerogative.

Thus the exemption from taxation, which the nobles had enjoyed prior to the Revolution, was not restored, nor were their judiciary rights in the villages and other former privileges renewed. The nobility, then, had lost much of its power, but it had preserved in great part its landed property, and this still constituted the principal base of wealth.

Although the commercial and industrial classes had developed, they had not as yet amassed such great and numerous fortunes as to form a social system founded on wealth, for those few members of the middle classes who had become rich fawned on the aristocracy, bought large estates, sought by the means of matrimonial ties to enter the sacred circle, and later by the aid of a title consolidated their position and entered the elect and dominant class. In this way, by the gradual absorption of those members of the middle classes who had risen above their fellows, the aristocracy continued to hold in its hands almost all the wealth of the country. This economical power provided means of exercising an immense authority over society in general, and over the sovereign in particular. The latter, in his turn,

reserved for the ruling class the most important offices of the State and the highest ranks in the Army; the Church bestowed on this favoured caste its most distinguished and remunerative dignities.

The clergy had lost a few particular privileges as well as large estates, during the Revolution: but when the storm had passed, men's minds returned once more to religious sentiments, and the clergy speedily regained their ascendancy. The Jesuits, recalled to life by Pius VII. in 1814, penetrated, either secretly or openly, into the majority of Catholic countries. This fact largely contributed to the intensive work of reaction, whilst the Legitimist Party proclaimed the necessity of an alliance between the Altar and the Throne.

. . . . . .

Only two amongst the great states of Europe were furnished with a Constitution—England and France; these, then, presented themselves to the eyes of the Liberals in other countries as model states: but even in these countries political power remained in the hands of the sovereign and of a small fraction of the most exclusive society. For many years these constitutional Governments proceeded in full accord with those absolute sovereigns who were bound to each other by the Holy Alliance.

For centuries England had possessed a constitutional Government, and this had been firmly established by the two great revolutions of the seventeenth century; but the political power belonged to the king and to the aristocracy.

The French Revolution had terrified the privileged classes and had inspired them with a horror of every innovation, so that for thirty years the English Government had introduced no reforms: thus in 1815, not only did the Old England of the eighteenth century exist, but its social order had become almost petrified.

Political newspapers certainly existed: the *Times*, for example, had been first published in 1785, but this journal, by reason of the heavy stamp tax, which in 1815 amounted to fourpence a copy, was still a luxury: so that, in reality, even the newspapers represented a privilege of the rich, and naturally reproduced their ideas.

England had been governed for a century by the dynasty

of Hanover, which had succeeded to the throne in the female line. Simultaneously it continued to hold the throne of Hanover, and this continental possession had certainly been a proximate cause of the more direct participation of England in continental wars. George III. had been reigning from 1760, and had lost in his old age not only his sight but also his mental faculties. At the end of January, 1811, his son George had been nominated Regent. This latter, a profligate and a libertine, was solely interested in his own pleasures: in that splendid period of change which takes its name from Napoleon—in the tumult of continual wars, his chief preoccupations were dress, dancing, racing, cooking, and the society of women of easy virtue. His way of living excited the indignation of the country: this feeling was responsible in part for the sympathy accorded to his wife, Caroline of Brunswick, whom he had abandoned, though her life it must be confessed was by no means correct nor blameless.

For a long time the Government had been in the hands of the Conservative Party, which could justly boast that its long fight with Napoleon had largely contributed to the aggrandisement of England. On the conclusion of peace, England preserved her conquests won: in her hands were Malta and the islands adjacent; the Ionian Isles, which formed a republic under an English Protectorate; Heligoland, in the North Sea, and outside Europe the former Dutch colony of the Cape of Good Hope, with the islands of Mauritius and Ceylon. All these possessions added to the security of the great Indian Dominion which England had founded in those stormy years. Owing to her victories in the long wars over the fleets of France, Spain, and Holland, she had become Mistress of the Seas.

In her home affairs she had endeavoured by the Bill of 1800 to bring about a closer union between Ireland and herself. This Bill admitted a certain number of Irish representatives to the two English Chambers, but this suppression of Irish autonomy was neither accompanied nor followed, as many Irishmen had hoped, by a declaration of equality of treatment to all religions, so that the Union aggravated still more the already existing differences, which were not only religious, but racial and economic. From the time of

the Irish Conquest the English had considered all Irish property as belonging to the conquerors, and had seized it, robbing the natives who had thus been reduced to the position of tenants. All this hindered the fusion of the two peoples, and for this reason the Irish question agitated then, as it does to-day, the political life of the Kingdom.

In the twenty-five years which had elapsed since the French Revolution the population of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland had risen from fourteen to nineteen millions. It began to gravitate towards the cities. London already possessed a million inhabitants. It was at this period that the great manufacturing centres arose and that machinery came into being. When the continental blockade was removed English manufacturers believed that the Continent would again receive a large proportion of their products; but manufactures had also developed in those countries which for years had been closed to British exports, so that when commercial relations were resumed no need of many English exports was felt by them.

A grave industrial crisis arose in England owing to this loss, and an immense number of men were thrown out of employment. Machinery was considered by these workers as the true source of their troubles, and many acts of violence were committed in manufacturing districts. By a strange coincidence a year of agricultural scarcity synchronised with this industrial crisis, and corn was only obtainable at an excessive price. In favour of the English landowner the duties on imported corn had been raised to a height which prohibited foreign competition, and the price of home-grown corn was therefore uncontrolled.

A political faction had recently sprung from the flanks of the two old political parties—the Tories and the Whigs—which had hitherto disputed for power. This new party which called itself 'radical' attempted to exploit to its own advantage the discontent of the lower classes: it strenuously maintained that the amelioration of these classes could only be attained by the consideration that the interests of the working classes were those of the nation at large, and it therefore insisted on universal suffrage, secret voting, and regular electoral circumscription. In numbers this party was far from important—

one member only, Burdett, representing it in Parliament: but the discontented working classes soon enrolled themselves under its banner, and, in 1816, it succeeded in organising important demonstrations and held colossal open-air meetings. The Government, however, repressed the agitation energetically, and though the demonstrations were again repeated and petitions presented in 1819, no result was obtained, and for many years the English political situation remained unchanged.

The prestige of the Royal family, in these times, still continued to diminish. On the death of George III.—January 29, 1820—the Prince Regent ascended to the throne with the title of George IV. His wife, Princess Caroline, who had been leading an adventurous life in Italy, now proclaimed her intention of returning to England for her coronation. To this project the king was bitterly opposed, and offered her a magnificent allowance if she would consent to live outside the United Kingdom. This offer the queen refused, and on her arrival in London was enthusiastically welcomed by a large crowd, which seized with avidity this occasion of showing its hostility to the king.

George IV. then brought an action against the queen for adultery, and an opportunity was thus offered to her counsel of gravely impugning the marital conduct of the king. The small majority obtained in the House of Lords warned the minister to withdraw from the House of Commons the accusation against the queen. In spite of this favourable circumstance, the queen was not admitted to the coronation ceremony, and she died soon after—August, 1821.

Naturally, as the Crown lost prestige, the Ministry gained power, and Parliament asserted its authority in an ever-increasing degree: but both king and Parliament still remained defenders of the ancient régime, and no concessions were made to the new aspirations of the nation.

. . . . . .

In France, the Bourbon dynasty had been restored to the throne in the person of Louis XVIII., the brother of Louis XVI. He possessed intelligence, and no small degree of culture. Previous to the Revolution and for some months after its inception, he had formed a link between the Court

and the nation: but the trend of political affairs had gradually disgusted him, and in 1797, when Louis XVI. attempted flight, he had succeeded in escaping by another route and had crossed the frontier. He had settled at Coblentz, where he had become the centre of all the plots formed by the emigrant nobles, against the Revolution and naturally he had absorbed not a little of the atmosphere of his reactionary surroundings. After the death of Louis XVI., he had assumed the title of Regent, in the name of the captive Dauphin, and continued his work of diplomatic intrigue against the Republic.

But, as the field of war was gradually extended by the victories of the French armies, he was forced to quit the French frontier. At Verona in Italy he assumed the title, on the death of the Dauphin, of Louis XVIII., King of France. He was speedily compelled to return to Germany, and, later, sought refuge in Russia—Mittau in Courland—and finally he settled in England—the only Power which had resolutely remained hostile to France through all this memorable period.

Even in the most difficult circumstances, Louis XVIII. knew well how to preserve a high sense of his own royal dignity, and his long sojourn in England re-confirmed in him the liberal ideas of his youth. On the whole, he possessed a well-balanced mind, and strove to restrain the reactionary excesses of his courtiers.

He had been left a childless widower and all his affection was concentrated on his niece—the daughter of Louis XVI. —whom he had given in marriage to the Duke d'Angoulême, son of his younger brother—the Count d'Artois.

From the moment of his restoration in 1814, he had granted a constitutional charter by which two chambers were established: but the Hundred Days of Napoleon's return had aggravated the differences between the Old France and the New: the Chamber of Deputies, which had been elected in August, 1815, under the impression that Napoleon had definitely fallen, was composed almost entirely of ultra-Royalists who would have welcomed the total destruction of the work of the Republic. The Opposition consisted only of a few Constitutional Monarchists. This unanimity of

Parliamentary opinion induced Louis XVIII. to apply to the chamber the epithet of '*non-existent.*'

Soon, however, the extreme reactionary tendencies of many of these deputies who relied on the support of the Count of Artois and the more fanatic members of the Court Party, appeared dangerous to Louis XVIII., who had already passed his sixtieth year, and would very willingly have avoided every sort of excess, in order to spend his remaining years in peace. Friction arose between the Ministry and the Chamber: the ultra-royalists now championed the rights of the Chamber, in opposition to those of the sovereign.

A law, which laid down that every voter must at least be thirty years of age, and must pay a minimum of three hundred francs in taxes, was approved by the Chamber: this raised the number of electors to ninety thousand out of a population of twenty-nine millions. Political life, therefore, was by this measure restricted to a small portion of the nation only, but even so, liberal ideas continued to make headway. Only one-fifth of the Chamber was renewed annually: yet the Liberal Opposition, though it only numbered twenty-five deputies in 1817, already in 1818 had increased to the number of forty-five.

It had also become necessary to reorganise the Army: for the Napoleonic troops of 1815 had been disbanded, in order to satisfy the *amour-propre* of foreign Powers: the Bourbons, on their entry into France in 1814, with the desire of satisfying the population on whom the military levies had weighed heavily had proclaimed the abolition of conscription. But voluntary enlistment, encouraged by the offer of many prizes, had soon proved insufficient. It became necessary, therefore, to return, though indirectly, to conscription: the latter system was now limited to the enrolment for a period of six years of 40,000 soldiers, annually, selected by lottery.

With a reorganised army, France was able to demand of the foreign Powers that they should diminish the number of the troops which occupied France: accordingly in 1817 the Army of Occupation was reduced from 150,000 to 120,000 men. This first step having proved successful, France

requested the concession of a premature withdrawal from the soil of France of all the Allied troops.

In order to discuss this point, a Congress met at Aix-la-Chapelle in the autumn of 1818. This body was composed of the three sovereigns of Austria, Russia, and Prussia, with their ministers and the representatives of the Courts of England and France. The question was speedily settled in the affirmative: this decision was expedited by the fact that a large part of the indemnity fixed by the Powers had already been paid by France; another reason also contributed to this settlement, for the sovereigns themselves were feeling anxiety lest those of their troops which were in contact with the French nation might become contaminated by the new ideas with which the population was saturated. Subsequently, the Allied Powers received France into their Alliance.

All things seemed now to favour the prosperity and progress of France: the new laws passed concerning the Press were liberal in tendency, though they exacted a substantial surety from the editors of newspapers. But the Conservatives became alarmed by the result of the elections of 1819, since the number of Liberals in the Chamber were raised by them from forty-five to ninety. Among the new deputies appeared the Abbé Grégoire, who had been a member of the National Convention and had been the first to demand the trial of Louis XVI. in 1792. The ultra-royalists had taken part in the election in the hope of causing a division in the ranks of the Liberals: they were in part successful, since the more temperate Liberals were alarmed at the progress of the advanced ideas.

Shortly after, a grave event determined the triumph of the reactionaries. On the night of February 13, the Duke de Berry, second son of the Count d'Artois, was assassinated at the door of the Opera House. He was only forty-two years old, and was not only the youngest member of the reigning dynasty, but the only one from whom an heir to the throne could be expected. His brother, the Duke d'Angoulême, who had been married for more than twenty years to the daughter of Louis XVI., was childless: the Duke de Berry had a few years before married the Princess Caroline of Naples, and she had presented him, a year before

his death, with a daughter. With his death, therefore, the dynasty would seem to have become extinct.

The assassin had acted entirely on his own responsibility, but it was easy for the reactionaries to throw the burden of the crime on the shoulders of the whole Liberal Party, and in this way enter a protest against the general trend of Government. The indignation of the nation was so cleverly exploited that for a long time reaction triumphed. Special laws were enacted for gagging the Press and restraining individual liberty. The electoral laws were modified, and in 1820 new elections carried to Parliament many members of the '*non-existent*' Chamber.

When, soon after the death of her husband, the Duchess de Berry gave birth to an heir—the Duke de Bordeaux, 'the child of the miracle,' the party of reaction deemed their future assured, since the elder branch of the Bourbons now possessed an heir to the throne. Thus, in France, the Governments followed the old paths, leading yet farther and farther from the currents of national life.

. . . . . .

If reactionary ideas triumphed in France and England, it may be imagined how desperate was the situation in those countries whose affairs were directed by absolute Governments.

The Spanish Peninsula, during the period of Napoleonic domination, had known neither rest nor peace. The French invasion had aroused a marvellous resistance, but simultaneously had shaken the country from its torpor: for since the King of Spain had been interned in France those Spaniards who had taken up arms in defence of the ancient régime had been forced to organise a new Government, and they had called together the 'Cortes' in Cadiz. In the midst of the perils of siege, the new Constitution of the Kingdom was discussed and voted. The latter was formed upon the model of the French Constitution of 1791: the sovereignty of the nation was recognised and the legislative power entrusted to one Chamber elected by universal suffrage. Every class of liberty was proclaimed, always excepting that of religion: 'The religion of the Spanish nation is, and will always be, that of the Roman Catholic and Apostolic Church—the only

true religion: the nation protects it with its wise and just laws, and prohibits the exercise of any other cult.—(Art. 12).'

The Constitution was promulgated on March 18, 1812: on the same day, the English general, Wellington, who had already succeeded in driving the French out of Portugal, attempted an advance into Spain, in order to bear aid to the insurgents: later, in 1813, English and Spanish succeeded in driving the French to the Pyrenees: it was then that the Cortes meditated a transference of their session to Madrid, and on the 15th of January, 1814, they entered into the capital.

King Ferdinand, who had been confined by Napoleon at Valençay, in the centre of France, was finally allowed in March, 1814, to return to his own country.

In this manner, the Bourbon dynasty was restored in Spain. Ferdinand VII., though only thirty years of age, had already exhibited on several occasions the feebleness of his intellect, the cruelty of his disposition, and the exceeding vileness of his character. Hardly had he entered Spain, when he surrounded himself with the most reactionary elements: before his entry into Madrid he had declared the Constitution of 1812 null and void, and had ordered the arrest of the chiefs of the Liberal Party. He re-established the old corrupt order, recalled the Jesuits, restored the Inquisition to its pristine strength, and granted every licence to the small Court Camarilla.

It must, however, be admitted that the reactionary tendency of the Government corresponded to the sentiments of the great majority of the country; the latter was composed only of aristocratic landowners, a numerous and powerful clergy, and a swarming population sunk in misery and ignorance. The middle-class element which in England and France was not only numerous but represented a considerable part of public opinion, scarcely existed in Spain, owing to her scanty commercial and industrial development. Liberal sentiments had only penetrated into the higher ranks of the Army, which in the absence of the sovereign had fought for six years in defence of their fatherland and their ancient dynasty. But the most prominent officers were either imprisoned or exiled, so that it seemed probable that the

king might with impunity force his atrocious Government on the people. He neglected every good principle of government and the Army received so little of his attention that it was unable to repress the rebellion, which some years before had broken out in the American colonies.

The example given by the English North-American colonies and their resultant prosperity had begun to arouse a desire for independence in the Spanish colonies at the end of the eighteenth century: the diffusion of the new ideas of liberty, during the period of the French Revolution, had aided in developing these aspirations. When, later, Spain was invaded by the Napoleonic troops, and the Spanish patriots took up arms against them, a very flame of insurrection spread from Mexico and Venezuela to the provinces of Buenos Ayres. Spaniards devoted to their country, alike with those of their countrymen who were desirous of independence, found themselves in agreement in the determination to throw off the French yoke.

The beginning of this great insurrectionary movement may be dated from 1810. Its most prominent leader was Simon Bolivar, who has been called 'the Washington of South America.' The two conflicting Governments in Spain were too much occupied with their own battles to pay any attention to their colonies: this opportunity of unrestricted action so favoured the rebels that from 1810 to 1814 they effectively maintained their independence.

But after Ferdinand's restoration in Spain, those who had taken up arms against the French laid them down, and Spain was now able to reassert her authority in many of her colonies. Some, however, preferred to retain their independence: in the vast plains of the Plata, the insurrection had completely triumphed: the Congress of Tucuman, on July 7, 1816, proclaimed the independence of the former viceroyalty of Buenos Ayres. From the Argentine the insurgents penetrated into Chili, and pronounced that state independent of the mother country: the revolt then extended to Peru. In Paraguay, a Dr Francia proclaimed himself absolute lord of this territory, and he succeeded in maintaining his dictatorship. In Venezuela, Simon Bolivar was the hero of a series of adventurous exploits, and in 1819, proclaimed

the union of New Granada and Venezuela in the Republic of Columbia.

Ferdinand built his hopes on the potent aid of the Holy Alliance, and directed an appeal to the Czar Alexander to intervene in his favour: but the friendly intentions of the Czar were paralysed by the attitude of England. The sympathy of this Power was extended to the revolted Spanish-American colonies, for the reason that they opened an important market for its own exports: fully convinced that King Ferdinand was impotent to suppress the rebellion without exterior aid, it endeavoured to prevent the interference of foreign Powers. The United States of America took the same view, for in the future states of the south it foresaw both political and commercial clients: for some time past it had suspended relations with Spain and now profited by this occasion to expropriate Florida.

The reigning House of Portugal—the Braganza dynasty—still resided in its colony of Brazil, whither it had taken refuge on the French occupation of Portugal, in 1807. This country had been rescued from French domination by the special work of the English Army. But the king, John VI., had not yet left Brazil, since he thoroughly understood that, since public opinion in South America was entirely in favour of independence, his departure from Rio de Janeiro would immediately give the signal of revolt in Brazil. It was due to this fact that Lord Beresford, a general of the British Army, governed Portugal almost as he pleased, with the title of Regent and with the assistance of a Council of Regency. Naturally King John's neglect of his people wounded the national pride of many: their sense of dignity was hurt by their subjugation to the military rule of a foreign Government, and even in the Army many officers eagerly looked for a change.

. . . . . .

If we now examine the conditions of the Italian Peninsula we shall see that the differences between the peoples and their Governments were even more marked.

After sixteen years of French rule, Turin, the ancient capital of Piedmont, saw with joy the re-entry of their former sovereigns of the House of Savoy on May 20, 1814. The

Prince who represented this ancient dynasty was Victor Emmanuel I., and he was welcomed with loud acclamations by his people, who were delighted with the independence finally regained.

Unfortunately, their sovereign, now fifty-five years of age, had lived till then in an atmosphere entirely at variance with the new ideas diffused by the French Revolution. He therefore was unable to realise the changes which had taken place in his state during his absence. These had been enormous, since the Piedmontese, either by reason of the length of time they had been subject to French government, or by their neighbourhood and affinity to the French, had absorbed the new maxims with extraordinary ease. But Victor Emmanuel, on the other hand, considered all that had taken place during his absence as a long dream and imagined that he was giving a high proof of generosity by simply drawing a veil over the past.

He made his entry in old-fashioned dress, with powder, pigtail, and a hat in the style of Frederick II.: the courtiers, who accompanied him, were dressed in the same manner: and as was their dress, so were their thoughts—antiquated and out of date.

The sovereign attempted, both as regards men and things, the reconstruction of the past: he re-established the power of the Church, restoring the clergy to lay offices and abolishing religious liberty: he surrounded himself with the old nobility and restored functionaries and officials to the posts they had held before the French occupation had forced the House of Savoy to abandon Piedmont.

This return to the ancient order of things disgusted many, more especially those who belonged to the educated classes. Manifestations of discontent with the reactionary tendency of the Government were not wanting. These assumed a serious form in Liguria, for the Genoese had seen with grief the suppression of their ancient republic: this latter, by the will of the Powers, had been annexed to the dominions of the House of Savoy. Old rivalries between the two provinces were not only perpetuated after the annexation, but were aggravated. Genoa thus became a centre of opposition to the Piedmontese Government.

Neither had the Republic of Venice been restored: its territories had been handed over to Austria in compensation for that Power's renunciation of Belgium: by this addition to its ancient possessions of Milan and Mantua more than four millions of Italian subjects dwelling in the richest and, strategically speaking, the strongest provinces of Italy were placed under Austrian rule. To this new Austrian province was given the name of Lombardo-Veneto: it had been the very centre of Italian life during the period of the French Revolution and had, therefore, undergone the most profound modifications. It was precisely in this province that national sentiment had reached its highest development. So, though the province possessed a good and regular administration which fostered material progress and might have been envied in many parts of Italy, the more cultured and intelligent classes were bitterly hostile to the Government simply on account of its foreign character.

Its sovereign, Francis I., the Emperor of Austria, had been born in Italy; but his rigid and cold character did not permit this fact to lessen the antipathy to his Government. He had passed his life in fighting France and those French ideas which were now diffused through the world, and age had but made him more fervid in the defence of the principles of Absolutism. Not only so, but ever at his side during his lifetime stood Clement, Prince Metternich, who directed his policy and was justly considered as the Standard Bearer of reaction.

Some few of the citizens demanded permission to open popular schools, in order to spread amongst the masses the elements of Liberalism: this permission was denied.

Austria also lorded it over the Duchies of Parma and Piacenza, which had been assigned to the daughter of the Emperor Francis, Maria Louisa, the wife of Napoleon. The ex-Empress of France, now Duchess of Parma, preserved many French institutions and had she had her way would have governed mildly enough; but unfortunately she was forced to bend to the will of Austria, which, by the Treaties of 1815, had been allowed to hold the fortress of Piacenza with its own garrison: hence, in very truth, Austria was the real mistress of the duchy. So much was this the case, that

Marshal Neipperg, to whom had been given the charge of alienating the love of Maria Louisa from her husband, exercised over her an absolute power, causing her not only to forget her exiled husband at Saint Helena, but also her son who was held in Vienna.

The Duchy of Modena was also governed by a prince of the Austrian House—the Archduke Francis IV. The latter possessed both genius and ambition, and his private life was without reproach, but he was dominated by the most despotic ideas. He re-established the ancient laws and maintained close relations with the Jesuits, in order to save the country from the plague of Liberalism.

In Tuscany, by the courageous initiative of Pietro Leopold I., many reforms had been introduced even prior to the French Revolution. It resulted that the restoration of the old Grand Ducal Government made by Ferdinand III.—the brother of Francis I., the Austrian Emperor—was less in contrast with the new ideas than that of any other state in the peninsula.

Opposition here, therefore, was scanty and the Government showed a mild disposition, yet the semi-toleration which the people enjoyed seemed the essence of liberty compared with the absolutism of the other Italian states.

The old Pope, Pius VII., after so many unhappy adventures, now enjoyed undisturbed possession of the states of the Church. He owed this entirely to the diplomatic skill of his minister, Cardinal Consalvi, who at the Congress of Vienna had laid bare those Austrian schemes which were aimed at the province of the Romagna, and had defeated the plans of Ferdinand of Naples, who would have added the principality of Benevento to his own dominions. This diplomatic success assured to Consalvi the direction of the Government during the whole of the pontificate of Pius VII. He endeavoured to moderate the excesses of reaction, though his efforts in this direction availed little, since the Pope, though animated by good intentions, possessed a feeble character and allowed himself unresistingly to be borne along by the strong reactionary current which prevailed at the Vatican. He restored the Inquisition, recalled the Jesuits to life, and did not hesitate to put in force the atrocious Pontifical system

of past ages. Laymen were again removed from offices of state, and the whole administration was placed in the hands of ecclesiastics. French legislation was abolished, and the former ancient and obscure code of laws was restored in its entirety.

At Naples the old King Ferdinand felt himself more secure on the throne—to which he had recently been restored—by the death of Murat, who had been shot in Calabria, October 13, 1815, after his abortive attempt at the reconquest of his kingdom. He now determined to free himself from the inquietude caused by the trend of political events in Sicily. Through all the various conquests it had undergone, this island had preserved its ancient Parliament: in fact, in 1812, in consequence of an agitation which had been encouraged by England, it had obtained a genuine Constitution, formed on the English model, with a House of Lords and a House of Commons. King Ferdinand, after his recall to Naples, had entirely neglected to convoke the Sicilian Parliament: he now proposed to suppress, once for all, the differences which had always existed in the administration of the two sections of his dominions; he therefore published a decree, by which it was established that the whole of his dominions, on this and that side of Messina, should, in future, form one kingdom which should bear the name of the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies. The titles of Ferdinand IV. of Naples, and Ferdinand II. of Sicily, which he had hitherto borne, were now discarded for that of Ferdinand I., King of the Two Sicilies.

King Ferdinand, even after the death of his wife, Maria Carolina of Austria—1814—continued to follow the policy she had initiated, and remained the obsequious slave of the Vienna Cabinet.

As a whole, then, Italy was divided into many States which were all ruled by absolute Governments. Many of its princes were related to the Austrian House, The latter dominated the major part of the basin of the Po. On this account the concentrated hate of the Italian Liberals was directed against Austria.

. . . . . .

It must be admitted that Austria, more than any other

Power, was interested in repressing tendencies towards liberty and nationality, seeing that it not only represented Absolutism but consisted of an artificial group of various nationalities. Besides its Italian territories, it possessed—the hereditary Austrian provinces—mainly German—the ancient Kingdom of Bohemia, in which the Slavs predominated—Polish Galicia—the Roumanian Bucovina—and finally the Kingdom of Hungary, consisting almost entirely of Magyars. Each of these countries was composed of a conglomeration of races, and all were bound together by the monarchy which governed everywhere absolutely: Hungary alone possessed an ancient Constitution, with a Diet: Austria, however, to the best of her ability avoided convoking the latter, and permitted the Hungarian Constitution simply because the national sentiment of the people prevented its abolition. Liberal ideas were not prevalent in the empire, owing to the fact that Austrian territory had remained immune from the French Invasion. Therefore, the Dynasty, buttressed both by the bureaucracy and by the Army, felt itself strong enough to make its power felt outside its national boundaries, not only in Italy but even in Germany.

For more than three and a half centuries—to be precise, from 1438—the House of Austria had worn uninterruptedly the Crown of the Holy Roman Empire, elected by the Germanic nation: but in the turmoil of the Napoleonic period—1806—the Emperor Francis II. had thought it advisable to renounce this empty and unsubstantial title for that of Francis I., Emperor of Austria.

The Roman Empire had not been restored in the new map of Europe which had been prepared at the Congress of Vienna; because, as has been before stated, it had represented to its possessors weakness rather than strength, for it bound them to defend gratuitously the remaining Germanic states. Very gladly would Austria have insisted on the right to the Roman Imperial Crown had she been able to avail herself of some new organisation which might have given to the Central Power an efficient offensive and defensive force: but had such an organisation been formed, the Protestant House of Hohenzollern would have contested its right to the Imperial Crown. In the presence of such a powerful

rival, the idea of reconstructing the Roman Empire was therefore renounced by Austria—all the more readily since a strong Central Power was neither desired by individual German states, who preferred their own independence, nor by the Great Powers, who were apprehensive of a solidly organised Germany. Hence, a simple Confederation of Sovereign States was formed, with a Federal Diet, which assembled at Frankfort-on-Main. Since each individual state was independent, the Diet could do no more than appeal to the respective Governments and await their orders. Thus the Diet was reduced to complete impotence from the clashing interests of the small and great states of the Confederation: for the same reason, the Presidency of the Diet, which had been confided to Austria, represented for the latter no material advantage.

This Diet, which entirely annulled the political importance of the Confederation, and hence of Germany herself, did not satisfy the national aspirations of the populations, which during the war of 1813 had been so strongly affirmed. Neither did the internal order of individual states correspond to the longing for freedom which had developed in recent years.

The states of the Confederation were thirty-nine in number —*i.e.* an Empire—that of Austria—excluding the Kingdom of Hungary and the Austro-Italian territory—five kingdoms —Prussia, Bavaria, Saxony, Würtemberg, and Hanover— seven Grand Duchies, nine Duchies, eleven Principalities, four free cities, Bremen, Hamburg, Lübeck, and Frankfort-on-Main, and, finally, Luxemburg, which depended on the Crown of the Low Countries with the Duchy of Holstein, which belonged to the King of Denmark. The two last-named sovereigns belonged to the Confederation only by right of the territories belonging to them.

Each sovereign regulated his own state according to his pleasure. It is true that Art. 13 of the Federal Constitution laid down: 'The Assemblies of the various states shall be called together within the period of one year,' but this was by no means a binding phrase and many states entirely disregarded it. The most Liberal Prince of the Germanic states was the Grand Duke Charles August of Saxe Weimar,

who justly boasted that he had made his small capital the intellectual centre of Germany. In 1816, he granted a Constitution by the creation of a House of Nobles, Cities, and Peasants, with the power of examining the finances of the duchy and voting the taxes: liberty of the Press was also granted by him in his dominions.

Little by little the southern states followed his example: Bavaria, Würtemberg, Hesse-Darmstadt soon possessed representative assemblies. In some few northern states, the sovereigns convoked the ancient House of Notables, but the most important state of all—the Kingdom of Prussia—the state which, above all others, should have given a liberal impulse to the whole country, because the national aspirations of Germany were centred in it—the Kingdom of Prussia—still preserved its Absolute Government.

This startling exception irritated the German Liberals, who had dreamed of ideals of Liberty and National Unity. The students formed associations, some secretly, others openly—the latter with the ostensible aim of fostering gymnastic exercises. The small city of Jena, in the Grand Duchy of Saxe Weimar, was the centre of this patriotic movement. A few Liberal Professors of the Grand Duchy thought of organising for October 18, 1817 a patriotic-religious festival, in order to celebrate simultaneously the third centenary of the Lutheran Reformation and the fourth anniversary of the Battle of Leipzig. About four hundred professors and students attended the celebration, and in the evening they made a bonfire into which they cast reactionary books, together with some symbols of repressive Governments: the awed silence of the crowd gave to this scene the appearance of a revolt: the Great Powers protested to the Grand Duke, who found himself compelled to suppress both student association and the liberty of the Press.

In the Congress, which was summoned soon after at Aix-la-Chapelle—1818—Prince Metternich impressed on the sovereigns the necessity of attentively watching the development of these new ideas: shortly after—1819—as if to justify this advice, a student stabbed Kotzebue, the German playwright, who had accepted the odious task of reporting to the Czar the condition of public opinion in Germany.

An attempt was also made on the life of the Governor of Nassau.

Metternich then called together the representatives of the Great States at Carlsbad, and it was there decided to insist on repressive measures. All the princes were ordered to dissolve the Students' Associations and to appoint officers in each University who might keep a watchful eye on both professors and students: a Federal Commission was organised at Mayence, furnished with powers of police and charged with the mission of inquiry into the Liberal Movement. A few months after, at Vienna, the conclusions of the Carlsbad deliberations were revised and clearly stated. In the new Congress, Metternich had demanded the abolition of the Constitutions of the southern states: but the less important sovereigns perfectly understood that were his orders to be obeyed, they would be delivered, bound hand and foot, into the power of Austria: they therefore preserved the Constitutions, not from any tendency towards Liberalism, but because these assemblies furnished a means of withdrawal from the too aspiring dominion of Austria.

Another Confederation was organised in 1815, that of Switzerland. This country also had been profoundly shaken in the Napoleonic period: the French invasion had destroyed the ancient order, which included thirteen confederate cantons, and, with these, the Allied cantons and towns dependent on those by which they had been subjugated. The new Constitution, which was approved in 1815, re-divided Switzerland into twenty-two cantons, each of which was a sovereign state. Here also Federal Power was weak. The Federal Diet was only an assembly of representatives sent by individual states, in order to hear the proposals made, and to refer them to their respective Governments, and later to lay before the Assembly the decisions of the cantons.

The Diet sat alternatively at Zurich, Berne, and Lucerne: and the executive power of the Confederation was left to the Council of the Canton in which the Biennial Diet chanced to be sitting: this rendered still weaker the action of the Central Power. In addition, its work was almost entirely confined to military and diplomatic affairs, which were necessarily unimportant, since, in order to secure the

independence of Switzerland, and also to guard the general interests of Europe, the Great Powers, in the Treaty of Paris, of November 20, 1815, had proclaimed the perpetual neutrality of the new Confederation. All the activity, therefore, of Swiss political life developed in individual cantons, organised under totally differing methods, since some preserved an aristocratic system and others a commercial and democratic one: while one—that of Neuchâtel—belonged to the King of Prussia. In the religious field each canton followed its own predilections: some had adopted the principle of religious tolerance, but others prohibited the exercise of any other cult except that of the state: thus the Valais prohibited the Protestant cult, while the Canton of Vaud interdicted the Catholic Religion.

Another country, on the borders of France, had been essentially modified in its political conditions by the events which had followed the French Revolution: this was the state which assumed the new title of the Kingdom of the Low Countries.

Before the Revolution these countries had formed three separate dominions: Belgium belonged to Austria; Holland constituted the Federal Republic of the United Provinces; while the territory of the City of Liège was ruled by its Bishop: this state of affairs had disappeared in the revolutionary period and had not been restored. Austria, satisfied with her aggrandisement in Italy, willingly renounced her claim to far-off Belgium: the ecclesiastical lordship of the Bishops disappeared: republics being no longer in fashion, the United Provinces sought for a sovereign, and found one in the family of Orange, which had already possessed such power in the State in the office of Stadtholder: William I. accepted the throne, and obtained permission from the Powers to annex to Holland the territory of Belgium and the Bishopric of Liège: in this way he fulfilled the desire of the Great Powers that a substantial state should stand on the frontiers of France, strong enough to defend her frontiers against any threats.

Either by reason of Dutch Republican traditions, or because those countries had deeply drunk of the new ideas, King William I. deemed it advisable to grant a Constitution to the Low Countries: he established two Chambers—one

nominated by the King, and the other composed of representatives elected from the Provincial Councils: he assured to all, equality of civil and political rights, liberty of religion, and freedom of the Press. The Government, in fact, had taken into account the changes of recent years: it therefore seemed probable that it might have proceeded in complete accord with its people.

But the Union of Belgium with Holland had been made by diplomats, and was based entirely on their calculations of general interest: no attention had been paid to the fact that they were binding together two peoples, differing in race, in language, in historical tradition, and in religion: therefore, while the Dutch people were in perfect accord with their sovereign, the latter was fiercely opposed in Belgium, since he was both a Dutchman and a Protestant, and had surrounded himself with Dutch functionaries: to her own people Catholic Belgium seemed to occupy the position of a conquered country. Therefore in this new Kingdom of the Low Countries, which yet was governed by Constitutional methods, there was a scission between the Government and a portion of the population.

King William I. of Orange-Nassau, in the rearrangement of Germany, had obtained the Grand Duchy of Luxemburg, as a recompense for the occupation by Prussia of the German possessions of his family: as Grand Duke of Luxemburg, he therefore took part in the deliberations of the German Confederation.

. . . . . .

Frederick VI., King of Denmark, also became a member of the German Confederation by virtue of his position as Duke of Holstein-Lauenburg—German territory which had been granted him in 1815: this duchy had been given him in exchange for Norway, which had been taken from him as a punishment for having remained, even to the last, the faithful friend and ally of Napoleon.

The Norwegians, however, had considered the treaty by which they had been ceded to Sweden as null and void: they had formed a Constitution, modelled on that of the French of 1791, and had attempted to repel the Swedes by force of arms. But it was not possible for this small

country, unaided, to oppose the will of the Great Powers. In the end, therefore, the Norwegians had concluded a convention with the King of Sweden by which they recognised him as their sovereign: they did, however, obtain permission to retain a separate Government and their own Constitution. But a misunderstanding sprang from this arrangement, which proved a perpetual impediment to a perfect understanding between the two countries : the Swedes considered that they had conquered Norway and hence could impose their supremacy upon them, whilst the Norwegians consistently maintained the absolute equality of the two countries.

Charles XIII. was then King of Sweden, and had granted to his people a Constitution restoring the ancient Diet: this was composed of four Orders: the nobility, the clergy, the commercial classes, and the peasants. As he was childless, he had recognised, as Heir Apparent, the French General Bernadotte, who ascended the throne in 1818 and was the only one of the princes produced by the Revolution who succeeded in founding a stable dynasty.

In 1809, Sweden had been forced to yield Finland to the Czar, Alexander I. This country, also, under the new Government preserved its Diet, composed of four classes, and retained as the religion of the State, the Lutheran Cult: in other words, it did not become, strictly speaking, a province of the Russian Empire, but a separate state, which recognised as its head the Czar of Russia, by the title of Grand Duke of Finland.

The Czar, Alexander I., was also Constitutional Monarch of another state—the Kingdom of Poland, which was united to Russia only in the person of the sovereign. Poland had preserved the Catholic Church as its State religion, the Polish language as its official tongue, and possessed its own administration and Army: in addition, the Czar, in December, 1815, had granted a Constitution and created a Diet: this was composed of a Senate of thirty members, nominated by the sovereign and a deputation of sixty members, elected from the nobles and the cities. But the powers of this Diet were strictly limited and their brief session was only held biennially.

Naturally, the Liberals were dissatisfied: Polish sentiment demanded that its ancient provinces of Lithuania should be

restored to the Kingdom of Poland: down to the eighteenth century they had formed an integral part of the kingdom and had then been expropriated by Russia, in the general dismemberment of that century. Alexander I. was stupefied at not finding in the Polish nation that gratitude which he imagined to be his due. His displeasure speedily produced acute friction between the Russian Government and the Polish nation.

The Constitutional sovereign of Finland and Poland was autocrat in Russia. This—the most vast of empires—was still essentially an agricultural country. It may be accurately stated that it was composed of two classes alone—an immense number of peasants, who were tyrannised over by one hundred thousand families of nobles: the commercial classes were restricted in number and possessed no wealth: the clergy were but slightly elevated above the labouring class. These two clearly cut divisions of society—one still Oriental, orthodox and cut off from all political and cultured life, the other entirely Westernised, sceptical in religion and disposed to adopt the ideas of the remainder of Europe—were governed by the Czar, Alexander I.

The latter had ascended the throne in 1801, before he had attained his twenty-fifth year, after the bloody tragedy which had deprived his father both of his throne and life. He was animated by the best intentions and possessed high humanitarian ideals, but his character was flexible and easily influenced: his life was therefore passed in spasms of vacillation between weak Liberal instincts and despotic inclinations.

Thus, while in friendly relations with Napoleon, he had proposed to follow his example and carried out the difficult reforms advised by his minister, Michael Spéransky: but, when he had broken with Napoleon, he fell under the influence of the anti-French, orthodox, and absolutist party: he sent his great minister to Siberia, and opposed, vigorously, the ideas which he had enthusiastically adopted in the early part of his reign.

But in the meantime the cultured classes had begun to watch with interest the events which were happening in the rest of Europe. The expedition of Napoleon into Russia,

and, later, the entry of the Russian Armies into France and their sojourn in French provinces for full three years—1815-1818—brought into contact these widely-differing societies: if the ignorant and illiterate soldiery did not understand these matters deeply, their officers brought back to their own country their impressions of the new ideas. Even in Russia itself, then, it followed, though in a minor degree, that the conflict between Governmental tendencies and the aspirations of the cultured class attained certain proportions.

In the Congress of Vienna, the Czar would allow no mention of the Ottoman Empire, in order to preserve untrammelled his ambitions and plans in the East. Thus, Turkey might be said to be beyond the pale of International Law.

. . . . . .

On the whole, then, if we examine the life of Europe in the years which followed 1815, we shall find Absolutism almost everywhere triumphant. In the few countries which were distinguished by constitutional Government, the Governmental methods seemed out of date, and the small minority of the country, in whose hands lay political power, was also animated by reactionary sentiments.

Everywhere we find that a tacit agreement between the sovereign, the aristocracy, the clergy, and the bureaucracy aimed at preserving intact the ancient order of things; and as if this were not enough, the Holy Alliance kept watch and guard in order the better to ensure its conservation.

Opposed to these formidable internal and international coalitions the forces of Liberalism seemed scanty enough: those nobles were few indeed who, by their intelligence and culture, had recognised the new times and the new needs, and who were disposed, for them, to sacrifice their privileges. The class which was specially impregnated with the new ideas was that of the *bourgeoisie*—the new social class which had developed simultaneously with commerce and industry: but in every place it was few in numbers and often, from economic reasons, dependent on the nobility. But the mass of the population, more especially the peasantry, were still too ignorant and too inert to understand the new principles: hence this class remained isolated from all political life: not

only so, but generally speaking, instead of bringing strength to the Liberal Movement, it favoured the existing régime.

It would have seemed, then, that the aristocratic and absolutist régime was solidly based and likely to endure: certainly, when the first shocks menaced the solidity of the social edifice, the work of restoration was speedy and energetic. But as gradually the newer generation supplanted the old, the progress of ideas became more rapid, and this new undercurrent undermined the very foundation of the edifice so thoroughly as to overthrow it in less than half a century.

CHAPTER II

THE FIRST BREACHES AND THE WORK OF REPARATION

Secret Societies and the Military 'Pronunciamenti.'—The Revolutions of 1820 *in Spain and Portugal, and the Establishment of Constitutional Governments.—The Neapolitan Revolution : Austria's Intervention and the Restoration of Absolutism.—The Piedmontese Revolution of* 1821 *: Carlo Alberto.—Triumph of Reaction : Patriotic Martyrology.—Prevalence of Reaction, even in France.—The Second Congress of Vienna* (1822).*—French Expedition against the Cortes and the Re-establishment of Absolutism in Spain.—Changes in Portugal.—Separation of Brazil under Don Pedro I.—The Monroe Doctrine of the United States and the Independence of the Spanish-American Colonies.*

THE first open manifestations against those Governments which had been restored in 1815, came from the ranks of the Army; this was due to the fact that, in the Napoleonic Period—in that perpetual turmoil of war—all the young men in whose veins life ran strongly had embraced with ardour the career of arms, since it opened for them the speediest path of advancement and the satisfaction of all their ambitions. But these young officers, in the somnolence and inertia which characterised the life of Europe during the Restoration, felt suffocated by the general drowsiness of the atmosphere.

In the states directed by Absolute Governments, since many who felt discontent at the political direction pursued by their rulers possessed no legal means by which an attempt might be made to change the political course of affairs; they could not even declare their opinions on this subject, for, had they done so, they would certainly have been arrested. The only way, which suggested some hope of success, lay in the foundation of secret societies, in the confidence that these would finally acquire force sufficient to impose their desires on the Governments. These years, therefore, were distinguished by a strong growth of secret societies, which, from the above-mentioned reasons, found a fertile soil in the ranks of the Army.

In Spain, King Ferdinand VII., with the intention of quelling the American Revolution, had collected an army at Cadiz, in order to embark troops at that port for the rebellious colonies. But, as the ships were not ready for the reception of the soldiery, the latter were delayed at Cadiz for some considerable time. The soldiers were, naturally, not eager to go and fight in those distant lands, and their discontent was fostered by agents, sent for that purpose directly from America: the officers, the majority of whom had belonged to the armies of the War of Independence against France, were disgusted at the abolition of the Cortes of 1812. It was therefore easy, in such an atmosphere, to prepare one of those political manifestations, which are called by the Spanish '*pronunciamenti*.'

On January 1, 1820, Colonels Riego and Quiroga, at the head of their troops, proclaimed in Cadiz the Constitution of 1812, but they did not succeed in capturing the fortress of the city. Riego crossed over with his men into Andalusia, but he was unable, in that province, to excite the rising he had hoped for. This, however, broke out in the north, in the commercial centres of a few cities; and since the Army refused to suppress the revolt, the terrified king accepted the Constitution and took a solemn oath of fidelity to it on March 9, 1820. For four months, the Government was in the hands of a Provisional Junta composed of the chiefs of the Liberal Party: in the meantime the Cortes was convoked.

In the adjoining state of Portugal, the effect of the Spanish Revolution was strongly felt; here, too, the revolt was essentially the work of the Army: on August 24, 1820, the garrison of Oporto rose, demanding the return of the king from Brazil, and the establishment of a Constitution.

The Lisbon garrison followed its example a few days later: the Regency, which governed in the name of King John VI., decided, therefore, to convoke the Cortes in order to prepare a Constitution.

. . . . . .

But even before these events had occurred in Portugal, the Revolution had broken out in Italy, in the Kingdom of Naples. Here, also, the discontent found its first outlet in

the Army, where many officers who had served under Murat lamented the crowded life of those agitated years. The secret society, called the Carbonari, had obtained numerous adherents. The easy triumph of the Spanish Revolution induced the members of this organisation to decide on action. On July 2, 1820, in the little city of Nola, which was situated at the foot of Vesuvius, two sub-lieutenants—Morelli and Silvati—followed by a little more than a hundred soldiers, initiated the revolutionary movement and demanded the Constitution. The rebels marched from Nola on Avellino, where the governor—himself a Carbonari—joined them with the small garrison he commanded: he placed himself at the head of the insurgents and marched towards the capital.

On the night of July 5-6, General Guglielmo Pepe, fearing lest his reputation as a Liberal should lead to his arrest, left Naples and betook himself to the revolutionary camp, which welcomed him as its head. Simultaneously, many provinces welcomed the movement, and even in the capital itself the agitation assumed such proportions that King Ferdinand, fearing for his throne, promised the Constitution—July 6—and, under the pressure of the conspirators, adopted without delay the Spanish Constitution of 1812.

The news of these events produced a lively ferment in Sicily, where the desire for the ancient autonomy awoke. Palermo arose and attempted to organise in the island a Government separate from that of Naples. But the movement failed to appeal to the people, and it was soon quelled.

The establishment of a Constitutional Government in the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies alarmed the Powers of the Holy Alliance, more particularly Austria, who saw in this development a threat against the tranquillity of her Italian dominions. A diplomatic congress was held at Grappau—the capital of Austrian Silesia—at which the Czar of Russia, the King of Prussia, and the Emperor of Austria agreed upon the necessity of an Austrian intervention: the representatives of England and France, while withholding their entire assent, allowed it to be understood that they would not oppose such an expedition. Metternich then

invited the King of Naples to be present at a new Congress, which was arranged to be held at Laibach—the capital of Carniola.

According to the Spanish Constitution of 1812, the king could not leave the kingdom without the consent of Parliament: in order to obtain this he wrote to the Chamber, desiring permission to go and defend the Constitutional Cause before the sovereigns of the Holy Alliance: he stated that, in any case, if he could not succeed in influencing them in its favour, he would return in sufficient time to defend his people's cause by arms. Parliament, therefore, consented to his departure, and Ferdinand left Naples, confiding the Government to the hands of his son Francis.

At Laibach, in January, 1821, the fate of Naples was decided. An Austrian army received the order to march on Naples, and King Ferdinand wrote to his subjects, requesting that they should give a friendly reception to the troops of his faithful ally, Francis I. The Neapolitan Parliament did not trust the king, and thought it advisable to declare that no confidence was to be placed in the words of Ferdinand, since he was surrounded by the Northern sovereigns and was, therefore, no longer a free agent: it decided to defend the kingdom against the Austrian invasion. The Regent, Francis, ably carrying out the plan which his father had devised for him, appeared to throw himself zealously into the plan of defence.

But nothing was done to resist the invasion. The Ministry was, in great part, composed of men of weak or dubious character: alike in Parliament and in journalism, empty garrulity and the illusions of men who entirely ignored the gravity of the situation, predominated: the Army was undisciplined and the bitterest discord reigned among its chiefs. General Guglielmo Pepe, at the head of a body of troops 10,000 in number, met the Austrians at Rieti, on March 7, 1821: he was defeated: two days later, at Antrodoco, his troops were completely defeated and scattered, carrying dismay into the provinces. Many Liberals fled into hiding, while the Austrian troops advanced without encountering further opposition. On March 27, the Austrians entered the capital and there re-established an Absolute form of

government. Opposition in the provinces was quickly suffocated.

. . . . . .

The sovereigns and the ministers who were assembled at Laibach remained there for some months awaiting the success of the Austrian expedition against Naples: the Congress was about to dissolve, when news arrived that another Revolution had broken out in Piedmont at the other end of Italy. The Piedmontese movement differed from that of Naples in that it not only aimed at the establishment of a Constitution, but it had also a definite national character: the Piedmontese Carbonari—for even here the revolt was organised by members of that society—proposed to remove Victor Emmanuel from the influence of the reactionary courtiers by whom he was surrounded: this step achieved, he was to be induced to sign the Constitution and to declare immediate war against Austria: they unfurled again the tricoloured flag—that symbol of the New Italy—which had first been hoisted, twenty-four years before, in the Cispadana Republic, and which had sunk with the Kingdom of Italy in 1814. The Carbonari thought that they could count on the support of Carlo Alberto of Savoy-Carignan.

This prince, who was hardly twenty years old, had been educated in France, and, there, had freely imbibed the new ideas: he could not approve the reactionary tendency of the other branch of his family which was now represented by princes, who belonged to another generation, and had always lived in an atmosphere of antiquated ideas. He had not even concealed his personal opinion on this subject, and had thereby acquired the fame of a Liberal. The young officers who lived at his court, though they belonged to the aristocracy, had also welcomed the new school of thought and fired the ambition of the young prince with the dream of taking a prominent part in the longed-for redemption of Italy.

Carlo Alberto had passed a youth deprived of family affection; at two years of age he had lost his father, and on his mother's second marriage with a French count, he had been sent to school in Paris. The eloquence of his friends,

inspired by enthusiastic patriotism, had a strong influence on his somewhat mobile character, and he allowed himself to be drawn into the vortex of advanced political opinions: further, perhaps, than he himself would have wished. It has even been asserted that he was enrolled as a member of the Carbonari: certainly, he was intimate with such heads of the revolutionary party as the Marquis Carlo Asinari di San Marzano, a colonel in a cavalry regiment—Count Giacinto Provana di Collegno, a major of artillery; Count Guglielmo Moffa di Lisio, a cavalry captain; and Count Santorre di Santarosa, a major of engineers.

The Piedmontese conspirators had decided to rise at the moment when the Austrian Army should be engaged in the struggle with the Neapolitans; an insurrection in the rear of the Austrians would have ensured the success of the Liberal and International Cause. On March 10, 1821, before the rumours of the Neapolitan defeat had arrived in Piedmont, the garrison of Alexandria, incited by those officers who were enrolled in the Carbonari, mutinied and demanded a Constitution and a war with Austria: two days later, though the news of the Neapolitan disaster had already begun to filter through, the garrison of Turin followed the example of that of Alexandria and threatened to bombard the city if a Constitution were not granted by the king.

King Victor Emmanuel I., good-natured and genial as he was, abhorred the idea of shedding the blood of his subjects in fratricidal strife, and he had also promised the Holy Alliance that he would introduce no changes in the Governmental methods of Piedmont. He therefore abdicated in favour of his brother, Carlo Felice, since he himself was childless. Carlo Felice being absent at Modena, Carlo Alberto was appointed provisional Regent of the kingdom.

This young Prince, urged by his friends and flushed with the success of the Revolution, called together the ministers, generals, mayors, and lesser functionaries of Turin, and agreed to publish a proclamation, granting, in the name of the king, the Spanish Constitution of 1812: this was accordingly done on the evening of March 13.

But Carlo Felice, who was a prince of Absolutist tendencies, entirely disapproved of the step taken by his Regent, and

published a decree from Modena in which he annulled the measures taken in his absence: he peremptorily ordered Carlo Alberto to leave the city of Turin immediately. The young Regent was placed in an extremely painful position; the Liberals wished him to proclaim open war against the king, but a revolt against the elder branch of his family appeared to him to be an infamy: in addition, tidings, ever more precise, continued to arrive of the easy victory of the Austrians over the Neapolitans, so that it seemed clear that all hopes of preserving the Piedmontese Constitution were finally extinguished. Carlo Alberto was persuaded that any opposition on his part to the will of the king would infallibly ruin himself and would be of no advantage to the cause of revolution; he therefore decided to abandon the cause. Unfortunately, his weakness of character prevented him from resolutely affirming the necessity of his decision even to his own ministers, and on the night of March 21-22 he left Turin almost secretly.

The unexpected departure of the Regent spread disaster and dismay through the ranks of the partisans of the Revolution: many fled, whilst that section of the nation which was attached to Absolutism, strengthened by the attitude of the king, came boldly forward. General de la Tour unfurled anew the azure banner of Savoy, and invited all those troops, which had remained faithful to Carlo Felice to gather round it. In this terrible crisis Count Santorre di Santa Rosa, who had been appointed Minister of War by Carlo Alberto, assumed the reins of government. Notwithstanding his enthusiastic proclamations, the Constitutionalists only succeeded in collecting together 4000 soldiers, who were easily defeated on April 8, 1821, under the walls of Novara by de la Tour: the latter was also aided by a body of Austrian troops which had passed the Ticino. This disaster determined the Constitutionalists to disperse, and those who felt themselves seriously compromised fled into exile.

. . . . . .

When the Piedmontese Revolution had been finally suppressed, the sovereigns of the Holy Alliance who were still assembled at Laibach, decided to dissolve the Congress; on May 12, 1821, they sent a circular to their ambassadors

at the various European courts expressing their satisfaction at the result of the labours of the Congress. They then retired to their own countries, where, soon after, the news arrived of the death of Napoleon I., at Saint Helena—tidings which finally relieved them of any anxiety concerning the great 'son of the Revolution.'

In the first place, the family of Bonaparte did not appear to possess any further representative who might prove dangerous to the peace of Europe. The son of Napoleon I., then a boy of ten years of age, had received from the Emperor Francis the rank of Prince of Austria, with the title of Duke of Reichstadt: he lived in Austria under the vigilant eye of Metternich, who attempted to keep him in complete ignorance of the glorious deeds of his father. The brothers of Napoleon were scattered over the world: Joseph had emigrated to America, where he led the peaceful life of a great landed proprietor; Lucien, to whom the Pope had granted the title of Prince of Canino—near Viterbo—had settled in the Pontifical State, and devoted himself to study; Louis, who had separated from his wife Hortense, had satisfied his ambition with the title of Count de Saint Leu—from a castellated property which he possessed near Paris—and spent the greater part of his time at Florence: the youngest, Jerome, had obtained from his father-in-law, the King of Würtemburg, the title of Count de Monfort and lived at Trieste. All had peacefully returned to private life and aroused no serious preoccupation.

Hence the Powers could peacefully await the opportunity of carrying out their scheme of vengeance against the rebels of Naples and Piedmont; nor did they limit thus their desires of retaliation, but determined to suffocate every Liberal tendency in other countries. As far back as the end of October, 1820, after the revolts of Naples, the Austrian Government had begun a series of arrests in Lombardy: Maroncelli, Pellico, Gioia, Romagnosi, and Arrivabene had been then imprisoned. Notwithstanding this action, in 1821, many Liberals in the Lombardo-Veneto had hoped that the Piedmontese would cross the Ticino and had come to an agreement with them. The Austrian Government, while it condemned with the very heaviest penalties the persons

who had been arrested in the previous year, attentively watched the schemes of the Liberals, and after long and patient study succeeded in discovering their plots. At the beginning of December, 1821, Gaetano Castilia and Giorgio Pallavicino had been arrested on account of their having attempted, in March of that year, to obtain the intervention of the Piedmontese in Lombardy; later, Count Federico Confalonieri, who was considered as the chief of the conspiracy, and was one of the most influential citizens of Milan, had been imprisoned. Their fate was determined only after two years of examination: Confaloniere, Pallavicino, and many others were condemned to death; but the emperor deigned to commute such sentence to the severest form of imprisonment, which was to be expiated in the fortress of the Spielberg, in Moravia, where Maroncelli, Pellico, and other patriots were already languishing. These sentences, which struck at the flower of Lombard culture and rank, raised a still higher barrier between the Austrian Government and the Italian peoples.

Unfortunately, too, the Italian sovereigns, who had become more suspicious and timid than formerly, competed with each other in following the example of the Austrian Government. Those patriots who had succeeded in eluding the persecution of the police aroused, in foreign countries, a great and burning sympathy for the Italian cause. England became for them an especially secure asylum: amongst others who had taken refuge there was the Neapolitan poet, Gabriele Rossetti, the head of a family which has since become celebrated in English Art and Letters, and the Modanese Antonio Panizzi, whose learning soon rendered him famous and became Director-General of the British Museum.

The sovereign of the small duchy of Modena, Francis IV., specially distinguished himself by his unequalled ferocity. He attempted in this way to acquire the sympathy of the Holy Alliance, in the hope of procuring their support to his claims to the throne of Savoy, by right of his wife, the eldest daughter of Victor Emmanuel I. As Carlo Felice was childless, the presumptive heir to the throne was Carlo Alberto; but the Duke Francis attempted to take advantage of the aversion which, subsequent to the events of 1821,

Carlo Felice had manifested for Carlo Alberto: he flattered himself that he would be able to exclude this prince from the throne by abolishing the Salic Law in Piedmont. But even the Austrian Government understood that France would steadfastly oppose the settlement of an Austrian archduke on her frontiers, and therefore did not believe it opportune to support the ambitious designs of the Duke of Modena.

Everywhere reaction triumphed. Metternich had succeeded in eradicating the Liberal fancies of former times from the mind of Alexander I., so that the Czar, on his departure from Laibach, had decided to combat the revolutionary spirit. In France, also, the elections of 1821 had increasingly reinforced the reactionary party: the Chamber approved a new Press law, increasing the penalties and removing from the province of a jury all those journalistic offences which savoured of Liberalism: these were now appointed to be tried by a tribunal: in addition, a new crime was created—the crime of ' tendency '—by which a journal might be condemned, though no single article contained criminal matter, by the detection of a Liberal tendency: in a number of collected articles naturally this law might be very easily abused.

Thus, even Constitutional France followed the political direction of the Absolutist Powers, which furnishes an explanation of her readiness to assume the mission of undertaking in Spain a work similar to that which Austria was accomplishing in Italy.

. . . . . .

In Spain, the great majority of the country—nobles, clergy, and peasants—were contrary to that form of government which had been imposed by the military *pronunciamenti*; personally, King Ferdinand VII. had sworn to the Constitution under the pressure of threats, and proposed to destroy it as soon as opportunity should arise. He communicated this project to the sovereigns of the Holy Alliance and stated that he hoped for their aid in this undertaking.

At Laibach, the Allied sovereigns had decided to convoke another Congress in the following year; it met at Verona in October, 1822. The Emperors of Austria and of Russia,

with the King of Prussia personally attended the Congress with their ministers; France was represented by her Minister of Foreign Affairs, the Duke de Montmorency, and by the ambassador at London, the famour writer, René de Châteaubriand; England sent the Duke of Wellington—the victor of Waterloo. All the sovereigns of the smaller states of Italy came to pay homage to the sovereigns of the North: the Italian princes did not, however, participate in the more important meetings, but were only called when their own particular affairs were treated of. The Duke of Modena, Francis IV., in the hope of gaining the support of the Holy Alliance for his own ambitious dreams, posed as an exceedingly zealous champion of reaction.

On the other hand, King Carlo Felice, Jealous of his own independence, demanded and obtained that those Austrian troops which had entered into Piedmont in 1821 should be immediately recalled. Ferdinand of Naples, however, acted far otherwise, since he had too much need of foreign help to assure him his throne: and since the Powers were jealous of the growing dominion of Austria and wished to reduce the number of soldiers in the Neapolitan kingdom from fifty to thirty-five thousand, King Ferdinand, in order to fill their place, hired mercenary Swiss regiments.

But the most important discussions of the Congress concerned the affairs of Spain. The Czar, Alexander I., now fully converted to reactionary ideas, proposed that France should accept the mission of military intervention in Spain. Metternich was not too eager to support this arrangement, since he feared lest France might derive increased prestige from the expedition, and the possibility occurred to him of a Franco-Russian Alliance, which would be dangerous to Austria in the East; but after the part taken by Austria in Italian events, he could not openly oppose the Czar's suggestion: on this account he was forced to adhere to it, as did also the King of Prussia.

Either from their reactionary ideas, or influenced by the thought that in this way the predominion of Austria in Italy might be counter-balanced, de Montmorency and Châteaubriand were easily induced to give their promise to this arrangement. The Power, however, which decidedly

and openly cut itself loose from the Holy Alliance, was England.

It is at this moment that a change of direction in politics may first be noted in the Government of Great Britain: this was not because the government was no longer in the hands of the Tory Party, but because the persons who represented it had changed. The man who till this moment had directed the foreign policy of England was Castlereagh—whose character was domineering and instincts aristocratic. Though he had adopted with reserve the deliberations of Groppau and Laibach, he had clearly let it be understood that he consented to full liberty of action on the part of the Holy Alliance. On August 12, 1822, he committed suicide: the reason of this act has never been made clear. His post was occupied by George Canning, who represented the less rigid tendencies of the Conservative Party—that is to say, that section which was not systematically closed to the new ideas: therefore he gave a new direction to English politics. General Wellington, the representative whom he had sent to the Congress of Verona, was a rigid Tory, but above all else he was a thoroughgoing upholder of English interests; therefore, when the other Powers agreed to the proposed French intervention in Spain, Wellington distinctly refused to assent to such an arrangement, considering it both inopportune and dangerous. He protested that by the treaties which bound England to Portugal, his country would oppose the entry of the troops of the Holy Alliance into Portugal; and he concluded with the declaration, that if the English Government did not intervene in order to prevent the French expedition, she reserved to herself full liberty of action with regard to the Spanish-American colonies, this question being vital to the interests of England.

On April 1, 1823, a French army of one hundred thousand men, under the command of the Duke of Angoulême, passed the Pyrenees and advanced into Spain. This time the populations of the peninsula did not oppose to the advance of the French the resistance which they had made to the forces of Napoleon, fifteen years before. On the contrary, the bands, which had been armed by the Absolutist Party, welcomed the invasion with enthusiasm, and henceforth

secure of victory, began everywhere a persecution of the Liberals. The Cortes decided to transfer their sittings from Madrid to Seville: on the 19th of May, Madrid was occupied by the French troops; a few days later they defeated a corps of Spanish troops on the frontiers of Andalusia and advanced rapidly to the south; the Spanish Government, no longer being in security in Seville, retreated to Cadiz. Around this city alone was any resistance maintained: but the fall of the forts of the Trocadero and San Pietro rendered the continuation of the defence impossible. Prince Carlo Alberto distinguished himself at the assault of the Trocadero: this prince, in order to obtain the pardon of the Holy Alliance and from King Carlo Felice forgiveness of his participation in the Revolution of 1821, and also to prevent his exclusion from the throne of Savoy, had been forced to join the French Army, which had been sent to destroy the very Constitution which he had promulgated in Piedmont: he thus fought at the head of French Grenadiers against the Spanish Constitutionalists, amongst whom were fighting a goodly number of emigrant patriots from Piedmont. This was for Carlo Alberto a terrible punishment.

King Ferdinand VII., on October 1, promised a complete amnesty, and was allowed to go free by the Constitutionalists, who had taken him with them to Cadiz; but hardly had he arrived in the French camp than he annulled all the Acts of the Government posterior to March 7, 1820, and pronounced terrible sentences against the leaders of the Constitutional Government. The reactionaries abandoned themselves to the worst excesses; everywhere Liberals were hunted down, imprisoned, and condemned to death.

The events in Spain had their repercussion in Portugal. Subsequent to the insurrection of August, 1820, King John VI. had decided to entrust the Government of Brazil to his eldest son, Don Pedro: he himself returned into Portugal with his wife, Carlotta—the sister of Ferdinand VII.: and his second son, Don Miguel. He arrived in Lisbon in the June of 1821: the Cortes prepared a Constitution modelled on that of Spain of 1812, and the king accepted it. This Constitutional Government alienated from itself the sympathy of the only state which was able to support it: for, in order

to defend the economic interests of the country, it conceived it necessary to annul the commercial treaty made with England in 1810, which was exceptionally favourable to the latter nation. The king, whose disposition was benevolent and conciliatory, would have willingly granted a moderate Constitutional Chamber; but from henceforth the Absolutist current prevailed and was favoured both by the queen and the second son, Don Miguel. Portugal returned almost to the same state in which it existed prior to the Revolution.

. . . . . .

In the meantime, the separation of Brazil from Portugal was effected. After the departure of John VI. from Brazil, the inhabitants of the latter country insisted that the Regent, Don Pedro, should assume the title of Emperor of Brazil: with this aim, an insurrection broke out in Rio de Janeiro, in 1822, and Don Pedro consented to accede to his people's wishes. This change of government was recognised with sympathy by England, which, since it was displeased with the Constitutional Government of Portugal, had every reason for wishing to separate Brazil from the mother country in order to number the new state in the ranks of her commercial clients: by an able diplomacy, she induced King John VI., himself, finally to recognise the independence of Brazil—1825.

From this time onward, the principles of independence triumphed in all the former colonies of America. Agitated by the Revolution at home, Spain could no longer hope to send her troops across the Atlantic, and in this way the cause of independence made easy and rapid progress. In Mexico, General Iturbide placed himself at the head of the rebels and proclaimed himself emperor—1822: in the following year, however, the Republican Party prevailed, and he was forced to flee; in 1824 he attempted to regain possession of the throne, but he was captured and shot. Mexico now reorganised herself as a Federal Republic on the model of the United States.

Central America also proclaimed her independence after the events of 1821 and formed herself into a Republic, which comprised the States of Guatemala, Costa Rica, Nicaragua, Honduras, and Salvador.

Bolivar, the liberator of Venezuela, had caused the union of New Granada and Venezuela to be proclaimed in the Republic of Colombia; later, he had attempted to free Ecuador and Peru, where at least he succeeded in repressing anarchy: his lieutenant, Sucre, definitely defeated the Spanish troops at Ayacucho—between Cuzco and Lima—on the 9th of December, 1824; Upper Peru was formed into an independent republic and named Bolivia, after Bolivar, who was its first president.

Henceforth, the Spanish Dominion in America may be considered at an end. This was due not only to the impotence of Spain, but also to the attitude assumed by both England and the United States.

The English Government had placed no obstacles in the way of French intervention in Spain, but it had openly disapproved of it: Liberal sentimentalism was in accord with the economic interests of the country, therefore England had entirely favoured the emancipation of the Spanish-American colonies: its firm attitude also prevented the Holy Alliance from lending aid to King Ferdinand VII., with the object of dominating his insurgent colonies.

Still more daring was the political step taken by the United States of America, whose president, Monroe, made in Congress the famous declaration, which remains as an authentic political doctrine:—

'My Administration, in its negotiations with Russia, has established as a principle, in which are bound up the rights and interests of the United States itself, that the American continents, by the free and independent position which they have assumed and maintained, ought no longer to be considered as a dominion adapted for colonisation by any European Power. By the good faith and friendly relation existing between the United States and these Powers, we are bound to declare that we shall in future consider any attempts on their part to extend their political system to this hemisphere as dangerous both to our peace and security. So far as concerns the colonies and actual dependencies of any European Power, we have not, so far, intervened, nor shall we in the future. But with regard to these Governments which have declared and maintained

their independence, we can only consider any intervention of a European Power, with the object either of forcing their submission or exercising any influence on their destiny, as the manifestation of a disposition hostile to the Government of the United States.'

The date of this declaration was December 2nd, 1823.

The United States were the first to recognise the independence of the new American Republics: their example was soon followed by England—January 1, 1825—and gradually by the other Powers. Thus the Revolution which had broken out in Europe in the year 1820-1821, though it had not in any durable manner modified the political condition of those countries which had given it birth, had yet facilitated this radical change on the American continent.

. . . .

The new American States, which had been formed from the old Spanish colonies, though they possessed a more fertile soil, made progress far inferior in every respect to that of the United States: this may have been partly due to the more enervating climate or to the protracted duration of the atrocious Spanish Government, which was responsible for the worst habits rooted in the populations: it may have been that the peoples, which were composed of Spanish adventurers, of lazy Creoles, of Indians who were opposed to all ideas of progress, did not possess the strong, moral fibre of the Anglo-Saxon race: only one advantage did these countries possess over the United States; this consisted in the fact that from their first years of emancipation they had suppressed the institution of slavery.

He who had taken the chief part in the work of liberation from the Spanish domination—Simon Bolivar—dreamed of being able to group together all these new States in one immense Latin Confederation: he therefore convoked a congress at Panama in 1826, but, besides the representatives of Central America, the only delegates who attended the re-union were those of Mexico, Colombia, and Peru: nothing positive was concluded at the congress. Bolivar did not succeed in linking together by a common chain even the republics of Colombia, Peru, and Bolivia, which had acclaimed him as their president: his autocratic and centralising

tendencies everywhere excited revolt. After many years of strenuous fighting—ill and weary—he renounced his power and died a few months later, on December 17, 1830, at the early age of forty-seven years: with his death the great idea of the confederation of all the Spanish Provinces was abandoned.

Everywhere particularist ideas reigned: Federal Republics were organised, and in each of them might be seen the spectacle of a series of civil wars which arrested or impeded the march of progress.

CHAPTER III

FIRST PHASE OF THE EASTERN QUESTION

Conflicting Interests of Russia, Austria, and England.—Re-awakening of the Christian Races.—Condition of the Greeks, Albanians, Bulgars, and Rumanians.—Rebellion of Ali Pasha of Janina.—Alexander Ypsilanti initiates the Struggle for Independence in Moldavia, March, 1821.—General Insurrection in the Islands and the Morea.—Turkish Success.—Attitude of the Powers.—Phil-Hellenic Societies.—Mehemet Ali, Viceroy of Egypt, aids the Sultan.—Greek Disaster.—The Policy of George Canning.—Death of Alexander I., 1825.—Nicholas I. and the Anglo-Russian Agreement in favour of the Greeks.—Fall of Missolonghi, 1826.—France joins the Alliance between Russia and England.—Battle of Navarino, 1827.—Turco-Russian War.—French Intervention in Greece and the Peace of Adrianople, 1829.—The Conference of London.—The Rearrangement of Greece.—Count Capodistria.--Definite Settlement of Greece under King Otho.—The Princes of Serbia, Moldavia, and Wallachia.

More than four-and-a-half centuries have passed since the day on which the Turks planted their banner on the walls of Constantinople. In the first flush of victory they had advanced exultantly in Europe; vainly the ancient republic of Saint Mark had attempted to bar their progress in the Archipelago; in vain the Christian races of the Balkan Peninsula had opposed to them a vigorous resistance; by land and sea, for many years, the Turk triumphed, and in 1683 even besieged the walls of Vienna. Austria's capital was saved by the intervention of the famous Polish king, John Sobieski: that day, it may be said, marked the ebb of the Turkish tide: a leisurely reflux, it is true, and marked on some occasions by fortunate resumptions of the offensive.

Against these invaders, who retired so gradually, Austria and Russia advanced as the vedettes of Europe: later, a rivalry arose between these two Powers, and each sought reciprocally to limit the conquests of the other.

Another Power, also, soon took a direct interest in the question: after the foundation of its Indian dominions, England found it necessary to secure her communications with Asia by preventing Russia from advancing too rapidly

southward. In the beginning, she believed that this aim could be accomplished by buttressing the tottering Turkish Empire.

Added to the perils by which she was threatened outside her frontiers, from the opening of the nineteenth century, a new and far graver danger menaced Turkey at home:—the awakening of the Christian nationalities which she had subjugated in the past.

The essence of the Eastern Question consists in the conflicting interests concerned in the liquidation of the heredity of the Turkish Empire.

Amongst the Christian races of the Balkan Peninsula the Greeks inherited the most glorious past. In culture and economic prosperity they occupied a far higher rank than the remaining populations. They had, therefore, absorbed with facility the new ideas diffused by the French Revolution: these had brought to the birth in the minds of the more energetic Greeks, a burning desire to be freed from the humiliating oppression of the Turk.

For this reason a secret society called the 'Hetaireia' had been organised in Greece, and on all sides it propagated aspirations for independence. The constitution of the republic of the Ionian Islands, under an English Protectorate, aided in affirming these sentiments of nationality.

On the other hand, in Albania, the majority of the population, after the death of the celebrated Scanderbeg in 1467, had not only accepted the Turkish domination, but had also welcomed the Mahometan religion: those families which had been converted to the cult of Mahomet lorded it over their Christian brethren in the name of the Sultan, whose authority scarcely penetrated in this mountainous country: The Sultan, generally speaking, contented himself with levies of Albanian soldiers, and the population eagerly flocked to the Turkish banner in the hope of participating in the spoils of war. This race, which is considered as identical with the ancient Illyrians, possessed no desire for national independence.

The Bulgars, also, were as yet completely satisfied with their servile condition: this race was of Mongol blood and on its penetration into the Balkans had so completely identified

itself with the Slavs, who were already resident in the Peninsula, as to accept from them both language and customs. The country which they inhabited had fallen under the Turkish dominion from the end of the fourteenth century, and had served a bitter servitude: the Mussulman land-owners had formed an aristocracy with the result that the Bulgarian Christians had sunk to the rank of simple peasants. On account of its vicinity to Constantinople, and because the land was thronged with Turkish troops, Bulgaria had not the slightest prospect of any new change of affairs.

The Serbian race had also been cruelly oppressed by the Turk. It had reached the zenith of its power in the fourteenth century, but the battle of Kossova in 1389 marked its ultimate resistance to the Turk. The latter desired to dominate, in durable fashion, the countries of Serbia, Bosnia, and Herzegovina—territories which stood between him and his other conquests in the Danube valleys. But in the mountains which encircled Cettinje a small body of Serbs had maintained their independence. The Turks, who in the subjugation of this tiny territory had not much to gain, and whose every attempt to impose their authority met with a bitter resistance, had decided in the end to pay but small attention to these hardy rebels: therefore, in this region, to which the name of Montenegro had been given, a patriarchal Government had been established under the rule of a prince-bishop of the family of Petrovich of Niegosh.

Serbia had been the theatre of the combat between Austria and Turkey, and in the eighteenth century had even for some time fallen into the hands of Austria: this fact naturally aided the growth of the spirit of nationality: indeed, Serbian peasants had enlisted in Austrian regiments.

One of these peasants, named George, surnamed Kara —a Turkish word implying 'black'—had been a sergeant in an Austrian regiment: he determined, in 1804, to organise a Serbian insurrection against the Turks. At the head of courageous, irregular bands he maintained his resistance for some years, and at length received aid from Russia at the time when the latter declared war against Turkey in 1806: later, when Russia, in order to make head against Napoleon, made peace with the Turks—1812—the insurgents found

themselves abandoned. Pursued by numerous enemy troops, they were forced to disperse, and Karageorge himself took refuge in Austria in 1813. He was the ancestor of the dynasty which occupies the Serbian throne to-day.

A founder of another Serbian dynasty now came on the scene—Milosh Obrenovich. He, too, was a peasant—a pig merchant—but occupied a certain position in the country. He continued the work of Serbian emancipation, though more by craft than by force. At first he accepted from the Turks the mission of reorganising Serbia under the Turkish suzerainty, posing almost as the agent of the Sultan: but since he retained the Serbians in arms, he won a forced respect from the Turks. It is said that in 1817, when Karageorge returned secretly to his native land, Obrenovich betrayed his hiding-place to the Turks, who then assassinated the first champion of Serbian freedom. Milosh Obrenovich finished by dividing the authority of the country with the Turkish Pasha of Belgrade, and obtained certain fleeting and precarious concessions for the Serbs.

Less directly subject to the Turks were the Rumanians, who inhabited the principalities of Wallachia and Moldavia. they were the descendants of the ancient colonists placed in that region by the Emperor Trajan, and the phenomenon of this nation is curious enough, seeing that for more than eighteen centuries in a land deluged by so many invasions they have preserved in features, disposition, language, customs, and traditions the seal of the ancient race of Rome. They were obliged to submit to the Turks in the last years of the fifteenth and the first of the sixteenth centuries: but their land did not lie in the road of Ottoman advance towards the north-west: therefore, the Turks did not settle there, and were contented with a tribute, alone. Hence these countries had preserved their national chiefs—hospodars—their own orthodox clergy, and their own Christian aristocracy of landowners, called Boyars. But when the wars broke out between Russia and Turkey, this region became the theatre of fighting, and Rumania paid the penalty: since on one side Austria, in return for the diplomatic aid given to Turkey in her war against Russia, received the Rumanian territory called the Bucovina in 1775: and later,

Russia in the war of 1806-1812, after having held the Danube Principalities for these six years, retired at the conclusion of peace, retaining Bessarabia and assuming a species of protectorate over the two principalities.

. . . .

In 1820, the Turkish Governor of Janina, Ali Pasha of Tepelen, rebelled against the Sultan. The Greeks thought to take advantage of this insurrection and prepared themselves for war. The Hetaireia hoped to obtain the aid of Russia, for the Czar Alexander I., in furtherance of his own ambitious schemes in the Balkan Peninsula, had given continual encouragement to the propaganda for liberating the Christian populations from the Mussulman yoke. The Hetaireia had chosen for their chief Prince Alexander Ypsilanti, of Greek origin, who at this time was serving as an officer in the Russian Army and was a personal friend of the Czar. His father had been Hospodar of Moldavia and Wallachia: he, therefore, thought that he had some influence in the country, and decided to initiate the insurrection in the hope that Russia would be easily induced to give him aid. In the month of March, 1821, he left Odessa, where his preparations had been made, and with eight hundred horse crossed the frontier of the Pruth, calling on the populations to rise for their independence. But the Rumanians were not much moved by this invitation from a Greek, so that in one month he had, with difficulty, collected a force of 5000 men.

The Czar at this time happened to be at the Congress of Laibach, and through the influence of Metternich was persuaded that this Eastern agitation sprang from the same revolutionary spirit which had swept Europe. Alexander I., therefore, publicly disapproved of Ypsilanti's movement; the latter had advanced nearly to Bucharest, but seeing that he was menaced by strong bodies of troops he retreated towards the Austrian frontier, and after an unsuccessful engagement took refuge in Transylvania in June, 1821.

But the concentration of Turkish troops against Ypsilanti in Rumania and against Ali Pasha in Albania, smoothed the way for insurrection in Greece: in a few months the Peloponnese and the islands were freed from Turkish rule: in October, 1821, the fortress of Tripolitza, which was

considered as the capital of the Peloponnese, fell into the hands of the insurgents. At Constantinople and in many Turkish cities the fanatic crowds massacred Christians with impunity. In 1822 the Turks succeeded in entering Janina and killing Ali: they were now able to dispose of larger forces against the Greeks and in consequence the mainland of Greece was soon subdued. But in the Peloponnese a bold leader of insurgent bands, Kolodotrones, succeeded in collecting all the forces of the country and was able to disperse the hostile army. In its turn the Turkish fleet from the beginning had advanced victoriously in the Archipelago, and having occupied Chios, massacred the population: in revenge for this infamy Constantine Kanaris, with heroic bravery, reached the Turkish flagship in a small boat, and succeeded in setting fire to it: the Turkish fleet, on this, returned to the Hellespont.

In vain the Greeks sent a deputation to the Congress of Verona, in order to invoke the aid of the Holy Alliance: their delegates were not even admitted to the Congress.

But if the Governments remained hostile to the Greek cause, the peoples, more particularly in the west, showed their zeal for the Hellenic ideals in gratitude for the benefits which civilisation owes to ancient Greece. Phil-Hellenic societies were organised everywhere for the purpose of raising money and aid for the Greeks, while many enthusiastic young men enlisted as volunteers for this war, which was considered as a crusade of civilisation and liberty.

Unhappily in Greece, from the very beginning of the war, a conflict had arisen between the political tendencies of the commercial classes, who desired to establish a civil government, and those of the chiefs of the insurgent bands, who favoured a military one.

Fortunately for Greece, Turkey found herself in a dilemma, for the lack of money provoked indiscipline in the army and the long duration of the war rendered still more manifest and acute the hostility of the Christian subjects of the empire. Seeing that he was impotent to deal with the rebellion, the Sultan Mahmoud decided, though unwillingly, to invoke the aid of the most important of his vassals—Mehemet Ali, Governor of Egypt.

In return for the promise of the cession of Crete to him, Mehemet sent a fleet, which disembarked troops in that island and conquered it with savage ferocity, 1824: he then appointed his son, Ibrahim, Governor of the Morea: the latter, at the head of the expedition, landed numerous forces in this, the principal centre of revolt. In the first months of 1825 he concentrated his forces in Messenia and obtained many and rapid successes; he occupied Navarino, and, having captured Tripolitza, advanced into the mountains of Nauplia—the seat of the Provisional Government. Simultaneously, a Turkish army, under the command of Rescid Pasha, descended from Albania into Greece and besieged Missolonghi.

Henceforth the Greek cause seemed to be irretrievably lost. Its salvation was alone due to a change in the policy of the Great Powers. The English minister—Canning—had watched these events attentively, hoping to find in this Eastern Question, even as in that of the American colonies, an agreement between the sympathy of the English people for the Greek cause and the economic interests of England herself. This skilful opportunist, taking into account the proofs of vitality which Greece had for so many years exhibited, was persuaded that in the end she would succeed in gaining her independence: but he did not desire that the credit of aiding her to attain this aim should be given to Russia alone, for the Czar, in spite of the horror of the revolutionary spirit with which Metternich had inspired him, continued to indulge vague dreams of an intervention hostile to Turkey. It was soon noted that the English Government of the Ionian Isles favoured the insurgents: at the same time, the representatives of England strove to make themselves indispensable, both to the Greeks and the Turks. Such was the position of affairs in 1825.

. . . .

The Czar, Alexander I., died on December 1, 1825: his successor, Nicholas I., at the very beginning of his reign, was forced to repress a military *pronunciamento*: this had been organised, in imitation of that of Spain and Naples, with the object of obtaining a constitutional Government:

many of the revolutionists—called Decembrists—were executed, and the remainder were sent to Siberia.

Nicholas I. was about thirty years of age when he ascended the throne; he possessed an energetic character, and his ideas were clear and precise. He soon showed that he had decided to adopt a military form of government. In Russia the autocratic system had been weakened by the liberal dreams and vacillating character of Alexander I.: the new Czar proposed to restore to the system all its former strength and to proclaim himself the champion of Absolutism throughout the world. Simultaneously, he developed Russia's schemes of aggrandisement in the East. As a preliminary, he protested against the suffering inflicted on the populations of the Danube Principalities by the Turks, after the events of 1821, since these people had taken but little part in the insurrection. The new Czar sent a threatening ultimatum to the Turkish Government.

The prospect of a speedy Turco-Russian War alarmed Canning, and he determined, if possible, to prevent the Czar from becoming the sole arbiter and regulator of the Eastern Question. He therefore sent the Duke of Wellington to St Petersburg, in the hope that his military fame and rigid Tory principles would render him acceptable to the Czar. Wellington induced the Czar to sign the secret agreement of April 4, 1826, by which the Czar promised to support the mediation of England between Greece and Turkey, and counselled the Sultan to grant autonomy to Greece. Although this protocol speaks of Greece as the tributary of Turkey, it may be considered as the first diplomatic foundation of Hellenic independence.

. . . .

Missolonghi, which had for many months sustained a Turkish siege, and was now little more than a heap of ruins, was occupied by the Turks—April 22-23, 1826: the valour of the defenders had excited the enthusiasm of every lover of Greece, and the loss was correspondingly felt. Encouraged by this success, the Sultan attempted to strengthen his own position by introducing reforms, but the body of Janissaries, which had enjoyed great privileges and had assumed the haughty bearing of ancient Pretorians, refused to accept

the proposed changes. The Sultan, who had foreseen their resistance, surrounded them with artillery in the streets of Constantinople, and many thousands of this body perished in the conflict which ensued: others were taken prisoners, only to suffer execution, and the whole force was annihilated —June, 1826. But their destruction caused a depletion of the Turkish military ranks, and till the loss was made good the Sultan had not sufficient troops at his disposition wherewith to confront the armies of the Czar: he was, therefore, compelled to accept the terms of the Russian ultimatum.

A Treaty was signed at Akermann, in Bessarabia, in October, 1826, by which the privileges of Moldavia and Wallachia were confirmed. It was arranged that these provinces were to be governed in future by Hospodars, who were to be nominated by local councils composed of the Boyars—the aristocracy of the country—while Turkey reserved to herself the right of approval of the decisions of these councils. The length of tenure of government of these Hospodars was limited to seven years: in addition, Turkey engaged, within a period of eighteen months, to grant to Serbia a separate Government with liberty of religion and administrative independence. This arrangement seemed as if it had solved the Russo-Turkish question.

But the Greek situation was still acute. The Turkish General, Rescid, after the fall of Missolonghi, had occupied Athens, and for several days had actually besieged the Acropolis.

Russia and England communicated their agreement of April 4 to the other Great Powers: Metternich violently inveighed against Canning, whom he designated as 'the Genius of Evil': nor would he hear of Austria's adherence to the agreement. Prussia followed the example of Austria: but, in France, the whole strength of public opinion was in favour of the Greeks, and induced the Government to demonstrate their willingness to join the agreement between England and Russia.

On July 6, 1824, a Treaty was concluded at London, in which France, England, and Russia engaged themselves to act as mediators in the Greco-Turkish conflict. This Treaty

has not only a great historical importance, but takes high rank as a document of International Law.

At that time it was undoubtedly necessary to explain why three sovereigns should arrogate to themselves the right of intervention in the affairs of another State, whose sovereign did not desire such interference. Therefore the preamble of the Treaty stated:—

'The three Sovereigns feel deeply the necessity of putting an end to a sanguinary conflict, which not only throws the Provinces of Greece and the Islands of the Archipelago into the disorders of anarchy, but every day increases the impediments to European commerce and encourages piracy. These conditions not only expose the subjects of the High Contracting Powers to considerable losses, but they exact onerous preventive measures of vigilance and repression: the monarchs of France and Great Britain have received pressing invitations from the Greek people to exercise their powers of mediation with the Ottoman Porte: they are animated, equally with the Emperor of Russia, by the desire of avoiding the further effusion of blood and preventing the evils of every kind which follow in the train of the prolongation of such a state of affairs. They have, therefore, determined to offer themselves as mediators between the belligerents, and they request a suspension of hostilities preliminary to the opening of negotiations.'

According to this Treaty, the base of agreement was to be the recognition of the autonomy of Greece, which was, however, to remain under the High Sovereignty of the Turk, and was bound, in addition, to pay a certain annual tribute.

A few days after the signature of this Treaty, which marked the rupture of the Holy Alliance, the man who had been the soul of the diplomatic labours which had led to this result—George Canning—died after a short illness, on August 8, 1827, at the early age of fifty-seven years. By his death, England sustained an irreparable loss, and it seemed, indeed, as if the event would react disastrously on Greece, since the successors of the Minister did not entirely share his views: but the common action of the three Governments had already begun. The Greeks warmly welcomed

the communication of the Treaty of London, while the Turks absolutely rejected it.

The three Powers, according to their agreement, gave orders to the admirals of their fleets, which were cruising in the Archipelago, to impose, by force, should that be necessary, an armistice, on the shores of the Greece which was to be. The commandant of the Turco-Egyptian fleet, Ibrahim Pasha, had collected his ships at Navarino: on the invitation to cease hostilities, he replied that he received orders only from his Sovereign: the admirals, in consequence of this reply, sailed their fleets to Navarino, in order to compel the Turkish fleet to abandon the shores of Greece. But while the Allied ships were entering the roadstead the Turkish fleet fired on an English pinnace: a flag of truce, which was sent to demand an explanation of this outrage, was also fired upon: the battle, therefore, began, and in less than two hours the Turco-Egyptian fleet was entirely destroyed—October 20, 1827.

. . . .

The notice of the Battle of Navarino produced a profound emotion throughout the whole of Europe. The peoples, generally, saluted the event enthusiastically, since it appeared to assure the triumph of a popular cause. But the Governments of the Powers received the news with no particular satisfaction. The Czar, now wholly decided on war with Turkey, was triumphant. France derived satisfaction from the fact that once again victory had attended her arms: but England was preoccupied by the thought that the destruction of the Turco-Egyptian fleet had henceforth placed Turkey in the power of the Czar. Very naturally, the Sultan was furious in the highest degree at the news of the battle, which had been fought without a declaration of war. He published throughout his Empire a violent manifesto against the Christian Powers in general, and against Russia in particular. The Czar was delighted to seize on this occasion and declared war in April, 1828. His satisfaction was increased by the successful issue of an expedition against Persia, extorting from the Shah the territories of Erivan and Nakhitechewan, which brought the Russian Empire into touch with the frontier of the Aras:

this boundary, even to-day, divides the territories of the two States.

In the meantime, the Greeks had boldly resumed the offensive, with the idea of occupying as much territory as possible, in order to preserve it on the conclusion of peace: they hoped also to establish a stable form of Government, at the head of which they had placed Count John of Capodistria. In order to accomplish more easily the dispersion of the Turkish troops, the latter invoked the aid of the Powers. England did not desire that the breach already existing between her and Turkey should become irreparable, and therefore allowed France to accept the invitation: when, therefore, Russia opened the war in Asia, and in Europe a corps of French soldiers disembarked in the Morea, the Turco-Egyptian forces evacuated the small extent of territory which they still held, almost without resistance.

The Russians obtained notable successes in Asia: but in Europe they were forced to retreat. In the following spring, however, they resumed the offensive with greater energy: after some successful engagements they passed the Balkans, and on August 20 they triumphantly entered Adrianople, whilst Erzerum, in Asia, the capital of Armenia, was forced to capitulate. The Sultan was terrified and was forced, on September 14, 1829, to sign the Peace of Adrianople: by this Treaty, Russia consented to restore the occupied territories, with the exception of some islands at the mouths of the Danube and some part of Asia, the retention of which isolated Turkey from the Caucasian Provinces, which latter hence passed under Russian influence.

The Sultan promised to pay to the Czar 137,000,000 francs within a period of ten years, during which time Russia should maintain her troops in the Danube principalities: in addition, a larger measure of independence was granted to Moldavia and Wallachia, whose Hospodars were nominated for a life-period and could not be dismissed, except with the agreement of both Russia and Turkey. Finally, Turkey confirmed the clauses of the Treaty of Akermann, relative to Serbia, and gave its adhesion to the agreement of the three Powers respecting Greece.

. . . .

By the Treaty of July 6, 1827, it was arranged that the ambassadors of Russia and of France in London, together with the English Foreign Ministers, should gradually take the necessary measures for regulating the affairs of Greece. These deliberations are generally known as the Conference of London. On February 3, 1830, it declared Greece completely independent, but it limited its Northern frontiers to the mouths of the Aspropotamo and the Sperchio. This State included about 800,000 inhabitants.

The Conference of London offered the crown of Greece to the German Prince, Leopold of Saxe Coburg, who had, as a young man, come to England and married the only daughter of George IV. He had soon been left a childless widower, but he had continued to reside in England and had acquired some fame as a man of intelligence and culture. Meantime, the Provisional Government of Greece, inspired by Capodistria, declared that the Greek nation had a right to be consulted on the question of its Constitution, that its prince must embrace the Greek religion, and finally, that the limits assigned to the new State were not sufficient for the needs of its people. These deliberations of the Greek Senate were communicated to Prince Leopold by Count Capodistria, who also drew a dark picture of the misery and anarchy reigning in Greece. Prince Leopold then decided to refuse the crown offered to him.

The Revolution, which had broken out in France in the July of this year, and its repercussion in many parts of Europe, distracted the attention of the Powers from the affairs of Greece. In the meantime, Count Capodistria was assassinated on October 9, 1831. This aggravated the situation, and the Powers understood that if they did not wish to compromise the success of the work already achieved by them, it was necessary immediately to put a stop to the anarchy. In May, 1832, they agreed to offer the crown to the young Prince Otto, youngest son of Louis of Bavaria—a sovereign who had always displayed lively sympathy for the Greek cause. He was allowed to extend the frontiers of his State to the Gulfs of Arta and Volo, paying to Turkey for this privilege an indemnity of twelve millions. But the Powers were indisposed to accede to the claim of the

new State to the islands of Crete and Samos. The government of Crete had been given by the Sultan to Mehemet Ali as a recompense for the aid lent to him during the war. Samos was left to the Turks on account of its vicinity to the Asiatic coast; the part it had taken in the war gained for it, however, a separate Government, a State flag, and its own Prince of the orthodox religion—the latter to be named by the Sultan.

The Turkish Government was also forced to legalise an administrative autonomy in Serbia: in fulfilment of the engagement of the Treaty of Adrianople, the Sultan issued a firman on November 30, 1830, by which Serbia was granted full liberty of religion and the right of administering its own affairs by means of an Assembly of notables under the government of a native hereditary prince, who should remain a vassal of Turkey. Milosh Obrenovich was recognised as Prince of Serbia : Turkey retained a garrison at Belgrade, but, with that exception, withdrew its troops from the whole country.

The two principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia then received a regular administration. It was elaborated under the inspiration of the Russian Government, and the first Hospodars were, in reality, only Russian Prefects.

Thus the new States of the Balkan Peninsula, after the crisis of the Ottoman Empire, began clearly to develop along their own lines.

CHAPTER IV

PROGRESS OF LIBERAL IDEAS

The Generation Born in the Napoleonic Era enters on the Scene.—France under Charles X.: Reactionary Government and Increasing Discontent: The Royal Ordinances of July 26, 1830.—Insurrection of Paris: The Elder Branch of the Bourbons forced to Abdicate and the elevation to the Throne of the House of Orleans.—Belgium: the Insurrection of August, 1830: The Conference of London: Election of Leopold Saxe Coburg Gotha, 1831: Struggle with Holland: Definite Constitution of Belgium as a Kingdom: Polish Insurrection of November, 1830: Battles of 1831: Fall of Warsaw: Poland under the Czar's yoke: Italy: Revolution in the Romagne, in the Marche, and in Umbria: Proclamation of the United Italian Provinces: Insurrection of Modena and Parma: The Principle of Non-intervention:—The Austrians at Parma and their Intervention in the Romagne.—Capitulation of Ancona, March 26, 1831.—Memorandum of the Powers to the Pope.—Opening of the Reign of Carlo Alberto.—Giuseppe Mazzini: His Youth: His Letter to Carlo Alberto and the Formation of 'Young Italy.'—Liberal Propaganda in the whole of Italy.—England: Emancipation of the Catholics: Lord John Russell and the Electoral Reforms of 1832: First Attempts at Legislation for the Working Classes: Triumph of the Parliamentary Régime.—The First Ten Years of the Reign of Louis Philippe.—Legitimist and Republican Opposition: Bonapartist Attempt: Conquest of Algeria: Dynastic and Political Struggle in the Spanish Peninsula: Economic Development and National Awakening in Germany.—New Eastern Crisis: Isolation of France: The Convention of the Straits: English Colonial Progress: Beginning of the Reign of Queen Victoria: Richard Cobden: The Chartists: The Irish Agitation: Sir Robert Peel and the Abolition of the Corn Duty: Rise of Disraeli to Political Power: Government of Louis Philippe after 1840: Guizot and Resistance to Reform: Spanish Marriages and their Consequences in International Politics: End of the Republic of Cracow: Awakening of Nationality in the Austrian Dominions.—Gioberti's 'Primate of Italy' and the No-Guelph Party.

From now onward the generation born in the period of the French Revolution and the Napoleonic era began to enter political life—that generation which had not known the Governments of the eighteenth century, whose childhood had been passed in an atmosphere of new ideas and in the midst of a feverish life of continual change. The most impulsive temperaments, which consequently had readily absorbed the principles of the Revolution, felt their highest

aspirations in direct conflict with the bureaucracy of the day: an ardent desire of a complete renewal of all things took possession of them—a re-birth not only of politics but also of literature, philosophy, and art: with the enthusiasm of youth they entered into life, thirsting for the battle. A movement of idealism permeated the new life, and hand in hand with it marched an economical transformation caused by the fact that the introduction of machines began to produce a great industrial and economic development, especially in France and England: this determined an increase both in the number and wealth of the middle classes, who gradually developed a larger consciousness of their own power, and resolved to stand no longer in second line. Therefore, while the Governments attempted to suffocate Liberal aspirations, these by historical necessity everywhere became stronger.

. . . .

In the kingdom of France, after the Spanish expedition in 1823, an ever-increasing division between the two social and political elements developed. On September 16, 1824, the old king, Louis XVI., died: this prince, who had attempted to check the reactionary tendency of the Government, was succeeded by his brother, the Count d'Artois, who assumed the name of Charles X.: he was in every respect a representative of the past.

He restored, with all the mediæval apparatus, the function of regal coronation in the Cathedral of Rheims, and proposed to rely pre-eminently, as the sovereigns of former years had done, on the support of the nobles and clergy. This Count d'Artois, who in 1789 had been the first to emigrate, was naturally eager to recompense those who had followed him into exile: he would have liked to have been able to restore to them, in their entirety, the estates confiscated at the Revolution, but this measure would have thoroughly disorganised the French proprietary system: not only so, but in order to carry out this design he would have been forced to violate the Constitutional Charter of Louis XVIII., which guaranteed the integrity of national property.

But the new king was strongly persuaded that the first duty of France was to recompense these devoted supporters

of the throne: he therefore caused a law to be presented to the Chambers which assured an indemnity to the emigrants. The Chambers approved the project, fixing the indemnity at twenty times the income of the estates in the year 1790. Naturally, this enormous sum—about a milliard of francs—which was to be paid to those who had fought against their country, roused great indignation in the majority of the French people.

A law, also, which punished by death any profanation of sacred things, though it was never applied, aided in alienating the more liberal minds from the monarchy. Each law presented by the Government only too plainly showed its tendency to reconstruct the past.

The growing disgust of the nation was manifested in an open manner when, in the month of August, 1829, Charles X. entrusted the direction of the Government to Prince Jules de Polignac, son of that intimate friend of Marie Antoinette who had aroused such detestation in the times of the Revolution. This appointment seemed in truth to be little else but a counter-revolution, and awoke in the breasts of the Liberals a desire of organised resistance.

In these circumstances, a party was formed among the wealthier of the middle classes which possessed a clear and definite programme of substituting the collateral Branch of the House of Orleans for the elder Branch of the Bourbons, since the latter had evidently lost touch with the times. This party founded a journal—*The National*—which was first published in January, 1830. It took England as the continual text of its articles, and praised the political perspicacity of that country: it attempted to draw an historical parallel between the historic changes of the two countries. England, too, in its first revolution, had executed its king and proclaimed a republic: later, a man of energy—Oliver Cromwell—had been dictator: but the anarchy caused by his death had induced the country to restore the ancient Stuart Dynasty in the person of Charles II., the son of the murdered sovereign. The latter, however, had speedily shown that he had learnt nothing either from his father's death or from his long exile, and his brother and successor, James II., had been an even worse sovereign than he.

Therefore, England had carried out a second revolution, free from the excesses of the first: it had contented itself with a change of dynasty: it had in this way assured the working of a constitutional Government.

The allusions were evident: the example of England must be followed by initiating a more ardent and vigorous revolution than the first: a dynasty must be set upon the throne which might give some guarantee of progress in accordance with the times and with the views of the nation: allusion was then made to the merits of the House of Orleans: Duke Louis Philippe at this period represented his family: in 1792 he had fought at Valmy in defence of France and the tricoloured flag: he had only gone into exile after the excesses of 1793, without allying himself to those emigrants who had fought against their country: at the Revolution he had returned to France and had dwelt apart from the Court, living the life of a simple citizen and sending his sons to college. He enjoyed great popularity in Paris; he was often to be seen walking on foot with his sons through the city, and was in the habit of chatting familiarly with the poorer classes. With the new dynasty it might reasonably be hoped that the great principles of the Revolution might be maintained.

These were the opinions which the *National* with great skill attempted to impress on its readers.

The Minister, Polignac, remained for some months inert, during which time the opposition laboured intensely: the result was that when in March, 1830, the Chamber was convoked, an answer was passed by 221 votes to 181, to the Royal Address protesting against the unmerited lack of confidence of the Government in the nation, and inviting the king to choose between the Chamber and the Ministry. Indignant at this freedom, the king prorogued the Parliament and then dissolved it. An attempt was then made to avert public attention from internal affairs by the Algerian expedition.

For some years France had been in open hostility with the Dey of Algiers: but its experience of Eastern affairs had led it to be satisfied by the despatch of a small fleet in order to blockade the coasts: not much importance had

hitherto been attached to the expedition. But Polignac decided to send a fresh expedition. In June, 1830, a corps of French troops disembarked in the neighbourhood of Algiers and initiated the bombardment of the city. On the evening of July 4 the Dey capitulated, obtaining permission to withdraw with his treasures and family wherever he pleased. On the morrow the French occupied the city.

. . . .

The election of the New Chamber had meanwhile been proceeded with. The Liberals—well-organised and disciplined—had determined on the re-election of those deputies who had signed the protest to the king: of these, 202 were re-elected: new Liberal deputies were, in addition, returned by many other constituencies, so that the opposition numbered 270 whilst the Ministerialists only mustered 150. This result was a disaster for the Government: but the latter was soon heartened by the news of the African success: it flattered itself that the military victories would enable it to impose its will on the country, and it was audacious enough to attempt a *coup d'état.*

The king, in agreement with his ministers, dissolved the Chamber even before it met: a new law was promulgated which placed a preventive veto on all printed matter; in other words, an authorisation, which certainly would not be granted, was to be demanded for the publication of newspapers unfavourable to the Court party. A new electoral law notably diminished the number both of the electors and deputies; the new lists were to be brought into force with the new elections of September. These Royal Decrees appeared in the official *Moniteur* on the morning of July 26, 1830. The first to protest against this arbitrary proceeding were the journalists, who speedily published an energetic protest drawn up by Adolphe Thiers, who at this time began, and for more than a half-century continued, to play an important part in the critical moments of French History.

A few demonstrations hostile to the Government took place on the evening of the 26th, but they were unimportant. On the following evening a few printing-houses closed and the unemployed workmen with the students began a more serious agitation. Meanwhile, the articles of *The National*

and of a few other journals which had managed to get printed, excited general indignation against the Decrees. The Government had not expected to encounter open resistance; it had believed that the mere publication of the decrees would be sufficient, and had organised no military arrangements to suppress possible demonstrations. The king was at Saint Cloud, waiting for the hunting season. On the 27th, the Government decided to entrust the military command of Paris to Marshal Marmont, who was unpopular with the Parisians because he had, on March 30th, 1814, signed the capitulation of the city without attempting to defend it. Aware of his unpopularity and not wishing to add to it, he ordered his officers to be lenient with the demonstrators. The crowds which had collected were dispersed, so that on the evening of the 27th the situation did not appear alarming. But the weakness and vacillation shown by the Government increased the boldness of the insurgents. On the night of the 27th-28th barricades were erected which could easily be defended by the populace in the then narrow and tortuous streets of Paris.

On the morning of the 28th the fight began, in which the students and the workmen took the leading part against the military. Marshal Marmont quickly realised the difficulties of his position. The troops were not only welcomed with bullets, but projectiles of every description were showered on them from the roofs and windows: they soon showed a disinclination to continue the conflict. The Marshal repeatedly informed the king that a revolution was in progress, and that in order to save the Crown speedy concessions were necessary: but Charles X. at Saint Cloud ordered him to resist and await the morrow for further orders. But on the morrow the situation had become desperate indeed. Marmont was soon forced to concentrate his defence on the Royal Palaces of the Louvre and the Tuileries. Even here he could not sustain his position long: on the afternoon of the 29th the tricolour flag was hoisted on the Tuileries. When this was reported to him, King Charles X. finally decided to withdraw the Decrees and to call a new Ministry: but this decision came too late.

The street revolution had been mainly accomplished

by the aid of the Republicans, who were sufficiently numerous at Paris: but their organisation was defective, and hence they were not able to impose their will on the country. The son of Napoleon lived forgotten at Vienna, so that the most natural solution of the succession was that presented by the Orleanist candidate. Thiers prepared a manifesto which appeared on the walls of Paris on the morning of the 30th: in it he declared that Charles X. could not re-enter Paris since he had shed the blood of the citizens: that a republic would expose the country to fierce intestine struggles and disastrous European conflicts: that the Duke of Orleans was the only prince worthy of restoring the tricoloured flag, and of carrying out the Constitutional Charter which France desired and willed should be carried out. The deputies determined to entrust the post of Lieutenant-General of the Kingdom to Louis Philippe, and the latter accepted.

Charles X., feeling his position insecure at Saint Cloud, retired to Rambouillet, where, on August 5, he abdicated the throne. The Duke d'Angoulême abdicated with him in favour of the Heir Presumptive of that Branch—the little Duke de Bordeaux: but a boy of ten years of age was not the sovereign adapted either for the times or circumstances. Charles X. remained some few days longer in France in the hope of a change in public opinion, and then departed into exile with his family.

In the meantime, the Chamber had discussed the modifications which had become necessary to be introduced into the Constitutional Charter: the Catholic religion was no longer declared to be that of the State, but was simply recognised as the religion of the majority of French people: the House of Peers no longer was hereditary, though its constituents possessed a life membership: the political power was specially concentrated in the Chamber of Deputies: the age of voting was reduced from 30 to 25 years, and the amount of taxes to be paid necessary to ensure a vote was diminished from 300 francs to 200: this reform doubled the number of the electors and placed the essential power in the hands of the middle classes. The tricoloured flag was adopted as the national banner and in defence of the New Constitution, a National Guard was formed of citizens

who were taxpayers and could afford to buy their own uniform.

The king was entitled, 'King of the French by the Grace of God and the Will of the French People,' thus reconciling the divine right of heredity with the right of the Sovereign People. The Throne was now declared vacant, and the Duke of Orleans mounted it. On August 9th the new king, Louis Philippe, swore to the new Constitution.

. . . .

The French Revolution of 1830, either by the intellectual and political prestige which France enjoyed, or by the ease with which it had triumphed, made a deep impression on Europe.

The first country which felt the repercussion of this event was that one which was nearest to France—Belgium. By the Treaty of 1815 it had been united to Holland, with no consideration for the profound difference which existed between the countries—differences not only of race, language, history, religion, and traditions, but also of economic interest, since Belgium was an agricultural and industrial country, which, therefore, desired protectionist tariffs, whilst Holland was devoted to shipping and commerce, and hence preferred free trade. Belgium, which possessed a more numerous population than Holland, was not slow in feeling herself sacrificed. Little by little a strong desire for separation from Holland began to make itself felt. The news of the Paris Revolution set the country in a blaze: on the night of the 25-26th August, 1830, the population of Brussels took up arms against the Government. In a few days the insurrection triumphed in Brussels and extended to the other cities of Belgium: the rebellion was rendered easier by the fact that in the low countries conscription was territorial: consequently the soldiers were quartered in the very provinces to which they belonged: hence a majority of the troops fraternised with the population.

At the very beginning, the citizen classes who had seized the Government and had formed a Junta were satisfied with demanding the dismissal of the minister, Van Maanen, who was considered as the evil genius of the king: the speedy convocation of the States-General was also requested and

the consideration of the complaints of the Belgians. But the Dutch element which surrounded the king were hostile to the negotiations which had already begun between the king and the insurgents: the king was disposed to grant concessions, but his Dutch counsellors advised him to take military precautions. When the States-General met at the Hague, the Belgian deputies were received with evident signs of contempt. That section of the Belgian people which held decided views on the necessity of separation hotly resented these manifestations, and, in consequence, their views spread rapidly through the whole of Belgium: so that when a body of 10,000 men, under the command of the second son of the king, advanced towards Brussels, the Bruxellois determined to confront them in arms. They therefore defended themselves energetically and succeeded in repelling the Dutch army. These days of the 26-27th of September not only marked the rupture of the negotiations, but also the definite separation of Belgium from Holland. The new Provisional Government, which was constituted in those days, declared Belgium to be an independent State, and convoked a National Congress.

King William appealed to the great Powers: Austria, Russia, and Prussia would have been delighted to intervene, but the French Government declared its intention of supporting Belgium should any Power attempt to coerce her. The Diplomatic Congress, which was at the moment discussing Eastern affairs, was then sitting at London. It also debated the Belgian Question and, indeed, proposed an armistice and caused it to be accepted.

Meanwhile, the National Congress met at Brussels on November 10, 1830; it instantly proclaimed the independence of Belgium and discussed the form of the new Government; but it emphatically declared that the House of Orange was for all time excluded from the throne of Belgium. A Constitution was then prepared which succeeded in surpassing, in liberal ideas, the most advanced Governments of those days: it guaranteed to the citizens the four fundamental liberties, of the Press, religion, education, and the right of holding public meeting: these are symbolised in the statues of bronze around the column which national gratitude

erected a little later at Brussels in memory of the Congress. The electoral census was, perhaps, a limited one, seeing that out of a population of nearly 4,000,000 there were only 45,000 electors. The duty of nominating the representative deputies of the nation and those of the Senate devolved on the same electoral body, so that the Upper House had no affinity with a hereditary Chamber or one of life members nominated by a king. It differed from the Lower House only in the conditions of election and the duration of the mandate.

In the month of December, 1830, the Congress of London had recognised the separation of Belgium from Holland; whether in order to assure the independence of Belgium or for the purpose of erecting a barrier to French ambition on the north, it had subsequently proclaimed the perpetual neutrality of Belgium.

The candidate for the Belgian throne who evoked the general sympathy of the Powers, and, indeed, of the Belgian people itself, was Prince Leopold of Coburg, who a few months previously had refused the crown of Greece. On June 4, 1831, the National Congress of Belgium acclaimed him as sovereign.

But at this juncture, King William, who was irritated by the concessions made by the Powers to Belgium and was confident in the strength of his army, proclaimed the rupture of the armistice and invaded Belgium. The Dutch advanced victoriously; in a few days they had reduced King Leopold to such extremities as to compel him to call upon France for aid. A French army immediately invaded Belgium, whilst England for her part demanded of the Dutch Government that its armies should retire. But the defeats which Belgium had suffered obliged her to accept the conditions imposed on her by the Powers: these were that a portion of Luxembourg should remain in the possession of the Kingdom of Holland and should continue to form a part of the Germanic Confederation. In addition, Belgium was forced to take over a considerable portion of the National Debt of the Low Countries.

These terms, however, did not satisfy the Dutch king, who continued to hold the fortress of Antwerp. In the

prevailing indecision of the other Powers, England and France determined to act alone; they sequestrated all the Dutch ships that were to be found in their ports and sent a fleet to blockade the Dutch coast: at the same time a French army laid siege to Antwerp, and in December, 1832, compelled the Dutch garrison to capitulate. Actual hostilities ceased soon after this event, but peace between the kingdoms of Belgium and of the Low Countries was not signed till April, 1839.

The triumph of the Belgian Revolution had been due to the favour of the two neighbouring Great Powers—France and England; the Eastern Powers had been unable to interfere owing to the preoccupation of Russia with the Polish question and to the absorption of Austria in the developments of the Italian movement.

In the constitutional kingdom of Poland the discontent which had already been manifested in the reign of Alexander I. had attained alarming proportions under the severe government of Nicholas I. Secret societies sprang up on all sides, whilst the Polish literature was inspired by the most ardent patriotism.

The news of the success of the Revolution at Paris created much excitement. Secret preparations were made for an insurrection: this broke into flame when it became known that the Czar intended to issue orders that the Polish army should march against Belgium.

On the evening of November 29, 1830, Warsaw rose. Here, also, for the reason that the majority of the troops were Polish and supported the cause of the people, the Revolution triumphed with ease. But from the beginning of the movement two tendencies had characterised the Provisional Government—that of moderation, which desired the assurance of respect for the Constitution and a promise that the Provinces of Lithuania should be restored to the kingdom, and one—more advanced—which was unwilling to enter into any negotiations with the Russian Government.

On his side, the Czar would not hear of any parley with the rebels; he at once prepared a military expedition. He was able to count on the indirect support of the two neighbouring Powers—Austria and Prussia; both of these were

interested in the suppression of the revolt since both possessed Polish territory. When the news arrived at Warsaw that it was impossible to treat with the Czar since he was determined to grant the Poles nothing but his bare pardon for their rebellion, the advanced element in the Provisional Government gained the ascendancy, and the Diet instantly declared that the House of Romanoff was for ever excluded from the Polish throne—January 25, 1831.

It was evident that the whole Polish nation must face the crisis in arms. The Cause of Poland was not supported by any Power; England, who even in her Liberal policy never forgot her own interests, did not think it worth while to rouse the wrath of Russia; Louis Philippe, too, desired to preserve the goodwill of the Czar; he therefore turned a deaf ear to those advanced French politicians who wished to compel him to intervene. He contented himself with advising a reconciliation which had by this time become impossible. Thus the Poles could count on no other assistance than that conveyed by purely platonic manifestations of sympathy in the columns of the English and French Liberal Press.

By an immense effort, this kingdom, which only numbered 4,000,000 of inhabitants, succeeded in raising an army of 80,000 men, but the majority of these were inexperienced troops, whilst the 110,000 Russians who advanced against them formed a well-armed corps, magnificently furnished both with cavalry and artillery. The spirited resistance made by the Poles at Grochow merely enabled them to retire in good order on Warsaw, while the Russians took possession of the neighbouring villages.

Numbers of the Russian troops had arrived from Asia, and the cholera began to make havoc in their ranks. This epidemic penetrated into the Polish army, so that the plague decimated the ranks of both the contending forces. But the war continued in spite of this outbreak of disease. The Poles made numerous attempts to surprise the Russians in their quarters, but they met with little success: on May 26 the Russians even gained a victory.

These disasters caused discord among the revolutionary chiefs. After a terrible bombardment on September 6, the

first lines of the Warsaw trenches were occupied by the Russians and the cannonade, on the next day, broke out with renewed fury. Finally, on the morning of September 8, 1831, the Russian General, Paskievits, made his solemn entry into the conquered city: he wrote to the Czar the laconic note, 'Warsaw is at your feet!' Many of the most distinguished Polish patriots emigrated and offered their swords to all revolutionary movements: to them and to their cause Western Europe offered her sympathy.

Poland remained under a military dictatorship: the constitution and the separate form of Government were abolished: and the Russian organisation was everywhere introduced. Henceforward Poland was forced to identify herself with the Russian nation.

. . . .

Italy also felt the repercussion of the French Revolution. A revolutionary organisation had already, and for some time, existed in the Province of Emilia: at its head was a young business man of Modena, named Ciro Menotti. In his ardent desire to find some means by which Italy might be freed, he had confided his aspirations to his reigning duke, Francis IV. of Modena. This latter had lost all hope of succession to the throne of Savoy since the reconciliation of the reigning monarch, Carlo Felice, to the heir presumptive, Carlo Alberto: but in his secret heart he still desired the aggrandisement of his own dominions: he seemed, also, not indisposed to favour the revolution, in the hope of obtaining the crown of the new kingdom which was dreamed of by the revolutionists.

The conspirators founded their calculations upon the strength of the Carbonari, which was widely diffused in Central Italy, aided by the great wealth of the Duke of Modena and by the arms of the French. But Louis Philippe, in Italian as well as in Polish affairs, soon showed that he had no wish to compromise himself and his throne in the interests of the Liberal cause.

When the moment of action arrived, Duke Francis considered the adventure too perilous: he therefore decided to withdraw from the conspiracy; not only so, but he caused Ciro Menotti and the principal conspirators of Modena to

be arrested. At this crisis a revolution broke out in the neighbouring province of Bologna—one of the Papal States. The Romagna and the Marche—provinces which had formed a part of the Napoleonic kingdom, and on this account possessed a flourishing commerce and a strong middle-class —had continually manifested their hatred of the Papal Government. Cardinal Rivarola, who was sent to calm the agitation, had passed terrible sentences on the rebels, condemning to the galleys indiscriminately nobles, civil servants, officials, professional men, and workmen, thus plainly showing the universality of the loathing felt by the population for the Papal Government.

During the conclave which preceded the election of Gregory XVI. in February, 1831, the conspirators, in agreement with Ciro Menotti, decided to fling off the Papal yoke. On February 4 Bologna burst into open rebellion and the Pope's pro-legate fled: a commission which the latter had himself appointed formed itself into a Provisional Government of the city and Province of Bologna; it declared that the bond which had united the Bolognese to the dominion of the Roman Pontiff was severed for ever. Peacefully and without bloodshed, the revolution extended in a short time to all the Romagna, than to the Marche and a part of Umbria; everywhere the Pontifical authorities resigned their offices into the hands of the most distinguished citizens and fled, whilst the Papal troops either followed these prelates or fraternised with the population.

Naturally, the news of the events of Bologna provoked great excitement at Modena and in all the provinces of the Duchy. Francis IV. on the evening of February 5 fled in terror at the head of seven hundred men; he made his way to the Austrian fortress of Mantua. With him he led as a prisoner Ciro Menotti, who might have been a dangerous witness against him. The flight of the Duke facilitated the success of the revolution in Modena.

In the neighbouring Duchy of Parma the revolution also spread; Maria Louisa left her capital on February 14 and fled to the city of Piacenza, where was an Austrian garrison: a Provisional Government was also formed in Parma.

In the meantime, at Bologna the deputies of those provinces which had revolted against the Pope met in Congress on February 26, 1831: they reaffirmed in that assembly the declaration of the fall of the Temporal Power of the Pope and they formed a federation of the United Italian Provinces, adopting the tricolour as their national flag.

Two young nephews of the great Napoleon—sons of King Louis and Hortense Beauharnais—participated in the rebellion: one of the two died shortly after at Forli: the other, a few years later, became Emperor of the French under the name of Napoleon III. Their names were cleverly made use of by Metternich in order to make a wider breach between Louis Philippe and the Italian Cause.

The Pope, the Duke of Modena, and the Duchess of Parma protested against the acts of the Provisional Governments which were established in their States and requested the aid of the Imperial armies. But the Government of Vienna was itself eager to subdue those revolutionary Governments which had risen south of the Po, since their existence would have been a standing menace to their power in the Lombardo-Veneto. The Italian patriots relied on the principle of non-intervention proclaimed by the new Dynasty of France, which had lately been applied to the Belgian question. But the course of events soon enlightened them and they speedily learnt that Louis Philippe displayed no zeal in defending against Austria the principles he had himself proclaimed.

In the same month of February, 1831, the Austrian troops, which were at Piacenza, brought back the Duchess Maria Louisa to Parma. So far, it could not have been said that the principles of non-intervention had been violated, since the Duchess had not left her Duchy, and the troops, which had restored her to her throne by the Treaty of 1815, had their quarters in the Duchy itself.

But at the beginning of March, Austrian troops from Mantua also entered Modena. The few troops which were defending the Provisional Government of Modena were unable to resist and retreated into Bolognese territory. On March 9, Francis IV. re-entered Modena, surrounded by Austrian troops. Even in its occupation of the Duchy of

Modena the House of Austria could plead in excuse that it possessed eventual rights of succession in that State: the Government of the United Italian States might therefore continue to feel itself secure.

But in reality Austria paid no heed to the official declaration of Louis Philippe since it was apprised of his secret intentions. In the same month of March it sent troops into the Romagna. The Provisional Governments of the United Italian States realised the impossibility of any adequate resistance in Bologna, and retired to Ancona, carrying with them Cardinal Benvenuti as a hostage; the latter had been sent by the Pope to the insurgents with the invitation to return to the obedience of the Church.

On March 21 the Austrians entered Bologna without opposition, and on the 25th, in the neighbourhood of Rimini, a sanguinary engagement ensued; the result of this action assured at least the retreat of the insurgents towards Ancona. But in the latter city the revolutionary chiefs found nothing prepared for the defence: by this time, too, they were completely disillusioned as to the expected aid from France, and they deliberated on the wisdom of surrender. They set Cardinal Benvenuti at liberty and concluded with him a Treaty of capitulation, replacing in his hands the reins of Government. The Cardinal pledged them his sacred word that no individual should suffer for the part he had taken in the insurrection: this treaty was signed on March 20, 1831. Thus in less than a month the revolution, which had been initiated with such high hopes of success, was completely suffocated.

Among the Princes who had been restored, the Duchess Maria Louisa, distinguished herself by her clemency. She allowed the chiefs of the rebellion to make good their escape and proclaimed a general amnesty. On the other hand, Francis IV. believed that cruelty was the only method with the rebels: one of his first victims was Ciro Menotti, to whom, when he was privy to the conspiracy, he had given his princely word that his life, in any circumstances, should be spared. The Pope also displayed great severity: he annulled the capitulation of Ancona, under the fiction that Cardinal Benvenuti was not, at the time that he had signed

the document, a free agent. He ordered a series of trials of the rebels; but the sentences passed by these tribunals were not heavy since the chiefs of the movement had escaped.

All these latter had embarked at Ancona; but Austria had not considered the capitulation valid, and the fugitives were captured by two Austrian warships as they were leaving the harbour. These patriots were imprisoned in the dungeons of Venice, and it was only by grace of the intervention of the English and French Governments that they escaped the peril of being consigned to the Governments of Francis IV. and of Gregory XVI. After some months' imprisonment they were sent into exile, where some few of them, such as the Marquis Terenzio Mamiani, by their writings, increased the sympathy felt by civilised Europe for the Italian Cause.

But the very Powers who had, either directly or indirectly, contributed to the re-establishment of the Temporal Power, clearly understood that the Papal Government must undergo some form of modification. Therefore, in May, 1831, the ambassadors of the five great Powers—France, England, Austria, Prussia, and Russia—to which body the kingdom of Sardinia also added its representative—presented to Cardinal Bernetti, the Secretary of State to the Holy See, a Memorial insisting on the necessity of the introduction of some indispensable reforms, such as the admissibility of lay officials to the higher offices of the State, municipal elective councils, the institution of provincial councils, and a council of State.

The Roman Court professed to welcome these recommendations with the greatest deference and promised to carry out the proposed reforms. But the concessions conceded by it were paltry and insignificant. Thereupon, those Liberals who had built high hopes on this diplomatic intervention, determined to employ force and organised armed bands: this movement assumed speedily alarming proportions, for the Austrians, fearing to wound French susceptibilities, had, in the month of July, 1831, withdrawn their troops. The Papal Government demanded Austrian aid anew and sent a corps of Swiss troops into the Romagna with such other military aid as it had, meanwhile, had time to organise. In January, 1832, a few bands of insurgents

resisted the Papal troops near Cesena; they were defeated and the soldiers of the Church advanced into the city, where they committed the worst excesses. Soon after, at Forli—a city which they had entered without encountering any resistance—they repeated these outrages. At the same time the Austrians occupied Bologna.

It was then that Louis Philippe, who had been bitterly reproached by the Chamber of Deputies for the unseemly way in which France had acted towards Italy, thought it necessary to take some steps in consonance with his own dignity: in order to counteract Austrian influence, he sent a French regiment to occupy the citadel of Ancona (1832). The Austrians remained at Bologna and the French at Ancona till 1838; these two nations thus acted as custodians of the Papal Authority.

The system of violent oppression of every Liberal manifestation was rampant almost throughout Italy; even in Piedmont, where Carlo Felice—who had died on April 25, 1831—had been succeeded by Carlo Alberto. The highest Liberal hopes had been built on the accession of the latter to power, for the Liberal remembered in him the Carbonari of 1821. But they were disappointed, for the new monarch not only made no modification in the governmental system but allowed the power to remain in the hands of the reactionary ministers of his predecessor.

Under such auspices Giuseppe Mazzini had begun his apostolate. Born in Genoa, in 1805, he had passed his boyhood under French Government. Later, when the time arrived for him to begin his studies, his father, who was a distinguished doctor, obtained for his son a private tutor, perhaps because he felt an instinctive dislike of the Piedmontese Government which had succeeded that of the French.

In 1821, Giuseppe Mazzini was profoundly impressed by the sight in the streets of Genoa of fugitives of the Piedmontese revolution, who had come into the city in order to embark for foreign lands.

'That day,' he wrote later, 'was the first on which the thought vaguely occurred to me that one could and ought to fight for the liberty of one's own country.'

At the University his enthusiasm for these ideals increased more and more. Though he was temperamentally indisposed to make many friends, he succeeded by the superiority of his intellect and by the nobility of his character in gathering around him a few devoted followers.

In 1827 he took his degree in Law, but his official studies did not prevent him from continuing his literary and political researches, which he pursued with passion. It was at this time that he began to publish a few bibliographic notes in a commercial journal called *The Genoese Indicator*—a journal which the Government subsequently suppressed on its gradual transformation into a literary periodical.

His patriotic enthusiasm led him willingly to accept the invitation to enrol himself as a member of the Carbonari: but he was denounced by a spy and arrested on November 11, 1830.

In prison he meditated deeply on the political situation; he was persuaded that the Carbonari was incapable of directing the Italian movement, and that instead of wasting time and labour in galvanising it to life, it was better to construct a new edifice.

It was in this way that he began to conceive the first idea of the celebrated society of 'Giovane Italia,' or 'Young Italy': he pondered over the principle on which this new secret society should be based; he determined on the persons who should be called by him to be its original members, and he attempted to discover a bond which should unite this new brotherhood in one common labour with the revolutionary elements of all Europe.

On February 2, 1831, he was set at liberty, simply from lack of evidence; but as the Government was convinced that Mazzini was a dangerous individual, they laid before him these alternatives—either to settle in some obscure city of Piedmont or to leave the kingdom. Mazzini realised that were he to accept confinement in a small city of Piedmont, under the perpetual supervision of the police, he would never be able to carry out the plan he had designed. Hence he preferred exile and chose Marseilles as his residence: there he immediately began that political apostolate which

he carried on, untamed and untameable, for the remainder of his life.

It was at this moment that Carlo Alberto came to the throne. Before Mazzini constructed his new association, he deemed it advisable to write a letter to Carlo Alberto, and circulated printed copies of the same on every side to Italian patriots, invoking the king to assume the direction of the Italian movement. In this letter, which glowed with patriotic eloquence, and was signed, 'An Italian,' Mazzini clearly placed this dilemma before Carlo Alberto:—either to follow the petty policy of his predecessor, or to place himself at the head of a national free Italy. He attempted to re-awaken in the breast of the king his enthusiasms of 1821.

Carlo Alberto seemed to have accepted the first of the suggestions of Mazzini: he continued the policy of his predecessor. It was for this reason that Mazzini, in founding the association called 'Young Italy,' affirmed that the Italian fatherland could not rise except by the strength and government of the people. From this time his propaganda assumed a republican character: yet, whilst affirming the principle of the sovereignty of the people, he naturally declared that the nation, once free, should give its own irrevocable judgment upon the fundamental laws of its existence.

The essential characteristic of the Mazzinian doctrine is not centred in the republican idea but in the sentiment of humanity.

Hence he proposed to educate the people in the thought of an Italy 'free, one, independent, and republican,' and in 1832, for the purposes of propaganda, he founded a periodical bearing the same name as his association—*Young Italy*; this was naturally prohibited and its readers persecuted by the police throughout the length and breadth of the peninsula; but it succeeded in penetrating everywhere, since many exposed themselves to the danger of prison and even death for the 'crime' of reading and circulating it. In fact, Mazzini, by his high, moral ideals, by his ardent faith, and by his flaming style, succeeded in transforming love of the fatherland into an authentic religion.

The Mazzinian propaganda caused the arrest and

execution of many enthusiastic young men, especially in Piedmont and Liguria. These bitter persecutions of the Piedmontese Government drove Mazzini to organise a movement against Carlo Alberto; at the beginning of 1834 Mazzini collected a few hundred fugitives on the Swiss frontier and they succeeded in penetrating into Savoy: but after a minor engagement with the royal troops they dispersed. It had been arranged that a simultaneous rising should have broken out in various cities of the kingdom, but the disastrous issue of the Savoy expedition caused the postponement of the movement. The police, however, were informed of the intended rising and made some arrests.

In this conspiracy a young sailor of Nice was implicated, no other than Giuseppe Garibaldi, who was born on July 4, 1807. He had tried to make converts in the Royal Navy to the Mazzinian doctrine: fortunately for Italy he succeeded in escaping from Genoa in the disguise of a peasant. He fled to Marseilles, and there, while casually reading a newspaper, saw for the first time his own name in print; it occurred in a report of the sentence of death pronounced against him in his absence and re-copied by a French paper.

Mazzini was also condemned to death in contumacy. After he had founded the international society of 'Young Europe' on a secure base, he took refuge in the freer land of England, where in the first years of his stay he was forced to struggle with the direst poverty. At last he managed to secure a hearing in the reviews. His publications effectively contributed, amongst the English, to an ampler knowledge of Italian literature: they also created a warm current of sympathy for the Italian National Cause. Whilst engaged in this work he ceaselessly prosecuted his revolutionary propaganda in Italy.

Here, too, patriotic sentiments were kept alive by the literature of the epoch. In 1832, whilst Mazzini ardently spread the propaganda of his 'Young Italy,' a little book was published at Turin, which, according to the famous phrase of Cesare Balbo, did Austria more harm than a defeat in the field. It was called *My Prisons*, and Silvio Pellico had written it, in the gentlest spirit, a short time after his release from the prison of the Spielberg: this calm narrative

of martyrdom, endured by him with unflinching patience, had an immense effect on the minds of Italians.

In all the prose and poetry which was produced in these years the political allusions were frequent, and they were seized upon with avidity by the public, which felt itself in union with the writers. Hatred against Austria had become the predominant sentiment in Italy.

The Austrian Emperor, Francis I., died in 1835, and his son, Ferdinand I., succeeded him. The latter was in every respect absolutely inept, therefore the spirit of Metternich was even more dominant in Austria than in the past. Metternich thought that it would be advisable to conduct the young emperor into Italy, there to be crowned king of the Lombardo-Veneto in Milan. To this solemn function he resolved to invite all the princes of the Peninsula, so that they might, as vassals, come and pay homage to their common tyrant (September, 1838). But Carlo Alberto refused to attend: this act of independence was enough to re-awaken in the minds of the Italians that feeling of sympathy towards him which had long been absent. The few reforms which he had recently introduced into his State aided in giving life to this sentiment.

But King Ferdinand II. of Naples, who had begun to reign only a few months before Carlo Alberto—in November 18, 1830—amid the lively hopes of his subjects, had already convinced these latter that these same hopes were illusive. His vulgar mind and vicious instincts had gained for him the title of 'Re Lazzaroni'—the 'Vagabond King.' He allowed near him none but men who possessed no sense of dignity. He himself esteemed and respected no one and amused himself by jibing and jeering at his courtiers. He was so miserly that his penurious administration forced his officials to resort to theft in order to supplement their small salaries. His superstition was such that his confessor and the Jesuits were his only advisers in Government affairs. Greedy of power, he would not even hear the name of Constitutional Government. His favourite phrase was, 'My people have no need to think: I will watch over their welfare and dignity.' So well did he watch over the latter that he rendered his Government odious in the highest

degree. Naturally, agitation and tumults continually disturbed the kingdom, and in 1837 a great rebellion broke out in Sicily: the ferocious repression of Ferdinand, however, soon re-established 'order.'

Nor were conditions any better in the Pontifical State under Pope Gregory XVI. The English historian, Macaulay, when he was in Rome in 1838, said plainly, 'The State of the Church is the worst governed in the world. The imbecility of the police, the venality of the public functionaries, the desolation of the Campagna, the degradation of the people attract the observation of the most unobservant traveller. It is no exaggeration to say that the population consists principally of foreigners, priests, and beggars.'

The Grand Duchy of Tuscany was, on the other hand, distinguished among the Italian States by the mildness of the Grand Ducal Government. This province became in those years the chief intellectual centre of Italy: and many groups of Liberals, who had emigrated from the other provinces, were to be found there. From 1824 Leopold II. had occupied the throne, and he dedicated both time and money to the reclamation of the Maremma and the improvement of the port of Leghorn. He desired to obtain the reputation of a patron of the *beaux arts* and permitted the first Congress of Italian scientists to be opened in Pisa in 1839: he also honoured the men of learning who were there assembled. His example influenced the more ambitious princes of the Peninsula: both Carlo Alberto and Ferdinand II. allowed these Congresses, which aided greatly the national cause, facilitating relations between the more eminent men of the Peninsula.

Another and much more important innovation was now introduced into Italy—railways. The more cultured minds took a lively interest in this advance. All these changes helped to shatter the old ideas and to impress on cultured society the necessity of a radical alteration in the political world of Italy.

. . . .

The restricted horizon which hitherto had bounded the life of the people began to widen. Everywhere one saw a notable awakening: banks, savings banks, and insurance

societies were founded, small industrial and artistic exhibitions were opened, and agricultural societies were created for the improvement of farming implements: at the same time an attempt was made to foster popular education: schools were opened, journals were printed—political ones in constitutional countries, literary and illustrated ones where absolutism was dominant: yet even these latter aided to create public opinion.

In England, the old Tory policy had been moderated since new and strong men had come to power by the side of Canning—men who were disposed to introduce reforms, like Robert Peel, who was minister of the Home Office from 1822-1830. His colleague, William Huskisson, Secretary of the Board of Trade, opened the way which led to commercial liberty. He modified the antiquated Navigation Act, which had prohibited commerce to foreign ships, and concluded treaties with various Powers concerning this question: he lowered certain duties and substituted for the fixed duty on corn the so-called sliding scale which varied according to the prevailing price. He caused the laws to be abolished which prohibited the union of workers, thus opening the road for the rise of Trades Unions. It was the moment in which English industry, aided by an ever-increasing application of machinery, made a prodigious leap: the great manufacturing centre of Manchester was united to the port of Liverpool by a railway which may be considered the most important one hitherto constructed.

In the midst of this economic development two grave questions occupied the public mind—Catholic emancipation and electoral reform. The old seventeenth-century laws against Catholics were still in force in England. Catholics had no political rights. The majority of the Irish, who had remained Catholics, demanded the suppression of the laws, but in vain: Parliament, the Ministry, and the King all united in rejecting their petition. At this juncture, Daniel O'Connell, an agitator of great ability and energy, rose among the Irish Catholics: he made the question a burning one. In a short time he became the idol of the Irish: though as a Catholic he could take no seat in Parliament, in 1828 he presented himself as a candidate and was enthusiastically

elected. It was then that the Duke of Wellington, himself a rigid Tory, who had succeeded Canning in the Ministry, allowed Sir Robert Peel to persuade him to offer no further opposition to Catholic emancipation. In his turn Wellington conquered the opposition of the King and the House of Peers, which latter had hitherto obstinately opposed the proposed reform: in April, 1829, the law was passed which threw open all public offices to Catholics, thus putting an end to an odious inequality.

This question had, however, produced a schism in the ranks of the Tory Party, and this division strengthened the Whig Party. Meanwhile, the unpopular king, George IV., had died (June, 1830), and his brother, William IV. had succeeded him. The latter, compared with his predecessor, appears as almost a good king: he was called the 'Sailor King,' and, in fact, possessed the legendary good nature of the sailor: but these qualities were accompanied neither by ability nor by any other superiority. Even under him the Crown did not acquire great prestige, and political power passed more and more into the hands of the Parliament.

The French Revolution, which had carried the House of Orleans to the throne, had made a great impression in England, since it was truly stated that it had been carried out on the English model. The desire for electoral reform found voice. The Whigs had presented a Bill for reform in a more practical shape than had the Radicals, since they limited their demand to a more reasonable distribution of seats. Disturbances took place in the industrial districts, which were sparsely represented in Parliament: Lord Grey, the head of the Whig Party, presented a Bill on the subject to the House of Lords. The old Duke of Wellington did not understand the situation and opposed the Bill. He energetically maintained that no better system than the English could be found: the conclusion of his speech was greeted by a strong murmur of disapprobation: being somewhat deaf, he inquired of his neighbour what was happening: he received the reply, 'Simply that you have overthrown your own Ministry.' Shortly after he was forced to resign.

A new Ministry, composed mostly of Whigs, was formed:

but in it were found places for those Tory reformers who were called 'Canningites.' In this Ministry, which left a famous record of its labours by its daring reforms, two men at the side of the veteran Liberal, Charles Grey, were destined to become conspicuous in English political life—Lord John Russell and Lord Palmerston. The first became Minister for Home Affairs and the second Foreign Minister.

On March 1, 1831, Lord John Russell presented his Bill for Electoral Reform: this had for its object the abolition of seats of many small boroughs and the redistribution of these among the more populous counties and the larger cities which were without representation: the Bill also demanded the modification of the qualifications necessary for the possession of a vote. The Bill met with violent opposition from the Tory Party: in the House of Commons the Bill passed a second reading by a majority of one: the third reading was rejected by a majority of eight. The Minister obtained the King's consent for the dissolution of Parliament. The elections were bitterly contested on one programme alone—electoral reform. The House approved of this reform by a majority of 109; but the Bill was again rejected by the House of Lords—October, 1831. Great disturbances took place in many districts and much excitement was felt throughout the country.

At the re-opening of the House after the holidays the latter re-confirmed the decision of the country, while making a few alterations in the Bill. The Lords did not dare to reject the Bill outright but entirely mutilated it by an amendment. The Ministry then obtained from the King a promise to create new peers favourable to the Bill, should the House of Lords still prove refractory: under this threat the Lords finally passed the measure. In June, 1832, electoral reform was an accomplished fact. From boroughs, which had become unimportant, 143 seats were taken: 64 were given to 42 cities and the remainder were distributed among the counties. The old method of public and written voting was retained, but the duration of the elections was limited to two days. The conditions relative to the right to vote were so changed that the total number of the electors was increased by about one-third and reached

the number of 700,000. Here again the triumph was substantially one of the middle-classes.

After this great political reform, public opinion exercised a greater influence on government policy, as was shown in the proposal to abolish negro slavery. This question had been discussed at the Congress of Vienna and subsequently it had again been raised with the hope of arriving at an agreement among the Powers: but nothing decisive had been arranged. The Minister, Canning, had brought in a Bill which provided that in English colonies the more severe penalties to which slaves were liable should be abolished and their matrimonial arrangements should be regulated. But these half measures only served to embitter the relations between masters and slaves. In 1831, the English Government liberated those slaves which were dependent on the Crown, and in 1833 proclaimed the emancipation of the remainder: the question was regulated as follows:—all children of slaves under the age of six years were declared free: the remainder, who numbered 750,000, were still to continue in slavery for the period of seven years. At the expiration of this period they would automatically become free. Twenty million pounds were to be given as an indemnity to the proprietors.

The humanitarian sentiments which had achieved the solution of this old problem, induced the English Government to adopt measures for the protection of factory children. On January 1, 1834, the employment in factories of any child under the age of nine years was prohibited and the hours of the working day were limited to all workers under the age of eighteen. These were the first attempts at operative legislation.

From this time onward the formation of great manufacturing centres brought together great masses of workmen, who began to realise the power which they might wield by united effort. Robert Owen, a distinguished philanthropist, formed his cotton factory into a co-operative society: he afterwards became a zealous promoter of social reform. From the year 1833 he continually demanded of the Government that the working day should be fixed at eight hours in order to allow workmen the opportunity of educating

themselves. In this way the Socialist movement was initiated.

In 1834, relief for the poorer classes was better organised. Hitherto the law had declared that their maintenance devolved on their individual parishes, which exacted a tax for this purpose. This tax increased enormously and became an intolerable burden on the middle classes: laziness was so greatly encouraged that the old law, which granted relief only to the infirm, was restored: the sick poor were sent to infirmaries: those who were in a condition to labour were placed in workhouses, where they were compelled to work and submit to discipline. Naturally, many who had previously willingly received parish pay now preferred to work rather than enter the workhouses: in a short space of time the poor-rates were reduced by one-half. For the organisation and maintenance of workhouses and the proper distribution of the expenses necessary to this end, parishes were authorised to unite together in the formation of 'Unions': thus between counties and parishes, the two ancient administrations of England, rose the Unions, to which were also entrusted the working of a sanitary scheme. Even for public works, many parishes were united together into one district.

Thus, in a few years, many daring reforms were introduced, but the House would still not hear of any radical changes in the Irish political system. The emancipation of the Catholics had not modified the economic situation of Ireland: the Irish still cultivated the estates of their foreign owners, they were forced to maintain luxuriously the clergy of a religion which was not their own: they were ruined by a Customs tariff which was entirely in favour of England: therefore, they considered themselves as an oppressed nation and welcomed the great tribune, O'Connell, as the father of his country.

The social and religious opposition to the Protestant proprietors easily assumed the character of an Irish National sentiment. O'Connell and his supporters for some time supported the Liberal Ministry, which attempted to diminish the causes of enmity between the two countries, but the reforms which it was able to pass were scanty

enough: it succeeded only in abolishing a few Anglican bishoprics, and in dedicating the sums thus spared to other uses.

But even these measures raised great opposition in England, and enabled King William to dismiss this Ministry, with which he was not in sympathy: the power was again placed in the hands of the Conservatives—November, 1834. The new Ministry, though it included such men as the old Duke of Wellington and the eminent statist, Robert Peel, only lasted six months: the dissolution of the Parliament and the appeal to the country did not diminish the Liberal majority, so that in April, 1835, the King was again forced to accept a Liberal Ministry. The call to power of the Conservatives, in 1834, was the last occasion on which an English king attempted to choose a Ministry unsupported by a Parliamentary majority.

Henceforth the House of Commons possessed such a preponderating force as to change the Constitutional régime for one which was strictly parliamentary. The old parties abandoned their historic names: the Tories, who had hitherto supported the power of the Crown in the Government, now accepted the new political departure and styled themselves Conservatives: in a similar manner, the Whigs united with the Radicals and called themselves Liberals. The Parliamentary sittings became public: as the ancient Hall of Parliament had been destroyed in 1834 by fire, a new and splendid House of Parliament was built, with galleries for the public.

With the new Liberal Melbourne-Russell Ministry, reforms were undertaken with greater ardour; the administration of the cities was reorganised under mayors, aldermen, and councillors: some families were deprived of their hereditary privileges, which, till then, had left in their hands the control of municipal affairs: electoral rights were given to all taxpayers: a new Civil Service was organised: in order to encourage the publication of newspapers, the tax on journals was reduced from fourpence to one penny a copy. This last measure doubled the number of journals in the space of a few years.

On June 20, 1837, King William IV. died, leaving no

issue, and his niece, Victoria, succeeded him on the throne, at the age of eighteen years.[1]

. . . .

In France, the first years of Louis Philippe's reign were agitated both by Legitimist plots and Republican menace. The romantic expedition of the Duchesse de Berry, with its object of reconquering the throne of France, failed completely in 1832. The Republican outbreaks at Paris in 1832 and at Lyons in 1834 were severely repressed. Bonapartists were also active: the son of Napoleon I. had died at Vienna in 1832, but the nephew of Napoleon I. had assumed the claim to the throne: after the Revolution of the Romagna, in 1821, he had, with his mother, resided in Switzerland, where he had devoted himself seriously to study, with the fatalistic confidence that one day he was destined to reign over France and there to continue the work of his uncle: in 1836 he formed a plot with a few officers in the garrison of Strasburg, and attempted to excite a military insurrection in France: the plot failed, and Louis Napoleon was arrested. Louis Philippe considered the affair as a mere boyish freak and ordered him to be deported to America: but the young Napoleon returned immediately to England and took up his abode there.

In the midst of all these dangers, and in spite of his authoritative character, Louis Philippe had been compelled to adapt himself to the exigencies of the time: therefore he chose his ministers according to the manifestations of the Parliamentary majority in the Chamber.

Thus, at first, the Presidency of the Chamber was held by the Banker, Lafitte, who was a lover of popular adulation, and on occasions tolerated the excesses of the people. But when disorder had disgusted the public mind and Conservative ideas came into favour, Casimir Périer came into power with the object of restoring order and maintaining respect for the Law. After Casimir Périer came de Broglie and Guizot, representing the group which was called *doctrinaire* from the dogmatic tone of its oratory and of the journals devoted to it: the name was also derived from the tendency

[1] As women were excluded, by the Salic Law, from the throne of Hanover, the latter passed to Ernest Augustus, Duke of Cumberland.

of this group to regulate its conduct more by general principles and axioms than by the material facts which governed the situation. With de Broglie and Périer was associated Adolphe Thiers, a decided partisan of parliamentary government—so much so, that to him is attributed the phrase,—'The King reigns, but does not govern'—a phrase which wounded the susceptibilities of Louis Philippe. Amidst all these conflicting policies, one form of government had persisted:—a government preferred by the King, who wished to substitute for the nobility of blood, which had hitherto ruled the State,—an aristocracy of wealth. In fact, the reign of Louis Philippe represented the domination of the banking world and the industrial plutocracy: this particular class of government desired, above all other things, tranquillity at home and peace abroad, and such was the policy adopted by successive French Governments during these years.

The only war conducted by the French Government during this period was that of Africa. Algiers had been conquered in 1830, with no precise programme of any subsequent policy. The successive Algerian Governments sought to establish their authority in the country, and occupied the principal points of the littoral. But in the interior the native tribes maintained their independence and hostility: they took advantage of every opportunity of molesting or attacking the French. The situation became more difficult when the native forces were organised under one bold and capable chief,—Abd-el-Kader, who was looked upon by his people as both poet and saint: he succeeded in collecting under him a large number of fighting men and inflicted many defeats on the French. Finally, General Bugeaud, who was appointed Governor-General of Algiers in 1840, proposed to pursue the enemy without intermission: for this purpose he created selected bodies of light horse, and adopted those very tactics of mobility and rapidity which had hitherto constituted the superiority of the Arabs. He succeeded in occupying all the important points which Abd-el-Kader had, till then, held in his own possession. The latter was soon compelled to retreat into the desert, where he was reduced to a nomadic life. But the war still dragged on for some years, and was even extended to

Morocco, for Abd-el-Kader obtained the aid of the Sultan of that country. General Bugeaud also defeated the Moorish army, and forced the Sultan to expel Abd-el-Kader from his territories. The latter returned to Algeria and succeeded for some years in avoiding capture: it was not till 1847 that he constituted himself a prisoner. With his surrender the Algerian war may be said to have concluded.

. . . .

In the ten years, dating from 1830-1840, Constitutional Government triumphed also in the Spanish Peninsula. In Portugal, King John VI. had died in 1826. His son, Don Pedro, the Emperor of Brazil, should have succeeded him, but he realised that had he resigned the throne of Brazil for that of Portugal, the former would have separated from the mother country. In this dilemma he determined to renounce the throne of Portugal in favour of his daughter, Maria, and proclaimed, in her name, a Portuguese Constitutional Government. But his brother, Don Miguel, was in Europe: the latter paid no attention to the claims of his niece, and seized the throne, placing the political power in the hands of a bigoted and reactionary Government.

Don Pedro hoped that the French Revolution of 1830, together with the presence of Liberalism in England would militate in favour of his claims: he had himself lost all popularity in Brazil: a disastrous war had deprived him of the Province of Banda Orientale, which constituted itself an independent State under the name of the Republic of Paraguay. Irritated against his people, Don Pedro, on April 6, 1831, abdicated in favour of his son, Don Pedro II., who was still a child: he himself, sailed for the Azores with his daughter, Maria, in order to organise an expedition against Don Miguel. With the indirect support of England and France he was enabled to arm a fleet, and with it occupied Oporto, where he was enthusiastically received (July, 1832). The following year he gained a naval victory over Don Miguel's fleet, off Cape St Vincent: Don Miguel was forced to abandon Lisbon, and Queen Maria made her triumphal entry into that city, saluted as Queen by the English and French Ambassadors. The greater part of Portugal then acknowledged the Government of Queen

Maria. Don Miguel took refuge at Santarem on the Tagus, and there maintained himself in arms. This was all the easier for him, since war had broken out in Spain from which he hoped to draw advantage.

This also was a war of succession, with which were bound up a number of conflicting political opinions. King Ferdinand had no male issue: he had left by his wife, Maria Cristina, a daughter,—Isabella, who was born in 1830: in order to assure the throne to her he had abolished the Salic Law and had restored the old Spanish custom of admitting the female branch to the succession. Ferdinand had died on September 29, 1833, and his brother, Don Carlos, who had been the Presumptive Heir to the Throne, took arms in defence of his rights: he possessed strong reactionary opinions, and could thus count on the support of the nobles, priests, and peasants. Maria Cristina, who assumed the regency in the name of her daughter, necessarily was supported by the Liberal Party and proclaimed a Constitution in 1834.

Thus, both in Spain and Portugal, a Regency held power in the name of two Queens, both of whom were minors: these were both supported by the Liberals, while, on the other hand, the two Pretenders were acknowledged by the Absolutist Party. Since the Pretenders made common cause, the Governments of Spain and Portugal resolved on common action, and had the good fortune to obtain the aid of England and France. An agreement was concluded between Spain and Portugal on the one hand, and England and France on the other, in April, 1834.

In Portugal, affairs were speedily settled: Don Miguel was deposed and compelled to sign a convention at the end of the year 1843, by which, on the payment of an annual pension, he pledged himself not to interfere in the internal politics of Portugal. He subsequently established himself in Germany. A few months later, Queen Maria, now fifteen years of age, was declared to have attained her majority. Her father, Don Pedro, having died, a husband was sought for her, and in January, 1835, she married Duke Augustus of Leuchtenberg, son of Eugène Beauharnais. Two months after the marriage the Duke died at the age of twenty-seven

years. A year after, Queen Maria married Prince Ferdinand of Saxe Coburg, a young man of twenty, nephew of Leopold, the new King of the Belgians.

In the midst of these dynastic events, a Constitutional Government had been formed in Portugal. Spain was still a prey to a terrible civil war. Don Carlos had been forced to abandon Portugal in 1834: he was handed over to the English fleet, which brought him to England, where he was set at liberty. He profited by this to return immediately to Spain: he there sought the hospitality of the Basque mountaineers, who had taken up arms with enthusiasm to defend monarchical and religious traditions and their ancient privileges,—*fueros*,—by which they fixed their own taxes and were exempt from conscription and the salt duty: these privileges had been menaced by the new Constituton. This gave a new impulse to the war and all the country to the north of the Ebro was speedily in the hands of the Carlists.

The Absolutist Powers favoured the cause of the Pretender. This dynastic war had now assumed the character of a war of principles. Legitimist adventurers from every country of Europe joined the ranks of the Carlists, while on the other hand many Liberals who had fled from persecution in their own country fought for the Constitutionalists. In the end, the latter were victorious: in 1839, Don Carlos was finally driven over the Pyrenees.

Henceforth all Western Europe was freed from Absolutism: other European countries took courage from this fact: in particular, the Liberals of Central Europe redoubled their efforts to obtain Constitutional Government.

. . . .

Even in Germany the French Revolution of 1830 had made its influence widely felt: in the Southern States it gave a greater impulse to the demand for reform, and the language, both of journals and deputies, showed greater vigour and freedom. Some of the more badly-governed Northern States, such as Saxony, Brunswick, the Electorate, Hesse Cassel, etc., broke here and there into open rebellion. Under popular pressure Constitutional Governments were formed. But the two most important States of the

Confederation,—Austria and Prussia, continued to maintain the Absolutist régime.

Prussia was an essentially military power, but it also possessed a well-ordered bureaucracy, and this latter carried out works of decisive importance for the future of the nation: —the Zollverein and the Customs League. By these reforms 25,000,000 Germans were reunited by commercial interests under the patronage of Prussia: Austria, however, was excluded. Thus something akin to a national sentiment was founded, which was bound to grow stronger with the lapse of time: the excellent material results of the Customs Union strengthened this current of national feeling. The Customs Union was introduced simultaneously with the first railways, at a moment favourable to the commercial and industrial development of Germany. So long as the latter Power had been an essentially agricultural country, with scanty commerce and ill-developed industries, the political horizon of the people had been limited enough. Each small State had merely been interested in local affairs, but the development of economical life enlarged the political horizon, whilst literature and science also contributed to the greater intensity of the national life.

When French ambition seemed on the point of raising its head in 1840, an explosion of patriotic sentiment was provoked in Germany. This episode is connected with an Eastern crisis which sprang from a schism in Islamism itself, due to a quarrel between Sultan Mahmud II. and his powerful vassal, Mehemet Ali, the Viceroy of Egypt.

During the Greek War the Sultan had promised, to Mehemet Ali, Crete and the government of the Morea, as a recompense for the loan of the Egyptian fleet: but the intervention of the Powers had not only occasioned to the Viceroy the loss of his entire fleet but it had deprived him also of the government of the Morea. Hence he demanded that the Sultan should grant him the government of Syria in recompense: but Mahmud II. was already apprehensive of the ever-increasing power of the Viceroy: the intelligent and energetic government of the latter had not only increased the military forces at his disposal, but had vastly developed the natural riches of Egypt: the Sultan, therefore, refused

to grant the demand. Relations between the two became strained: the Viceroy refused to pay the annual tribute to the Porte on the ground that he had already spent in the Sultan's service more than the sum demanded: nor did he limit himself to this refusal, but, taking advantage of the first favourable opportunity, he seized Syria.

The Turkish armies sent to oppose him were defeated, and the Egyptian troops advanced against Asia Minor. In terror, the Sultan invoked the aid of the Powers, who succeeded in enforcing peace. The Sultan was induced to grant to Mehemet Ali the government of the whole of Syria and the district of Adana. The arrangement displeased the Sultan: shortly after (1835), he deprived the dynasty of Karamanli of the Province of Tripoli, in Africa, and included it in his own dominions: this encouraged his hope of revenge on the Viceroy of Egypt, and he bent all his efforts on reorganising his army. The Powers were apprehensive of the consequences of a fresh rupture, and sought to reconcile Sultan and Viceroy. For a time they were successful, but in 1837 war broke out again between the two, and again the Turks were defeated.

Again European diplomacy enforced a cessation of hostilities and attempted to arrange a durable peace: the Turk in the meanwhile attempted to set his house in order by introducing much-needed reforms: these were undertaken by the advice of Rescid Pasha, the Turkish Foreign Minister, who, on November 4, 1839, published the famous decree (*hatti-cherif*), dated from Gülhané (the garden of the Sultan); this decree promised a just and equal administration for all Turkish subjects, both Turks and Christians.

This was the first step taken by the Ottoman government towards modern civilisation: it is known as 'Tanzimat'—an Arabic word which signifies 'reform.' In reality, however, the reforms introduced were few and ineffective, and even these lost much of their power owing to the opposition of the Old Turkish Party and to the passive resistance of the bureaucracy.

The Powers, who sought a solution of the Eastern problem, could not agree on the proper method to be employed. In Egypt, the Viceroy had employed both French

officers and officials, and France was proud of the prestige she enjoyed in that country and desirous of increasing it: she, therefore, determined to support Mehemet Ali in the quarrel. Adolphe Thiers, who was Prime Minister, sought to bring about a direct reconciliation between the Sultan and Mehemet: he was confident that if he could succeed in doing this the other Powers would be forced to recognise the compact, since disunion among themselves would hinder any attempt at its destruction. But the secret negotiations of France became known to Palmerston, who was jealous of French influence, and by an agreement with the other Powers, he proposed to ruin these negotiations.

The Czar Nicholas I. was a determined opponent of Louis Philippe—'the King of the barricades,' as he contemptuously termed him: in order to humiliate France he therefore accepted the English proposal. Frederick William of Prussia, who had just come to the throne, was alarmed in common with all Germany at the reappearance of French ambition: therefore he, too, was happy to enter the coalition against France. Austria naturally joined the other three Powers.

Therefore, on July 1, 1840, the representatives of the four Great Powers signed a convention at London, by which it was arranged that Mehemet should restore Crete, Adana, Northern Syria, and the Holy Cities of Arabia to the Sultan: in lieu he was to receive the hereditary government of Egypt and the government of Syria for his natural life. If within ten days of receiving this communication he refused to accept these conditions, Egypt alone should be guaranteed to him: and should he remain recalcitrant for yet another ten days, the Powers would not pledge themselves to any concession.

. . . .

This Treaty, which seemed aimed at the exclusion of France from the European Concert, and which compelled her to stand by in impotence and watch the ruin of her client, roused intense exasperation in the minds of the French people: they looked on the Eastern Question as one of their national honour: their most bellicose instincts were unfettered and the *Marseillaise* resounded everywhere. The

French Government had obtained permission from England to transport into France the ashes of the great Napoleon: even this event contributed to excite public opinion, since it reminded Frenchmen of the military glory of the Empire.

The young Louis Napoleon, who had taken refuge in London, determined to profit by this ebullition of renewed enthusiasm for the memory of his uncle: and he decided to attempt the reconquest of the throne of France. Some officers who were quartered at Boulogne entered into a conspiracy with him, and on August 6, 1840, he disembarked in the neighbourhood of this town, hoping to raise an insurrection among the garrison: But again his attempt was foiled. He attempted to return to the ship which had carried him from England, but he fell into the sea, and was saved from drowning by the efforts of those who had come to arrest him. He was brought before the French House of Peers and sentenced to perpetual imprisonment in the fortress of Ham, a town in the department of the Somme.

During this episode, which aroused the mirth of the majority of the nation, Thiers, whose pride and patriotism had been deeply wounded by Palmerston's counter plans, prepared boldly to face a European conflict. He strengthened the army and navy and asked for a vote of one hundred millions of francs for the fortification of Paris. The nation seemed in complete accord with him: the rupture of the Treaty of 1815 was openly discussed, and it was proposed to reconquer the Rhine frontier. This patriotic effervescence in France and the threat of aggression roused the German national instinct.

At Leipzig the commemoration of the invention of the printing-press became the occasion of a great national manifestation; it may be said that the year 1840 marked a decisive date in the preparation of German unity.

In the meantime the hopes of Thiers had been disappointed; he had confidently expected that Mehemet Ali would have bravely held out till the spring, and that in the meanwhile the Quadruple Alliance would have dissolved. But the Anglo-Austrian fleet bombarded Beirut on September 11, and obliged the Egyptians to abandon that city. Mehemet's troops soon evacuated the whole of Syria; Thiers still

continued to vociferate and threaten, but King Louis Philippe did not desire to run the risk of a European War, and when Thiers submitted to him the text of the Speech which he was to read on the re-opening of the Chamber, its too bellicose tone was not approved by the King. On this Thiers resigned (October 20, 1840). The new Ministry, nominally under the Presidency of Marshal Soult, but really representing the views of Guizot, the Foreign Minister, displayed pacific tendencies. The English fleet, too, had arrived at Alexandria, and under its threat of bombardment Mehemet Ali decided to submit, contenting himself with the hereditary government of Egypt.

These events naturally irritated France against the other Powers, but at the same time she felt uneasy at her own isolation. The other States shared this feeling, and negotiations were initiated in order to admit France once more into the Concert of Europe. The four Allied Powers signed a protocol by which they declared the Egyptian Question to be closed and the clauses of the Convention of the previous year abrogated: with the participation of France, a new Treaty was concluded on July 13, 1841, called 'The Convention of the Straits,' by which the closing of the Bosphorous and of the Dardanelles to all ships of war was fixed as a principle of international law: the only exceptions to this rule were the lighter war-craft in the service of the various embassies at Constantinople.

England was the only country which had profited by this crisis, and her influence as a World Power increased and solidified daily. This was due entirely to the work of Palmerston, who judged every situation from the point of view of English interests. His patriotism was violent, egotistic, greedy, and scornful of men, nations, and theories: but however distasteful it might be to other nations, it increased the grandeur of his own country and excited the enthusiasm of the populace, who were proud of 'Pam,' as they delighted to call their great Minister.

The political checkmate he had inflicted on France had weakened her influence in the East, and had permitted Palmerston to occupy the desert rock of Aden in order to secure English commerce in the Red Sea. At the same

time he carefully watched the ambitions of Russia in Asia: the latter Power was seeking to advance in Central Asia, either by the conquest of Turkestan or by the insinuation of her influence in Afghanistan and Persia: everywhere the English succeeded in rendering fruitless the designs of Russia. It was at this time that England completed her conquest of India.

The East India Company had renounced the formula by which it had described itself as the 'Vicar of the Great Mogul,' and at Delhi, the ancient capital of his Empire, it proclaimed its independent sovereignty. Gradually, as it assumed this character, the Company was compelled to relinquish its commercial monopolies, since, as a sovereign, it could not put its own interests in opposition to those of its subjects. In 1813 the English Parliament reconfirmed to the Company its possession of the Indian Dominions for twenty years, but it had taken from it the monopoly of English commerce with India, leaving to it its Chinese monopoly alone; even this was suppressed at the expiration of the Convention in 1833; thus the Company finally lost all its commercial attributes: the income of its shareholders was derived exclusively from the land taxes exacted from native cultivators.

Prosecuting her scheme of expansion, England also opened China to Europe. Till now, the commerce of China with the West had been confined to the Portuguese settlement of Macao and to the European factories established in the neighbourhood of Canton: here, however, the Europeans were only allowed to stay for the period strictly necessary for the transaction of their commercial affairs, and then were obliged to return to Macao, where their families resided. Chinese functionaries often impeded and ruined English commerce, and the remonstrances of the various European Governments had hitherto been in vain. By the so-called Opium War the English obliged the Chinese to sign the Treaty of Nankin (1842), by which the Chinese opened to foreigners the five ports of Canton, Amoy, Fusciu, Ningpo, and Shanghai: the island of Hong Kong was also ceded to England, and China paid to her a heavy war indemnity. By this enterprise the English inaugurated a new

era in the history of China, and at the same time they acquired new territory in the island of Hong Kong, at the entrance to the Bay of Canton; from a sterile rock they soon transformed this possession to a flourishing colony.

Henceforth the colonies assumed an important part in the economical life of Great Britain.

. . . .

In the Mediterranean, Gibraltar,—occupied in 1704,—Malta, and the Ionian Islands were essentially strategic points: but in the other parts of the world England possessed colonies important both for their extent and their population.

Canada was a former French colony which had been ceded to England by the Peace of 1763,—it had remained faithful to its new sovereign during the rebellion of those other English colonies which are now known as the United States: in 1791 it had obtained a Constitution from the English Parliament by which it had been divided into two provinces:—Lower Canada and Upper Canada: the former, with its capital of Quebec, was chiefly occupied by settlers of French extraction, while the latter, with its capital of Toronto, was populated by English: each of these provinces had an elective assembly and a Governor. Even during the second war of independence of the United States (1812-1815), these colonies demonstrated their fidelity to England. But a hostile feeling existed between the differing sections of French Catholics and English Protestants. Since the latter element appeared to be favoured by the Governors, the French population nourished an increasing enmity towards the Government. For a long time this feeling was exhibited solely in the legal camp, but in 1837 it broke out into open insurrection. This was repressed, and the Government took advantage of the rising to suppress the Constitution.

But the English Government was not slow to perceive that the policy of reconciliation was preferable to that of severity: it had the wisdom, in 1840, to vote the so-called Act of Union, by which the Provinces were fused into one only, under a Constitutional Government: the capital was fixed at Montreal. The first Canadian Parliament was opened in March, 1841, and marked the beginning of a

complete reconciliation. Canada then numbered a little more than a million inhabitants.

The maritime colonies did not possess much importance: they consisted of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Prince Edward's Island, the Island of Newfoundland, inhabited by fisher-folk, and the Bermudas, which were discovered by a Spaniard named Bermudes, but colonised by the Englishman, Somers, and therefore called Somers' Islands.

Jamaica, however, was the most populous and the richest of the English colonies of North America: it had been occupied by the English in 1655 and had possessed from that period a legislative assembly. In this island the negro population was predominant: therefore, the emancipation of slaves, which was voted by the English Parliament in 1833, produced grave consequences in Jamaica and in the Antilles also, since the latter group of islands also possessed a large negro population: the hostility between the two races was very marked, and the proprietors, in order to supply the lack of labour, were forced to have recourse to Chinese coolies.

British Honduras, British Guiana, and the Falkland Islands, the latter of which faced the Straits of Magellan and had been occupied in 1834, had no great population.

In Africa, without mentioning the islands of Saint Helena and Ascension and the unimportant settlements of the Guinea Coast, the Treaty of 1815 had confirmed to England the possession of Cape Colony, which had been taken from the Dutch in 1806: naturally, the original Dutch settlers, who were called 'boers' (peasants), were dissatisfied with the change, and this discontent was increased by the abolition of slavery, which caused them grave financial losses. The native Kaffir tribes saw with grief the advance of the white man: in the district of Natal, Kaffir chiefs rebelled: they organised their tribes in a military manner and began to attack the villages and farms of the colonists: but, in 1834, the Governor—Urban—who gave his name to the principal port of this district, conducted a victorious expedition against them. At the same time many of the Dutch colonists, irritated against the English, began (1836) their emigrations towards the interior: these treks gave origin

later to the Orange Free State, situated between the Orange River and the Vaal. A group of these settlers, led by Andreas Pretorius, settled in Natal: but the English Governor occupied their capital of Pietermaritzburg and obtained their submission. In 1843 Natal was officially annexed to Cape Colony, though it was still separated from the latter by territory which was occupied by independent Kaffirs.

On the road to India the English possessed the Island of Mauritius, which was seized from the French in 1810: from that point they attempted to establish their influence in the vast Island of Madagascar. At the entrance of the Red Sea they had occupied Aden: to the south of India, they possessed the large Island of Ceylon—a former Dutch Colony, taken from Holland in the Napoleonic Wars: on the other side of the Indian Ocean their possessions in the Straits of Malacca assured their entry into the Chinese Sea, where, besides the Island of Hong Kong, they had already established naval stations on the northern coast of Borneo.

At the same time the colonisation of Australia assumed importance owing to the influx of many free emigrants: from 1787 to this epoch it had simply served as a convict settlement: to the first colony, New South Wales, which had for its capital Sydney, many others were added: Van Dieman's Land or Tasmania, capital Hobart (1825); Western Australia, capital Perth (1829); South Australia, capital Adelaide (1834); and, not long after, the English Settlements of the two Islands of New Zealand were established.

In 1840 penal deportation to New South Wales was suppressed, since that province had developed a notable prosperity: longings for autonomy were soon manifested in this province, and the English Government, in order to avoid an agitation, granted it a Statute in 1842, by which the Governor was assisted by a legislative assembly composed of 36 members, of whom 24 were elective. Thus, in this far-off colony was founded that representative system which England introduced later into all those of her colonies where a European population was predominant.

In initiating this new policy of autonomy, England assured to herself the devotion of her colonies.

. . . .

With the accession of Queen Victoria to the English throne (1837), the scandalous life of the Court ceased: under the later kings Court frivolity had deprived the monarchy of much prestige. The whole nation soon manifested its cordial sympathy for their new Sovereign, who was young and of a charming and attractive disposition: she also added to the simplicity of her manners an extensive culture.

In 1840 she married the German Prince, Albert of Saxe Coburg Gotha: like her, he was born in 1819 and was a nephew of Leopold, King of the Belgians. Both the Queen and her Consort were animated by the most excellent intentions, and understood each other perfectly: in fact, the Prince Consort became the most valued counsellor of the Queen: with great tact he knew both how to maintain his position as Prince Consort and how to conquer the prejudices of the English aristocracy against a foreigner. The country still continued its magnificent development: the railway construction made rapid progress: in 1838 the first English steamboat crossed the Atlantic: in 1840 a great postal reform was introduced, by which, instead of the receiver paying on letters a sum varying with the distance covered, a uniform tariff of one penny was charged on each letter: this system resulted in an immense increase of correspondence, and was soon adopted on the continent.

But, in spite of this economic progress, great misery existed among the working classes: a succession of bad harvests increased the price of bread enormously. The celebrated economist and philanthropist, Richard Cobden, in 1835, formed with the distinguished orator, John Bright, the Anti-Corn Law League—a union of propagandists who were determined that the duty on all cereals should be suppressed.

While he and his friends with exemplary ardour dedicated all their powers to the attainment of this reform, the Radical group, on the other hand, continued their agitation for political reforms. This group was energetically supported by the first Socialist organisations, which were founded at this time.

Six articles of a People's Charter were formulated:—

annual elections, universal suffrage, secret voting, equal electoral circumscription, the right of being elected without conditions, and payment of members of Parliament. After many tumultuous meetings in 1839 the Chartists presented a petition to Parliament which bore more than a million signatures, and since the House of Commons scornfully ignored it, the demonstrators assumed a more violent attitude. The tumults excited by the Radicals were energetically suppressed.

Simultaneously, in Ireland, the Tribune O'Connell announced that the year 1843 would signalise the separation of Ireland from England: he organised enormous meetings, in which the minds of the Irish were excited to violence. Finally, O'Connell was forbidden by the Government to hold meetings and was arrested and committed for trial: he subsequently went abroad, and, after travelling in Italy, died at Genoa in 1847.

All these difficult problems had come into being during the Conservative Ministry of Sir Robert Peel and had continued under the Liberal Ministry, which had been brought to power by the elections of 1841. Peel rejected every idea of political reform, but he sought to conciliate the minds of the people by an attempt to maintain a just equilibrium of social interests: in Ireland, he greatly augmented the State subsidy of the Catholic Seminary of Maynooth.

In the summer of 1845 potato disease made its first appearance: this destroyed the principal nutriment of Ireland, and produced in that country a pitiful scarcity and an enormous emigration. The misery of the working classes in England was also great, and Tom Hood's *Song of the Shirt*, which was written in the Christmas of that year, was its effective expression. Under similar circumstances, Sir Robert Peel, who till then had steadily opposed the Cobden propaganda, was persuaded of the necessity of abolishing the protectionist duties; he had the boldness and honesty to carry out the conviction which the force of facts had imposed on him, and in 1846 he proposed the abolition of the duty on corn.

During the memorable debate, which lasted full twelve days, he said, 'I ask you to approve of this measure, since

cheapness and abundance in the country will aid in diminishing crime and in elevating morality.'

Among the Conservatives who fought this great economic reform with the greatest tenacity was a young and already celebrated novelist, who was destined to play an important rôle in English politics. This was Benjamin Disraeli, whose Hebrew ancestors had emigrated from Spain to Venice when the Jews had been expelled from Spain; from Venice they had emigrated to England in the seventeenth century in order to seek their fortune—an end which they had succeeded in attaining. Disraeli's father, together with the young Benjamin, had been converted to the Anglican cult in 1817, when the boy was only twelve years old. The young Disraeli was a lover of pleasure and luxury, and thrust himself into aristocratic society without heeding the disdain which his Hebrew descent procured for him: full of genius, ambition, and courage, when his novels had gained for him celebrity, he entered into political life as a representative of rigid conservative principles.

His first speech in the House, on December 7, 1837, was a disaster: he was forced to cut short his speech and to resume his seat in silence amid the laughter and jeers of his colleagues: as he sat down he uttered the words, 'A day will come when you shall hear me.' In fact, he became one of the most finished orators of the House of Commons.

He meditated an infusion of new life into the Conservative Party by forming an alliance with the Radical Party, in order, as he said, to found the Party of Young England. But during this time, unfortunately, he gave way to the dictates of disappointed ambition, and because Peel had neither deigned to flatter him or to promote him, he fought, from this ignoble motive, every reform of the great Minister.

The Conservative Party divided over the proposed reform, which was passed at length by the support of the Liberal Party. But the passing of the Bill marked the end of the political career of Sir Robert Peel. Those Conservatives who were indignant with him on account of his suppression of the Corn Laws seized the first opportunity which presented itself, when Peel was no longer supported by the Liberal Party, and voted solidly against him; this

forced his resignation. On June 29, 1846, he resigned. On this occasion he uttered the following generous words:—

'I may, perhaps, leave behind me a name which will be severely blamed by those who bitterly deplore the rupture of Party ties, and who are convinced that fidelity to Party pledges and the maintenance of great Parties are powerful and essential means of government. Others will also blame me, who, apart from personal interest, believe the principle of Protection necessary to the prosperity of the country. I shall leave a name detested by the controllers of monopolies, who, for less honourable motives, demand a protection, by which they profit. But perhaps also I may leave a name which will sometimes be pronounced with gratitude in the cottages of those who earn their bread by the sweat of their brow, and who will remember me when they recruit their strength with a food which is abundant and free of duty—with a food which will taste to them all the sweeter since no sentiment of injustice will embitter it.'

This great reform not only did not ruin agriculture, as some had feared, but improved it, since it forced the proprietors to introduce methods of scientific progress: on the other hand, the prodigious development of industry and commerce impelled England more and more towards the principles of Free Trade: the new Russell-Palmerston Ministry had only to follow the policy inaugurated by Sir Robert Peel.

. . . .

But in France, whilst the country progressed with an assured step, the Government had halted. In the first ten years of his reign, Louis Philippe had been forced to resist Legitimist and Republican opposition, and Bonapartist attempts: he now believed that all dangers were conquered and that therefore he could adopt a policy of quiescence. But the great development of industry and commerce increased the importance and the numbers of the working classes. This section of the community, seeing the riches and the luxury of their employers, considered themselves as a sweated class and began to give favourable reception to the doctrine of a few advanced thinkers, who severely and acutely criticised the crimes of the middle class and

attributed the cause to its economic organisation. Louis Blanc formulated the Rights of Labour, while Eugène Sue contrasted the nobility of mind of the poorer classes with the egotism of the rich. In this way, even in the great cities of France, a Socialist Party began to rise, though it was still weak and disorganised. It joined itself to the remnants of the Republican Party, which also lacked leaders. These Parties had no legal standing nor means of enforcing their opinion, therefore the Government ignored them: the Chamber only represented the views of a minority of the nation, and thought its position was secured by the support of the middle classes. The King, who was seventy years of age in the year 1843, did not understand the new era of thought: his eldest son, who enjoyed great popularity, died in 1842 in a carriage accident; with his death, a cord, which united the dynasty with the nation, was severed, since his son, the Count de Paris, was hardly four years old. The Minister Guizot was in perfect agreement with the King that there was no need of any reform.

But this Minister, though he still followed a quiescent policy, possessed for seven successive years the votes of the majority of the Chamber: apparently, therefore, no one could blame the King for enforcing a policy which was not conformable to the will of Parliament. But in, reality, one half of the total number of deputies was composed of functionaries of State, while the thirty or forty other deputies who were necessary to obtain a majority in the Chamber were bought by concessions of public works or other similar methods of corruption: not only so, but when the time for the selections arrived, the support of the electors for the Government candidate was assured by the grant of many personal favours. Guizot, who was personally scrupulously honest, made corruption his system of government. Thus, not even that small portion of the country which possessed electoral rights—a little more than 200,000—could make its voice heard in the government of the country.

The Socialists and Republicans demanded nothing less than universal suffrage: but the Liberal Opposition, which, in spite of prevailing conditions, had been formed, only requested a Parliamentary reform which would diminish

the number of those deputies who were members of the Civil Service, and an electoral reform which would remove, in some measure, the stigma of corruption from the elections. Guizot and the King refused to make the smallest concession: secure of the support of the Chamber, they ignored the agitation, which was being spread by means of journalism throughout the country.

The Foreign Policy, which was almost servile, rendered the Government still more unpopular. With the exception of the Algerian Campaign, the Government, to all appearance, did not sufficiently guard the dignity, honour, and interests of France, and, indeed, the general public took little interest in the war in Algiers, except when a more than usually important engagement took place. King Louis Philippe, after the disorders of 1840, had deemed it opportune to cement cordial relations with England, and for this purpose had given way to the demands of England on every occasion. Only on one question did he dare to withstand the will of the latter Power: but this was dictated by simple dynastic reasons.

In Spain, a heated contest had arisen at the conclusion of the Carlist War, between the Moderates and the Progressivists. The Queen Regent, Maria Cristina, supported the Moderates, but her prestige was not great. But General Espartero, who favoured the Progressivists, was at the height of popularity owing to his victories over the Carlists. The Queen Regent, in consequence of violent disorders which had broken out here and there, was forced to leave Spain, entrusting her two children to the courage and patriotism of Espartero. He was appointed Regent of the Cortes: but Spain was not tranquil, even under his government. Espartero severely suppressed the riots and ordered Barcelona to be bombarded: but the riots and tumults continued. In 1843 Espartero was compelled to fly the country, and took refuge in England. In November, 1843, the Cortes proclaimed the majority of Isabella II., who then completed her thirteenth year: she recalled her mother, but the power remained in the hands of General Narvaez.

The really important question which now interested the Courts of Europe was the marriage of the Queen.

England would have preferred her to marry a Coburg—a cousin of Prince Albert—the Consort of Queen Victoria: France put forward the claims of one of the sons of Louis Philippe: Austria suggested the son of Don Carlos. The reciprocal conflict of interests brought about the rejection of all these candidates. A Spanish cousin of the Queen was now brought forward—Francisco d'Assisi, who was a brother of Ferdinando VII. and of Don Carlos. This prince was under the age of twenty-five years, but his health was more than indifferent: the Queen did not hide her dislike for his character or her contempt for his dullness of intellect. Louis Philippe was greatly interested in concluding this marriage, since this might give him also the opportunity of marrying his son, the Duke de Montpensier, to Isabella's sister—the Infanta, Luisa Fernanda. The line of reasoning adopted by Louis Philippe was this:—if, as was probable, the Queen Isabella should have no children by her husband, the crown of Spain would pass to the descendants of Montpensier. With the vision of settling one branch of his family on the throne of Spain, Louis Philippe desired to finish the negotiations as speedily as possible: he therefore broke the pledge he had given to Queen Victoria, and on the 10th of October, 1846, successfully concluded the two marriages.

Naturally, Queen Isabella's marriage was an unhappy one, and she sought consolation in the friendship of the young General Serrano. But so far as international politics were concerned, the Spanish marriages definitely broke off the cordial relations hitherto existing between the Courts of England and France. Lord Palmerston, who at that moment had been appointed Minister of Foreign Affairs in the Russell Liberal Cabinet, was not slow in taking advantage of this opportunity of showing his animosity to France.

This division of the Western Powers enabled the Absolutist Governments to attempt the solution of a problem which had faced them for some time.

. . . .

After the ferocious repression of the Polish Rebellion of 1830-1831, the small Republic of Cracow had become the refuge of all those Polish patriots who were meditating new insurrections, either in Russian Poland, in the Prussian

Duchy of Posen, or in Austrian Galicia. In order to eliminate this peril, the three Northern Powers, in the spring of 1846, occupied the city; and since they were now secure from the danger of interference by either France or England, they held a conference in Vienna in November of that year, in which they concluded a Convention by which Cracow and its district was annexed to Austrian territory, while Austria ceded to Russia and Prussia a few Cantons of Galicia in exchange. This Convention marked the end of Poland.

The two Western Powers contented themselves with polite diplomatic protests, delivered separately, to the three Northern Powers: but the populations of the whole of civilised Europe felt the repercussion of the Cracow episode. For this act of brutality, aimed at the Polish nation, was accomplished precisely at the time when there was a vigorous recrudescence of the sentiment of nationality throughout Europe.

In the dominions of Austria herself an extraordinary outburst of national sentiment marked the event. In particular, Hungary, though it enjoyed its own government, more boldly affirmed its aspirations for a greater autonomy.

It had preserved its ancient Diet, which was divided into two Assemblies: the Table of Magnates, in which the great nobles sat by right of hereditary descent, and the Table of States, which was composed of 110 nobles, nominated by the 55 Committees into which the realm was divided, two representatives of the cities, and the Croatian Deputies. The Diet, which had been convoked in 1833, demanded that the Emperor-King should visit Hungary more frequently; that the meetings of the Diet should take place at Pest instead of at the German town of Presburg, and that the Magyar tongue should be adopted as the official language instead of the Latin which had hitherto been used. In these demands of national character all the Hungarians were agreed: but they were divided on the question of political reforms into a Conservative and a Liberal Party.

The social organisation of Hungary was still mediæval; the nobles numbered about 700,000, and they, only, could consider themselves as citizens, though they paid no taxes. The first attack on this latter privilege was made with the

approval of the Diet: it consisted in the demand that the nobles should pay the tax for foot passengers over the suspension bridge—newly constructed over the Danube at Pest. The Diet also approved several peasant reforms, and thus the transformation of this feudal society was begun.

In order to spread the reports of the decisions passed by the Diet through the country, which now began to take an intelligent interest in such matters, a young lawyer named Louis Kossuth founded a political journal in the Magyar tongue: his bold language brought about his arrest, and he was imprisoned for two years. This fact procured for him an immense popularity.

The Diet, which had been summoned in 1833, sat for three years and four months: when the Government declared, in 1835, that its sessions were suspended, it permitted the text of the laws to be compiled in the Magyar tongue: in the Diet of 1839-1840, Magyar was finally declared to be the official language. Henceforth the linguistic question became the form under which claims to autonomy were manifested.

But in the kingdom of Hungary, Hungarians were in a minority: the Croat nationality was the most prominent, among the others, since it was more compact in form: it, also, had its own official Government under a native Governor—the Ban—and above all it possessed its own history of the Middle Ages. The Croats were unwilling to submit to Hungarian supremacy. The struggle began to be apparent in the Diet of 1843, in which the Hungarians proposed that the Magyar tongue should be definitely established as the only one that could be legitimately used in Parliamentary debates: the Croat deputies still continued to speak Latin, as they had done for centuries: but whenever a Croat began a speech with the accustomed formula, 'Excellentissime Domine,' the Hungarians refused to allow him to continue.

By a decree, dated 1844, the Government recognised the Magyar as the official language of the Diet, but it permitted the Croats to preserve the Latin language for another six years. The Croats, in their turn, in 1845, declared the Croat language to be the official tongue in the Provincial

Diet of Agram. A dispute, pregnant with danger, was thus accentuated in Hungary.

The Nationalist tendencies of the Southern Slavs awoke a sympathetic echo in the hearts of the Northern Slavs who inhabited the Austrian Empire: in particular, the Czechs, who formed the majority of the Bohemian race, asserted their nationality: so that, in Bohemia, Slav nationality awoke and manifested itself in an enthusiasm for the Czech tongue, and in an attempt to sustain it against the prevalent German language.

The German provinces of the Monarchy in which these conflicting tendencies did not exist appeared more tranquil; but even here Liberal aspirations filtered through to the populace and found vent, at the sittings of the Provincial Diets, in demands for reform.

But the country where the national awakening assumed a dangerous aspect was Italy: if, in country districts, the peasants were indifferent to every political idea, in the cities, on the other hand, the hatred of foreign domination became every day more general.

As a matter of fact, in these years, Italians, not only in the Lombardo-Veneto, but from one end of the Peninsula to the other, manifested daily a greater interest in their national rights. In 1843, at Brussels, a book was published which soon became famous: *The Moral and Civil Primacy of Italy.*

It was the work of an Italian priest, Vincenzo Gioberti, who had been an exile from Florence since 1833. In this volume he celebrated the past glories of Italy and lamented its present misery: but he added, 'With a little goodwill and determination we may still become, without agitation, revolution, or injustice, one of the first nations of the world.' He sought to harmonise the theories of revolution with the reality of things; he renounced the Mazzinian aspiration for unity, which he considered impracticable, and he was satisfied with the idea of a Confederation of States existing under the Presidency of the Pope: he expressed the hope that both Pope and Princes, when they had once become imbued with the principles of justice and piety, would unite themselves fraternally with their peoples.

Vincenzo Gioberti participated in that democratic Catholic movement which then appeared throughout all Europe: he declared that the Italian Renaissance should have as its base the corner-stone of the Pontificate. He added: 'Rome, the religious capital, should be as well the civil and moral metropolis of civilisation and of the human race: as Rome is the privileged seat of Christian wisdom, Piedmont should also be the principal centre of Italian military force: hence on Rome and Turin hangs the fate of Italy.'

This book, which by its singular temperance of thought and by its eulogy of the Pope and Princes was not prohibited, was widely circulated in the Peninsula, and excited great enthusiasm amongst Liberals: the latter party were persuaded by the Giobertian ideas to abandon secret societies and conspiracies for a more practical road.

Just at this time came a new cry of revolt, with the tragic episode of the brothers Bandiera. The latter were two Venetian youths—officers in the Austrian Navy. They were full of patriotic enthusiasm and had decided to consecrate their lives to the redemption of Italy. In agreement with another Venetian officer, named Domenico Moro, they had planned to capture the frigate on which they served: but before they could put this idea into execution, they had reason to believe that their plot had been discovered, and they fled to Corfù. Here a rumour reached them that a revolution had broken out in Calabria: with seventeen companions they embarked for that district in order to aid the insurgents: but before their arrival the rising had been suppressed. These few youths found themselves surrounded by a numerous body of troops: after a brief struggle they were captured and taken to Cosenza, where, on July 27, 1844, nine of their number, among whom were the brothers Bandiera and Domenico Moro, were shot. They fell under the Bourbon bullets, shouting joyously to the few and mute spectators of this terrible scene, 'Long live Italy!'

Mazzini and Gioberti were both animated by an intense patriotic enthusiasm; both had a full and fervent faith in the destiny of Italy, and both prophesied it clearly, affirming that from Rome the regeneration of mankind should again

spring to light: but Gioberti believed that he had found an easy and practical way of solving the Italian problem, and was contented with demanding reforms, whilst Mazzini wished to destroy all the existing States of the Italian Peninsula in order to make room for one alone,—the Italian Republic. Hence he gathered to himself the hottest and nost excitable temperaments, while the more moderate Liberals followed the Giobertian ideas. In the end the latter founded that party which is called Neo-Guelf, since it desired to place the Pope at the head of the Liberal movement.

Another Piedmontese writer, Cesare Balbo, fostered this last idea in his book, *The Hopes of Italy*. He maintained that the first aspiration of the Italian should be one of national independence: this alone should exclude Austria from the Italian League. He suggested that the approaching downfall of Turkey pointed out to Austria that her true way of advance lay in the Balkan Peninsula: there she could extend her Empire and cede the Lombardo-Veneto to Italy. Yet neither did the Austrian Government show itself disposed to carry out such intentions, nor did the Government of the Pope, Gregory XVI., justify the enthusiasm for the Papacy displayed by Gioberti.

As public opinion gradually awoke, King Carlo Alberto felt quickening within him his former patriotic ambitions: his aspirations were, in part, fettered by his profound religious sentiment, which bordered on mysticism. This alone alienated him from every friend of political liberty, since in their ideas he saw a menace, not only to the throne, but to the altar also. This attitude of mind did not, however, prevent him from aiming at national independence.

In 1845, Massimo D'Azeglio, in a familiar conversation with Carlo Alberto, received from him the mission of conveying the information to the Liberals of the other Provinces of Italy, that when the decisive moment arrived they could count on the King. In April, 1846, the Piedmontese King dared to face the indignation of the Austrian Government on a question of Customs dues: compared with the servility of all the other Italian States his opposition may be regarded as a piece of great hardihood. But the kindling spark of the

new life of Italy was not destined to spring from Carlo Alberto.

. . . .

Political activity in Switzerland for a long time had been concentrated in individual cantons: in many of these, the Liberal Party succeeded in modifying the Constitution by democratic reforms, in the hope that the Federal Pact might also be reformed. But interwoven with these political questions, religious animosities assumed such an importance as to induce, in the year 1845, the seven Catholic Cantons of Lucerne, Uri, Schwytz, Unterwald, Zug, Fribourg, and the Valais to form a separate League, called the Sonderbund.

The Federal Diet ordered its dissolution, but the Sonderbund decided to resist this command. In November, 1847, the Federal troops occupied Lucerne and Fribourg: the troops of the Sonderbund then dispersed and the Catholics immediately offered their submission. Thus the lay party, which demanded centralisation, triumphed over that of Sectarianism and decentralisation. It was then that the Federal Party saw the necessity of making changes in the Constitution of 1815: the Canton of Neuchâtel took advantage of these circumstances to fling off the yoke of the King of Prussia, and reorganised itself in agreement with Republican forms of Government.

The Swiss Constitution of 1848 substituted for a Federation of States one Federal Government, which was organised in such a manner as to provide a strong Central power. A new Assembly was also constituted in place of the former and ancient Diet: it possessed two Chambers:—a National Council, which was directly elected by the people, and a State Council, which consisted of deputies from each individual Canton,—two deputies representing each Canton. The executive power was centred in a Federal Council, which was formed of seven members elected from the Assembly, for the space of three years, and the seat of Government was fixed at Berne. Finally Federal power had vanquished the Cantonal system.

CHAPTER V

REFORMS AND REVOLUTIONS

Election of Pius IX. amid general enthusiasm : Reforms in the Pontifical State and in Piedmont : Cavour a journalist : Conditions of the Lombardo-Veneto and of the Duchies of Modena and Parma, on the eve of 1848 *: The Sicilian Revolution : The First Constitutions in Italy : The French Revolution of* 1848 *: Deposition of Louis Philippe : Provisional Republican Government.—New Electoral Laws in Belgium. —Revision of the Dutch Constitution.—End of the Chartist Agitation in England.—Government of Narvaez in Spain.—The Constitution in the Pontifical State.—The Insurrection in Venice and the 'Five Days' of Milan.—Beginning of the War of Independence : Austrian Victories : Armistice* (*August* 9, 1848).—*War of Ferdinand II. against Sicily.—Flight of the Pope and of the Grand Duke.—The Rising in Vienna of March* 13, 1848 *: Autonomy of Hungary and social reforms : Concessions to Bohemia : New Rising at Vienna and the Triumph of Democracy* (*May* 5) *: The Slav Congress of Prague : Submission of Bohemia* (*June,* 1848).—*Radetzky and the Submission of the Lombardo-Veneto.—Constituent Assembly : Abolition of Feudal Rights.—Jellalich, the Ban of Croatia, and the Hungarian Government : Kossuth and the rupture of Hungary with the Imperial Court.—The Revolt of October* 6 *in Vienna : Re-occupation of Vienna.—Abdication of Ferdinand I. in favour of his nephew, Franz Josef* (*December* 2, 1848). —*The Campaign against Hungary : First Austrian Successes.— Closing of Parliament : The Constitution of March* 4, 1849.—*Germany : Liberal aspirations and manifestations of desire for unity.—March* 18 *and* 19, 1848, *at Berlin.—The National Parliament at Frankfort. —The Question of the Danish Duchies.—The First successes of Reaction—Dissolution of the Prussian Chambers.—Changes of the French Republic : From the* 23*rd to the* 26*th of June : Defeat of the Socialist Party : The Republican Constitution : Election of Louis Napoleon to the Presidency* (*December,* 1848).

New ideas are like those strong perfumes which penetrate into places which would seem to be hermetically sealed: and absolutely barred to all new ideas was the Papal Court during the fifteen years pontificate of Gregory XVI. Yet, hardly had he died (June 1, 1846) when a prevalent current of Liberal ideas entered into the Conclave with the election of Giovanni Mastai-Ferretti, who assumed the title of Pius IX. He inaugurated his Pontificate with the grant of an amnesty to political prisoners. In the minds of those Italians who had already been influenced by the Neo-Guelf Party,

this step alone was sufficient to foster the illusion that a Pontiff had at last arrived who should restore the liberty and the grandeur of the country. A splendid enthusiasm, therefore, was manifested for Pius IX., which assumed greater proportions when it was known that he had nominated a commission of Cardinals, who were to inquire into the reforms that might be found necessary to the well-being of the Papal State: this enthusiasm was not diminished when the Pope gave orders that plans of railway construction should be proceeded with, since his predecessor, Gregory XVI., had forbidden the introduction of railways into the Papal State. Each time that the Pope issued from his Palace he became the object of delirious acclamations from the crowd, who, in the cry of 'Long live Pius IX.', concentrated the expression of the hopes and the vows of Italy.

Pius IX. abandoned himself with joy to the pleasurable emotions of popularity: but the majority of the members of the Roman Curia was composed of tenacious adherents of the old ideas, and these, aided by the Ambassadors of the Absolutist Powers, among which latter Austria figured conspicuously, sought to restrain the Pope from prosecuting this new policy: Pius IX. possessed no very clear or precise ideas on the subject, and his wish to please everybody prevented him from coming to any definite conclusion. Months passed, and none of the proposed reforms were actuated. Thereupon the people began to manifest their desires more clearly: the liberty of the Press was usurped rather than conceded; political journals began to appear in the two principal cities of the State—Rome and Bologna—in January, 1847, and with them came the institution of various clubs. Finally, in April, 1847, the Pope announced the appearance of that State Council which had been demanded by the insurgents of Rimini in 1845; but, owing to the ill-will of the Curia, it first assembled on the 15th of November.

Thus, more than a year had passed without any changes in the essential governmental methods of the Pontifical State; but one moral fact of extraordinary gravity had been verified: the impetuous awakening of the national conscience. The belief that the Head of Christianity, who had till then

been considered the enemy of all new ideas, supported reform, profoundly moved the whole Peninsula.

The first province to feel the effects of this emotion was the neighbouring one of Tuscany: the demonstrations which had there been made in honour of the new Pope, and which had been organised with the especial object of spurring on the Grand Duke to follow his example, had been tolerated by the mild government of Leopold II. A clandestine Press quickly arose, with the aim of exciting public opinion, and this decided Leopold II. to give a wider and more lenient law respecting the Censorship (May, 1847). Instantly, at Florence, Pisa, and Livorno, important journals were published. Through the advice of the Press, the Government of Tuscany were led to introduce wide judiciary and administrative reforms.

In the Kingdom of Sardinia, Carlo Alberto was persuaded that the first aspiration of the Italians should be for national independence: towards this aim he sought to direct the current of public opinion: therefore, in September, 1846, he permitted the warm, patriotic speeches which were delivered at the Congress of Scientists which was held at Genoa, as also those of December, delivered on the centenary of the flight of the Austrians from that city: the latter demonstration was held with wild enthusiasm, for in paying homage to the events of the past the people augured a speedy repetition of the victory.

Metternich, the Grand Chancellor of Austria, who had declared that Italy was nothing but a geographical expression, began to be alarmed at the political agitations which were manifested in that country. He brought pressure to bear on the Pope which should induce him to change his policy, and made the same suggestions to the Courts of Florence and Turin: he realised, however, that the Grand Duke was hand in hand with the popular desire, and his friendly exhortations at Rome and Turin produced no result: he, therefore, determined to carry out an act of bold menace, which should coincide with a reactionary conspiracy prepared at Rome, and which, as he thought, should put an end for ever to the Italian political ferment. By the Treaties of 1815 Austria was allowed to garrison the citadel of

Ferrara, in Pontifical territory: but in August, 1847, these troops, fully armed, occupied the rest of the city, and their commandant assumed the effective Government of Ferrara, seizing it from the Papal representative.

But the reactionary plots which had been organised in the Pontifical State were discovered in time by the Liberals: whilst the insolence shown by Austria in Ferrara aroused a deep indignation throughout Italy. Pius IX., under the pressure of public opinion, protested energetically, and Carlo Alberto offered him his willing aid: even Mazzini united his voice to the universal chorus, which incited the Pontiff to liberate Italy. The Civil Guard was immediately organised in the two States which seemed to be most threatened by an Austrian invasion:—Tuscany and the Pontifical State,—whilst in the Agrarian Congress of Casale Monferrato a letter from Carlo Alberto to an intimate friend was publicly read; in this letter the King expressed a wish for a speedy war of independence, and declared himself ready to march at the head of his army.

At this time, Carlo Alberto received the visit of Lord Minto, one of the most distinguished English diplomats, who, though his ostensible object was a journey of pleasure through Italy, was, in reality, charged by the English Government with a secret mission. Lord Minto exhorted the King to put an end to his procrastinating and temporising policy, to free himself from reactionary counsellors, and to concede wide reforms. This advice was successful in conquering the King's vacillating policy, and on October 9 he dismissed the Count Solaro della Margherita from his post of Foreign Minister. The fall of this most conspicuous representative of reactionary ideas was soon followed by other measures: on October 30 he published a decree which contained the so-long-desired reforms:—free election of communal and provincial councillors, reform of the police service, and administration of justice with some measure of liberty to the Press. As already had been the case in the Pontifical State and in Tuscany, so also in Piedmont, political journalism sprang to life. This last factor, in the hands of men who were distinguished, not only by their skill, but by their honesty of purpose, aided powerfully in impelling the

Government in a Liberal direction, and it also educated the Piedmontese people in the ideas of freedom and liberty.

The first political journal which appeared in Piedmont was the *Risorgimento*, and was directed by Count Camillo Benso di Cavour.[1]

The younger son of a noble and rich family, he had first gone into the army: this profession was but little adapted to his fiery temperament and Liberal aspirations, which latter, even as a young man, he had cultivated with enthusiasm. He was a sub-lieutenant of engineers, at Genoa, when the French Revolution of 1830 originated. The young officer could not restrain his enthusiasm: and he let fall a few hasty words, which awakened the suspicions of the police. In the following year his eagerness for a more unrestricted life and his dissatisfaction with the way in which the King was following the reactionary policy of his predecessors, led him to resign his commission: he took over the management of a few of his father's farms, and in this way acquired a working knowledge of the more practical side of life.

But his passion was politics: he studied the various economic and social publications with great care: in his frequent journeys to Switzerland, France, and England, he grew more and more enthusiastic for Liberal institutions, and he was persuaded that could they but once be introduced into Piedmont, they would not only lead to the political resurrection of the country, but they would bring about an economic re-birth and a salutary revivication of every energy. His love of work rendered all inaction intolerable to him: he persuaded his father to allow him to take over the administration of his great estate of Leri, in the Vercellese, and he devoted himself with new ardour to the active life of a country gentleman: he now organised industrial societies and took an active part in railway enterprise, carrying the same enthusiasm into business matters which he had displayed in agricultural pursuits.

By the advice of certain of his Genoese friends, he wrote a few articles for the Swiss and French Reviews on financial

[1] Camillo Cavour was born at Turin on August 10, 1810: his father was the Marquis Benso di Cavour: his godfather was Prince Camillo Borghese, then Governor of Piedmont, in the name of Napoleon I, and his godmother was the Princess Pauline Bonaparte.

and politico-economical questions: in 1846 he published an article on railways, in which he compared the immense consequences of the new discovery with those which were derived from the geographical explorations of the fifteenth century: he added that so far as Italy was concerned, railways would enable her to conquer that *summum bonum*,—independence,—without which she could not hope for any real or durable improvement in her political conditions, nor advance with an assured step along the path of progress.

The moment, therefore, that Carlo Alberto, by his decree of October 30, 1847, granted a licence for the publication of political writings, Cavour flung himself into the journalistic arena with all the ardour of his sanguine temperament: few entered political life better prepared than himself: he was now only thirty-seven years old, but he was little known and much misunderstood in his native city of Turin. The articles which he published in reviews were widely diffused in other parts of Italy, but were not read by the Piedmontese public, which knew nothing of the fiery thoughts which agitated the mind of the young Cavour.

He had also joined in a few Liberal manifestations: he had been one of the promoters of agrarian societies and a founder of Homes for destitute children: but all these philanthropic efforts did not impress the stubborn mind of the Liberal middle classes, who felt for him some of that antipathy which they had already bestowed on his father on account of the reactionary zeal with which the latter had exercised his authority as Vicar of Turin—a post which corresponds to-day with that of the director of police. Under such unfavourable conditions Cavour began his journalistic life.

. . . .

In Piedmont, Tuscany, and the Pontifical States, a few reforms, which were enthusiastically received by the people, enlivened political life, and a Customs League prepared the way for one of a political nature: but very different conditions prevailed in the other States of the Peninsula.

In the Lombardo-Veneto, also, the election of Pius IX. had raised the hopes of the patriots and excited the minds of the people: the patriots seized every opportunity which

offered itself of pacific protest against foreign tyranny, whilst waiting until events should allow them to act in a more efficacious manner.

These agitations, which assumed alarming proportions, induced the Austrian Government not only to redouble its police supervision, but also to send into Italy new reinforcements for their army: the latter was commanded by the aged Marshal Radetzky. Almost daily the Austrian police had opportunities of observing the marvellous agreement of the Italian subjects of Austria in their manifestations against the Government at Milan; for instance, on January 1, 1848, many patriots begged the citizens to abstain from smoking in order to damage, in some measure, the finances of the Imperial Government. The invitation was generally obeyed. The police were irritated at the attitude of the people, and indulged in excesses: massacres occurred in the streets: similar scenes were repeated in Pavia and Padua. Later, in Venice, Daniele Manin, Tommaseo, and the learned Dalmatian, Niccolo, who were considered as the chiefs of the agitation, were arrested.

Austria took it upon herself to maintain order in the neighbouring provinces: she, therefore, concluded a Treaty with the new Duke of Modena, Francis V.,—who had, in 1846, succeeded his father, Francis IV.,—by which the Duke conceded to the Emperor 'the right to introduce his troops into Modenese territory and to take possession of its fortresses whenever the interests of common defence and military policy demanded.' Thus the Duchy of Modena may be considered henceforth as an integral part of those Italian Provinces which were under the rule of Austria.

A similar Treaty was also made with the Duchy of Parma. The Duchess, Maria Louisa, had died on December 17, 1847, and, as had been arranged at the Congress of Vienna, Charles Louis of Bourbon, formerly Duke of Lucca, succeeded her: the latter, in order to assure his new throne, deemed it advisable to conclude with Austria a Treaty analogous to that which had been concluded with the Duchy of Modena.

Neither had King Ferdinand of Naples expressed any intention of granting reform: therefore the patriots of that

kingdom prepared for revolution. Many clandestine publications were printed and distributed in order to incite the people to rebellion. The little work, entitled *Protest of the People of the Two Sicilies*,—the authorship of which the police were unable to discover—created an immense impression: the celebrated professor, Luigi Settembrini, was known by Liberals to be the author of this work. On the 1st of September, 1847, an insurrection broke out simultaneously at Reggio Calabria and at Messina: but it was suffocated in blood, and only resulted in new and more savage persecutions.

Sicily, in particular, had imbibed the spirit of opposition to the Neapolitan Government. In the first days of January, 1848, the Revolutionary Party dared to affix on the walls of the suburbs of Palermo a spirited appeal to the people, urging them to rise on the 12th of January—the King's birthday. The invitation was accepted and the Revolution broke out. After a fortnight's fighting, the Bourbon troops were obliged to evacuate Palermo; a scanty garrison remained in the city fortress, and these capitulated on February 4. The other cities and towns in the island were not slow in imitating the example of the capital; and a Provisional Government, totally independent of that of Naples, was organised in Sicily.

The minds of the Neapolitans were excited by the events of Palermo; the Liberals, with increased boldness, held demonstrations demanding a Constitution, and Ferdinand II., seeing plainly that Sicily was lost, desired at least to preserve Naples; in a decree of the 29th of January, 1848, he promised a Constitution, which was modelled on that of France of 1830. The Kingdom of Naples now placed itself at the head of the national movement: it thus passed before the other Italian States, which had hitherto limited their demands to simple reforms, while Naples exacted a new Constitution.

Affairs were precipitated by the events of Sicily and of Naples; great demonstrations were held at Turin; these latter conquered the last scruples of Carlo Alberto, who published, on February 8, a decree, promising a Constitution and determining its essential points. On March 4, 1848, this statute was promulgated by the King; later, it was

extended by Victor Emanuel II. to the whole of the rest of the Peninsula, and is the same which to-day is in force in the Kingdom of Italy.

The Grand Duke of Tuscany, Leopold II., naturally felt himself forced by the current of public opinion to concede a similar Constitution. Rome, which had given the first impulse to the movement, had now been surpassed by many of the other States: it was not till the 12th of February, 1848, that the first Lay Ministry was formed in the States of the Church; but that was now no longer sufficient: soon, even here, the demand for a Constitution rose from the people. It is true that the task of determining the limits which separated ecclesiastical and lay affairs was an extremely difficult one; but the news of the Revolution at Paris cut short discussions, disputes, and all vacillation.

. . . .

In France the Guizot Government had constantly opposed all ideas of electoral and parliamentary reform, declaring them to be inopportune: it stated that the country recognised these measures as unnecessary. The Parliamentary Opposition therefore proposed to organise great political demonstrations in order to educate the public opinion. A whole series of banquets was initiated in the summer of 1847, each of which invariably concluded with violent diatribes against the Government and demands for electoral reform. This movement continued in the autumn, and assumed huge proportions, since all the Oppositions found themselves in agreement with this demand. It was then that the Government began to take the matter seriously, but instead of initiating reforms it proposed to restrain popular agitation.

A banquet was being organised at Paris on a bigger scale than any of those which had preceded it; the date of the event was fixed for February 22: full ninety deputies had promised to attend. The Government realised that the public mind was excited, and prohibited both the banquet and the procession which was to have preceded it. Notwithstanding the prohibition, however, an immense crowd collected in the Place de la Madeleine on that date at the point from which the procession was to have started: the crowd was largely composed of students and workmen, and

the police used every means in their power to disperse them. On the following night, in the more crowded quarters of Paris, workmen began to erect barricades. The Government desired to use moderate measures, and called the National Guard to arms; the latter, however, refused to march against the insurgents, and declared itself in favour of those reforms which had been demanded. Naturally, the tumult was increased by this intelligence, and the demonstration assumed a more threatening character. Louis Philippe, who had always reckoned on the support of the National Guard, was disagreeably impressed and decided to dismiss his favourite Minister: on the evening of February 23, Guizot's resignation was announced. This event appeared to put an end to the agitation.

But if the Liberal middle class only desired electoral reform, there were other elements which were possessed by much more advanced ideas: on the evening of February 23 a demonstration was held under the windows of the Foreign Office: the soldiers charged the crowd, and fifty of the latter fell to the ground wounded or dead: this distressing occurrence served the Republican-Socialists admirably as a preparation for Revolution. A few corpses were placed on a car and were drawn through the streets in the midst of an excited and angry crowd, while a workman on the car itself held a lighted torch over the dead in order to show their wounds to the crowd, and thereby further excite their minds to revenge.

Such a nocturnal spectacle, accompanied by the noise of pealing bells, transformed the demonstration to an authentic Revolution, made with the object of deposing the King. 'Louis Philippe murders the people in the same manner as did Charles X.: let him go and join him!' Such was the thought which was rooted in the minds of all those who had armed themselves and descended into the streets.

On every side barricades arose, so thickly that the aspect of Paris, on the morning of February 24, signalled the rapid growth of the Revolution. The soldiers, who had not slept for two days, were wearied, disgusted, and demoralised; they opposed but a faint-hearted resistance to the insurgents, who found themselves speedily masters of the situation.

It was then that the old King decided to abdicate in favour of his young nephew, the Count de Paris, who was at this time a child of ten years of age: his mother, the Duchess D'Orleans, was appointed Regent.

But there was not even time to publish the decree; at one o'clock in the afternoon the insurgents arrived at the Tuileries. Louis Philippe, with his family, left in two carriages, escorted by a group of cuirassiers, whilst the crowd penetrated into the Palace and committed the usual acts of vandalism.[1]

The Duchess of Orleans, accompanied by her son and her brother-in-law, the Duke de Nemours, went to the Chamber, where she was received by the majority with applause. The reign of Louis Philippe II. was just about to be recognised, when a deputy, who was none other than the celebrated poet, Lamartine, observed that it was impossible to deliberate on any question in the presence of the Duchess and her son. The Duchess then retired, and the monarchical enthusiasm evaporated, and finally disappeared when the crowd invaded the Hall. The President declared the sitting to be dissolved: the unpopular deputies speedily left the Hall, but the Republican members remained in order to deliberate on the formation of a Provisional Government. The members of this new Government immediately went to the Hôtel de Ville, where another group of politicians had already organised an Executive Council: those who were members of this latter body were received into the first group, and the fusion of these two groups constituted the new Government. The crowd demanded the proclamation of the Republic, and the Provisional Government acceded to this request, reserving to themselves the right of appealing to the country.

The Republican Government was composed of Republican and Socialist elements. Its most illustrious member was the poet and historian, Alphonse Lamartine, who represented the Republican tendency. The Socialist members of the Government were headed by their most famous chief, Louis Blanc, while the advocate, Ledru-Rollin, constituted the bond between the two parties.

[1] Louis Philippe took refuge in England, where he died in 1880.

The new Government proclaimed the full liberty of the Press and also suppressed the tax on the newspapers, so that many journals were immediately published in Paris and in the principal French cities: these were sold in great numbers and penetrated into the popular classes, spreading the most advanced ideas. Full liberty of open meeting was also proclaimed, and many working men's clubs were formed. Another provision which was pregnant with grave consequences was the authorisation given to all citizens to enrol themselves in the National Guard: this force, which was originally composed of the middle classes, now became a military force of the proletariat. The Socialist Party wished to hoist the Red Flag, and on the 25th of February an immense crowd presented itself at the Hôtel de Ville in order to gain permission to adopt this symbol of the new ideas: but Lamartine, by one of his brilliant discourses, succeeded in persuading the crowd to renounce such a desire. The Socialists, however, succeeded in obtaining the proclamation of the principle of the Right to Labour; and in order to apply this decree, the Government drew up plans for the construction of National workshops.

The Revolution was received with stupefaction in the Provinces, but no opposition was excited, for even in the Provinces the Government of Louis Philippe was detested. For the constitution of the Assembly, universal suffrage was granted, so that the right of voting passed in one day from a restricted body of about 250,000 persons to one of more than 9,000,000. In the meantime the Government, in order to relieve the prevailing financial embarrassment, established an increase of forty-five centimes (fourpence-halfpenny) on every franc of direct taxation. These forty-five centimes created an antipathy to the Government, especially in the country, since almost all the French peasantry, who were also proprietors, found their pockets affected by this provision.

In the Provisional Government, there existed two tendencies,—that which simply had aimed at a political revolution, and another which could only see in the violent upheaval the instrument of a social revolution: these two tendencies clashed. At the beginning the Socialist Party prevailed;

but on the occasion of a new Socialist manifestation, on the 16th of April, Ledru-Rollin, Minister of the Interior, who had till now vacillated between the two parties, declared for the Republican group, and gave orders to the National Guard to disperse the demonstrators. The demonstration was then energetically repressed.

A double current of thought also existed in Foreign Policy: some would have aided the fire of the Revolution to spread from Paris throughout Europe, and would have had France support the peoples in their fight against their tyrants. But the more temperate considered that it was not to the interests of France to engage in war, and that the more pressing necessity was to consolidate the Government in the country.

Lamartine, who had accepted the post of Foreign Minister, declared that the French Government desired entrance into the family of those now existing, not as a disturber of the world's peace, but as a regular and normal power:—

'The French Republic proclaims itself the intellectual and cordial ally of all rights and of all progress; it will never promote a dark and incendiary propaganda among its neighbours, but by the clarity of its ideas, by the spectacle of order and peace which it hopes to give to the world, it will exercise the only honest proselytism,—that of esteem and of sympathy. This will not inflame the world: it will shine from its own station on the horizon of the nations, in order, simultaneously, to precede and to guide them.'

Taken as a whole, Lamartine's speech reassured the Governments of Europe, though contradictory phrases in it were not wanting: so that the peoples of Europe were inclined to believe that France had promised to come to their aid against the tyrants. As a matter of fact, the attention of all was quickly withdrawn from France: for in almost all of the European States, both peoples and Governments began to be occupied with their own affairs.

. . . .

The French Revolution of 1848 produced in Europe a general democratic movement: but in constitutional countries the effect was less severely felt than in those of absolute

Governments. Thus, in Belgium, the Liberal Party, which was in power, easily maintained order by carrying out the electoral reform which had already been promised; State functionaries were declared ineligible for election, and the right of voting was rendered less difficult to obtain.

In Holland, the King, William II., though he had always been opposed to any political reform which had been demanded by the Liberals, hastened to nominate a commission, after the Revolution of Paris, for the revision of the Constitution: the modifications which were introduced in October, 1848, transformed this constitutional monarchy into a Parliamentary one.

In England, the latest French Revolution had alarmed the middle classes, and had revived, with the Republic, the old national animosity to France of former times. This movement, instead of giving an impulse to Liberal ideas, in reality fostered reactionary tendencies. The Chartists were led by an Irish Member of Parliament named O'Connor: they believed that an exceptional opportunity of gaining their end now presented itself: they framed a still more colossal petition than those which had preceded it, and organised an immense procession for April 12, which should accompany the petition to Parliament. But, though the Government was a Liberal one, it prohibited the procession, and called on all peaceably disposed citizens to enrol themselves on that day as special constables: the invitation was accepted, and 170,000,—a number which surpassed that of the demonstrators themselves,—composed this body of voluntary police. There was, therefore, no procession: O'Connor, however, presented the petition. On examination, it was found that instead of the 5,000,000 signatures which had been announced by O'Connor, there were not even 2,000,000; a large proportion even of these consisted of non-existent and ridiculous names invented by would-be wits: this discovery covered both demonstrators and their petition with ridicule. The Chartist agitation, which for ten years had excited the country, ended with this episode.

The Government also displayed much energy in Ireland: a portion of the population, compelled by the prevailing

misery, had emigrated to America, and in Ireland some excitable youths abandoned themselves to acts of violence: an armed band attempted an insurrection, but its members were captured and its chiefs transported.

In the Kingdom of Sardinia, in Tuscany, Naples, and Sicily, new Constitutional Governments were organised, and Pius IX. also granted a Constitution at Rome: in addition to the two Legislative Assemblies common to other States, Pius IX. created a 'Senate inseparable from the Pope,' composed of the Sacred College of Cardinals, which shared the powers of Government.

Throughout Italy a greater development of democratic conditions might be observed in all those Provinces and States which had already obtained Constitutional Government, while on the other hand, Revolution broke out in those governed by Absolutist methods.

In the Lombardo-Veneto, and in the Duchies of Modena and Parma, which might now be considered as simple appanages of the Austrian dominions, the popular ferment increased daily. Austria had recourse to extreme measures and proclaimed a state of siege. The people, on the other hand, prepared for revolution: they collected arms and money, and cultivated nearer relations with the Piedmontese and with Carlo Alberto.

The news that the capital of the Empire itself was in a state of insurrection hastened the revolution. On March 17 it became known at Venice that several days previously the Viennese people had risen with the demand for a Constitution, and that Prince von Metternich had been forced to fly. The Venetians then demanded loudly the release of political prisoners: without waiting for the response of the authorities they rushed to the prisons and broke them open, carrying off, in triumph, Manin and Tommaseo. The excitement increased on the following day; a conflict was on the point of taking place between the soldiers and the populace, when the Municipality, in order to avoid bloodshed, demanded permission to organise the Civic Guard. The two Governors,—civil and military,—had received continuous and grave reports of the situation at Vienna, and in the doubtful predicament in which they were placed,

they consented to the demand. Meanwhile, the news arrived that the Government had granted a Constitution: peace at once returned and the city resumed its wonted aspect. It seemed that quiet had been restored.

But at Milan, events had turned out very differently. On the afternoon of March 18 a solemn demonstration was held; the *podestà*, Gabrio Casati, went to the Governor's palace, preceded by an immense crowd, in order to demand the institution of the Civic Guard: while the procession was returning after having obtained the requisite signature for the decree, hostilities broke out between the soldiers and the crowd: a volley of musketry was fired and a citizen was killed. At the sight of blood, the insurrection, which had hitherto lain dormant, immediately broke out, and extended to the whole city of Milan. Everywhere barricades were erected and all classes of citizens eagerly took part in the rising, with the firm resolution of driving the Austrians out of the city. The combat lasted five successive days and nights. On March 20, Marshal Radetzky proposed an armistice, which was refused: on the 21st the Austrians were driven from their barracks in the interior of the city: the walls and the fortresses, however, remained in their hands; on the 22nd, the fighting was concentrated at Porta Tosa,—now called Porta Vittoria,—in order to open communications with the surrounding country. Finally, the people triumphed. The Austrian troops were driven from Milan, nor could they remain longer in Lombardy, since all the cities had risen against them. They were, therefore, obliged to retreat towards the fortress of the Mincio.

At Venice, after two days of tranquillity, suspicions were aroused as to the intentions of the Government: the first vague notices of the successful revolt of Milan renewed the agitation: a workman at the Arsenal killed Commandant Marinovich, whose severity had rendered him unpopular. Daniele Manin, on hearing this, went to the Arsenal, followed by the Civic Guard, and by moral force alone succeeded in obtaining its submission. Simultaneously, a Municipal deputation persuaded the Austrian Governor to leave the city with his troops: he retired, ceding his power to the Municipality. Thus, on March 22, Venice was freed,

and a Provincial Government was formed on the following day under the Presidency of Daniele Manin.

The other cities of the Veneto were liberated at the same time from the presence of the Austrian troops, who were forced to take refuge in Verona and other neighbouring fortresses. Towards the end of March, all the territory which had been occupied by Austrian troops, lying between the Mincio and the Adige, was free: of their Italian possessions, the Austrians only retained the four fortresses of Mantua, Peschiera, Verona, and Legnago: the only open road to Austria which still remained, lay along the narrow vale of the Adige, and here the Piedmontese army was stationed.

One sole thought animated the breasts of all Italians,—to bear aid to their brethren who were fighting against the foreigner. The excitement felt at Turin when the news of the 'five days' of Milan reached the city was tremendous: on the night of March 23, the Council of Ministers, presided over by Carlo Alberto himself, decided on war: the King announced that fact to his people and declared that henceforth he adopted as his own the Italian tricolour—that flag which had for so long been considered as the symbol of revolution.

But aid in the War of Independence did not come from Piedmont alone. The example of the Lombardo-Veneto had caused both Modena and Parma to rise; speedily they had deposed their Dukes: they had driven out the Austrian forces and had followed the latter into the Quadrilateral. The Grand Duke of Tuscany, though himself an Austrian, had been forced by popular enthusiasm to organise an army for the war. Pius IX., also, was compelled by Roman sentiment to send a body of troops: and finally, a promise was extracted from the King of Naples to despatch an army of 15,000 troops; he contrived, however, to delay its departure. Sicily was obliged to defend her own territories against the Bourbon forces of Naples, and thus could not dispose of her forces elsewhere; but in order to show her adhesion to the general movement, she sent some hundreds of volunteers into Lombardy.

For the first time in history all Italy was united in one

determination: everywhere the famous phrase of Carlo Alberto was repeated—'Italy relies on herself alone.'—'Italia farà da se.' In very truth there was little else to be relied on. Only two Powers showed themselves favourable to the Italians, and these only up to a certain point,—England and France. But England, after the French Revolution of February, had suspended some of her Liberal sympathies, and had no wish that the political conflagration should be extended: as for the French Republic, it did not seem inclined to take any decisive action which might aid the formation of a great kingdom in Upper Italy: besides, its intervention would have jarred on the susceptibilities of the monarchical governments of Italy, and in particular on those of Carlo Alberto.

On April 1 the Piedmontese armies began to arrive in sight of the enemy, who were stationed on the banks of the Mincio; by the engagements of Goito, Valeggio, and Monzambano, the Piedmontese succeeded in getting astride the river and occupied the bridges of the central part, situate between Mantua and Peschiera. Carlo Alberto then began to invest Peschiera,—the nearest of the four fortresses of the Quadrilateral.

But meanwhile, Austrian forces had crossed the Friuli, occupied Udine, and marched rapidly on the Piave. The Pontifical troops attempted, unsuccessfully, to impede the Austrian advance at Cornuda; then, in order to prevent Vicenza from falling into Austrian hands, they occupied that city. The reinforcements encouraged Radetzky to take the offensive. While the larger portion of the Piedmontese army were engaged in the investment of Peschiera, which seemed to be on the point of surrender, Radetzky left Verona and marched towards Mantua, in the environs of which he found the scanty troops of Tuscany. These vigorously resisted for the whole of May 29, near the villages of Curtatone and Montanara, but they were compelled by the far superior forces of the enemy to withdraw. Their long resistance, however, gave the Piedmontese army the opportunity of concentrating in force on the Mincio; on the following day, Redetzky attacked the bridge of Goito, but found himself faced by such a formidable force, that he

was forced to retreat. Radetzky's attempt to bring aid to Peschiera having failed, this fortress capitulated on May 30. Unfortunately, these successes were the last of the campaign of 1848.

Whilst the first phases of the war were developing, Parliaments were opened in the various Italian States. The Sicilian Parliament was the first to inaugurate its sessions; it confirmed the venerated Admiral Ruggero Settimo in the Presidency; discussions then took place on the formation of the new Sicilian Government. The general current of public opinion was in favour of federation and not unity; hence the Sicilians thought of constituting a separate kingdom, which should league itself with the other Italian States. Secret negotiations were opened with Ferdinand of Naples, in order to induce him to allow his son to assume the throne of the island, but the King refused: Parliament then proclaimed the Bourbon dynasty to be for ever excluded from the Sicilian Throne (April 13): a definite rupture now took place between Sicily and Naples.

King Ferdinand, in his secret heart, proposed not only to re-subjugate the whole of Sicily, but to revoke all the concessions he had made to the Neapolitans: his behaviour soon excited the suspicions of the Liberals. It is not strange, therefore, that the Neapolitan Parliament found itself in conflict with its King on its first sitting (May 15). Ferdinand II. took instant advantage of the opposition manifested against him on that day, not only by the deputies, but by the Liberal middle classes; he quickly repressed all riots, by the aid of those troops which had remained faithful to him, and he dissolved the Parliament. He then ordered General Guglielmo Pepe, who commanded those Neapolitan troops which had started for Upper Italy, to return immediately. The old General, rather than obey the treacherous King, resigned his commission and invited the soldiers to follow him beyond the Po in order to fight for National Independence: only a few hundreds, however, obeyed his orders. Ferdinand, though he did not dare to fling off the mask completely, modified the electoral law and forced an election, based on the new lists, obtaining by these means a much more obedient House.

But the first to give the signal to the Italian States of desertion of the National Cause was Pius IX., whose reforms had given the first impulse to Independence. Of a weak character, and disinclined for perilous or glorious adventure, he had never dreamed of being the herald of a revolution; he had simply wished to ameliorate the lot of his subjects; but the current of public opinion had taken him by the hand and dragged him ever forward. The aim of the war, too, threw the Pope into the liveliest apprehension: the reactionary elements which surrounded him painted for him the possibility of a new German schism, and it was then that he decided to withdraw from the conflict: on the 29th of April, he declared in Concistory that as the representative of God on earth, he could not desire strife, and that he included both Austrians and Italians in one paternal embrace.

This phrase, which was uttered at the moment when the struggle between Austrians and Italians was fiercer than ever, excited an immense disdain in the Peninsula; there were riots in Rome, and the Pope finally yielded to the pressure of the popular voice and allowed the Pontifical troops to carry on the war in Upper Italy. But henceforth everybody understood clearly that the Pope was no longer in touch with the Italian nation.

This was the beginning of the desertion of the princes from the National Cause; even among the people the splendid agreement of the first days of enthusiasm showed signs of demoralisation; though many still vaguely desired a strong and united Italy, yet the Italian peoples had been so long and so deeply divided, that it was impossible to eradicate at the first attempt all their racial and topographical hostilities. From this cause arose local conflicts and discords, which had their effect on the Army and diminished its enthusiasm.

The Duchies of Parma and Modena had proclaimed by a plebiscite their annexation to the Kingdom of Sardinia; Lombardy had followed the example of those duchies. But Venice had proclaimed a Republic and the principal cities of the Veneto had given their adhesion to it; Padua, however, with Vicenza, Treviso, and Rovigo, had felt alarm at the

Austrian advance, and had voted for immediate union with Piedmont.

Naturally, in the Lombardo-Veneto region, which was the theatre of war, political life had been essentially concentrated in the preoccupations which the fight against the foreigner had awakened. The morale of Marshal Radetzky's troops had been depressed by the defeat of Goito and the loss of Peschiera; in order to encourage them, their leader proposed at once to occupy Vicenza, which was held by the Pontifical troops. He therefore left in the fortresses of the Quadrilateral some few thousand men who might delay and deceive King Carlo Alberto, and launched an attack with the greater part of his army on Vicenza; the latter city made a vigorous resistance, but was forced to capitulate on June 11. Radetzky himself returned in haste to the Quadrilateral, in order to compel Carlo Alberto to give battle, and at the same time he sent troops to occupy Padua and Treviso.

These Austrian successes led the Venetians to consider the advisability of joining themselves to Piedmont; a proposal of union with the kingdom was approved by an assembly which had been convoked in the Halls of the Ducal palace. Daniele Manin himself urged his party to sacrifice their personal preferences for a Republic on the altar of National Independence. It was at this time that the Sicilian Parliament offered the island Crown to Ferdinand, Duke of Genoa,—second son of Carlo Alberto; Ferdinand begged to be allowed time for the consideration of the proposal; everything depended on the issue of the War of Independence, and this issue was already seriously compromised.

By this time the Austrian reinforcements had arrived, and the Austrians were cheered by their successes in the Veneto; Radetzky, therefore, determined to resume the offensive; with the concentrated mass of his forces he attacked the Piedmontese on the heights of Custoza, between the Mincio and the Adige; the battle lasted three days (July 23-25); finally the Piedmontese Army was forced to retreat, and recrossed the Mincio. Unfortunately, after the March insurrection, the Italians had deemed the return of the Austrians to be an impossibility; therefore, neither on the Oglio nor the Adda had defences been prepared.

Between the Mincio and Milan there was no position which might be held by the King against the enemy: even the engagement, under the walls of Milan, on August 4, was disastrous to the Piedmontese. A war-council of the Generals declared that it would be impossible to defend Milan against the Austrians: the King, therefore, was under the painful necessity of abandoning Milan—which was again occupied by the Austrians—and of retiring into Piedmontese territory.

On August 9, 1848, an armistice was concluded, by which the frontier of the two States was established as the dividing line of the two armies.

There were, however, some who would not recognise this armistice, and wished to continue the war. Amongst these was Giuseppe Garibaldi. In 1834 he had emigrated to South America, where his poetic and romantic inclinations had found free scope: at first he had fought for the Republic of Rio Grande, which had rebelled against the Emperor of Brazil; he had then assisted in the defence of Monte Video against Manuel Rosas, the Dictator of Buenos Ayres, and he had there acquired fame as a leader, both by his bravery and by his military genius.

In the Spring of 1848, at the news of the Italian War of Independence, Garibaldi had left Monte Video with a company of devoted brothers in arms and had arrived in Italy, where he organised a few companies of volunteers. Hard on this followed the armistice of August 9; Garibaldi refused to recognise it, and at the head of a thousand men resisted the Austrians for a fortnight on the shores of Lake Maggiore: a whole Austrian Army Corps was directed against him, and he was compelled to take refuge in Switzerland. Neither had Venice wished to recognise the armistice: it dismissed the commissaries of Carlo Alberto who had come to Venice after the annexation to Sardinia, and it entrusted the Presidency to Daniele Manin. Of all the Italian territory which had risen against Austria, Venice alone remained free. In the Duchies of Parma and Modena, the Austrian troops had restored the ancient Governments. The suspension of the war against Piedmont had given Austria the opportunity of concentrating greater forces

against Venice. For the purpose of heartening the defenders, the Venetian troops, on October 27, 1848, advanced against Mestre, which was occupied by the Austrians, and inflicted grave losses on the enemy; but, this notwithstanding, the circle of iron which now girded the city remained unbroken.

The heart of Ferdinand of Naples had been filled with joy by the Austrian victories. He became more audacious, prorogued the Neapolitan Parliament, and sent an army against Sicily. The Duke of Genoa had renounced the Sicilian Crown after the late disastrous war : the Provisional Government of Palermo was therefore forced to confront the Neapolitan troops unaided; but it, too, had made no great preparations for resistance. On September 3 the Bourbon fleet anchored off Messina and began to bombard the city; the guns from the citadel, which had remained in the hands of the Bourbons, also opened a terrible fire on the city; yet the inhabitants heroically sustained the unequal struggle; not till September 7 were the enemy troops able to enter Messina; yet, even then, the desperate defence was continued from house to house, so that the Bourbon troops set fire to quarter after quarter in order to put an end to the struggle. When they had finally triumphed, they abandoned themselves to horrible excesses. The commanders of the French and English fleets, which patrolled the Sicilian coasts, would not tolerate such barbarity, and imposed a truce, which Ferdinand unwillingly accepted; this accomplished, they initiated negotiations, which lasted for some months.

Through the continual disagreement of Pope, Ministers, and public opinion, Government in the Pontifical States was practically non-existent. The situation became so grave that the Pope placed the Government in the hands of Pellegrino Rossi. The latter was a man of great ability and strong character; he assumed the difficult charge with zeal and courage, with the hope that he might yet be able to stem the flood of reaction and mob law, which flowed in from every side.

His first aim was to re-establish the prestige of the Government and to maintain order and tranquillity in the

State; these successes gained for him the hate of the demagogues, who, under the preceding weak Ministry, had shown great audacity. But, at the same time, the reactionary party violently opposed him and would accept none of his administrative and financial reforms; nor did he receive the support of the patriots, who considered him wanting in enthusiasm in the conduct of the war against Austria; his haughty manners, too, repelled those who would have supported him: all these circumstances aided in the creation of a strong current of hostility to the new Minister.

On November 15, as he was mounting the stairs of the Cancelleria, which was then used for the sittings of the Roman Parliament, he was assassinated; so greatly did furious party feeling cloud all sense of moral criticism at that time, that neither sympathy with the victim, nor horror at the crime was felt by the Romans. The Radicals determined to profit by the general confusion, and attempted by riots to impose the choice of a Radical Ministry on the Pope. The Pope obeyed the demands of the mob; but a few days later he fled secretly from Rome and took refuge in the Castle of Gaeta, which Ferdinand of Naples had placed at his disposition. By this act the Pope openly abandoned the national cause. Amid great excitement the Romans determined to convoke a Constituent Assembly, which should decide on the destinies of the State.

In Tuscany, and especially at Leghorn, distrust of the Grand Duke had given rise to frequent riots, and, in October 27, 1848, the Grand Duke was compelled, by the force of public opinion, to appoint a democratic Ministry, of which the novelist, Guerrazzi, and Professor Montanelli made part. But Leopold II. soon followed the example of Pius IX.; he first took refuge at Sienna, which was the centre of the reactionary party, then he, too, fled to Gaeta. A Provisional Government was then organised in Tuscany, at the head of which was the novelist, Guerrazzi.

The one dominant thought of every mind was a speedy resumption of the war against Austria. The probability of success was small, since Piedmont now saw that she would be unsupported: yet the Liberals felt that Piedmont, in order to preserve its own prestige in the National movement,

should again make a bid for military fortune. The King himself, Carlo Alberto, was of this opinion. He was now the only Sovereign who had remained faithful to the National Cause: he wished to renew the war in the hope that he might this time prove victorious, and that his eagerness to take up arms might at least show to the world the falsity of the calumnious statements which had been bruited about him. On March 12, 1849, the armistice was cancelled: on the 20th hostilities were to recommence. But the Austrian situation was now entirely different from that of March in the preceding year.

. . . .

The Spring of 1848 represented the triumph of Liberal and National aspirations, and hence, the Austrian Monarchy was entirely demoralised. The first effect of the Revolution of Paris was felt in Hungary, which already possessed its own Constitutional Government; in the Table of the States, on March 3, 1848, the deputy, Louis Kossuth, by his impassioned eloquence, succeeded in inducing the majority to adopt a motion demanding of the Emperor-King not only a Minister who should be responsible for Hungary, but also a Constitution for the other States of the Empire, as guarantees of a greater regard of Hungarian liberty and of better government for all. From Hungary, the agitation soon spread to the other States of the Monarchy. On March 13, one of those Provincial Diets, whose work till then had passed unnoticed, had arranged to meet at Vienna: this particular Diet represented Lower Austria. Its representatives were satisfied with a simple demand for reform, but the students excited the crowd, which gave way to tumultuous demonstrations; the soldiers fired on the crowd: this was the signal of such furious disorder in the capital that Prince von Metternich was compelled to resign his office and fly the country; for more than forty years he had directed the politics of the Austrian Government, but this incident closed his career.

The Emperor, Ferdinand, was the personification of absolute incapacity; Metternich's disappearance from the scene left him with not one counsellor who possessed either decision or will-power: therefore the Government conceded all that was demanded of it:—liberty of the Press, a civic

guard, and, finally, a Constitution. Meanwhile, journals and public meetings spread ever-increasingly the spirit of revolution. Power passed to the people: armed bodies of students, in academic order, and a national guard formed from the Liberal middle classes, organised a Committee, which speedily became master of the situation.

The German Provinces followed the example of Vienna in affirming their aspirations for National Liberty; but Hungary led the way to autonomy, and the Government yielded to its every demand:—the removal of the Diet from Presburg to Pest, annual Parliamentary sessions, and a new electoral law. At the same time, Kossuth, who now ruled over the Lower Chamber, persuaded it to vote large measures of reform, such as the obligation of all to pay taxes, and the abolition of seigneurial rights. Even the Magnates were forced to yield to the prevailing current.

But the Croats refused to give way to the will of the Magyars, and agitated for their own autonomy: they demanded the triple autonomous Kingdom of Croatia, Dalmatia, and Slavonia. In the meantime, they obtained the nomination of a new Ban, or Governor, in the person of the Croat colonel, Jellalich, who favoured their national aspirations.

In Bohemia, too, the disputes became acute between Czechs and Germans: as the revolutionary movement gradually penetrated into the lower classes of the Czech race, it assumed a more decided character of national autonomy: even here, the Emperor conceded all requests for the equalisation of the Czech and German languages, and for the convocation of the Bohemian Diet.

On April 25, the Emperor promulgated the first Austrian Constitution, with two Chambers and an indirect suffrage, based on property qualifications; but it neither satisfied the democratic party, nor pleased the heterogeneous nationalities of the Austrian Empire, since it aimed at a centralised State with one Parliament for all these races.

Czechs and Poles would not recognise it; in Vienna, the democratic party, which now dominated the Liberals, and which considered itself master of the situation, since the troops were absent in Italy, organised, on May 15, so violent a manifestation that the Government annulled the

Constitution: a promise was extracted from the Government that an Assembly should be convoked for the purpose of preparing a Constitution. The democratic party hailed this triumph with joy: but two days after, the Emperor left Vienna in his carriage for his usual afternoon drive to his castle of Schoenbrunn, and deemed it hygienic to prolong his drive to Innsbrück, in the Tyrol.

The disapprobation of the Emperor of the general trend of affairs was manifested by this withdrawal; the step, taken by him, influenced those more moderate elements which were attached to the Monarchy, and they also began to desert the Revolution, which was left entirely in the hands of the Radicals. The Government attempted to disband the academic legion, but students and workmen raised barricades, and again the Government yielded.

The triumph of the Viennese democracy encouraged the Bohemians to bolder efforts in order to obtain their autonomy; they called a Congress for the purpose of organising the Slav population; this Congress met at Prague on June 2. During the sittings the conflicts in the city between Slavs and Germans developed into riots; the Governor, Prince Windischgrätz, unable to come to an agreement with the chiefs of the disorders, bombarded the city; after four days of fighting, he remained master of the situation. On June 16 the Congress dispersed; the Bohemian Diet, which had arranged its session, was also dissolved: the Bohemian question, therefore, seemed as if it were finally settled.

Simultaneously, Radetzky in Italy, conquered the Veneto, and a month later gained the decisive victory of Custoza. Thus the Army regained all its prestige, and since it had remained in the service of the Monarchy, it enabled the latter to annul all the concessions it had made.

In the meantime, the Constituent Assembly opened at Vienna and begged the Emperor to return to his capital; he assented. But the Germans realised, with irritation, that the majority of the Assembly was composed of Slavs; these would not allow the privilege which the German language had hitherto enjoyed in Austria. In the Assembly many languages were spoken, and it became necessary to translate into these languages all proposals on which it was

necessary to vote. The only important result achieved by this Assembly was the abolition of such Feudal Rights as had remained:—forced labour, exaction of the tithe, rights of justice, etc.; but this was enough to transform Austria into a modern State.

The peasants were satisfied with the results which had been attained, and took no further interest in the political movement: a portion of the middle classes, alarmed at the increasing strength of the Radicals, also severed themselves from the Revolution. The Austrian Court now felt more secure of its own future; whilst the deputies gave themselves up to long discussions on the proposed Constitution, the Government deliberated on a way by which it might annul the concessions made to Hungary. Naturally, the disputes between Croats and Hungarians furnished the Government with a useful weapon.

The Ban of Croatia, Jellalich, in secret accord with the Emperor, proposed to invade the Hungarian territory. But Kossuth, who had become a Minister, denounced in Parliament the treachery of the Court: this naturally brought about a complete rupture. General Lamberg was appointed by the Emperor, Supreme Commandant of the Hungarian troops: Lamberg went to Pest in order to demand that his appointment should be ratified by the Ministry, as the Constitution required. He was, however, captured by the crowd and murdered as a traitor, September 28. Two days later, Count Eugène Zichy was sent by the Emperor into the Croat camp; he fell into the hands of the Hungarians, who condemned him to death and then hanged him.

In consequence of these tragic episodes, the Emperor decided to act with all possible energy: he declared the dissolution of the Hungarian Parliament and openly prepared for war. The Parliament of Pest, on the other hand, appointed a Committee of Defence, of which Louis Kossuth was the animating genius.

Kossuth's party was not only national and Hungarian, but it was also a democratic one: hence the Viennese democracy sympathised with and adhered to it. The Hungarian Parliament sent a deputation to the Viennese Assembly and people, which the majority of the Assembly,

with the assent of the Ministry, refused to meet: but the deputation was received very cordially by the democratic committee of the Austrian capital, which understood perfectly that if the Government succeeded in conquering Hungary, its next step would be their own suppression. Therefore, when the Government desired to send troops of the Viennese garrison against Hungary, and a regiment of grenadiers refused to obey this order, the democrats of Vienna supported the rebel regiment: this new Revolution had an astonishing success, October 6; General Latour, the Minister of War, was taken by the crowd and hanged to a lamp-post. On the morrow, the Emperor Ferdinand fled from Schoenbrunn and took refuge in Slav territory at Olmütz in Moravia; he gave orders to General Windischgrätz to coerce the capital into submission.

Vienna had no means of raising a regular army; for a few days it attempted defence, but on October 30 the Municipality entered into negotiations for capitulation. It was then that a Hungarian Army arrived in sight of the city: the struggle was resumed with ardour, but the Hungarians were defeated: Windischgrätz, by a new bombardment, definitely mastered the city. Many of the democratic leaders were executed; among these was Robert Blum, one of the German deputies from the Frankfort Parliament, who had come to Vienna in order to congratulate the Austrian Radicals on their successes. Vienna became a prey to military terrorism. The Assembly was transported to a small provincial city—Kremsier, in Moravia—and occupied itself in the useless labour of preparing a Constitution, which was destined never to see the light.

The new Ministry, nominated at this time, was presided over by Prince Felix Schwartzenberg, who proposed to re-establish an absolute and centralised Monarchy. In order that this should thoroughly succeed he deemed it necessary for the Emperor Ferdinand to abdicate, so that the new Sovereign might feel freed from every pledge.

The incapable Ferdinand willingly listened to this advice, and at his abdication on December 2, 1848, his young nephew, Francis Joseph, mounted the throne: he was but

eighteen years old, and naturally left the reins of Government in the hands of Schwartzenberg.

The Hungarian Parliament refused to recognise Francis Joseph as King, since, according to the Constitution, the consent of the country was necessary for the King's abdication: it declared that Ferdinand was the legitimate king, and Francis Joseph but a usurper, and it prepared for war. Windischgrätz, with more than 100,000 men, then invaded Hungary. The Hungarian Government, after vain attempts to check his advance, decided to abandon the capital and to retire behind the line of the Theiss; on January 5, 1849, the Austrians entered Pest and considered the campaign as finished.

The belief that the Hungarian revolt could be easily suppressed induced the Court to free itself from the Assembly of Kremsier. After a few months' labour, the Parliamentary commission had framed a project, which it presented: but before the discussion began the Assembly was dissolved, and the Government published, under the date of March 4, 1849, a Constitution, which should be common to the whole Empire; this document declared that the Hungarian Constitution should remain intact, except in those particular cases where its own provisions clashed with those of the new Constitution; this clause in reality made the Hungarian Constitution null and void. As a matter of fact the new Constitution was never applied: its publication served as a half-way house on the road to Absolutism.

. . . .

Austria was so immersed in her own internal difficulties that she was not able to interest herself in what was happening in Germany.

In the latter country, also, the effects of the French Revolution were chiefly felt in those States which already possessed a Constitution, since in them the Liberals were enabled to use legal means—to hold meetings and to demand greater political liberty; their Government yielded without opposition to the people's demands for more democratic methods of control.

In Prussia, King Frederick William IV. was disposed to obey the wishes of those who wished that his dynasty

should place itself at the head of the National Movement; but as regarded internal methods of government, he held as his ideal a patriarchal Government responsible to God alone. After vigorous protests from the Liberals, he finally decided, in 1847, to create a Diet—Landtag—which should be composed of deputies, who should be nominated by the Provincial Diets: a deliberative vote was to be granted them on new taxation, and a consultative vote on new laws. This, naturally, did not satisfy the Liberal aspirations of the country: for the periodical convocation of the Landtag was not provided for. The news of the Paris and Viennese Revolutions excited the Berlin Liberals. Popular demonstrations were held on May 18, and the King made his first concessions by announcing the approaching convocation of the Landtag. But while the crowd still stood before the Palace, two musket shots came from the files of the soldiers. This at once transformed the demonstration into a Revolution. Cries of treachery were raised, and the crowd rushed to arms; barricades were erected, and at five o'clock in the evening a fight began, which lasted through the night. On the morning of the 19th, the King decided to give orders that the troops should withdraw. This was interpreted by the officer in charge as an order to leave Berlin; instead of simply evacuating the Royal Palace and the Public Offices, the troops left the city; Berlin was now in the hands of the Revolutionists, who considered themselves victorious. They entered the courtyard of the Palace, bearing the bodies of those citizens who had fallen in the conflict; the mob, with loud shouts, demanded that the King should show himself on the balcony; Frederick William appeared with the Empress, who was ill and almost unconscious, hanging on his arm: he was forced by the cries of the crowd to uncover his head and salute their dead.

His brother, William, the heir apparent, whom the crowd considered as responsible for the bloodshed, in his capacity of Chief of the Army, was sent on a diplomatic mission to London in order to protect him from the fury of the people, who nicknamed him 'Prince Grapeshot.' The King was forced to yield to the demand for a Provisional Constituent Assembly, elected by universal suffrage. The

Berlin Revolution deprived Frederick William IV. of the prestige which was necessary to the leader of the National Movement.

The Liberal movement in Germany soon went hand in hand with the idea of a new national organisation; therefore the proposal that deputies should be elected to an Assembly which should discuss and vote for the new national Government was favourably received by the bulk of the nation.

The 18th of May, 1848, marks an important date in the political life of Germany: on that day the first session of the new Parliament was held at Frankfort; 586 deputies represented the German provinces. Among these were the most illustrious names of Germany:—the aged poet, Ernst Moritz Arndt, who was almost eighty years of age; Dahlmann, Grimm, and Gervinus, the celebrated German professors who, ten years before, had been expelled from Hanover on account of their political inclinations; other eminent historians such as Raumer, Stenzel, and Waitz; the poet Uhland, the eminent juris-consults, Mittermaier and Mohl, and others who had rendered themselves illustrious by research. These deputies had enthusiastically journeyed from all parts of Germany in order to consult together on the reconstruction of the nation. Baron Heinrich von Gagern of Hesse-Darmstadt, who was exceedingly popular among the Liberals, was chosen President of the Assembly.

The first item on the programme was the organisation of a Provisional Government for the new Germany, which should hold office till the Constitution should be completed. The Archduke John of Austria—one of the sons of Leopold II.—was chosen Head of the Government, with the title of Regent; for many years he had lived at Gratz, far from Court and Society; he had devoted himself to the study of Natural Science, and his modest life had gained him immense popularity. He accepted the post which was offered him, and on his arrival at Frankfort, appointed a Ministry which should serve under him; this body had no opportunity of testing its efficiency since it never had anything to work upon; the Chancellor of the Exchequer had no finances to administer since he received no money; the Minister of War commanded no armies, for none of the German States

would entrust him with the control of their troops; and the Minister of Foreign Affairs could undertake no negotiations, since the new State, which was about to be created, was not yet recognised by Foreign Powers. In fact, at Frankfort, the Assembly was occupied solely by theories; every day the discussions of Parliament demonstrated this fact more clearly. Before engaging on the task of the formation of the new Constitution, the fundamental rights of man were discussed. Many months were thus lost in reviewing all the political, religious, social, and economic questions, with the only result, that the Assembly separated itself entirely from the true interests of the nation.

These eternal discussions were a gain to the party of reaction, which gradually regained confidence in its own strength: it, therefore, determined to allow free vent to the eloquence of the Federal Parliament, which simply represented a moral force, and it determined to concentrate all its activities in individual States, with the conviction that could it succeed in impressing upon these its own ideas, the Federal Parliament might very easily be swept away.

So, while theoretical discussions prevailed at Frankfort, the reactionary party in each individual State energetically resumed the offensive, and here and there attained successes, since the habits of the people were disturbed by the exaggerations of the advanced elements.

But one question had keenly excited all Germany:—the destinies of the Duchies of Schleswig-Holstein. These belonged to the King of Denmark, as Duke of these two Provinces. Holstein, which was inhabited by a German population, formed a part of the Germanic Confederation; while Schleswig, its neighbour, did not, and the two countries had each its own separate administration. But ancient memories knitted a kind of moral union between these two States,—a *nexus socialis*, as jurists say. The Danish element prevailed in the north of Schleswig, and a German in the south of that province; these Germans, in agreement with those of Holstein, attempted to unite the two Duchies more closely, with the object of defending their own autonomy, which was threatened by the centralising policy of the King of Denmark. This problem, already complex, was rendered

the more intricate by a question of succession; in Denmark succession in the female line was admitted, whilst in Holstein the Salic law was in force, and in Schleswig the matter was doubtful.

King Frederick, on his accession to the Danish throne in January, 1848, had promised a Constitution, with a Diet, common to the whole of the country, in the hope that this concession granted to Liberal sentiment would bind the inhabitants of the German Duchies more closely to Denmark. On the 23rd of March the city of Kiel rebelled; the rising had the approval of the German garrison; it triumphantly extended to Schleswig. The insurgents invoked the aid of Germany, which suddenly manifested great enthusiasm for the question of nationality: although Frederick William IV. of Prussia experienced a certain reluctance in lending aid to subjects who were rebelling against their own Sovereign, the popular excitement prevented him from neglecting this appeal of the Northern Germans. Prussian troops entered the Duchies and repelled the Danes; they also occupied a portion of Jutland. But the Danish fleet blockaded the German coast and paralysed its commerce; this first impressed on Germany the necessity of creating a fleet.

The prospect that Prussia might seize the magnificent roadstead of Kiel and thus become a naval power, alarmed England; Palmerston instantly determined to check the Prussian advance. Sweden, too, was unwilling that this strong German State should face her across the Baltic, and issued from her tranquillity in order to place herself beside Denmark. Nor could Russia view with equanimity an increase of Prussian strength: to avoid war, Palmerston offered his mediation. King Frederick William IV., who, every day grew more disgusted with the revolutionaries, spent no sympathy on those who had revolted from the King of Denmark; he was, besides, preoccupied with the loss to German commerce caused by the Danish blockade, therefore he consented to withdraw his troops from Jutland and enter into negotiations: an armistice was concluded in August, 1848.

In Prussia, in the meantime, the Assembly had been sitting since May, discussing the form of the proposed Constitution. The majority were Liberal and Monarchical,

and the cordial support of the King was necessary if any useful and durable work were to be done. But Frederick William IV.'s mind proceeded spasmodically in its action, and he was excessively timid of all ideas which savoured of revolution: his wife, Elizabeth, of the House of Hapsburg, became the leading spirit of reactionary cabals: the military party, always extremely influential at Court, used its power in the same direction; gradually a concrete party was formed, which called itself the 'Party of the Cross,' from the name of its official gazette, the *Kreuz-Zeitung*.

The violent and arrogant demeanour of the officers was often the cause of conflicts between the military and the civilians, and sometimes these incidents were of a sanguinary character. The Chamber voted an Order of the Day, inviting the Ministry to remind the officers of the duty of respect they owed to the new Government, and added that if these gentlemen did not feel able to give the respect due to a Constitutional body, they should at once resign their commission. The King refused to sanction this decree, and the Assembly renewed its warning, declaring it to be of the utmost urgency.

The provocative demeanour of the reactionary party and the reticence of the King ended in the triumph of the Chamber: the King determined on a *coup-d'état*, but he sanctioned the decree and concentrated 50,000 soldiers in the environs of Berlin.

In October, the news of the fresh Revolution at Vienna aggravated the situation, since from the Assembly the excitement was communicated to the people; the reactionary party easily persuaded the King to take action: after the tidings of the fall of Vienna, Frederick William IV. prorogued the Chamber, but the majority refused to obey and continued their session; the troops then occupied the Hall and compelled the delegates to withdraw; the civic guard, which had refused to act against the Assembly, was dissolved, and Berlin was placed under martial law,—November 10-12, 1848.

So eager was the country for peace that it calmly submitted to this *coup-d'état*. On December 5 the King dissolved Parliament and at the same time promulgated a Constitution;

but he reserved to himself the right, in case of necessity, of publishing decrees which should have the force of actual law, even before it had been approved by Parliament. Thus King Frederick William IV., by the support of the army, again held the power in his own hands.

While Monarchy triumphed over democracy in Berlin, the Frankfort Parliament continued its laborious and theoretical discussions. In the midst of philosophical discussions, two practical questions which needed instant settlement intruded themselves:—(1) What territories should be included in the new Germany? and (2), who should be at the head of the new Federal State which was to supplant the Confederation?

The first question specially concerned Austria; many were anxious to exclude her from the new State on the ground that she was politically bound to non-German countries; but the Germans of Austria refused to be separated, and they were supported in their opposition by all those who were unwilling that the King of Prussia should be Chief of the new State; it was clear that, were Austria to be excluded, the selection of the King of Prussia was certain.

In November, 1848, the Austrian Government offended the Frankfort Parliament by the execution of the deputy Blum, and the Parliament vigorously protested; the Minister Schartzenberg aimed at a great central system, and declared that Austria must be included with all her territories; this proposal was naturally obnoxious to all Germans who were not Austrians.

In the midst of these warring interests the new Imperial Constitution was framed; it established the creation of two Chambers, a Chamber of States, which should be composed of members elected by the Governments and the local assemblies, with a popular Chamber, elected by general suffrage. But the one important decision was always postponed; the prevailing opinion in the Parliament was against the inclusion of the Austrians in the new State, but in favour of a perpetual international alliance with her. Au tria, however, was too much occupied with her Italian and Hungarian wars to prevent the Separatist movement.

. . . .

Even in the French Republic moderate ideas began to gain ground. Already in the Constituent Assembly the Republican element had prevailed over that of the Socialist; the latter attempted to seize the power by force; on May 15, 1848, a tumultuous crowd succeeded in penetrating into the Palais de Bourbon at Paris, where the Assembly held its sessions, and proclaimed a Provisional Socialistic Government; but the National Guard hastened to the scene: it freed the Assembly and arrested the chiefs of the insurrection; Louis Blanc, fearing that he might be compromised, fled the country.

This event excited great indignation in the Assembly, and it decided on the suppression of the national workshops, which had been inaugurated to give labour to the unemployed. A furious insurrection broke out; the Assembly, in defence of public order, gave plenipotentiary powers to General Cavaignac; for three days, June 24, 25, and 26, sanguinary street fighting took place at Paris in which both parties committed excesses; the Archbishop of Paris, Monsignor Affre, who attempted to address the revolutionists, was shot dead. But Cavaignac triumphed, and was acclaimed by the Assembly as the Saviour of France; but his triumph was but a sad one, and was soon followed by ferocious reprisals; many thousands of the insurgents were transported. Naturally, the Socialist Party was defeated and disorganised.

The Assembly could now tranquilly await the formation of the Constitution; it established that legislative power should be entrusted to an Assembly of 750 persons, elected by universal suffrage; the executive power was centred in a President, who was also to be elected by universal suffrage; his term of office was restricted to four years, after which period another interval of four years must elapse before he could seek re-election.

The Presidential election was fixed for December 10, 1848. The candidates were:—Lamartine, who flattered himself that the majority of the country would vote for him; Ledru-Rollin, the Socialist candidate, and General Cavaignac, who was supported by moderate Republicans; but, the man who in a short space of time became far more popular than any of the above was Louis Napoleon.

Those millions of peasants who now voted for the first time, and who had hitherto received no political education, were acquainted with but one name alone in the national story—Napoleon, and for that name they voted. Many of the lower classes, with Socialistic tendencies, also voted for him, because Louis Napoleon in his book, *Napoleonic Ideas*, had affirmed that the dominant aim of the great Napoleon had been the triumph of the lower classes; he had added that he proposed to carry out and continue his great ancestor's intention. Finally, the Monarchical Party having no candidate of its own, thought that it might utilise Louis Napoleon's personality, of which they had a poor opinion, to direct the country towards the restoration of the Monarchy. So, by a series of fortunate chances, on December 10, 1848, Prince Louis Napoleon gained 5,434,226 votes, whilst Cavaignac received 1,498,000, Ledru-Rollin 370,000, and Lamartine 7,913.

The new President chose the Palais de l'Elysée for his residence; he formed a Ministry from the Right, which, by means of prefects and Government agents in the provinces, soon gave a moderate direction to political life.

CHAPTER VI

THE TRIUMPH OF REACTION

Resumption of the War between Piedmont and Austria: Battle of Novara, March 23, 1849.—Abdication of Carlo Alberto.—The 'Ten Days' of Brescia.—Ferdinand II. subjugates Sicily.—Absolutism restored in the Kingdom of Naples.—Re-establishment of the Grand Ducal Monarchy in Tuscany.—The Roman Republic and Giuseppe Mazzini: Intervention of the French, Neapolitans, Spaniards, and Austrians in the Roman State.—June 13, 1849, at Paris, and the Defeat of the 'Mountain.'—Fall of the Roman Republic, July 2, 1849.—The Retreat of Garibaldi.—Magnificent resistance of Venice: The War in Hungary: Kossuth Dictator: Entry of a Russian Army into Hungary: Capitulation of Vilagos, August 13, 1849.—Changes in Germany: Offer of the Imperial Crown to Frederick William IV.: His refusal.—End of the Frankfort Parliament.—Various attempts of the King of Prussia to form a German Union.—Re-establishment of the Diet of Frankfort, 1831.—Constitutional Government preserved in Prussia: In Austria the Constitution is abrogated.—Difficulties which beset Victor Emmanuel at the beginning of his reign in the Kingdom of Sardinia: Massimo D'Azeglio, President of Ministers: Peace with Austria and the Proclamation of Moncalieri.

Amid the general disasters of 1848 the Austrian Government had the good fortune to possess an army solidly organised and devoted to the service of the Sovereign. The Austrian Army, under the command of the aged Marshal Radetzky, rendered, at this time, immense services to Austria, and later, on the renewal of the war against Carlo Alberto, finished its work. This time Piedmont stood alone: Naples and Sicily hastened to resume their fratricidal warfare; the Governments of Rome and Florence were entirely occupied in consolidating their Republics; the Lombardo-Veneto and the Emilian Duchies awaited the advent of the Piedmontese troops as the signal for revolt; Venice was absorbed in defending herself; therefore the Piedmontese Army faced the Austrians alone.

It is true that by immense sacrifices Piedmont's number of fighting men had been raised to 90,000, but the majority of these were newly enrolled and had never been under fire: in addition, the extremists spread discontent in the

Army, and the latter had no confidence in the officers who had directed the preceding campaign. King Carlo Alberto, realising his own inadequacy, completed his sacrifice—for him a terrible one, indeed—and relinquished the supreme command; the Polish General, Chrzanowsky, succeeded him: unfortunately, he did not rise to the heights which the occasion demanded of him.

Marshal Radetzky, the Austrian leader, commanded in Italy an army of 100,000 men, all of them rendered enthusiastic and sanguine by the recent successes; Radetzky's victories had restored to him his youthful vigour, and in this latest period he increased the fame which he had already won by fresh exploits. His intention was to concentrate his troops near the Ticino, to march boldly into Tuscany, and there to give decisive battle to the Piedmontese forces: if he were successful—and he was confident of victory—the insurrection of the Lombardo-Veneto would soon die down.

Therefore, on March 20, without encountering any resistance, he passed the Ticino, near Pavia, with 70,000 men. General Ramarino had been instructed to defend this passage, but instead of obeying these orders and stationing his troops at La Cava—a position which commanded the Ticino at this point—he remained on the right bank of the Po: it is true that he sent a few battalions to La Cava, but these were forced to retreat before the Austrian advance. Ramarino was accused of treachery: certainly his disobedience to orders, whether through carelessness or incapacity, was fully proved. He was, therefore, condemned to death, and shot in the citadel of Turin.

On March 21 the Austrians advanced and came into collision with the Piedmontese forces near Vigevano and Mortara; at Vigevano and the neighbouring Sforzesca, the Italians were victorious, but they were defeated at Mortara: Chrzanowsky then concentrated his army at Novara. The Piedmontese forces were depressed by the disaster of Mortara: in spite of this the battle opened favourably for them, and the King's second son,—the Duke of Genova,—who had two horses killed under him, succeeded in driving the Austrians from Bicocca; but Chrzanowsky had decided on

a defensive battle, and would not deliver an attack; instead of sending reinforcements for a decisive blow, he gave the order for retreat. Fresh troops arrived in the meantime to aid Radetzky's forces; after an obstinate struggle, which lasted till night, Radetzky remained in possession of the field.—March 23, 1849.

Carlo Alberto again and again had flung himself into the hottest fighting, in the hope that he might meet a soldier's death: but his efforts were vain. Death spared him for a more bitter fate. He demanded an armistice, but the conditions which the Austrians imposed appeared to him to be too severe; with the hope that his son might obtain easier conditions from the Austrians, he abdicated the throne in his favour.

Since public life had become distasteful to him, he determined to exile himself far from Piedmont, and took refuge in Portugal. Thus the Piedmontese Sovereign was the first of a new body of exiles, who were no longer conspirators, but who had been conquered in open field in defence of Italian Unity. The last few months of Carlo Alberto's life were passed at Oporto, where he died heart-broken on July 28, 1849, at the early age of fifty-two years.

At the beginning of hostilities between Austria and Piedmont, several cities of the Lombardo-Veneto, such as Como, Bergamo, and Brescia, had risen in arms; but the news of the Piedmontese disaster compelled their submission. Brescia, alone, deceived by false rumours of victory, held out against Austria and besieged the Austrian garrison, which occupied the citadel; but they were soon besieged, in their turn, by Austrian forces, at the head of which was General Haynau, that ferocious soldier who gloried in the terror of his name: he invited the Brescians to surrender in a proclamation which terminated thus:—'Brescians, you know me! I keep my word.'

Proudly and bravely the Brescians resisted the Austrian arms for ten days; they yielded only when the whole city was wasted by fire and sword, and the streets were piled with corpses. But those ten days of blood reiterated to the world the message that Italy would no longer submit to the

Austrian: it is true that in the Po valley Austrian power was restored, but its only supports were guns and gibbets.

The same may be said of the Bourbon régime, which Ferdinand II. had succeeded in re-establishing in Sicily by force of arms. Catania resisted heroically till it was sacked and burnt by the victors: the Provisional Government at Palermo negotiated with the Bourbons, but the people appointed other leaders and attempted to maintain their resistance; the royal troops were forced to fight for three days before they could enter the city: they were at last allowed to enter by the promise of lenient conditions which the King later refused to keep,—May 15. The island was subdued, but the chief citizens went into exile, and those who remained still nourished in their hearts a determination to shake off the Bourbon yoke at the first opportunity.

In Naples, the Parliament which had been convoked on February 1, 1849, was definitely closed on March 13. Not only was there no attempt to install a Constitutional Government, but many of the principal inhabitants, who had trusted in the King's word and taken part in the political life of the country, were either arrested as rebels or driven into exile.

King Ferdinand, in his castle of Gaeta, was the host both of the Pope and of the Grand Duke of Tuscany: this triumvirate rejoiced in the news of the Austrian successes and longed for the time when their Governments should be restored to them.

In Tuscany, the Moderate Party were dissatisfied with Guerrazzi's Government, and at the same time anxious to avoid collision with Austria; on April 12, 1849, Florence rose against the Government, and sent a message to the Grand Duke requesting him to return; the Moderates formed an interim Government while awaiting Leopold's arrival. Almost the whole of Tuscany supported the action taken by Florence; Leghorn alone maintained its revolutionary attitude. The Grand Duke sent one of his Generals to take possession of the Government, and begged the Austrians to send troops into Tuscany: this latter step caused universal indignation. Leghorn resisted the Austrian troops, but was soon compelled to submit. Though the

reprisals taken by the Tuscan Government were milder than those made by Ferdinand II. of Naples, yet even here some of the more prominent Liberals, including Guerrazzi, were thrown into prison, and others were forced to emigrate.

At Rome, the Constituent Assembly, at its meeting in February, 1849, had proclaimed a Republic. Naturally, Pius IX., at Gaeta, had protested, and following the counsels of Cardinal Giacomo Antonelli, who henceforth inspired his policy, he invited the Catholic Powers to restore his Government. Foreign intervention appeared imminent after the battle of Novara. In this grave crisis the Roman Assembly determined to place the executive power in the hands of a triumvirate:—Mazzini, Saffi, and Armellini.

Many Italians who, on account of their patriotism, had been expelled from their own States, had hastened in these days to Rome. The first troops against which both Romans and Italians were called upon to defend themselves were the soldiers of the French Republic.

After the battle of Novara, the President, Louis Napoleon, in order to gain the support of the clericals for his future schemes, determined to restore the Pope in Rome; but he did not dare to manifest his intention to the Assembly, which consisted mainly of Liberals: he therefore adopted an equivocal policy.

He caused to be passed an extraordinary vote of credit for the maintenance of an expeditionary corps, for three months, in the Mediterranean; concerning the destination of this corps he was silent; he simply gave out that the object of its mission was to counterbalance Austrian influence and to maintain that of the French nation; he ordered the fleet at Toulon, on which a large body of troops under Oudinot had embarked, to be made ready for sea.

It sailed for the Roman State; Oudinot on his arrival at Civita Vecchia, by ambiguous phrases and protestations of friendship induced the inhabitants to offer no resistance to his landing. But the Roman Republic considered this foreign intervention as an offence, and determined to repel force by force. On April 30, Oudinot's troops arrived under the walls of Rome, with the persuasion that entrance

into the city would be easy, since Oudinot was convinced that the reactionary element would open the gates and that the volunteers would be thrown into disorder; disillusion quickly followed; he met with a formidable resistance, in which Garibaldi specially distinguished himself; the latter had hastened to Rome with his volunteers, and the fame that he had already acquired in America was confirmed in his first engagements in Italy. After six hours of sanguinary combat, the French were compelled to retreat along the Civita Vecchia road as far as Palo.

The news of this military undertaking opened the eyes of the French Liberals, and aroused their indignation. The Constituent Assembly passed an order of the day, by which it demanded that the Government should immediately forbid the expedition from passing the limits assigned to its undertaking. The President knew that the elections for the Legislative Assembly were near; therefore, in order to gain time, he pretended to yield to the request of the Assembly, and sent an ambassador to Rome in the person of Ferdinand de Lesseps, who later acquired fame by piercing the Isthmus of Suez. Lesseps negotiated with the Triumvirate and succeeded in arranging a cessation of hostilities, while the basis of future agreement between the Pope and the Romans should be discussed.

. . . .

In the meantime, King Ferdinand I. of Naples, in order to procure the Pope's friendship, sent an army against the Roman Republic. But Garibaldi, at Palestrina and Velletri, inflicted on them two severe defeats, compelling Ferdinand to abandon his intention.

Spain had also sent troops to the Pope's aid; but the 8000 Spanish soldiers who had landed at Terracina satisfied their military honour by occupying a few hamlets in the district, where no opposition was to be met with.

Austria acted more vigorously, and she would have willingly undertaken, unaided, the task of restoring the Temporal Power. After having occupied the territory of Ferrara, the Austrians advanced on Bologna, which for some days resisted magnificently. Having captured Bologna, Austria marched on Ancona, which also refused to surrender;

but, besieged both by land and sea, she was compelled to open her gates to the enemy on June 19.

Before this, however, fighting had again been resumed at Rome.

The election for the legislative Assembly had resulted in a great victory for the Monarchists; only 250 Republicans sat in the new Assembly of 750 deputies, and the majority of this section belonged to the most advanced party—the 'Mountain'—whose excesses strengthened the reactionary tendencies of the other deputies. Hence, Napoleon was enabled to proceed more openly. He recalled Lesseps from Rome and refused to confirm his negotiations; at the same time he gave orders to Oudinot, to whom he had sent reinforcements, to continue the fighting. On June 1, Oudinot warned the Roman Government that hostilities were about to recommence; he added that in order to allow French residents in Rome to leave the city, he would not attack the forts before June 4. Relying on this promise, the Roman Generalissimo, Giuseppe Roselli of Ancona, neglected to guard the strong positions of Villa Panfili and Corsini, outside the gate of San Pancrazio; Oudinot occupied these positions on the evening of June 3, as if these outposts were no part of the defence. These heights dominated the gate of San Pancrazio, and thus were of decisive importance to the defence of Rome: on this account, Garibaldi attempted to reoccupy them. The conflict lasted for a whole day, and is memorable for the many acts of individual valour on the part of the Garibaldians, who several times gained these heights without being able to maintain the positions taken. The young poet, Goffredo Mameli, author of the famous hymn, 'Fratelli d'Italia,' which had been sung on every battlefield in the war of independence, fell wounded in this engagement; the poet-soldier was carried to the hospital, and died three days later.

The French Liberals protested violently: Ledru-Rollin presented an Order of the Day which accused the President and his Ministers of having violated that article of the Constitution which says:—'*The French Republic will never employ force against the liberty of other peoples.*' The Assembly rejected the motion; on this, Ledru-Rollin and his friends

organised an insurrection, which broke out in the streets of Paris on June 13. But the army of rebels who, the year before, had gravely imperilled the safety of the Assembly existed no more at Paris. On this account, the rebellion assumed no great proportions, and was easily quelled. Ledru-Rollin succeeded in escaping and took refuge in England. Louis Napoleon instantly took advantage of the situation; thirty-three deputies were implicated in this rebellion, and were cancelled from the number of National Representatives, while public meetings and liberty of the Press were restricted. President and Assembly were thus agreed upon the destruction of the Republican Party.

Fighting still continued at Rome. The final assault took place on the night of June 29-30. An armistice was agreed upon on July 1, for the purpose of collecting the dead and wounded; on the morrow the Roman Assembly determined to abandon a defence which had been rendered impossible. During the entry of the French into the city on July 3 the deputies, in sign of protest, proclaimed the Roman Republic, which had been discussed and approved during the siege. The hall of the Assembly was closed on July 4, and General Oudinot re-established the Papal Rule in Rome.

. . . .

Venice, too, felt that she must reinstate herself in the eyes of the Italians, after the degradation of the fall of the Republic in 1797; and, in very truth, she acquired new glory and merit in the hearts of all Italians. She had the good fortune of being directed in her resistance against Austria by Daniele Manin, the only statesman whom the events of 1848 and 1849 had produced in Italy. After the battle of Novara, Venice could no longer count on the aid of Piedmont; yet the Assembly of Representatives who were gathered in the Hall of Greater Council on April 2, 1849, unanimously declared, '*Venice will resist Austria at all costs*,' and President Manin was invested with full powers.

The Austrians concentrated at Mestre and attacked the fort of Malghera, on the margin of the lagoons; the bombardment lasted for twenty consecutive days and finally reduced Malghera to a mass of ruins: this fort was then

abandoned and the defenders retired over the long bridge which united the city to the continent; some of the arches were broken in order to impede the Austrian advance, and the defence of the bridge was organised.

During this obstinate resistance, secret agreements were made with the Hungarian insurgents. But food began to fail, and the Austrians, who had advanced to the edge of the lagoons, succeeded in reaching the city with their shells. That portion of the city which was being bombarded was abandoned by the inhabitants, and the consequent crowding of the fugitives caused disease to break out in several quarters. The situation day by day became more acute, and was soon rendered almost intolerable. On August 6 Piedmont transformed the armistice of March into a definite Treaty of Peace; the Hungarian rebellion had also been quelled by the Russo-Austrian troops; all further opposition, therefore, seemed vain: on August 22, 1849, Venice capitulated, and many prominent Venetian patriots, such as Daniele Manin and Nicolò Tomaseo, were forced to fly from the country.

Magnificent had also been the resistance of Hungary. At the beginning of the year, the Hungarian Government, which had retired to Debreczin, had proclaimed universal conscription, so that it was soon able to dispose of considerable forces. The Polish General, Bem, by a series of bold and rapid movements, restored Hungarian power in Transylvania, where Magyars, Saxons, and Rumanians were exterminating each other in a ferocious racial war: whilst two young Hungarian leaders, Arthur Görgey and George Klapla successfully resumed the offensive against the Austrians, who were forced to abandon Pest.

These fortunate successes of the Hungarian arms induced the Assembly of Debreczin to proclaim the deposition of the reigning dynasty. A Provisional Government was formed, which did not assume the title of Republic because the sentiment of the country was monarchical: but it placed Louis Kossuth at the head of the Executive, with the title of President Governor.

Austria, however, now that it was freed from its struggle with Piedmont, was able to send other troops against Hungary, under the supreme command of the ferocious Haynau, who

had rendered his name infamous by the massacre of Brescia. But Hungary resisted with such energy that the Emperor Francis Joseph decided to demand aid of the Czar Nicholas.

The Russian Czar was proud of the fact that the effects of the revolutionary crisis of 1849 had not been felt in his dominions: willingly, therefore, he accepted the task of quelling a Revolution outside his Empire. In 1848 he had sent his troops to suffocate the National and Liberal movements of the Boiars against the Hospodars of Moldavia and Wallachia. He now joyfully seized the opportunity of saving his colleague of Austria. A Russian army of 100,000 men crossed the Passes of the Carpathians and entered Hungary. It was then that the Hungarians lost courage; the quarrels between their chiefs, more especially between Görgey and Kossuth, aggravated the situation. The Government abandoned Budapest and retired first to Zegedin, then to Arad, while, on the one side Austrians, and on the other Russians, penetrated ever more deeply into the country. On August 11 Kossuth was forced by the Council of War to resign his powers to Görgey, and he took refuge in Turkey; two days later, Görgey judged the continuation of the war to be an impossibility; he would not surrender to the Austrians, but, with his camp of 23,000 men at Villagos, he capitulated to the Russian troops. This event marked the end of the Hungarian Revolution.

A sanguinary period of repression followed, and General Haynau's reprisals increased the hatred with which he was regarded by all civilised peoples. Many were executed: at Arad, in one day, thirteen Generals were gibbeted; Görgey owed his life alone to Russian intercession, and he was interned at Klagenfurt. The Austrian Government pressed Turkey to surrender the Hungarian fugitives who had taken refuge in that country, and this demand was supported by the Russians; but Turkey demonstrated a higher code of civilisation than that possessed by the reactionary Governments, and, to her honour, refused; in this refusal she was supported by England. But she withdrew the refugees from the frontier and interned them in distant provinces.

Austria may be said to have triumphed completely in her own dominions, but the preoccupations caused by her wars of repression had prevented her from attending to German politics.

. . . .

When, in March, 1849, Austria had resumed her conflict with Piedmont, the Parliament of Frankfort, by a small majority, had decided on the exclusion of Austria from the new national State: it had also decided to appoint one of the German princes as head of the Federal State, with the title of Emperor of the Germans: finally, on March 28, 1849, the Parliament nominated King Frederick William IV. of Prussia as Emperor.

Though Frederick William IV. had long dreamed of the Imperial Throne, he was reluctant to accept it, except from the hand of his peers,—those Sovereigns who held their power by 'the Grace of God'; he had also a strong objection to any offer made to him by representatives of the Revolution. Therefore, when the President of the Parliament, Edward Simpson, headed a deputation to Berlin in order to offer him the Imperial Crown, the King replied that he could not accept it without the consent of the other German Princes, and the revision of that Constitution which the Parliament had framed. Only the smaller States supported his nomination: the four Kings of Bavaria, Würtemberg, Saxony, and Hanover, were unwilling that their co-Sovereign should be invested with a higher dignity than their own: Austria, also, flushed with the victory of Novara, ordered the Austrian deputies to resign their Parliamentary positions. And, to add to the difficulties, the Parliament declared its resolution to maintain unaltered the Constitution to which it had given birth. Frederick William IV. decided to refuse the Crown offered him by the Frankfort Parliament: he declared, however, his willingness to continue his labours for German Unity.

The situation at Frankfort rapidly developed: the majority of the Austrian deputies had obeyed the mandate from Vienna and had returned home: of the remaining deputies, the more moderate resigned, so that the situation remained in the hands of the extreme section. On May 4

the Assembly declared its determination to promulgate the Constitution in spite of the opposition of the Princes; in order to force the Government to accept it, the more advanced elements of the Parliament organised Revolutions in every part.

These were easily quelled in Prussia. In Saxony the movement was more serious—only the intervention of Prussian troops succeeded in restoring order after many days of sanguinary fighting. In the Grand Duchy of Baden and the Palatinate the rebellion assumed great proportions: here, also, the Princes demanded the aid of Prussia. The few deputies who had remained at Frankfort determined, on the approach of the Prussians, to transfer their seat to Stuttgart, in the hope that Würtemberg would also revolt. But on June 18, the Würtemberg Government ordered their Hall of Assembly to be occupied by the military, and the deputies were dispersed.

Thus ended the first German Parliament.

The King of Prussia, however, whilst quelling the Revolution, sought on his own account to revert to the ideal of unity, and to actuate it by an accord with the various Governments, which, he flattered himself, would be grateful to him for his action against the rebels. Diplomatic Congresses were, therefore, held at Berlin. But the opposition of Austria, and the secret jealousy of the Kingdoms of Germany, prevented the negotiations which had been initiated from attaining any practical result.

In addition, the renewal of the war with Denmark had been of no advantage to Prussia. All negotiations for peace having failed, hostilities recommenced in April, 1849: but the events of the preceding year were practically repeated; the German troops obtained some successes, and the Danish troops were once again repelled in Jutland: the troops which garrisoned Federicia were surrounded and besieged; but the Danish fleet succeeded in disembarking numerous reinforcements in the neighbourhood of the city and inflicted a severe defeat on the besiegers. The same diplomatic reasons which had prevented the Prussian advance in the preceding year again prevailed, and

Prussia concluded a new armistice, which later led to the Peace of 1850, by which the Prussians evacuated the occupied territories.

Austria was now freed from the embarrassments which had fettered her, and was in a position which enabled her to wait for the opportunity of restoring the ancient order of things in Germany. She, therefore, in April, 1850, begged the German Governments again to send their delegates to Frankfort, in order to reorganise the Government of Germany. Prussia opposed this initiative with such violence that war between Austria and Prussia seemed imminent.

But Frederick William IV., with his usual vacillation in grave crises, dared not risk the war: after prolonged hesitation, he finally yielded completely to the Austrian demands. The Confederation anterior to 1848 was revived: the Federal Diet reassembled at Frankfort in May, 1851, and suggested that the very memory of Revolution should be cancelled. Almost all the Confederate States again suppressed the concessions of 1848 and re-established the ancient order of things.

But the Constitutional system was maintained in Prussia. The King, however, modified the electoral law and divided the electors into three classes, according to their property qualifications. He established that the number of deputies should correspond with the taxes paid by each of these three classes. Naturally, in the first category, but few electors were necessary in order to amass the sum stipulated for the election of a deputy: in the second class a considerable number were necessary for the raising of the prescribed sum, and in the third class an enormous number of votes were necessary for the return of but one representative.

This system, which favours the rich alone, was introduced provisionally, but it still exists in the Prussia of to-day. Manifestly, a Chamber elected on these lines would be intensely Conservative, and it approved this and other emendations of the Constitution : in ordinary affairs Parliamentary sanction was not necessary, for its power consisted almost entirely in the approval

of new taxes. These modifications made, the King decided to promulgate the Constitution—January 31, 1850: a few days later, he swore to it, and faithfully maintained his oath.

In Austria, on the other hand, the Constitution given by Francis Joseph on March 4, 1849, was never applied, and on December 31, 1851, it was solemnly annulled by an Imperial Decree. The Government declared that Hungary, by its rebellion, had forfeited its ancient Constitution, and neither the Diet nor the Assembly of Committees was re-established. Hungary, therefore, passed under the Absolutist régime and was governed by functionaries sent from Vienna. Thus, in Europe, the Austrian Government assumed an ever-increasingly reactionary attitude.

. . . .

Piedmont, alone, in Italy, had preserved its Constitution. This was fortunate, both for itself and for Italy, and was due, principally, to King Victor Emmanuel II., who had succeeded Carlo Alberto in the dark days which followed the battle of Novara.

He was then in the full flower of his youth, for he had but barely reached his 29th year: in the war of 1848-1849 he had carried out those traditions of valour which are hereditary to his House. It may easily be imagined, then, how keenly he felt the humiliation of entering on his reign in the position of a vanquished monarch. Fortunately, he had not inherited his father's indecision: from the day on which he ascended the throne, he saw clearly before him his pole-star, and marched directly towards it.

On March 24, 1849, accompanied by a few officers, he interviewed Radetzky, personally, in a locality near Novara, called Vignale. Necessity forced him to sign the severe conditions imposed on him by Radetzky, which permitted the Austrians to occupy, temporarily, a portion of Piedmontese territory: but he would not yield to the urgent prayer of Radetzky that he should restore an Absolutist Government in Piedmont. Animated by a noble sentiment of filial devotion, and guided by an exact perception of the political crisis, he determined to carry on the Liberal traditions of his father, and to raise high that tricoloured flag, which

represented the agreement of the House of Savoy with the ideas of the Revolution.

In order to show clearly the direction which he intended to give to Piedmontese policy, he chose for the head of his Ministry a man whose name alone was a sufficient guarantee of loyalty and patriotism:—Massimo D'Azeglio. The latter characterised the precise and constant aim of Piedmont in the words, 'We will begin again and do better.'

The first and gravest question concerned relations with Austria. The conditions which ruled Italy seemed to render a renewal of the war impossible: it became necessary, then, to transform the armistice into a stable peace. The negotiations were long and difficult; Piedmont decided to secure from Austria an amnesty for those citizens of the Lombardo-Veneto who had shown their hostility to Austria; this Power, however, declared that in any case this was a matter for the Emperor to decide in his relations with his subjects and had nothing to do with Piedmont; but Piedmont insisted, and the Austrian Government finally promised that an amnesty should be published before the notification of Peace. The Peace Treaty was signed at Milan on August 6, 1849, and Piedmont consented to pay a war indemnity of 75,000,000 lire.

It was necessary that this Treaty should also be ratified by Parliament. In vain Cesare Balbo proposed 'that the Peace Treaty should be voted in silence as a protest.' The majority of the members, instead, carried a motion to suspend the approval of the Treaty until a law should be passed regarding the rights of citizenship of the exiles from the Lombardo-Veneto. This suspension threatened serious difficulties, and might have led to a war with Austria, who was certain of her position and everywhere victorious; the Ministry was reluctant to assume responsibility. The Chamber was dissolved, and Massimo D'Azeglio, in summoning another Parliament, advised the King to appeal directly to the country's sense and loyalty, and to demand public support for the Government. This Proclamation of Moncalieri, so called from the name of the town in which it was signed by the King, was certainly dangerous, since the Ministry sheltered itself behind the King and put on

him the onus of advising the people to express clearly its political sympathies: but it exercised a salutary effect on the electors, who sent back a considerable majority of Ministerialists to Parliament, and these, without discussion, approved the Treaty of Peace with Austria.

This important question settled, Piedmont was able to devote its attention to its own internal affairs and to develop the liberties sanctioned by the Statute.

CHAPTER VII

PERIOD OF PREPARATION

England : Its industrial development and the Foreign Policy of Palmerston.—France : Struggle between the President and the Assembly : Coup d'état *of December 2, 1851 : The Plebiscite and the new Constitution : Proclamation of the Empire, December 21, 1852.—Development of the Constitutional Régime in Piedmont.—Cavour becomes Minister : The 'Marriage.'—Cavour President of the Ministers.—Moral growth of Piedmont.—The Neapolitan trials.—Reaction in the other Italian States.—The Lombardo-Veneto under the military dictatorship of Radetzky : Sequestration of emigrants' property and the protest of Piedmont.—The Czar's Projects.—Russian occupation of the Danubian Principalities.—Uncertain Policy of Austria.—Russo-Turkish War and Anglo-French intervention on behalf of Turkey.—Landing of the Allies in the Crimea : Defence of Sebastopol.—Alliance of the Kingdom of Sardinia with the Western Powers.—Fall of Sebastopol.—Congress of Paris : Conditions of Peace in the East : New Principles of Maritime Right : Discussion of the Italian Question.—Centralisation of Italian life in Piedmont.—Diplomatic rupture of France and England with the Kingdom of Naples.—Austria's change of policy in the Lombardo-Veneto.—Impatience of the Party of Action : Expedition of Sapri.—Sepoy Mutiny in India.—Anglo-French Expedition in China.—Representative Government in the English Colonies of Australia, the Cape, and Canada.*

Europe, in the first years which followed the revolutionary crisis of 1848-1849, appeared sunk in political inertia.

Even England was possessed by a spirit of inaction: the Liberal Party, which was in power, was satisfied with completing its programme, and on January 1, 1850, it abolished the last of the great monopolies,—that is, the Act of Navigation, which dated from the time of Cromwell and had been modified by Huskisson. Henceforth, ships of all nations could enter English ports, with merchandise of every description. The activity of the country was especially centred in business affairs: these were years of great industrial initiative, signalised by the first Universal Exhibition, which was opened in London, in the Crystal Palace, on the 1st of May, 1851. In the same year the electric submarine cable between Dover and Calais placed England in direct telegraphic communication with the Continent of Europe.

Contrasted with this internal peace, the restless spirit of Palmerston, which made the presence of England felt in every European question, rendered her foreign policy all the more conspicuous. Wishing to remove Greece from the French influence, he raised the question of a Jew of Gibraltar, named Pacifico, whose house in Athens had been sacked in a riot. Palmerston demanded an indemnity, and when he encountered difficulties, sent a fleet to blockade the port of the Piræus—January, 1850; Greece, naturally, was forced to yield. In a discussion in the House on this subject, Palmerston proudly affirmed the aim of his policy:—'Just as an ancient Roman believed himself entitled to all respect when he was able to say, "Civis Romanus sum," so the Englishman, in every country where he may chance to be, may rest assured that England with vigilant eye watches over him.'

In the European events of 1848-1849 he usually supported the cause of the insurgents; and when Austria pressed the Sultan to allow the extradition of Kossuth, Palmerston energetically supported Turkey in her resistance to the claim. In 1851, Kossuth went to reside in England, and Palmerston made a speech in his favour. This attitude of mind irritated Queen Victoria, whose tendencies, strongly Conservative, were accentuated by Prince Albert, her Consort. On this account the Queen repeatedly showed her dissatisfaction with Palmerston's policy, and explicitly declared that she would not tolerate his independent method of action unless his proposals were first submitted to her. But, notwithstanding these reproaches, Palmerston continued to follow his own initiative in foreign policy.

But he placed English interests above theories. When Louis Napoleon made his *coup d'état* of December 2, 1851, Palmerston, without any authorisation from the Ministry of which he formed part, manifested to the President his full and warm appreciation of the step. This time, however, his colleagues and the Queen united in forcing him to resign his post, December 16, 1851. A few days later his Ministry fell, and the power passed to the Conservative Party.

. . . .

In France, the President Louis Napoleon, in agreement

with the Legislative Assembly, the majority of which was Conservative in tendency, began that reactionary policy which was characterised in the phrase, 'a home-policy on the lines of the expedition to Rome.' But when he proposed to modify the Constitution in such a manner as to permit the re-election of the President, he clashed with the general feeling of the Assembly, and it rejected the proposed revision of the Constitution. Persuaded that he could not attain his aim by legal means, the President prepared a *coup d'état*, and surrounded himself with men who were absolutely devoted to him, such as Saint Arnaud, Morny, and Persigny.

On the night of December 1-2, 1851, the chiefs of the various parties were arrested in their houses: amongst these were General Cavaignac, General Lamoricière, General Changarnier, whom the Assembly would have placed at the head of those Parisian forces with which they would have overawed the President, and Adolphe Thiers, whose *History of the Consulate and the Empire*, which he had begun to print in 1845, had so greatly aided to spread the enthusiasm for Napoleon I. Thiers had at first supported Louis Napoleon, but had passed over to the opposition. Other principal citizens who might have become a source of embarrassment to the Government were also arrested. Napoleon sent troops to occupy the Parliament House, and caused proclamations to be posted, by which the President pronounced the dissolution of the Assembly. By a plebiscite, fixed for December 14, he asked the people to vote on the following modifications of the Constitution:—(*a*) A head of the Executive power to be elected for ten years, (*b*) A State Council, which should prepare all laws, (*c*) A Legislative Corps, elected by universal suffrage and individual scrutiny, which should discuss these laws and vote on them, and (*d*) A Second House, formed of the notables of the country.

When, on the morning of December 2, Paris became aware of these facts, many deputies of the opposition assembled in one of the Municipal buildings. They declared the Constitution to be violated, and pronounced the deposition of the President: but before they could commit any overt act, they were arrested and imprisoned: the populace looked on with indifferent eyes, for but little sympathy was given

to an Assembly which had so often shown itself inspired by reactionary sentiments. The middle classes were preoccupied by the dread of the Socialistic bogey, and feared that an insurrection might lead to excesses. Newspaper agitation was lacking, since all the printing offices were occupied by the military; the journalists, indeed, assembled to protest, but they were unable to find means of printing their resolution.

On December 3 a proclamation signed by Victor Hugo and other Republicans was published: barricades were erected in some places, but any resistance was soon suffocated in blood. Grave disorders occurred in the provinces, and thirty departments were placed under military law; but, finally, all opposition was successfully stamped out.

Meanwhile, the plebiscite invoked by Louis Napoleon was taken. The opposition journals were not allowed to be printed, and all who abused the President were imprisoned. Under such conditions the country approved the *coup d'état* by a majority of 6,799,000 votes out of a total of 7,439,000.

Relying on this plebiscite, Louis Napoleon promulgated the new Constitution, which was based on the Constitution of the Year 8, given by Napoleon Bonaparte after the *coup d'état* of the 4th Brumaire. By it the only authority in France was the President, who was elected for ten years, and eligible for re-election; not only could he declare war and peace and form Treaties, but he alone could sanction the laws. His power was exercised through the medium of Ministers, who were responsible to him alone. He himself was responsible to the French nation, but the latter had no means of manifesting its ideas; it could only do so by a plebiscite on the invitation of the President. The executive power being thus strongly centred in one person, the Legislative power was divided into three councils, of which two—the State Council and the Senate, were emanations of the President, since he it was who nominated their members; the Legislative Corps was, however, elected by universal suffrage, but the functions of the deputies were extremely limited; they could only discuss and vote on the proposals presented to them by the State Council, without possessing the power either of proposing laws, or modifying the projected measures: the journals were only allowed to publish

the arid summary of the sittings, which was officially handed to them by the authorities. Thus the Legislative Corps became insignificant, while the Senate and the State Council acquired great authority:—the State Council, since it prepared the laws, and the Senate, since it revised them, or, if they were found to be contrary to the Constitution, cancelled them altogether. All these offices were richly endowed, and with them Louis Napoleon was able to reward his friends and his relations.

But the more zealous of the supporters of Louis Napoleon agitated for the restoration of the Empire; the Prince-President, in his journeys, was often greeted with the cry of, 'Vive l'Empéreur!' and he made it increasingly clear that he desired the Imperial Crown. The Senate, which was the guardian of the Constitution, proposed the restoration of the Empire in favour of Louis Napoleon; a plebiscite was demanded on this proposal, which took place on November 20, and resulted in 7,824,000 votes in favour of the Empire, and 252,000 against it. On December 2, 1852, the coronation of the new Emperor took place, and he assumed the title of Napoleon III.

The new Emperor chose as his residence the Palace of the Tuileries. The Powers had welcomed the *coup d'état* of December 2 because it represented the triumph of reaction; but the restoration of the Empire aroused some apprehension. In any case, they finally recognised the new Sovereign.

But Napoleon III. was considered as an interloper by his brother Sovereigns; so much so, indeed, that though he desired to marry, he could find no princely house willing to enter into relationship with him. He resolved to make an alliance of affection, and in January, 1853, he married the beautiful Spanish Countess, Eugenia di Montijo. On the morning of the marriage he granted a large amnesty to political prisoners, permitting them to return to their country if they but promised obedience to the existing institutions. Many eminent persons, such as Victor Hugo, Quinet, and others, would not accept the amnesty, and continued from abroad an implacable fight against the Empire.

Whilst the new Court was being organised, the activity

of the country was specially concentrated on business undertakings, in the development of industry and commerce, in banking, in railway construction, and extensive public works. England and France competed together in these labours of civilisation.

. . . .

After the disasters of 1849, Piedmont also had attempted to repair the damages she had suffered, and to recover her riches and prosperity of the past: political life had been actively maintained, since many Italian patriots, who had emigrated from other States of the Peninsula, had come to make their stable residence in the only Italian Province which had preserved the tricolour flag and a Constitutional Government.

The country quickly adapted itself to the new régime; political journalism, which was given complete freedom and not shackled by taxes, aided, in an efficacious manner, the political education of the people. The D'Azeglio Ministry occupied itself with the internal reorganisation of the country, and followed a distinctly Liberal policy.

In February, 1850, Count Siccardi, the Minister of Justice, brought forward a law abolishing the ecclesiastical privileges of a separate tribunal—annulling the right of asylum in churches and other sacred places, and limiting the number of Feasts of Obligation. This was the first step towards investing the State with its own rights of Sovereignty; but precisely because this law followed the direction of the policy indicated by the Government, it was violently combated by the party of reaction.

In the bitter discussion which followed, Camillo Cavour particularly distinguished himself. Cavour had done nothing worthy of notice in the preceding years; in the first election of April, 1848, he had not been returned; he was, however, elected in the supplementary election of June, but having allied himself to the Party of the Right, he had fallen in the election of January, 1849, when the democratic party had won. Finally, by the election, for which the King had been responsible, in July, 1849, he had definitely taken his place in the Chamber, and now achieved his first oratorical success.

Notwithstanding great opposition, the Law passed both the Chamber and the Senate. The reactionary party attempted to impede the Royal assent, but the King stood firm and sanctioned the Law. The clericals then became violent. At this very time the Minister of Agriculture, Count Pietro di Santarosa, fell mortally ill. Being a fervent Catholic, he demanded the sacraments of the Church; but the priests who attended him claimed that first of all he should declare his repentance for having drawn up the Siccardi Law. Santarosa refused to sign the document presented to him, and religious consolation was denied him.

His successor in the Ministry of Agriculture was Cavour —October, 1850. An enthusiastic partisan of the doctrine of Free Trade, he was assured that if Piedmont would only embrace it she would vigorously enter into the new business current which was then running through Europe. But, under the circumstances which then governed Piedmont, he contented himself with concluding with individual Powers commercial treaties of moderate tone, which, while they increased the prosperity of Piedmont, aided her in her international relations, since Cavour invariably represented them as benevolent concessions made to individual States.

Till now the Ministry of Agriculture had been regarded as a secondary post; in Cavour's hands it assumed an absolute pre-eminence over the other Ministries, whether from the many and bold reforms which Cavour presented, or because the new Minister dared to discuss questions which belonged to other departments: in every case, he expressed with perfect frankness his particular views. Sometimes, even without authority, he spoke as though he were at the head of the Ministry, and Massimo D'Azeglio, who was in weak health and a lover of tranquillity, allowed him so to do. In 1851 he assumed the post of Minister of Finance.

It was due entirely to Cavour and to D'Azeglio that the Government of Victor Emmanuel not only succeeded in conquering the antipathies which had been manifested at the inception of the reign, but in acquiring each day a greater ascendancy in the country, which marked with satisfaction that there was a governing and directing force which maintained a clear and constant policy. D'Azeglio had made

honesty the dominant principle of his Government, and in a speech to the House he declared that no one, in speaking of the rights of the people, had yet mentioned one supreme right to which he desired to call attention:—that of good example—the right of being governed with loyalty and with justice. It was D'Azeglio who first originated for the King the sobriquet of 'Re Galantuomo,' ('King Honestman')—a nickname which increased the affection and trust which already existed between the Sovereign and his people.

It was at this time that the great thinker, Vincenzo Gioberti—who, after the events of 1849, had retired to Paris—published his book on the *Civil Restoration of Italy*, in which, after having mentioned the mistakes made by the Italians in 1848-1849, he declared his renunciation of the dream of Papal Sovereignty, and added that for the sake of her future peace Italy should rid herself of the Temporal Power of the Papacy. He stated that Italy looked to Piedmont for the direction of the national movement. This book aided not a little in confirming Victor Emmanuel in the determination, which afterwards led him to fulfil the destiny of Italy in *Rome, the Capital.* But it was still very necessary to proceed with prudence, for throughout Europe reaction was becoming bolder; even in France, where occurred the *coup d'état* of December 2, 1851.

In Piedmont, too, the Extreme Right manifested its reactionary tendencies still more boldly. Cavour became alarmed. He was profoundly convinced that reaction would ruin the future of Piedmont for ever, and he decided to separate himself from the party of reaction and join himself to the group of democrats which, under the guidance of Urban Ratazzi, had gradually left the more advanced elements of the Left in order to follow a more temperate policy. Cavour realised that the union of the Right and Left Centres would give a majority over the extreme wings, and would enable him to carry out the policy which even then he was formulating. He did not believe that his Ministerial colleagues would dare to go so far; therefore, he secretly conferred with Ratazzi, thinking that when he had taken this step D'Azeglio and the other Ministers would agree to it.

The first sign of his agreement was shown in the debate of February, 1852, when Di Reval of the Extreme Right remarked that Cavour had simultaneously divorced one section of the Chamber, and had made a 'marriage'—*connubio*—with the other: and by this epithet the Parliamentary was henceforth called. Cavour's defection caused a great split in the Ministry, and Cavour, in May, 1852, was forced to resign. But without him the D'Azeglio Ministry could not stand; in October of the same year D'Azeglio himself advised the King to call Cavour to the Head of the Government. A Ministry was formed which was practically based on the '*connubio*.'

Under Cavour's Presidency a more vigorous and bolder policy was initiated, since Cavour wished Piedmont to enjoy a prestige equal to the height of the new ambitions of the country. Hence, the first object to be attained was the moral aggrandisement of Piedmont. Piedmont must become a model State of civil and economic progress, which should show to Europe the capacity of the Italians to govern themselves in liberty, and should thus attract the sympathies of the other patriots of the Peninsula. It was a policy of wide horizon, which simultaneously embraced internal Government, economic statistics, religion, diplomacy, and every branch of public life.

. . . .

A furious reaction raged in the other Italian States. In the fight against Liberalism, King Ferdinand II. of Naples especially distinguished himself. Among the many political trials which he demanded, the most important one was that of the 'United Italy' Society. After long months of trial, the process ended on January 31, 1851; Luigi Settembrini, Carlo Poerio, Nicolò Nisco, and others of the most distinguished and cultured men of the Kingdom were sent to the galleys.

In the Pontifical State the Temporal Power had been restored by the intervention of the greater Catholic Powers. Spanish troops, after remaining for some time, left in February, 1850; but the French still stayed on in Rome, and the Austrians in the Romagna. When the French had occupied Rome they allowed all those who might have reason

to fear Papal revenge to leave the city. Louis Napoleon, unwilling to appear a too warm partisan of reaction, deemed it opportune to advise the Papal Government, in a letter which was publicly printed, on a few essential points of policy:—a public amnesty, a lay administration, the introduction of the Code Napoléon, and moderate Governmental policy: but this only served to irritate the Pope against him, for Pius IX. had completely abandoned the Liberal aspirations of the first years of his Pontificate.

But the Pope perfectly understood that before his return some concessions must be made: he therefore issued a *motu proprio* from Portici, where he was then staying, by which he annulled implicitly the constitutional changes which had been made, and established a State Council for matters of finance, and Provincial Councils, that is to say, the same concessions which he had already made in 1847: but the number of exclusions from the amnesty were such as to render it illusory. Finally, in April, 1850, Pius IX. decided to return to Rome, and took up his residence at the Vatican; his Government policy became that which had existed previous to the Revolution.

In Tuscany, the restoration of the Grand Duke had been made, partly by the moderate section, which had hoped in this way to save representative Government, and partly by the Austrian troops, who had captured Leghorn and continued to be quartered in the Grand Duchy.

Leopold II. was embarrassed by the two tendencies in the State: the doubtful situation was well represented by the President of the Ministers, Giovanni Baldasseroni, who declared that Tuscany, from its central position in the Peninsula and its restricted territory, could not separate its own policy from that of the rest of Italy: and since, in Piedmont, the Constitution still stood but had been suppressed in the remaining States, an intermediate position was indicated. On September 21, 1850, the Grand Duke declared that political circumstances did not permit him to restore a Constitutional Government, and 'since it had not yet been possible to convoke a Constitutional Assembly, all power would, for the present, remain in his own hands: in doubtful

cases a Council of State would be summoned, and Constitutional methods would be adopted when possible.' But when reaction appeared to be triumphant throughout Europe, the Tuscan Constitution was abolished, May, 1852, and Guerrazzi and his companions were put on their trial. Guerrazzi was condemned to the galleys for fifteen years, but this punishment was commuted later, by the Grand Duke, to perpetual banishment.

The Ducal Governments of Modena and Parma had been restored by the Austrian troops in 1848. Duke Francis V., at Modena, followed on broad lines the policy of his father, though he was less cruel. But at Parma, the young Charles IV. had succeeded to his father, Charles Louis de Bourbon, who had abdicated in 1849. The new King's system of Government was the most infamous that can be imagined. Dissolute, arrogant, ignorant, and criminal, the Duke indulged his every caprice. Neither person nor property were secure from him. The hatred which had accumulated against him explains the fact that when he was assassinated in 1854, the only sentiment felt by his people was that of an immense relief. His son, Robert, succeeded him on the throne under the Regency of his mother; the Government became more humane, but the policy continued to be reactionary and Austrophile.

. . . .

In the Lombardo-Veneto, Radetzky ruled as a military despot: he had acquired the distinguished favour of the Emperor by his conduct of the last war, and this fact enabled him to act as a dictator. The population adopted a decided attitude of mute but tenacious opposition: Austrian functionaries and soldiers were severely boycotted. In 1851 the Emperor Francis Joseph hoped that his presence might arouse sympathy in Italian breasts, and visited Milan and Venice; but everwhere he was met by hostile silence; at Como the Communal Council refused to vote expenses for the fêtes, and it was consequently dissolved.

Two distinct currents began to manifest themselves in the midst of this atmosphere of hostility towards the foreigner: the richer classes had faith in the Liberal Monarchy of Piedmont, but the Piedmontese policy was still too timid

to claim the enthusiasm of the crowd. But the great majority of the people readily welcomed the Republican unitarian idea of Mazzini.

After the fall of the Roman Republic, Mazzini had fled to Switzerland, where he had founded a publishing society, which issued a series of political-patriotic writings: in the Spring of 1850 he went to England, where he formed a Central Committee which should prepare a national Italian war: he kept himself in continual touch with the sub-committees in the various provinces of Lombardo-Veneto.

In order to procure the necessary funds he founded the National Italian Loan, whose one pound shares were easily placed, though the owners exposed themselves to terrible danger in case of discovery.

The most active of the revolutionary committees was that of Mantua, under the presidency of a priest of great ability and generous character—Enrico Tazzoli. Each day the conspiracy spread wider and extended to the greater part of Lombardy and Venice. By pure chance the police arrested one of the conspirators, and gradually succeeded in discovering the whole plot. In a short space of time more than 200 prisoners were confined in the prisons. On December 2, 1852, the executions began at Mantua, in the plain which lies in front of the Belfiore fortress. The arrest of many of the conspirators and the flight of many others had thrown into confusion the preparations for the Revolution; yet, at Milan a group of ardent citizens prepared themselves for the struggle, under the illusion of repeating the miracle of the five days of 1848. On the evening of Sunday, February 6, 1853, a few groups of insurgents attacked, by surprise, some corps of the guards and killed a few sentinels, who were, after all, like themselves, only poor victims of Austrian tyranny who had been brought by Austria into Italy with the object of oppressing a sister nation. But the Revolution received no enthusiastic support; many of the more fiery patriots, who realised the impossibility of success, had discouraged it. In a few hours the two hundred who had taken up arms were dispersed by the troops; many were arrested, and the Austrian Government sent sixteen to the gallows.

A few days later, the Emperor Francis Joseph 'having considered how manifest was the participation of the political refugees from the Lombardo-Veneto in the recent events at Milan,' decreed, 'All property, landed and personal, of the political refugees from the province of the Lombardo-Veneto is to be considered as confiscated from this day.'

These refugees had become, since their exile, citizens of the Kingdom of Sardinia; therefore, Cavour demanded explanations from Vienna of this violation of international right. But Austria was encouraged by the indifference displayed by Europe towards Piedmont; it declared that this step was necessary for the security of the monarchy, and refused to withdraw the decree. Though Cavour felt that he was isolated, he had the courage to face any risk; he recalled the Piedmontese ambassador at Vienna—which naturally determined the retirement of the Austrian Ambassador at Turin—and in a memorandum directed to the Great Powers of Europe, he protested against the arrogance of Austria, and stated that it was the duty of a regular Government to prove the complicity of these emigrants before condemning them; he then introduced in the Subalpine Parliament a Bill of Credit with which to compensate the exiles who had been dispossessed.

These events strongly aroused the public opinion in the Peninsula. Many were alienated from the Mazzinian ideas, which were dreams rather than possibilities, and the futile sacrifice of so many lives; others, who saw the Piedmontese Government in strong and courageous hands, and heard it loudly affirm its sentiments of Italian nationality, felt their hearts go out towards Piedmont.

In reality, the fundamental problem was this:—How could a State, which only counted five millions of inhabitants and which had issued from the rout of Novara, languid in strength, exhausted in its finances, and deprived of allies, renew the war against Austria, and conquer that Empire, which counted 38,000,000 inhabitants?

This was the dominant question, since such a victory would necessarily determine the solution of other problems besides the Italian one. Unfortunately, the illusion of 1848,

that Italy could act alone, had vanished; therefore, in order to reach the long-dreamed-of end it was necessary not only to sustain the moral force of Italian patriotism, but to procure also the material force of an ally; this then was the reason why opportunity was sought for the intrusion of Piedmont, with its small forces and its vast dreams, into the general current of European affairs.

. . . .

On the evening of January 9, 1853, during a ball in the Winter Palace at Petrograd, the Czar, Nicholas I., addressed the English Ambassador, and, leading him aside, entered into an interesting conversation with him. He congratulated him on the formation of the New English Ministry, under the Presidency of Lord Aberdeen, his personal friend, declared his satisfaction at the good understanding existing between his Government and that of England, and added, '*Turkey is in a critical state, and may be a cause of many embarrassments*; *we have in our arms a sick man—mortally sick; it would be a great misfortune were he to die before all necessary arrangements had been made.*' A few days later he expressed the same thought with more precision: he affirmed that he did not aspire to occupy Constantinople permanently, and that he would be quite content with the protectorate of those Balkanic States, which might hereafter be organised in Turkish territory; that England, also, might take for herself Egypt and Crete. In fact, he thought that by an agreement with England he could easily arrive at the definite solution of that Eastern Question which constituted the dream of his life: he had begun his reign with this undertaking in view, and he wished to see the conclusion of the matter in his lifetime.

With the triumph of reaction he imagined that he had become the arbiter of Europe. He calculated on the gratitude of the Emperor Francis Joseph, nor did he know that Schwartzenberg, before his death, had said that Austria would amaze the world by her ingratitude; he had no great opinion of Frederick William IV. of Prussia, his brother-in-law, but he was certain that he would be more favourable than hostile. For Napoleon I. he cared little, since he thought that his whole energy would be spent in consolidating

his power in France; briefly, he judged that the European situation was such as to favour his ambitious designs.

But the English Government was alarmed at these projects, and was unwilling to enter into similar negotiations; it contented itself with replying that the disease of the sick man was not mortal and that, in any case, an attempt should be made to cure him. But the Czar believed that the memories of Napoleon I. would render an agreement impossible between the English and French Governments, and flattered himself that he could placate England by allowing her to share in the booty; he determined to precipitate matters; in February he sent an extraordinary Ambassador to Constantinople—Prince Menschikoff, with the ostensible pretext of settling various outstanding differences which had long existed between the Russian and Turkish Governments, but in reality with the instructions to search out an excuse for war.

Soon after the arrival of the Ambassador at Constantinople one of the questions to be discussed—regarding Montenegro—was settled. This region, though the Turks considered it as their own dominion, had in reality, owing to its impregnable position, maintained its independence under the government of its Prince-Bishops (*vladika*), a power which was transmitted hereditarily from uncle to nephew in the family of Petrovich of the village of Niegosch. These Prelates demanded their investiture from the hands of the Patriarch of Petrograd, a custom which soon gave to Russia a kind of moral guardianship over Montenegro. This form of Patriarchal and Ecclesiastical Government existed in Montenegro till the close of 1851, when the young Danilo, on his accession, deemed it advisable to laicise the State: he assembled the principal Montenegrins in March, 1852, and the transformation was approved by them. Danilo styled himself Prince, and established the right of succession in his family according to the law of primogeniture.

This action irritated Turkey profoundly, and she at once sent an army into Montenegro. Prince Danilo energetically defended his country, but at the same time he invoked the aid of the Czar, who collected troops in Bessarabia, which assumed a threatening attitude towards Turkey.

Austria, who desired at any cost to avoid a Russian intervention in the Balkans, attempted to extinguish the flame before it should spread, and for this purpose advised the Sultan to cease hostilities: by its determined and energetic attitude, Austria induced the Sultan, at the beginning of February, 1853, to desist from strife and to leave Montenegro in the conditions which existed before the war.

Another question which had been unsettled for some time concerned the Holy Places, and the rights of the respective Christian communities over the chapels, altars, and memorials in those spots of Palestine consecrated by the life of Jesus. Catholics and Greeks continually disputed together, and sometimes their quarrels ended in bloodshed. For many years France had assumed a species of Protectorate over the Catholics of the Levant: in her turn, Russia supported the cause of the Orthodox: these two contrary influences each endeavoured to gain the ear of the Sultan, who gave polite but dubious replies to both parties.

Such was the situation when Prince Menschikoff arrived at Constantinople and assumed an arrogant demeanour towards the Turkish Ministers. The question of Montenegro had already been settled, and the Czar's representative was forced to accept the situation. The question of the Holy Places was not sufficiently important to cause war: France, on her part, with great generosity, attempted to facilitate the negotiations of the Sultan with the Czar; on May 4, 1853, the representatives of France and Russia countersigned the Firman which closed the question of the Holy Places, and established that the cupola of the Holy Sepulchre should be restored in its existing form; that the Catholics should possess a key of one of the doors of the Church; that the Orthodox should have the priority in exercising their cult at the tomb of the Blessed Virgin, and that the two gardens of Bethlehem should belong in common to both Catholics and Orthodox.

The Czar, therefore, lacked all pretext of war. But he had put forward another demand—that of establishing a protectorate over all the Orthodox Greeks in the Turkish Empire; this was a very different thing from the French

Protectorate over the Catholics, since these latter were numerically insignificant, whilst the orthodox numbered more than ten millions, and in the Balkan Peninsula were, in number, superior to the Turks; such a demand meant the annulment of the power of the Sultan in the Balkan Peninsula.

The Ambassadors of France and England counselled the Sultan to refuse this claim, and Prince Menschikoff indignantly quitted Constantinople. The Russian Government, under the pretext of taking a guarantee, occupied with its troops the Principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia—July, 1853. War seemed imminent.

Austria found herself in a difficult and delicate situation: the Emperor Francis Joseph did not wish to appear ungrateful towards Russia, but at the same time he aimed at impeding her aggrandisement in the Balkan Peninsula: these two aims were so essentially contrary that the attainment of both was an impossibility: the difficulty was increased by the certainty that, in order to bridle Russian ambition, it would be necessary to treat with Napoleon III., whose very name constituted a peril for Austria, since it seemed to personify the ideas of revolution and nationality. Count Carl Ferdinand von Buol-Schauenstein had succeeded to Prince Schartzenberg as Foreign Minister; he imagined that the difficulty might be solved by diplomacy; but in the long negotiations which followed, the interested Powers had many opportunities of detecting his dubious and crafty policy.

On October 4, 1853, the Sultan again demanded that Russia should withdraw her troops from the Danubian Principalities, and declared that, if within a fortnight the evacuation was not completed, hostilities would begin. The Czar naturally refused the demand and war was declared. The Czar asked for the Alliance of the Central Powers; Austria not only did not accept the suggestion, but she refused to promise neutrality; she declared that she would reserve to herself full liberty of action. Frederick William of Prussia showed the Czar more deference, but the Austrian attitude gave him courage and saved him from compromising himself. Hence Russia was isolated.

Nor could she draw the small Principalities of Montenegro and Serbia into the struggle. Through the intervention of Austria, Montenegro had made peace with Turkey only a few months before, and Austria and France now begged her to preserve her neutrality. Serbia had undergone a series of dynastic changes. The Obrenovich dynasty had been deposed in 1842: Alexander Karageorgevich, the nephew of the first hero of National Independence, through the favour of Austria, had been exalted to the throne. This Prince, eager to show his devotion to Austria, declared himself neutral. Greece manifested her desire of profiting by the occasion by entering the war and attempting to extend her northern boundaries; but King Otho did not dare to rouse the wrath of the Western Powers. These latter, fearing lest mere diplomatic veto should prove too weak for the temptation, sent a French corps to the Piræus, which there remained during the period of the war and forced Greece to remain tranquil.

But while Russia could find no allies, Turkey was able to conclude an agreement with France and England; these two Powers also concluded another Treaty between themselves—April 10, 1854—by which they pledged themselves neither to treat separately with Russia nor to seek personal aggrandisement from the war.

The English Government appointed Lord Raglan Commander-in-Chief of the troops; Raglan had been Wellington's aide-de-camp, and he rigidly defended his own authority against that of Marshal Saint-Arnaud, the bold and ambitious French Commander-in-Chief. Whilst the Anglo-French Army was assembling at Gallipoli, the Turkish forces, under Omar Pasha, sought to defend the line of the Danube. But the Russians, under the command of the aged Marshal Paskievich, succeeded in crossing the river and laid siege to Silistria, which made a magnificent resistance: this enabled the Anglo-French to send a strong corps to Varna. Meantime, Austria was preoccupied on account of the Russian seizure of the Danubian Principalities, and Russia, in order to avoid complications, withdrew her troops from these territories. Austria, by a pact with Turkey, temporarily occupied these provinces,

so that one of the theatres of war was filled by a neutral Power.

In the North, whilst the English Admiral, Napier, blockaded the Russian Baltic ports, the French General, Boraguey D'Hilliers landed in the Isle of Aland and occupied the fort of Bomarsund—May, 1814. But it was impossible to conclude a decisive campaign in these waters. Therefore the Western Powers, in order to compel Russia to make peace, decided to attack Sebastopol—that formidable arsenal in the Black Sea, which constituted a perpetual menace to Turkey.

In September, 1854, the Allied troops—30,000 French, 20,000 English, and 7,000 Turks, with horses, mules, and all the munitions of war—left Varna and landed on the western coast of the Crimea; by a battle on the banks of the river Alma, a way to Sebastopol was opened.

General Menschikoff, who commanded the Russian troops, decided to remain with his army in open country in order to annoy the besiegers and prevent communication with Russia: but, simultaneously, he took energetic measures to defend Sebastopol. He ordered Admiral Kornikoff to close the entrance to the harbour by sinking some of his battle-ships, and to disembark men, provisions, and munitions in order to reinforce the garrison of that city: he entrusted the outer works of defence to Colonel Todleben, who with great skill defended the surrounding country: he constructed trenches which were protected by faggots and sandbags, which might easily be moved, and he assumed an attitude of offence rather than defence.

At the opening of the siege, Marshal Saint-Arnaud died of cholera—a disease which was devastating the army; he left the command to General Canrobert, a brave man, who desired to spare his soldiers, and was inclined to fight a waiting battle; on this question he was in complete accord with Lord Raglan. The Allies, whilst attacking the trenches of Sebastopol, were compelled to defend themselves against Menschikoff, who had received reinforcements, and now attempted the offensive. On October 25 he tried to gain possession of the small port of Balaklava, in which the English had collected their stores. He was not successful, but he

inflicted great losses on the enemy. On November 5, with more numerous forces, he assaulted the Allies in the position of Inkermann; the battle was a bloody one, but finally the Russian Army was defeated.

Notwithstanding these successes, Sebastopol could never be blockaded on all sides. Disease, meanwhile, ravaged the armies: rain, icy wind, and snow terribly impeded the besiegers. As England had no obligatory military service, it was impossible for her to supply her losses: it was feared that the war might be of long duration. In the hope of finding a speedy solution the two Western Powers continued their pressure on Austria, trusting that the interests of the Court of Vienna would triumph over her gratitude; in fact, every day increased Austria's irritation against Russia; on December 2, 1854, she was induced to sign a Treaty with England and France by which she pledged herself to defend the Danubian Principalities in case of a Russian offensive, and promised that if Peace were not secured by January 1, 1855, she would deliberate with the two Western Powers on an efficacious way of ending the war. She allowed herself to be drawn into taking this step, but still hoped that circumstances would render it unnecessary to maintain her promise. But the Allies needed prompt aid, and began to turn their eyes to the small but strong Piedmont.

. . . .

For some time Cavour had observed with sorrow the tendency of international policy, since an agreement of the Western Powers with Austria would have assured the predominance of that power in Italy. By good fortune the uncertain and equivocal policy which Austria had adopted, induced France and England to negotiate with Piedmont. Cavour, who understood the all-importance to Piedmont of rising from her isolation, caught the ball on the bound. With a courage which appeared temerarious, he assumed the responsibility of concluding the Alliance without guarantees of any sort—January 10, 1855.

This Treaty provoked bitter criticism in the Subapline Parliament, especially from the Liberals, who were irritated at the idea of buttressing, by armed force, the barbarism and despotism of Turkey: besides, the prospect of an

Alliance, in which they might find themselves side by side with Austria, alarmed them. The discussion was an animated one: finally, on February 10, the Treaty was approved by the Chamber by 95 votes to 64.

Meanwhile, the siege of Sebastopol continued, accompanied by grave inconveniences and by terrible disasters. The winter was very severe, and the Allied Troops suffered enormously. The mortality among the English, who were totally unprovided with all necessaries, was frightful: in January, 1855, the English corps was reduced to 10,000 men. Public opinion in England was roused against the Government for its culpable negligence in the administrative department: on January 29, 1855, the House approved the proposal of a Radical member that a Parliamentary inquiry should be held on the manner in which the war had been conducted, and the Aberdeen Ministry resigned. The only man who possessed the confidence of the country was Palmerston, who was Secretary of State for Home Affairs. The formation of the new Ministry was entrusted to him, and he instantly took energetic measures to ameliorate the conditions of the English Army. A disaster also happened to the French: a frigate, which had sailed from Toulon, laden with soldiers and munitions of war destined for the East, was overtaken by a storm amid the rocks of the Straits of Bonofaccio, and sank with all on board.

As for Russia, the War brought to light grave defects in the State machinery and dishonesty in the administrative department: the dissatisfaction of the people could no longer, as formerly, be suffocated. The Czar was broken down in health and disillusioned. On a certain February day in 1855, in which the thermometer marked twenty-three degrees below zero, he left the Palace, against the advice of his doctor, who was aware of his enfeebled state and had begged him to take precautions. A severe attack of pneumonia followed: it was then, and is still believed that he deliberately sought death; he died on March 2. His son, Alexander II., succeeded him at the age of thirty-seven years. The death of the Czar, who had been prime mover of the War, seemed as if it would facilitate peace, since the new Sovereign was known to possess a more pacific disposition, but the latter

seemed in no way disposed to submit to the imposition of the Western Powers. Therefore, round Sebastopol the struggle fiercely continued. There was a universal persuasion that the fortress must fall before Peace could be negotiated.

General Canrobert saw that the siege must be prolonged, and resigned his position as Commander-in-Chief: but he consented to remain on the scene of action as a simple Commander of an Army Corps. The Emperor, Napoleon III., who had even thought of personally assuming the command of his Army, determined to place General Pelissier in supreme command. The latter, of a resolute and daring disposition, obtained some successes and prepared a great attack for June 18. But the issue was not favourable: the Allied troops were repulsed with considerable loss.

With the summer heats, cholera again devastated the ranks of the armies: on June 28 the Commander of the English troops succumbed to this terrible malady. He was succeeded by General Simpson.

The Allied Armies, in consequence of large reinforcements, amounted to 180,000 men; the Russians numbered 150,000. The supreme command in the Russian Army had also been changed: Prince Michael Gortsciakoff, succeeded Menschikoff, who was recalled to Petrograd. Gortsciakoff, though averse from the idea of attempting the relief of the city by a decisive attack on the Allied camps, yielded finally to the opinion of a Council of War, which advised giving battle: on August 16, 1855, on the bridge of Traktir, over the Cernaia, this battle took place, and the Russians were repelled.

After the battle of the Cernaia, the great bombardment of Sebastopol began, and the besieged were no longer in a position to repair damages. On the 8th of September the general assault of the last positions took place; the Malakoff redoubt was defended by the Russians with obstinate desperation: finally, General Macmahon, at the head of a division, succeeded in storming it. The Russians now determined to evacuate Sebastopol, which was reduced to a heap of ruins.

But the war did not yet terminate; the Russians did

not abandon the Crimea, and the Allies received new reinforcements. Russians and Turks fought together fiercely on the Asiatic frontiers, and in November the Russians obtained an important success, capturing the strong fortress of Kars from the Turks.

The Allies, in their turn, had made vigorous manifestations in the Baltic Sea and had bombarded Sveaborg, in the Gulf of Finland. Some of the Allied Powers wished for the continuation of the war; Turkey, who was certain of the support of the Western Powers, had everything to gain in the prosecution of the war; the Kingdom of Sardinia also hoped that the war would drag on and induce such international complications among the Powers as might lead to the solution of the Italian problem; England, whose military successes had been few, desired a greater enfeeblement of Russian power, and proposed to destroy the fortress of Kronstadt, in the north, as that of Sebastopol had been destroyed in the south. But France was fatigued and satisfied: she had no particular animosity against Russia, nor was there between them any great rivalry in interests; therefore, satisfied with the military glory which she had already obtained, and which was indispensable to a Napoleonic Empire, she would very willingly have consented to peace. On his side, Alexander II. was convinced that the continuation of the war would be attended by great difficulties, partly owing to the condition of his army and finances, and partly owing to the dubious attitude of Austria, who, he feared, might pass over to the side of the enemy.

Certainly Austria was no longer able to maintain the doubtful and ambiguous position which she had hitherto occupied; she feared, too, that if the war continued, and she still refused to enter the Alliance, that Napoleon III. would raise the Polish Question, which, if it damaged Russia, was scarcely less hurtful to Austria, and might cause a rebellion to break out in Italy and in Hungary. It was at this time that King Victor Emmanuel II. visited Paris and London, and received in both capitals great dynastic welcome and an enthusiastic popular ovation.

The Court at Vienna was alarmed and determined to suffocate the blaze as quickly as possible; therefore, on

December 16, 1855, in agreement with the Western Powers, she sent Russia an ultimatum, begging her to accept, within a month, certain conditions which had already been diplomatically discussed; Russia was given to understand that, in case of refusal, Austria would make common cause with the Western Powers. Alexander II. understood the dangers of the situation, and he proposed Paris as the seat of the Peace discussions.

The Congress opened on February 28, 1856; the Presidency, as was natural, was given to the French Minister of Foreign Affairs, who was at that time Count Colonna Walewski, natural son of Napoleon I. He possessed neither great ability nor learning, but he knew something of most subjects, and possessed no strong personal opinions on any. The English Foreign Minister, Clarendon, represented his country at the Congress—a man of excellent parts, who had on various occasions demonstrated great diplomatic skill. The representative of Austria was Count von Buol, who thought himself superior to all his colleagues. Bismarck, who had the opportunity of knowing him well, said of him, '*I should like for an hour of my life to be as great a man as Count von Buol considers himself always to be; my glory would then be assured before God and man.*' Russia was represented by the aged Count Orloff, who had already played many important parts in the political and military changes of his country. The youngest of all the representatives was Ali Pacha, who represented Turkey; though only forty years of age, he had already been Ambassador to London and Minister of Foreign Affairs; he now held the post of Grand Vizier. Cavour represented the smallest State; therefore he showed modesty and reserve in those questions in which he was not interested, and sought solely to gain the goodwill of the rest of his colleagues.

Austria was the only non-belligerent Power represented, and owed this privilege to the position she had occupied as mediator. Prussia was displeased at her own omission from the Congress; but England feared lest she should show herself a client of Russia and perhaps an Ally of Austria, and stipulated that she should be excluded from the Congress. Later, she was admitted to discuss the question of the Black

Sea, since, with the other Powers, she had signed the Convention of the Straits in 1841; Manteuffel, her Minister of Foreign Affairs, assisted on this occasion.

The Western Powers did not wish to appear as supporters of barbarism against civilisation, and therefore they had insisted that Sultan Abdul Megid should first grant reforms; the Sultan, on February 18, 1856, had published in a *hatti-humavoum*,—*motu proprio*,—a declaration of equality of all cults and nationalities in the Empire, and eligibility of all Christians to State offices. In the Congress of Paris the Powers took note of this decree. Turkey was admitted to the participation of all the advantages of public right and of the European Concert, and the Powers pledged themselves to respect the independence and integrity of the Ottoman Empire.

The restitution of all territory which had been conquered or occupied during the war was fixed by the conditions of Peace. The convention of July 13, 1841, regarding the closing of the Straits, was confirmed; the Black Sea was declared to be closed to all ships of war except such few as should serve for the policing of the coasts of Russia and Turkey, and open to the navigation of mercantile ships of every nationality: its neutrality was formally laid down. Russia and Turkey pledged themselves neither to construct nor preserve on their coasts any military or naval arsenal. The liberty of the navigation of the Danube was affirmed, and in order to facilitate its development an international commission was appointed, charged with the execution of the necessary labours of dredging the mouths of the Danube. Russia consented to a rectification of the frontiers of Bessarabia, and ceded a portion of this territory to the principality of Moldavia. It was finally determined that the Principalities of Moldavia, Wallachia, and Serbia should have an independent national administration, and should preserve their privilege under the Protectorate of those Powers who were present at the Congress, and not, as formerly, under Russia alone. Russia also permitted the neutralisation of the Island of Aland in the Baltic.

After the signature of this Treaty, March 30, 1856, a few more sittings were held, on the steps necessary to be

taken for securing the fulfilment of some of its clauses; other important questions were also discussed. On the proposal of Lord Clarendon, the Congress expressed the desire, that should threatening disputes arise, the mediation of a friendly power should be sought before seeking recourse to arms. By the advice of Napoleon III., the Congress fixed the four following principles of maritime right:—1. Abolition of Piracy; 2. Contraband of war excepted, a neutral flag covers all enemy merchandise; 3. No neutral merchandise, even if under an enemy flag, can be seized unless it be contraband of war; 4. No blockade must be permitted unless it be effectual, *i.e.* maintained with sufficient strength to prevent all access to an enemy shore.

The most important of these supplementary sittings was held on April 8; Napoleon III. would have liked to have procured for Victor Emmanuel some positive advantage, such as the cession of Parma and Modena, which Duchies might have been exchanged for the Danubian Principalities; but the proposals put forward by him were negatived by Austria. Unable to obtain any material advantage for the King of Sardinia, Napoleon determined, at least, to give him some moral satisfaction, and ordered his Minister of Foreign Affairs, Count Walewski, to raise the Italian Question; Walewski, in fact, before the Congress was dissolved, rose to say that, in order to complete the work of the delegates, preventive measures should be taken in order to avoid those complications which might hereafter arise. He emphasised the abnormal situation in the Pontifical State, the northern portions of which were garrisoned by Austrians, whilst French troops remained in the capital; he then censured the evil government of the King of the Two Sicilies. The English Minister, Clarendon, then spoke and brought strong charges against both the Roman and Neapolitan Governments, declaring that some remedies must be sought for these indisputable evils. Count von Buol, the Austrian representative, declared that the plenipotentiaries had received no mandate to discuss any other question save that of the Orient.

Cavour, with well-calculated moderation, recognised the right of each plenipotentiary to take no part in questions

which had not been foreseen in the instructions already received by him, but he added that he felt it to be his duty to lay stress on the difficult situation of Piedmont, which, whilst she saw around her the inhabitants of the rest of the Peninsula in a constant state of revolutionary unrest owing to the violent and reactionary procedure of their Governments, on the other hand saw herself menaced by Austria. The latter, invited by the Sovereigns of the minor States to maintain order in their territories, had finally occupied, in a military manner, a great part of the Peninsula, advancing as far as Ancona on the one hand and Piacenza on the other, thus destroying the equilibrium of the various Italian States. The discussion was a stormy one—much more so than appears from the published resumé of the proceedings, and ended in the declaration that the Austrian plenipotentiaries united themselves to those of France in the desire that the Austrian and French troops should evacuate the Roman State as soon as could conveniently be done without danger to the Pontifical Sovereignty: that the greater number of the delegates recognised that a milder system of Government should be introduced into the Italian States, and especially into the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies.

Cavour, before leaving Paris, handed to Count Walewski and Lord Clarendon a memorial, in which, after having noted that the opposition of Austria had prevented the slightest alleviation of the Italian Question, he called the attention of both France and England to the perils which beset the Sardinian State—the only State which had erected a barrier against the revolutionary spirit, and had known both how to remain independent of Austria, and how to counter-balance her invading influence.

This was the part played at Paris by Cavour, with whom now for the first time the Italian people became acquainted, by means of the Press: but in his private conversations with Napoleon and Lord Clarendon, he succeeded in persuading them that the Italian Question could only be solved by a war against Austria, and that it was the first duty of Piedmont to prepare for such an eventuality; he obtained, both from one and the other, warm promises.

. . . .

Henceforth, the current of public opinion in the whole of Italy turned with greater hope to Piedmont, and that great dictator of Venice, Daniele Manin, interpreted this opinion in September, 1855, while he was in exile at Paris.

'Believing, above all things, that Italy must first be made, and that this is the prevailing and precedent question, the Republican Party says to the House of Savoy, "Unite Italy and we are with you! If not, No."'

After the Congress of Paris, in every part of the Peninsula, the Liberals manifested their enthusiasm for the policy of Cavour. Even Garibaldi joined this movement. After the events of 1849 the hero had passed some time in New York, where he had worked as a factory hand in a small candle manufactory; then he had again taken to the sea as a captain of a small merchant vessel, and in 1854 had again returned to Nice: in the following year he received a small legacy from a brother, and with it bought half the Island of Caprera, near La Maddalena, in order to lead a freer and more independent life. In August, 1856, Cavour called him to Turin, and had a first conversation with him, encouraging his hope. At the same time, Giorgio Pallavicino, once prisoner in the Spielberg, and Giuseppe Farina, a Sicilian exile, formed the 'Società Nazionale' at Turin, in order to propagate the policy of unity with Piedmont, with the aim of completing the great work of the liberation of Italy.

Meanwhile, other emigrants joined those who had already received such generous hospitality from Piedmont, and found there a new country in which they obtained employment, professorial chairs, and, finally, Parliamentary seats. In Piedmont, in fact, that fusion of thought, hopes, and affection was made which was to be the base of the new country.

France and England, willing to materialise their manifestation made at the Congress of Paris regarding Italy, had taken diplomatic action against the Governments of Naples and Rome.

During the Crimean War, King Ferdinand of Naples repeatedly and openly manifested his sympathy with Russia and his aversion from the Western Powers. These, therefore, desired to give him a lesson, and addressed to him a mutual

Note, inviting him to change the policy of his Government in a more Liberal sense and to grant an amnesty to all political prisoners. Ferdinand II., relying on the support of Austria, energetically replied that he tolerated the interference of no State in his home affairs. Diplomatic notes, each more bitter than the last, succeeded each other, till Napoleon decided to recall his Ambassador, October, 1856. England was not slow in following his example, but the whole matter ended there. Ferdinand II. continued his ferocious and reactionary policy, which roused fresh insurrections.

With regard to the Pope, Napoleon III. was grateful that he had consented to be the godfather of his son, who had been born during the Congress of Paris: he had no intention, therefore, of alienating his friendship. Hence he limited himself to friendly advice, which proved perfectly inefficacious.

But Austria, after the Congress of Paris, entirely changed her system of Government in her Italian dominions: she restored the property sequestrated in 1853, granted an amnesty to political prisoners, and remitted to various communes their debts to the State. The Emperor, Francis Joseph, visited Venice and Milan in person, and sought in every way to propitiate the population. But on the very day on which he made his solemn entry into Milan, the Turin journals announced the gift by the Milanese to Turin of a monument in honour of the Piedmontese Army; the Municipality of Turin placed this monument in a conspicuous spot in the Piazza Castello, in front of the seat of the Senate. The discussions of the Municipality and the violent language of the Piedmontese journals of that date, which, in alluding to the journey of the Emperor, commented on his past cruelties, roused the indignation of the Austrian Government: the latter decided to break off diplomatic relations with Piedmont: this was all the easier since after the events of 1853 they had been maintained by means of simple *Chargés d'Affaires*.

But at the same time the Austrian Government continued its system of cajolery towards its subjects of the Lombardo-Veneto; the Emperor suggested that the aged Marshal Radetzky should send in his resignation, and appointed in

his place the Archduke Maximilian—brother of the Emperor. The Archduke was noted for the nobility of his sentiments and the breadth of his culture. The latter did his best to win the goodwill of his new subjects and to unite himself in friendly relations with the principal personages of the Lombardo-Veneto. Notwithstanding all his good intentions, the results of his policy were scanty enough. The citizens of the Province showed that they were entirely at one with the sentiments already expressed by Daniele Manin:—'It matters nothing to us if Austria become humane; we simply ask her to leave us to ourselves.'

Meanwhile, Cavour governed Piedmont as if it were already Italy, and with his eyes fixed on the future, created the powerful military port of Spezia; in 1857, he initiated, entirely with Piedmontese money, the gigantic work of piercing the Mont Cenis.

Mazzini still continued to disagree with Piedmontese policy and appeared to pin his whole faith to popular insurrections; he secretly visited Genoa and arranged with Carlo Pisacane an expedition against the Kingdom of Naples. Pisacane was a fiery Neapolitan emigrant who had distinguished himself in the war of 1846, and in the defence of Rome in 1849. On June 25, 1857, Carlo Pisacane, with twenty-six courageous companions, embarked at Genoa on the steamship *Cagliari* of the Rubattino Firm, which was starting for Tunis; when the ship was in open ocean they compelled the captain to change his course and steer towards Naples. They liberated *en route* all the political prisoners on the Island of Ponza, and the next day landed at Sapri, in the province of Salerno. Instead of finding the welcome they had anticipated, they met with the hostility of the peasants of the district, and shortly after a strong body of Bourbon troops attacked them; Pisacane, with nearly all his companions, was killed while fighting heroically against odds. The steamship *Cagliari* was soon after captured by a Neapolitan frigate and brought to Naples, where the captain, sailors, and passengers were thrown into prison and the steamer considered as a prize of war. The Piedmontese Government energetically protested, and the passengers were then set free. As two of the engineers of the boat were English,

Cavour begged the English Government to support his protest; but it was only after long hesitation that the Neapolitan Government finally decided to release the *Cagliari* and free the prisoners.

The unsuccessful ending of the Sapri expedition alienated the public still further from the Mazzinian methods; thus Cavour's programme was finally adopted by all the Liberals in the Peninsula.

. . . .

At this time both French and English attention was concentrated on the extreme East; a diplomatic difference had risen between England and China, ending in a state of war between the two countries—1856: France showed a disposition to unite herself with England in the matter. But the beginning of hostilities was retarded by a great rebellion in India.

The East India Company, in order to maintain order over its ever-extending territory, kept an army of 270,000 men, of which 40,000 were Europeans. The rest were Sepoys, and appeared content with their pay and treatment. But causes of discontent were not lacking, such as enormous taxes, abuses of Government, and ill-treatment of every kind. The dethroned Princes fostered the discontent, which was rendered more acute by the religious propaganda of the English missionaries.

The natives looked with hatred on the English, and this sentiment affected the loyalty of the Sepoys. A prophecy was widely believed that the English rule was destined to be extinguished one hundred years after its inception. This date was marked by the year 1857.

The religious susceptibilities of the Sepoys were hurt by the distribution of cartridges greased with the fat of the cow, an animal adored religiously by the Indians. Whole regiments refused to use these cartridges, and they were dismissed. But since the disaffection increased, an attempt was made to punish the rebels, and the revolt broke out in May, 1857. The rebels soon seized the city of Delhi and there proclaimed a descendant of the great Mogul as their King. The insurrection had now a definite aim.

In the valley of the Ganges the rebellion assumed great

proportions: regiments rose and massacred the whites. Certain English troops had arrived at Ceylon on their way to China: these were lent by the English Government. An expedition was sent against Delhi, and the city was retaken after much bloodshed.

The English Army then marched against Lucknow, where the European residents had resisted the rebels for three months: on September 26 a small army, which had come to the rescue of the besieged, entered the city, but soon found themselves beleaguered in their turn. Only in November could it be liberated by a new army, commanded by Campbell, who deemed it advisable to abandon Lucknow for the time and retreat with the English, whom he had rescued. The city was not definitely occupied by the English till 1858.

The result of the rebellion was the suppression of the company. Already, in 1853, Parliament had refused to extend its privileges for more than twenty years: in 1858 a Bill transferred the government of India to the Crown, under a Secretary of State in London, assisted by a Council and a Viceroy, nominated by the Sovereign, who resided in India. Full religious liberty was assured to all the natives without distinction of race or religion; equality of justice and respect of property and ancient customs were also promised to all.

The expedition against China had in the meantime been successful. At the end of December, 1857, the English and French fleet had bombarded Canton and had occupied it, capturing the Viceroy—Yeh—who was sent to Calcutta. In order to impose Peace on the Emperor, the Allies moved to the north, in the Gulf of Pecili, with the design of marching on Pekin. After a bombardment of the forts on the Taku and their occupation, the French and English Ambassadors could advance with security to the neighbouring city of Tsin-tsin, where an Imperial Commission met them, fully prepared to treat of peace. Treaties were concluded between China, England, and France, by which China was compelled to open new ports to Europeans, to grant religious liberty throughout her Empire, and to admit an English and French representative to the Court of Pekin. A heavy war indemnity was then exacted.

But the Russians also established their power in the East, in the province of the Amur, and obtained the opening of the Chinese ports to Russian commerce. A Russian Embassy was established at Pekin.

In Central Asia, Russia had renewed her attempts to advance against the Khanates of Bokhara and Khokand, and even incited the Shah of Persia to again march on Herat—1856; this again provoked English intervention, and the Shah finally recognised the independence of Herat. Anglo-Russian rivalry now began to be the essential problem of Central Asia.

. . . .

Whilst India was being absorbed into the English Dominions, complete autonomy was granted to Australia, and, in general, to all English colonies populated by Europeans.

The southern part of New South Wales was formed into the colony of Victoria, and the two, with Southern Australia and Tasmania, now took on independent political life. Auriferous discoveries in 1851 brought a large increase of population to Australia; complete Parliamentary representations and responsible Ministers were granted to all Australian States in 1855. The policy was strongly democratic; universal suffrage and the secret ballot were proclaimed, this latter came into force in England in 1872. A new colony now rose in the north—Queensland, with its capital, Brisbane.

The two islands of New Zealand were also automatically governed, but the native Maori population here caused some trouble. Towards 1866 these were driven to the centre of the northern island.

The Cape of Good Hope obtained representative institutions at the victorious close of the Kaffir War in 1853. The Orange Free State had also been subjugated, and the Boers had retired between the Orange and the Vaal; but the Liberal Ministry then in power in England did not approve of this policy of conquest, and the conquered colony was handed back to the Boers, who organised a new State beyond the Vaal—the Transvaal. The discovery of diamonds in Griqualand, in 1867, increased the importance of the colony of the Cape of Good Hope.

The North American colonies not only possessed a perfect Parliamentary system, but they claimed federation; it was not, however, till 1867 that this step obtained the approval of the Home Government.

The ancient absolutist system now existed only in Gibraltar and a few fortresses. With the exception of India and the Crown Colonies, which were governed by councils, the Parliamentary régime was introduced into all these English colonies, where the European race was numerically superior.

CHAPTER VIII

TRIUMPH OF NATIONAL AND LIBERAL IDEAS. CREATION OF THE KINGDOM OF ITALY.

Napoleon and his policy of nationality.—Secret agreement of Plombières. —Prelude of War of 1859.—*Austria's Ultimatum.—Battles of Solferino and San Martino.—Preliminaries of Peace signed at Villafranca.—Situation of Tuscany, the Romagna, and the Duchies: Peace of Zurich. —Cession of Savoy and Nice to France, and Annexation of Central Italy to Piedmont.—The Expedition of the 'Thousand.'—The Marche and Umbria.—Proclamation of the Kingdom of Italy.—More Liberal Policy of the French Government after* 1860.—*Constitutional Government in Austria.—Absolution of serfdom in Russia.—Polish Renaissance.—Triumph of Rumania: Organisation of the Danubian Principalities.—Serbia becomes more independent.—Montenegro and Greece.—Turkish Reforms.—French Expedition in Syria.—Anglo-French War with China.—Opening of Japanese ports.—French in Indo-China and Africa.—Suez Canal.*

Napoleon's life and ideas make him one of the most interesting figures of the nineteenth century. He was wise enough to understand that nationality was the dominating principle of his age; he was convinced that France, by her championship of this principle, might obtain those Alpine and Rhenish provinces which ethnologically belonged to her. With this grandiose foreign scheme was linked his internal policy. With Europe reorganised on the principle of nationality, a period of profound peace, he felt, would ensue, which would enable him to develop French industry and commerce, and ameliorate the condition of the working classes, for he saw that the latter were destined to become increasingly important.

But his courage was not equal to his intellect: there were striking contradictions, in this man,—strength and weakness, tenacity and despondency, intellectual limpidity, and nebulous ideality. Therefore his policy abounded ever in the unexpected. His intimate surroundings were partly responsible for this. His cousin, Prince Napoleon, represented Liberal and anti-clerical opinions, whilst the Empress had Spanish bigotry in her blood. The vacillating mind of the Emperor

was unable to make definite decisions; almost invariably the realisation of his ideas depended on the driving force of circumstances.

Cavour had inspired him with confidence and had persuaded him that war with Austria was a necessity; but Italians had not forgiven him nor forgotten the Roman adventure. Orsini's attempt to assassinate him caused a real change in his policy. Since the plot had been prepared in England, the Government of the latter country was asked to guard against a similar contingency in the future. Palmerston attempted to bring in a bill to this effect, but the violent language of French journals wounded English susceptibilities. The Bill was rejected and Palmerston resigned—February, 1858.

From prison, Orsini, who had thought that this crime would benefit his country, wrote a moving letter to Napoleon, begging him to aid Italy. Napoleon was profoundly impressed and did his utmost to save Orsini from the extreme penalty, but public opinion was too strong for him. Cavour tried to persuade Napoleon that the way of suffocating revolutionary excesses lay only in the Emperor's intervention in Italian affairs. A secret colloquy was held at Plombières, in 1858, when the Emperor declared himself ready to aid Piedmont and drive Austria from Italy. This promise was verbal and was not even communicated to the French Ministers.

On January 1, 1859, at a diplomatic reception, Napoleon expressed his regret to the Austrian Minister that the relations between Austria and France had recently lacked cordiality, but he assured him that his personal sentiments to the Austrian Sovereign remained unchanged. These words made a marked impression on the bystanders and were considered as a prelude of war. At Turin, on the opening of Parliament, Victor Emmanuel roused a frenzy of joy in the hearts of Italian patriots by the words, 'We are not insensible to the cry of pain which rises to our ears from every part of Italy.' In the same month, at Turin, Prince Napoleon married Clothilde, the eldest daughter of Victor Emmanuel. It was generally understood that this matrimonial alliance covered a political one.

Austria now deemed it desirable to strengthen her Italian position. Her troops were massed on the Piedmontese frontier; Cavour boldly asked for a war credit of fifty millions, and Garibaldi organised his volunteer 'Alpine Hunters.' This body was recruited from all parts of Italy. Since Napoleon had stipulated with Cavour that his aid was only to be expected in case of Austrian aggression, Cavour determined to provoke an attack, which was not easy. Napoleon was vacillating, and French public opinion was opposed to war. Cavour's greatest difficulty lay in the fact that the English Conservative Government was friendly to Austria, and attempted to heal her division with France.

Out of regard for England, Napoleon entered into negotiations. Russia proposed that the question should be submitted to a Congress: the English Government supported this suggestion, but Austria would only accept a Congress of the five great Powers, which would thus exclude Piedmont; even here, however, she would not tolerate any territorial discussions, and she insisted that before the opening of this Congress, Piedmont should disarm. To this the English Government assented, and pressed Napoleon to persuade Piedmont to yield. Probably with the object of gaining time, Napoleon consented. Whilst European diplomacy laboured for peace, Cavour boldly played for war; feigning to accept the proposals of the Powers, he wearied Austria by emphasising trivial matters in order to provoke her to the attack.

Cavour's policy finally exasperated the military councillors of the Austrian Court. The latter, persuaded that diplomacy was useless, decided to insist on the disarmament of Piedmont; she hoped that Piedmont could be crushed before French help could arrive; she could then obtain the aid of Germany in the event of a war with France. On April 23, 1859, she sent an ultimatum demanding that within three days Piedmont should lay down her arms. This was equivalent to a declaration of war, and the King, Cavour, and the nation welcomed it as such.

. . . .

Napoleon willingly accepted Victor Emmanuel's appeal for help, and gave orders to his soldiers to march into Piedmont.

Prussia was under the regency of William, brother of Frederick William IV., who was seriously ill. Austria had hoped that German national sentiment would determine Germany to act against France; but as she would make no sacrifice herself to Prussia, and her haughty attitude alienated the Prussian Court, her hopes were disappointed; the Regent feared to abandon Austria, but desired compensation for his services; he, therefore, waited for a favourable opportunity of intervention. The other German States were more enthusiastic, but both they and Prussia feared Russia, who, desirous of punishing Austria for her perfidious policy during the Crimean War, not only declared herself neutral but gave the German States to understand that should they aid Austria, Russia would immediately declare war on them. England declared herself neutral, and Austria was thus isolated.

The rulers of the Italian States were withheld from interference by dread of public opinion. Ferdinand II. of Naples would willingly have acted against both Piedmont and Napoleon, but he feared the danger. On the occasion of the marriage of his eldest son, Francis, he determined to liberate those honest and patriotic citizens who had been sent to the galleys. Fearing their presence in Naples, he ordered them to be taken to Cadiz, and from there transported to America. These unwilling emigrants, when once on the high seas, forced the captain to disembark them in England, from whence many returned to Piedmont. Ferdinand died soon after, and Cavour begged his successor, Francis, to grant a constitution and unite himself with Piedmont and France—an invitation which Francis contemptuously rejected.

Pius IX., bound hand and foot to Austria, hoped for the triumph of the latter, for he feared that her defeat would lead to a revolution in the Romagna, where Austria's soldiers upheld the Papal Power.

In Tuscany, a pacific and bloodless revolution broke out at the declaration of war. The dynasty which then governed Tuscany, was the only one which was not hated by the Italian people. Leopold's only fault was that he was of Austrian blood, and had introduced Austrian troops on his re-entry.

At the outbreak of war the Piedmontese Ambassador at Florence officially demanded the alliance of the Grand Duke; Leopold refused, and this refusal roused Florence to rebellion; the chiefs of the insurrection demanded the abdication of Leopold, the proclamation of his son, Ferdinand IV., alliance with Piedmont, and Constitutional Liberty. This demand offended and disgusted the Grand Duke, who left Tuscany that same evening.

A provisional Government was organised, which offered the dictatorship to Victor Emmanuel during the war, reserving the question of Tuscany's definite annexation till the termination of hostilities. Cavour was anxious not to rouse Napoleon's suspicions, since the Tuscan question had not been discussed with him: he replied that Victor Emmanuel would assume the office of Protector and the command of their troops. The Piedmontese Ambassador, Carlo Boncompagni, was named Commissary Extraordinary of Tuscany.

Francis V., Duke of Modena, alone dared to declare his alliance with Austria, but time speedily showed him the folly of his decision.

The proclamation of Napoleon III. announced the liberation of Italy from foreign control, from the west to the shores of the Adriatic. The Emperor had promised at Plombières to send 200,000 men if Italy could furnish 100,000 more. But the Piedmontese Army numbered only 60,000 men, and Napoleon sent no more than 120,000.

The Austrian Army, exclusive of her garrisons, amounted to 170,000 under the command of General Giulay. To carry out the Austrian programme of crushing Piedmont before help arrived needed both audacity and decision—two qualities which Giulay lacked.

On April 29 the Austrians crossed the Ticino and advanced towards Sesia; but Giulay's indecision was fatal. While he hesitated to strike, French troops joined the Piedmontese and Napoleon personally assumed the command at Alessandria. Napoleon proved himself an excellent strategist, and thoroughly deceived the Austrians. At Montebello, the Austrian Army first came into touch with the Piedmontese, and met with a strong resistance. Victor Emmanuel, under Napoleon's orders, drove back the enemy

at Palestro, and the courage and fortitude of the Piedmontese Army enabled Napoleon to cover his main movement to the left, which consisted in crossing the Ticino and menacing communication with Milan. Guilay was forced to give battle at Magenta, June 4; his defeat permitted Victor Emmanuel and Napoleon to make their triumphal entry into Milan, now for ever freed from foreign domination. Garibaldi, in the meantime, had defeated the Austrians at Varese. In his march forward he was met everywhere with the greatest enthusiasm as the herald of Italian Unity.

Parma and Modena deposed their Sovereigns and proclaimed their union with Piedmont. Austria retired from the Romagna and Bologna; the Cardinal Legate was deposed and the tricolour flag hoisted. The Romagna, the Marche, and Umbria, were everywhere in revolt: in these latter territories the revolt was suppressed by the Papal troops with great cruelty, especially at Perugia, where the soldiers of the Church massacred, outraged, burnt, and pillaged; but the Romagna maintained its liberty and invited the dictatorship of Victor Emmanuel.

After Magenta, Giulay had been dismissed, and the Emperor of Austria personally took command, with Marshal Hess as his adviser. On June 24 the battles of Solferino and San Martino were fought. After twelve hours' hard fighting, the Austrian Army was forced to retreat over the Mincio. The Italo-French Armies pursued them; Venice was besieged by sea, and Napoleon arranged with Kossuth for the insurrection of Hungary.

But the difficulty of his task began to preoccupy Napoleon: he was filled with sorrow at the sight of the dead at Solferino: the famous Quadrilateral had yet to be taken; rumours from France of clerical dissatisfaction at the revolution of the Papal States disquieted him. Everywhere, too, he saw a growing desire on the part of the Italians to unite themselves with Savoy. He had dreamed of an Italian Federation protected by France; he had no wish for a United Italy under an ancient dynasty. Prussia was reported to be anxious to aid Austria, and in that case France would need all her troops on the line of the Rhine.

All these rumours were to Napoleon so many reasons

for peace. He proposed an armistice, to which Francis Joseph consented. The preliminaries of peace were discussed at Villafranca. Lombardy was to be ceded to Napoleon with the arrangement that he should hand it over to Victor Emmanuel II.; a federation of the Italian States under the presidency of the Pope was proposed. The Veneto, Mantua, and Peschiera, though forming part of the proposed federation, were to remain under the rule of Austria. The Sovereigns of Tuscany and Modena were to be reinstated; but since Napoleon would not hear of Austrian intervention, the difficulty was to bring about this restoration. Francis Joseph also objected to the annexation of Parma and Piacenza by Piedmont.

Victor Emmanuel was painfully impressed by these unexpected conditions: Cavour, in a state of violent irritation begged the King to withhold his consent. But Victor Emmanuel wisely took the chances offered him, and Cavour immediately resigned his post.

. . . .

Italy shared Cavour's fury and indignation. No one could understand why the French Emperor should not have finished his half-accomplished task, and imprecations were muttered against him when it was known that Venice was still under the Austrian heel. Cavour retired, it is true, but in his retirement he determined that the conditions should not be carried out. Carlo Farina accepted the dictatorship of Modena and Parma, determined at all costs to prevent the restoration of the old dynasties. Bettino Ricasoli assumed the direction of Tuscan affairs, and proposed to carry out the programme of Italian Unity under Piedmont. Popular Assemblies at Florence, Bologna, Modena, and Parma also proclaimed their annexation to Piedmont.

Austria threatened to break up the peace negotiations at Zurich. Though Napoleon could have tolerated the union of Parma, Modena, and Piacenza to Piedmont, he opposed that of Modena and of the Papal States. The Piedmontese Government of Ratazzi-Marmora was timid and uncertain in action, and a definite Treaty of Peace was signed.

Cavour in his retirement decided that another way must be tried,—that of a closer union with England and a widening

of the breach between her and France. Lord John Russell and Palmerston were now in power in England: the sympathies of both were frankly for Italy, and they were supported by Sir James Hudson, their Ambassador at Turin—an enthusiastic admirer of Cavour.

The attitude of Central Italy and the popularity of the Italian Cause in England convinced Napoleon that he could not hinder the annexation; he therefore changed his policy, and in January, 1860, dismissed his Minister, Walewski, who was hostile to Italy, and appointed Thouval. To pacify England he concluded a favourable treaty of commerce with her, and arranged for a second expedition to China.

The critical situation of Italy induced Victor Emmanuel to lay aside his personal resentment against Cavour, and he again appointed him Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs. Cavour's first action was to send a Circular Note to the Powers, pointing out that it was impossible for Victor Emmanuel to withstand the wishes of the nation. To Napoleon he proposed a plebiscite of Central Italy, knowing well that Napoleon could not refuse to permit the very means which had won for him the French Throne. At Plombières, Savoy had been promised to Napoleon in exchange for his aid, but since he had but half carried out his scheme the question had been dropped. Cavour now again offered Savoy; the Emperor insisted on the cession of Nice, and Cavour was obliged to consent, stipulating, however, that recourse should be had to a plebiscite in both these cases. Garibaldi was stung to the quick by the cession of his native city, and pronounced a violent tirade in Parliament against Cavour: but the Chamber, though respecting his sentiments, approved the Treaty, which, indeed, was necessary under the circumstances.

Meanwhile, a plebiscite was held in Central Italy on two questions:—Union with Piedmont or a Separate Kingdom. Tuscany voted for Union by 366,571 votes to 14,925 while Parma, Modena, and the Romagna gave 426,000 votes for their union with Piedmont and but 756 votes against. The will of the population was thus absolutely shown.

. . . .

The news of the events in Upper Italy set Sicily in a blaze; insurrection succeeded insurrection. Francesco Crispi returned from exile and kept alive the hopes of his companions. The Piedmontese determined to give active help to the neutral movement in the island, and prepared an expedition at Quarta. Garibaldi had been approached on the subject of acting as chief of an expedition, but the news came that the rising had already been suppressed, and he refused. Only on April 20 was he persuaded by the fiery words of Nino Bixio and Francesco Crispi.

But for Cavour, the position bristled with difficulties. He had already aroused the antipathy of Europe by the annexation of Central Italy: he was now asked to encourage an expedition against a Sovereign who was at peace with the monarch whose Minister he then was. The King happened to be in Emilia: an interview between him and Cavour at Bologna ended in the determination to allow the expedition to continue its preparation and to depart without Government hindrance.

It had been arranged by Garibaldi with the Rubattino Company that a pretence should be made of capturing two of their vessels in Genoa Harbour. On May 6, Nino Bixio, with a few companions, boarded the ships and proceeded with them to Quarta, where the embarkation had been prepared. About 1,200 volunteers, full of enthusiasm, of all ages, and from all parts of Italy, had joined the expedition.

To conceal his real object, Garibaldi sent sixty men out of his little company to the frontiers of the Papal States, so that the Powers might imagine that the expedition was directed against the Pope. The Bourbon Government, however, knew of the raid, and Neapolitan ships were on the watch; to avoid these, Garibaldi approached Sicily by a devious route, and on May 11 arrived at Marsala. Here he found two English cruisers detailed for the protection of the English wine factories; in less than two hours the Garibaldians had almost finished their disembarkation: the Neapolitan men-of-war now arrived and bombarded the empty boats till the English captain boarded one of their vessels and begged the Neapolitan commandant to respect the British flag flying on the factories. During this interval, the munitions

of war had been landed by Garibaldi. The Bourbons could, therefore, only possess themselves of one empty boat, the other having been sunk in harbour.

On the following day Garibaldi proclaimed the dictatorship of Sicily in the name of Victor Emmanuel, and many Sicilians flocked to his banner. A sharp engagement took place near the capital between his small force and the Bourbon Army, ending in the complete defeat and retreat of the latter to Palermo. By a clever manœuvre, Garibaldi avoided the troops which were sent after him, and on May 27 carried the city at the point of the bayonet. After a week of sanguinary fighting the Bourbons evacuated Palermo.

This success encouraged the Piedmontese Government to act openly. Fresh troops were sent to Sicily from Piedmont, and Garibaldi gained a new victory over the Bourbon troops at Milazzo.

Francesco II. of Naples, fearing to lose his throne, now declared his willingness to grant a Constitution, and to ally himself with Piedmont. The Government of the latter country was forced to act guardedly, since, with the exception of England, all the European Powers regarded Garibaldi's action with strong disfavour. Victor Emmanuel, in order to pacify Napoleon, wrote a letter to Garibaldi commanding him not to cross the Straits, but in a private note accompanying it, he advised him that his own hopes and intentions were with Garibaldi for the conquest of Naples. Cavour had no sympathy for the treacherous Bourbon dynasty, and attempted to rouse an insurrection in Naples before Garibaldi's arrival.

On August 19, Garibaldi landed in Calabria. Everywhere he was welcomed by the inhabitants, and the Bourbon troops fled before his small army. On September 6, Francis II. fled to Gaeta, and on the afternoon of the 7th Garibaldi made his triumphal entry into Naples.

Cavour now attempted a new stratagem, and induced the King to advance against the Marche and Umbria, which the year before had proclaimed their union with Piedmont. The Pope had suppressed this revolt and now overawed these provinces with troops collected from the whole of Europe, under the command of General Lamoricière.

Massacres and excesses of every kind were daily committed by the Papal troops; on September 11 Victor Emmanuel sent an Ambassador to the Pope, declaring that if these foreign troops were not dismissed he would feel compelled to interfere. The Pope returned a fiery refusal. On September 13 the Italian troops crossed the frontier, and on the 18th the Papal troops were defeated at Castelfidardo; Lamoricière, who had shut himself up in Ancona, was forced to surrender on the 29th. The undertaking was successful in less than a score of days.

Whilst Victor Emmanuel marched at the head of his troops into the Abruzzi, Garibaldi, at the head of an army of 24,000 men, after a sanguinary conflict, defeated a Bourbon Army of twice their number on the banks of the Volturno; a few days after, Naples and Sicily by a plebiscite declared their union with the Kingdom of Victor Emmanuel.

On October 26 the King met Garibaldi near Teano. Garibaldi saluted him as King of Italy and with great self-command quietly retired to his farm at Caprera, leaving the King to reap the harvest of his glorious enterprise. On February 12, 1861, Francis II. of Naples embarked for the Papal States in a French ship, lent him by Napoleon. Gaeta, besieged by sea and by land, surrendered on the morrow.

Thus, in less than two years, Piedmont was transformed into a Kingdom of twenty-two millions of inhabitants. The first Italian Parliament assembled at Turin on February 18, 1861. Victor Emmanuel, though he now reigned over the greater part of Italy, was still, officially, only King of Sardinia. On March 14 the Chamber unanimously passed the motion that Victor Emmanuel should take the title of 'King of Italy.'

The Italian successes had strongly affected France. On the one hand, the clericals were provoked at Napoleon's friendship with the House of Savoy, which they accused of spoliating the Pope. On the other hand, his commercial agreement with England offended French Industrials, who were Protectionists to a man. Napoleon, therefore, deemed it opportune to conciliate public opinion by a more Liberal policy, and gave greater powers to the Senate and to the Legislative Corps.

The absolutist Austrian Government was shaken by the constitution of a United Italy. The loss of Lombardy had caused grave financial embarrassments to Francis Joseph, and he was obliged to have recourse to his subjects in order to fill his depleted exchequer. The Emperor, therefore, decided to adopt a more Liberal policy; he restored the traditional Diets in his motley Empire, and accorded its ancient Constitution to Hungary. An Imperial Parliament was selected from the Provincial Diets to deal with affairs common to the Empire. But the decree granting these reforms never came into force since it pleased no one. The Hungarians would not hear of an Assembly which should occupy itself with Imperial affairs, and the remainder of the Empire considered the changes too Conservative in tendency.

In 1861 Francis Joseph promulgated another decree, by which the Reichsrath became a central body, divided into two Chambers,—Lords and Commons. The system of elections, even here, which supplied the Lower House, secured the ruling power to the richer classes.

But the Hungarians were unanimous in the determination to have their ancient Constitution restored, and decided that their legislative rights should be shaped with none other than their own Sovereign. Martial law was again proclaimed in Hungary. The Venetians took no part in the elections, while the Czechs, seeing that the House was to all intents German in composition, followed the example of Hungary and retired from the Assembly.

The current of Liberal thought ran so strongly in Europe that it penetrated even to Russia; the latter country, before changing its politics, was forced to undergo a social transformation. With the exception of Great and Little Russia and Lithuania, the European Empire consisted of vast estates inhabited by 23,000,000 serfs and their masters. Alexander II. decided to abolish the system in order that Russia might take her proper place in the world, and in 1866 he accomplished this vast reform. Each serf was given his cottage and the garden which surrounded it. Half the estate was retained by the proprietor and half allotted to the village commune: the State advanced the purchase

money to the communes, which pledged themselves to repay the sum in forty-nine annual instalments.

This generous reform assured to the peasant his personal and legal liberty and the administration of his communal affairs, and transformed mediæval Russia into a modern nation. But the Czar steadily refused to grant any political liberty to the upper classes. Poland, which had been roused by the Italian struggle for freedom, awoke once more to national aspirations. Peaceful demonstrations were first attempted. On February 25, 1861, the anniversary of the battle of Grochow, an immense crowd flocked to the cathedral in order to pray for the souls of the patriots who had fallen thirty years before. Two squadrons of gendarmes charged the people, who fell on their knees, chanting their national hymns. Many were killed and wounded, and the political situation became acute.

. . . .

A European inquiry was held into the status of the Danubian Principalities, and it was decided that Moldavia and Wallachia should be united into one country—Rumania: each State was to possess a Legislative Assembly, and both were to be governed by a hospodar, elected for life. In 1859, Alexander Cuza was proclaimed Alexander I. of Rumania. Turkey protested, but Europe was occupied in watching the Italian War; mainly by the support of Napoleon III. the new State was consolidated.

In Serbia the weakness which Alexander Karageorgeovich displayed both to the Sultan and to Austria had alienated from him the affection of his people. Alexander was deposed in 1858, and Milosh Obrenovich was recalled; he immediately ordered the Assembly to proclaim the hereditary rights of his family to the throne.

On the death of Prince Danilo in 1860, Prince Nicola had succeeded to the throne of Montenegro; Nicola was then a student at Paris, and his father, Mirko, acted as Regent. Some few Montenegrins having aided their nation in Herzegovina, in their insurrection against the Turk, Omar Pasha, in 1862, entered Montenegro with an army of 60,000 men. In spite of a brave resistance, Mirko was forced to yield, and in August, 1862, Prince Nicola was

compelled to accept the conditions laid down. The principal of these stipulated that a free road should lie open to Turkey through Montenegro to Herzegovina.

Revolts of the smaller States in the Turkish Empire continued, but the jealousy of the Powers prevented the fulfilment of their national aspirations. Greece could obtain none of her desires. King Otho had obeyed the dictates of the Powers and suffocated all political agitation; this conduct rendered him so unpopular that in 1862 he was forced to abdicate. William George, Prince of Denmark, was elected King of Greece by the Assembly on March 30, 1863, under the name of George I. England ceded the Ionian Isles, but insisted on the neutralisation of Corfu.

All attempts at reform in Turkey seemed impossible. A proposal was made that Christians should be admitted to the army; but they preferred to pay for their exemption, and the Mussulmen refused to obey Christian officers. The question was, therefore, left in abeyance.

The Christians were not anxious for reforms, fearing that they should lose the privileges which their religious communities had obtained for them. Patriarchs and Bishops supported them in this view. Owing to the absence of the spirit of nationality, reforms fell dead and were again abandoned.

In Asia, Turkish rule was even a greater failure than in Europe, especially in Syria, where the Christian populations were numerous. Two rival tribes inhabited the Mountains of Lebanon—Maronite Christians and Druse Mahometans. In 1860 the Druses, aided by hordes of Bedouins and other barbarians, massacred Maronite men, women, and children; the Turkish authorities took no steps to punish this outrage. Some fugitives succeeded in reaching Damascus, but their pursuers followed them there and continued the massacres with the tacit consent of the Governor.

Great indignation was felt in Europe at these atrocities. Owing to the efforts of Napoleon III. a French corps of 6,000 men landed at Beyrout and restored order. On June 5, 1861, by previous agreement, the French abandoned Syria; a convention was concluded with the Sultan by which Syria was placed under a Christian Governor, nominated

by the Sultan, who should preserve order by means of territorial troops.

England, however, looked with jealous eyes on French influence in the East, though English and French were fighting side by side in China. The Chinese Government having broken the Treaty of Tientsin, the Allied forces landed in China. They successfully marched on Pekin, and in October, 1860, occupied the Summer Palace; the immense riches of the ages accumulated in this Palace were distributed among the victors. The English then burned the Palace and besieged Pekin. The Convention of Pekin was signed on October 25, 1860. The former concessions were amplified and the Allied troops entered the Imperial City. Russia and the United States profited by this occasion to obtain similar privileges.

This expedition also facilitated the opening of Japan to Europe. The Dutch alone had had access to this country, till the middle of the century, but first the United States, then England and Russia, and finally England and France, obtained treaties granting them certain free ports.

But the lack of an Asiatic base deprived France of the advantages to be derived from the treaties. On this account, therefore, Napoleon III. determined to found a colony in Indo-China: the massacre of French Missionaries by the Emperor of Annam supplied him with the needed excuse. In 1859 the French occupied Saigon, and in 1861 took over the whole of Cochin-China. By a treaty with the Emperor of Annam, the territory occupied was officially handed over to the French, and Cambodge also became a French Protectorate.

In Senegal, too, the French founded a colony. Though the Algerian War had finished, military expeditions still took place. The oasis of the Sahara and the district of Kabylia became French possessions. French influence was also dominant in Egypt. Said Pasha continued the good work of his father, Mehemet Ali, and permitted Ferdinand de Lesseps to cut through the Isthmus of Suez. 200,000,000 francs were necessary for this undertaking; 400,000 shares of five hundred francs were distributed, of which 220,000 were raised by the French and the remainder by

the Viceroy. Twenty thousand soldiers were lent by the Viceroy for the work, and the first section of the canal was completed in 1862.

Owing to this important work the Red Sea became the world's chief maritime road. In 1862, in order to acquire a base in this sea, France bought the Bay of Obock, which faced the English Aden.

Under Napoleon I. France initiated her grandiose colonial policy. Unfortunately, the Emperor was induced by his advisers to interfere in American affairs. The United States, then occupied with her War of Secession, was not able to oppose his policy.

CHAPTER IX

FROM THE WAR OF SECESSION IN AMERICA TO THE WAR OF 1866 IN EUROPE

Economical and political developments of the United States.—Disputes between North and South: The Slave Question.—Election of Lincoln and rupture of the Union.—Confederate States against the Federal Government.—Abolition of Slavery: Death of Lincoln.—Civil War in Mexico.—Franco-Anglo-Spanish Expedition.—Franco-Mexican War.—Maximilian of Austria, Emperor of Mexico.—The Roman Question: Proclamation of the necessity of 'Rome, the Capital of Italy.'—Aspromonte: Convention of September 15, 1864.—*Insurrection of Poland: Attitude of European diplomacy.—Renewal of contest for the German Duchies of Denmark: German intervention in the Duchies.—Otto von Bismarck Prime Minister of Prussia.—Austria and Prussia against Denmark: Peace of Vienna, October* 30, 1864.—*Disputes between the victors: Convention of Gastein,* 1865.—*Bismarck's conversation with Napoleon III. at Biarritz.—Preparation of the Italo-Prussian Alliance.—War against Austria, June,* 1866.—*Struggle of Prussia with the Southern and Western States: Austrian Disaster at Sadowa, July* 3.—*War in Italy: Custoza and Lissa.—Mediation of Napoleon III.—Preliminaries of Nikolsburg, July* 26. —*Treaties of Prague and Vienna.*

THE United States had increased in a stupendous manner: at the end of the War of Independence, thirteen primitive States contained 3,250,000 inhabitants: in the census of 1860 the thirty-two States, which composed the Union, numbered 31,000,000. An ever-increasing immigration largely accounted for this. Generally the immigrants settled on the Atlantic coasts, but the great movement west completed the colonisation of new territories, which entered as new States into the Confederation. Already America had distinguished herself by her industrial development; every invention there found a home, and not a few owed their existence to the country. In the midst of this increasing prosperity grave disputes sprang up between the Northern and Southern States. The Puritan democracy of the North, whose prosperity was based on small holdings, commerce, and industry, had given birth to a progressive and utilitarian society, whilst the South was occupied by a landed aristocracy,

isolated in their vast estates, less intent on gain, and lacking any stimulus to progress.

The commercial North was strongly Protectionist, while the agricultural South supported Free Trade in order to avoid paying too dearly for their commodities, and to prevent their exports of cotton, tobacco, and sugar from being heavily taxed in reprisal.

But the great scission was caused by the Slave Question. The different evolution of North and South had led to the practical disappearance of slavery in the former, while the plantations of rice, sugar, cotton, and tobacco in the latter seemed to demand servile labour. Slavery, therefore, was defended in the South, while the North was largely abolitionist. The European immigrants had settled mainly in the North, where labour was paid well and highly valued. The resultant prosperity of the North aroused Southern rivalry and jealousy. Naturally, the new-comers were opposed to slavery, and they strengthened the desire for abolition.

In order to diminish these differences various compromises were attempted: slavery was forbidden in those new States which sought entry into the Union. Kansas, in 1854, was allowed free choice in the matter. North and South, therefore, rivalled each other in sending emigrants to this State: this competition resulted in a civil war, with two Governments and two Constitutions—pro-slavery and abolitionist. An increasing free population, however, caused the latter to prevail.

In this local war, John Brown, an enthusiastic abolitionist, lost two sons: he determined to give his life to the cause of abolition, and attempted to raise a rebellion in the South in the hope that the slaves would join him and support his efforts. His revolt was quickly suppressed, and he was hanged, December 2, 1859. Great indignation was felt in the North, and reprisals became more violent.

The South believed that slavery was necessary to its prosperity, and proposed to break loose from the North. In the Presidential election of 1860 the South declared that the election of an abolitionist President would be the signal of a rupture. On the election of Abraham Lincoln, a Northerner devoted to the cause of Abolition, South Carolina

declared its independence and the abrogation of the Constitution of 1788. Before Lincoln assumed the Presidency, seven Southern States sent delegates to Montgomery with the object of forming a new Confederation—called the Confederate States of America. Jefferson Davis was chosen as President.

At first the North was disposed to a policy of *laissez-faire*, but Lincoln, on assuming the Presidency, declared that no State could legally separate itself from the Union, and that any act of violence against the United States was revolutionary. In April, 1861, the Secessionists captured Fort Sumter in Carolina. The North, which had hoped for a peaceful settlement, now enthusiastically supported the Government in the strife. Four more Southern States joined the Secessionists: Delaware and Maryland supported the North, and Missouri and Kentucky remained neutral.

The Secessionist Government transported its capital to Richmond, which was situated less than a hundred miles south of Washington. The Federal Capital was menaced; the Southerners won the battle of Bull's Run on July 21, but the Federal General, MacClellan, cleverly prevented any further hostile successes in the neighbourhood of the capital.

The North possessed the greater part of the riches of the country, and more than two-thirds of the entire population. But the aristocratic South possessed a more military spirit than the Northern merchants. The Federal army and navy were almost entirely officered by Southerners, and these now crowded to the defence of the Southern States. The South, therefore, had an army and navy already prepared, and in addition they had organised a great number of privateers, while the North had to create their army and navy: the beginning of the contest, therefore, was favourable to the South.

The neutral States of Kentucky and Missouri were, at first, the principal theatre of war: here the Southern troops were repulsed, and in 1862 General Grant occupied the capital of Tennessee, and in the battle of Pittsburg repulsed the Confederate Army. The Federal fleet besieged

Vicksburg, and the upper valley of the Mississipi as far as Memphis was secured to the Union.

MacClellan, however, was forced to retreat on Washington, pursued by the Confederate General, Lee. The latter now attempted to detach Maryland from the Union, but MacClellan defeated him at Antietam, and on September 17, 1862, forced him to recross the Potomac.

The war was also fought at sea. In 1862 Commandant Farragut bombarded and captured New Orleans, the key of the Lower Mississipi. The Federal fleet then ascended the latter river as far as Port Hudson, and thus succeeded in dividing the western Southern forces from the eastern divisions, so that the onus of sustaining the war fell on the latter. The Federal blockade also ruined the cotton industry, so that in 1862 the situation of the South had become grave indeed.

In spite of the demands of the Abolitionists, President Lincoln did not proclaim Slave Emancipation. The salvation of the Union was his first aim, and he wished to avoid giving offence to the Central States. It was not till 1863 that slaves became free citizens of the United States.

This year was the decisive one of the war. Lee again advanced north and entered Pennsylvania: but General Mead defeated him at Gettysberg and drove him back into Virginia—July 3, 1863. The same date marked the capitulation of Vicksburg. Port Hudson surrendered a few days later, and on November 25 Grant defeated the Southerners at Chattanooga and forced them into Georgia.

In 1864 Virginia and Georgia were the chief theatres of war. Grant commanded the Federals in Virginia and sent Sherman to Georgia. Many fierce and sanguinary battles were fought. Grant besieged Petersburg, the key to the Confederate capital, while Sherman in Georgia captured Atlanta, and a few days later received the surrender of Savannah.

But the end of the war was at hand. Sherman marched north through Carolina: Charleston was occupied by the Federals, and in March, 1865, Sherman joined forces with Grant. Some fighting took place round Richmond and

Pittsburg, but the Confederate capital was abandoned in April; Lee capitulated on April 9, and Jefferson Davis was captured in May, 1865, and imprisoned in Fort Monroe.

Before the conclusion of war, Congress approved an amendment to the Constitution to the effect that neither slavery nor involuntary servitude could exist in the United States, nor in its subject territories. Thus slavery was definitely abolished.

But Lincoln—the man who had directed the Union in this terrible crisis—was assassinated on April 14, 1865, five days after Lee's capitulation. The whole civilised world mourned his death.

The war had absorbed all the activities of the United States: her armies numbered 4,000,000, and 500,000 men lost their lives in the struggle. Nor were her financial losses less colossal. It may then be easily understood how Napoleon III. was able to foster the dream which is connected with his Mexican expedition, and which his courtiers foolishly assured him, was 'the greatest idea of his reign.'

. . . .

After its proclamation of Independence, Mexico was a prey to civil war between the Democratic Federal Party and that of the Centralist Clericals. At the end of 1860, the democratic party, under Juarez, triumphed.

Some foreign merchants whose businesses had been damaged during the war demanded an indemnity, which Juarez refused. France, Spain, and England made common cause against Mexico. A triple fleet occupied Vera Cruz: Juarez immediately entered into negotiations, which Spain and England accepted and withdrew their fleets.

Napoleon, however, determined to profit by the preoccupation of the United States, and resolved to create a Catholic Empire, which should be allied to France; this, he believed, would enable him to dominate America and secure a market for French exports: he was supported by the Mexican clericals. A force of 30,000 French troops, under General Forey, landed at Vera Cruz in 1862. Puebla was besieged, and did not capitulate till May, 1863, when

Juarez retired to the northern provinces and organised a national resistance. Forey called an Assembly, which nominated as Emperor, Maximilian, brother of the Emperor of Austria, and heir to the rights of the ancient Spanish monarchy.

Maximilian, an intelligent and cultured prince, was reluctant to accept the offer. The persuasion of Napoleon and the ambition of his wife conquered his hesitation. He received the benediction of the Pope, and, with his wife, sailed for Mexico, where he arrived in May, 1864.

At first the French troops were victorious, under Bazaine, who had succeeded Forey, but this success was transitory: a terrible guerilla warfare followed with ferocious reprisals on both sides. Maximilian was unable, under these disastrous circumstances, to acquire popular sympathy, and Bazaine's devotion to the cause grew tepid: in France the Mexican adventure was unpopular. Napoleon, too, seeing that in the United States the Federals were gaining the day, looked forward to the time when America, basing its demand on the Monroe doctrine, should insist on the withdrawal of the French troops—a blow which would greatly damage his reputation in France.

. . . .

In Europe, Napoleon's word had lost its power. Three great questions now agitated Europe:—1. The destinies of Italy; 2. The Polish Question; 3. The dispute over the German Duchies of Denmark.

After the proclamation of the Kingdom of Italy, Cavour, whose ardour was only strengthened by difficulties, was anxious that the first declaration of the Italian Parliament should affirm the right of Italy to Rome as her capital. In his memorable discourse in Parliament in March, 1861, he fixed thus the precise terms of the problem:—

'If Italy could be imagined as strongly united without possessing Rome as her capital, then the Roman Question would be almost impossible to solve. Neither climate nor topography nor strategy settle the site of a capital; the question is decided solely by the popular sentiment. Rome fulfils all the conditions,—historical, moral, and intellectual,—which are necessary to the capital of a great State. Rome

is the only city in Italy whose history and associations are not wholly municipal. The History of Rome from the time of the Cæsars till to-day is the history of a city whose importance extends infinitely beyond its own territory—a city destined to be the capital of a great State.'

Parliament affirmed on March 27, 1861, the necessity of Rome as a capital, and negotiations were begun with the Pope with the object of inducing him to sever his temporal from his spiritual power.

But at this moment Cavour was attacked by severe illness. Wearied and worn by mental tension and fatigue he succumbed to his malady on June 6, 1861, at the age of fifty years. His death closed the most brilliant epoch of the Italian *Risorgimento*.

The new Kingdom was beset with difficulties. Four dynasties:—Naples, Tuscany, Modena, and Parma plotted at restoration; Austria and the Papacy aimed at destroying the new political edifice; almost all Europe looked askance at the new State; the Garibaldians were impatient to take Rome from the Pope and the Veneto from Austria; the different peoples of the Peninsula maintained their secular jealousies; finance was exhausted, administration disorganised, and brigandage flourished in the southern provinces; Francis II. at Rome encouraged the latter evil, hoping by organised murder and robbery to attain his restoration.

Negotiations were resumed, but the Pope,—even though France offered her mediation,—energetically refused any concessions. In 1862, Ratazzi became Prime Minister, and Garibaldi decided to act; in Sicily, where he was enthusiastically received, he enrolled volunteers to the cry of 'Rome or Death!'

But Rome was still occupied by the French. Impelled by the clericals, Napoleon declared that the entry of Garibaldi into the Papal States would be regarded by him as a *casus belli*, and Ratazzi was forced to forbid Garibaldi's expedition. At Aspromonte, in Calabria, his small force was surrounded by bersaglieri. Shots were exchanged, and Garibaldi was wounded, August 29, 1862. He and his troops were made prisoners and were not released till the amnesty granted to

all prisoners on the marriage of Maria Pia, daughter of the King, to Louis of Portugal. Durando, Minister of Foreign Affairs, had sent a Circular Note to the Powers, informing them that the Garibaldian expedition had but expressed an imperious necessity, and that the situation was intolerable.

But the hopes of the Italian nation were fixed on Rome, and Napoleon was begged to withdraw his troops from that city. He did so on the understanding that the portion of the Papal States which were left to the Pope should be respected, and he insisted that the capital of Italy should be fixed at Florence. In spite of the opposition of the entire nation, Florence was proclaimed the capital in 1865, and the French retired from Rome, to the deep disgust of the Pope. Napoleon, in trying to please both the Italians and the Roman Curia, had disgusted both.

. . . .

Even graver was the Polish situation. The claim of the Poles to their ancient Lithuania aroused Russian patriotism. Polish youths who had taken part in previous agitations were arrested in 1863, and this proceeding kindled the flames of insurrection. Armed Poles, at night, entered fourteen fortresses and many Russian soldiers were killed in their sleep.

In the rebellion of 1830, Poland was garrisoned entirely by Polish troops, and thus for some time maintained her liberty. But in 1863 Russian soldiers and functionaries dominated the whole country, and the insurgents did not succeed in occupying even one small town; the rebellion hence became a guerilla warfare of woods and forests. Western Europe enthusiastically supported the Poles; funds were raised and volunteers enrolled for the Cause.

The hopes of the Poles were based on Napoleon, the champion of Nationality. Napoleon was anxious to preserve Russian friendship, and attempted friendly advice to the Czar, which the latter brutally rejected. England—always the rival of Russia—sympathised openly with Poland. Strangest spectacle of all, Austria, in order to revenge herself on Russia, became a champion of freedom and gave shelter

to the rebels, who, when defeated by the Russians, retired into Austrian Poland.

Napoleon counted on the aid of both Austria and England. These two Powers demanded of Russia the restoration of the Polish régime of 1815. Gortschiakoff, the Russian Chancellor, divined that this Entente was purely diplomatic, and insisted that the insurgents should first submit; he laid down that the Polish Question only concerned those Powers who had shared Poland—Russia, Prussia, and Austria. The demand of England was simply inspired by the desire to break up Franco-Russian friendship; having compromised Napoleon, she declared her disinclination to adopt other than diplomatic means in the Polish Question. Napoleon comprehended that he was caught in a snare and was forced to abandon the Poles to their fate. Prussia induced Austria to declare military law in her Polish dominions, and the last Polish bands were destroyed in 1864.

A terrible repression followed. Many Poles were executed, and many deported to Siberia. All reforms were abolished. The Catholic clergy were persecuted and Poland remained under martial law. The nobility and the middle classes were crushed by confiscation and heavy taxes, but the peasants were allowed, by the payment of a small indemnity, to become proprietors. Nationally and religiously compromised, Poland entered on a new social transformation.

Reaction now dominated Russia. The last reform of Alexander I. was the creation of Provincial Assemblies, called *zemstvos*, representing the aristocracy, the middle classes and the peasants. The Czar now completely abandoned his policy of reform.

. . . .

The Polish Revolution had not only broken the Franco-Russian friendship, but had alienated Napoleon III. from England and Austria. Prussia considered the time as a favourable one for the solution of the question of the German Duchies of Denmark.

In November, 1863, Frederick VII. of Denmark died and was succeeded by Prince Christian of Glücksburg.

Prince Frederick of Augustenburg claimed Holstein, Lauenberg, and Schleswig, and was supported by the Diet of Frankfort. Saxon and Hanoverian troops entered Holstein in 1863. The Powers advised Denmark to evacuate the country south of the Eider, and in 1864 Holstein was occupied by Federal troops.

Under the pretext of obliging the Danish King to respect the rights of the Duchies, Prussian and Austrian troops occupied Schleswig. Each of the two Powers worked independently of each other. This subtle policy was inspired by Bismarck, who had recently become Prime Minister of Prussia.

Otto von Bismarck was born in 1815, at Schoenhausen in Brandenburg, of noble family: he had become prominent in 1848 as an ardent absolutist: he had also represented Prussia at the Diet of Frankfort, and his political ideas had become definite and precise. He was persuaded that the Confederation was dead, that Prussia alone could unite Germany, and that Austria must be expelled from German dominions. As Ambassador at Petrograd, he had obtained the friendship of the Czar, and had kept alive Russian hostility to Austria. His residence in Paris, as Ambassador, for a short time in 1862 ,had sufficiently manifested to him the vacillating mind of Napoleon III.

In 1862, William I. of Prussia, who had succeeded his brother, Frederick William IV., appointed Bismarck Prime Minister. William I., though sixty years of age, possessed energy and a strong character. He enthusiastically believed in national unification, but felt that military power was essential to this. With Roon and Moltke, War Minister and Chief of the Staff respectively, he had planned great schemes of military reform. When, however, these were presented to the Chamber, the Liberals refused the required credits and counted on the country to support them in this refusal. William I., a sincere absolutist, was irritated by their obstinacy. Persuaded that a great army was necessary to Prussia as the head of German unity, he placed at the head of the Government, Bismarck, as the man best adapted to carry through his policy.

Bismarck's reactionary reputation widened the breach

between Crown and Liberals. The latter, anxious for German unity, counted on wide reforms as an inducement to the other German States to join the Union. Bismarck had faith only in armed force. Soon after taking office he declared in the Chamber that speeches and associations were useless, and that Prussia must attain her end only by fire and iron: he, therefore, supported the proposed military reforms. The Chamber passed a vote of censure on Bismarck, and was dissolved. William I. contented himself with the assent of the Upper House, and proceeded with his military plans. The Press and the country still opposed them, and Bismarck therefore restricted the liberty of the Press, and in a few months became the most hated man in Prussia.

Bismarck now turned his attention to the Polish and Danish Questions: he cleverly worked the first problem to the advantage of Prussia in the second. Aware that Russian support was essential to his Danish plans, he aided the Czar to suppress the Polish rebellion. This support was all the more welcome to the Czar since he found himself faced by the hostility of all Europe. The King of Sweden sympathised with Denmark, but was restrained by Russian accord with Germany. The lack of cordial relations between France and England prevented armed common action on behalf of Denmark. Bismarck felt it necessary to free himself from the fetters of the Federal Diet, which sustained the cause of Prince Augustenburg and desired to exclude Austria from the Diet. He therefore resolved, temporarily, to make common cause with the latter.

Personally, he was convinced of the necessity of expelling Austria from Germany. But, when the Danish problem presented itself, he determined to bait his trap for Austria with an alliance, and thus from the very beginning demonstrated the unscrupulous and merciless policy towards foreign countries which marked his life schemes. Austria welcomed an agreement, either because she wished to break through her isolation or because she genuinely shared the enthusiasm of German peoples for the Germans of the Duchies. The Prussian Liberals were indignant at this alliance, and refused to grant the war credits.

Notwithstanding this refusal the war broke out. The Allied troops invaded Schleswig. The Danes resisted magnificently and every inch of ground was disputed. After the sanguinary battle of April 18, the Allies occupied the major part of Jutland. Later, by a bold stroke, they captured the island of Alsen. Abandoned by the Powers, the Danish King was forced to make peace with Austria and Prussia on August 1, 1864. By the Treaty of Vienna, in October, the Duchies of Schleswig, Holstein, and Lauenburg were added to Prussia and Austria. The Saxon and Hanoverian troops evacuated the provinces they had occupied.

. . . .

Bismarck had calculated on the fact that community of interests forms a fruitful source of conflict. The possession of these distant provinces was only an embarrassment to Austria, and she would willingly have ceded them to Frederick of Augustenburg. Prussia, however, coveted them for herself, for the possession of the coasts and the port of Kiel was of great value to her. The question grew acute. Bismarck, to justify his crime, placed the claims of the Prince of Augustenburg before a committee of jurists, who came to the conclusion that only the King of Denmark could legitimately claim the Duchies. But these rights had been transferred to Prussia and Austria. The Federal Diet's opinion was thus discounted and disposed of.

The Austrian Government was beset with difficulties: not only was Venice hoping for a speedy liberation, but the Constitution of 1861 had only embarrassed Austria the more: the Czechs would not attend the Reichsrath: the German Liberals fiercely opposed the Government: Hungary chafed under oppression. Francis Joseph began to wish for a reconciliation with Hungary; but to effect this a war must at all costs be avoided. He therefore met the King of Prussia at Gastein and made a provisional division of the plunder. The administration of Schleswig was to be the affair of Austria and that of Holstein was to be the care of Prussia; Lauenburg was bought by Prussia from the Austrians for fourteen-and-a-half millions of francs.

Bismarck felt this arrangement to be but temporary. While the King, Roon, and Moltke continued their military preparations, he pursued his diplomatic labours. In 1865 he met Napoleon at Biarritz: he pointed out the European necessity of expelling Austria from Germany, and hinted at an alliance with Italy, which latter would obtain the Veneto. The health of Napoleon was already feeble, and he came to no decision. He expressed his sympathy with the principle of nationality, but gave no formal pledge. Indeed, he thought that a war between Prussia and Austria would be a difficult achievement for the former, and would be of lengthy duration: he imagined that when both these countries were exhausted by the war, France would have the opportunity of interfering and sharing some of the spoil.

Bismarck was now entirely satisfied that France would not interfere in favour of Austria, and he returned immediately to Berlin: he assumed a provocative demeanour to Austria, and invited Italy to make common cause with Germany against her. A secret Treaty was signed by Berlin and Italy on April 8, 1866. Austria, foreseeing what was to come, offered to Victor Emmanuel, through Napoleon, the cession of the Veneto, if he would sever his alliance with Germany. Victor Emmanuel refused, and Bismarck determined to precipitate events. War was declared in June, 1866. Many German States joined Austria in this war, since they understood that the victory of Prussia and exclusion of Austria, would diminish their own independence.

. . . .

Bismarck had deliberately planned this war, which he deemed necessary to the settlement of the ancient rivalry with Austria. King William was dubious. Queen Augusta and the Crown Prince were opposed to it, as was the greater part of German public opinion. Prussia had against her three groups of enemies—Hanover, Hesse Cassel on the west, South Germany and Austria. The Western States, though forming a barrier between Prussia and the Danish Duchies, possessed but weak military forces, while the Southern States were slow in their preparation. The Prussians decided, therefore, to paralyse the Western States first of all and to suppress the Southern resistance with the

same forces. The Austrian Army was the chief danger, but this was diminished by the Alliance with Italy, since Austrian forces would be needed to defend the Veneto.

In a few days Hesse Cassel and Hanover were occupied by Prussian troops; the Hanoverian troops were surrounded and forced to capitulate: the smaller Southern States submitted, and the Northern were conquered in a fortnight. Prussia, then, felt herself able to restrain and isolate the Southern States.

Austria had 200,000 men under General Benedek in Bohemia, and Prussia's greatest effort was there concentrated. Saxon troops had left their own country undefended and formed part of this Austrian Army: Prussia occupied Saxony and entered Bohemia with 300,000 men. Half of this force pursued the Saxon Army, and the other half under the Crown Prince penetrated the difficult passes of the Riesen Gebirge.

On June 29 the two Prussian Armies formed a junction. Benedek, who had observed the advantage which the needle-gun gave to the enemy, and who found himself inferior in numbers, telegraphed to the Emperor an urgent message that peace should be made at any cost, as an Austrian catastrophe was inevitable. Francis Joseph, who naturally knew nothing of what had happened, sent a peremptory message to Benedek to the effect that he had never heard of peace being concluded without the preliminary test of battle, and that in any case peace was impossible as yet: he demanded if a battle had yet been fought, and ordered Benedek to retreat if, for any reason, a battle was impossible. Benedek now considered himself morally bound to give battle, and the rival armies met on July 3 at Königratz and Sadowa. The Austrians were disastrously defeated. The Prussian Army marched on Vienna and encamped at fifteen kilometres from the capital. In the meantime the Bavarians had been defeated, and Hesse Darmstadt, Nassau, and Frankfort had been occupied.

Austria, however, was victorious in Italy. From lack of combination among its Generals the Italian Army was defeated at Custoza and forced to retreat across the Mincio.

The Austrian Emperor, in order to recall his troops from Italy to the defence of the capital, after the defeat of Sadowa, telegraphed to Napoleon III. that he was ready to cede the Veneto to Victor Emmanuel, and invoked the Emperor's mediation in order to obtain peace with Italy and an armistice with Prussia.

Napoleon seemed to have become the final arbiter of the situation. But circumstances had developed very differently from what he had anticipated. Prussia, instead of being exhausted by a long war, had, in three weeks, defeated her enemies and had become a formidable military power. An efficient army and resolute measures would have been necessary to enable France to impose her own terms on Prussia. But Napoleon had imagined that the war would have dragged on indefinitely and had neglected to make any military preparations: his malady had undermined his health and weakened his will power. He offered his mediation, which Bismarck, who wished to avoid French intervention, refused. The latter stated that solemn pledges bound Germany to Italy, and that Italy, for her part, was anxious to wipe out the late defeat.

The Italians had hoped much from their fleet. But here, again, incompetence and divisions brought about a naval defeat and the Austrian fleet, under Tegetthoff, defeated the Italian navy at Lissa, July 20.

Fearing that France might claim Rhenish territory, Bismarck impressed on his Sovereign the necessity of peace with Austria. William I. wished to march on Vienna, but Bismarck would not expose Austria to too deep humiliation, and was apprehensive lest France might prepare herself for war. An armistice was concluded at Nikolsburg, by which Austria ceded to Prussia her rights over the Danish Duchies, and promised to pay a war indemnity. She recognised the dissolution of the German Confederation and gave Prussia *carte blanche* in the reorganisation of Germany, from which she confessed herself excluded. Prussia pledged herself to obtain from Italy peace, on the cession of the Veneto.

The Italian Government learnt with consternation the terms of the peace which were concluded without its intervention. Bismarck declared that he had fulfilled his pact

by obtaining the Veneto for Italy. In order to avoid a prolonged war with Austria, now free to concentrate her forces in the Peninsula, Italy accepted the terms arranged for her by Prussia, and peace was signed between Austria, Prussia, and Italy. A plebiscite of the population of the Veneto pronounced for union with the Kingdom of Italy by 647,246 votes to 69. On November 7, 1866, Venice triumphantly welcomed her King, Victor Emmanuel.

CHAPTER X

COMPLETION OF ITALIAN AND GERMAN UNITY

The Northern Confederation: Power of Prussia: Its Treaties with the Southern States.—Diminution of prestige of Napoleon III.: Question of Luxembourg.—Mentana.—Reorganisation of Austro-Hungary.—Government of Queen Isabella of Spain: Revolution of 1868.—Leopold of Hohenzollern and the Throne of Spain.—Declaration of War between France and Prussia.—First German Victories.—Capitulation of Sedan, September 2, 1870.—Napoleon III. a prisoner.—Proclamation of the Republic at Paris, September 4.—Marshal Bazaine and the Surrender of Metz.—Siege of Paris.—Gambetta and the Provincial Armies.—Capitulation of Paris.—Assembly of Bordeaux and the Preliminaries of Peace, February 26, 1871.—Proclamation of the German Empire.—Completion of Italian Unity: Occupation of Rome.—New Electoral Reform in England: Disraeli and Gladstone: The Expedition in Abyssinia: Precautionary measures in Ireland.—Political Life in Europe in and about 1870.—The Clerical Party and the Vatican.—Ecumenical Council.—Beginning of Socialist organisation.—Triumph of the Middle Classes.

The victorious war of 1866 changed the hatred of the Prussians for Bismarck into an enthusiastic admiration: he profited by this to make his peace with the Parliament. At the same time he awaited the organisation of a new Germany.

In the preparation of the new organisation a Confederation of States was maintained in appearance only. In reality, they were entirely in the hands of the Federal Government, which consisted of a Præsidium or Presidency, a Federal Council (Bundesrat), and an elective Assembly (Reichstag). The President, who was the King of Prussia, represented the Confederation to Foreign Countries and decided on its foreign policy: he was also supreme head of the military forces. In internal affairs, as Head of the Federal Government, he promulgated the laws, convened and dissolved Federal Assemblies, and appointed Federal Government Employees. Bismarck's idea was that the Constitutional and Monarchial Bundesrat would neutralise the action of the popular Reichstag, and that in this way the effective

authority would still remain in the hands of the King of Prussia. Outside this Northern Confederation of twenty-one States, remained four Southern States—Bavaria, Würtemberg, Baden, and Hesse Darmstadt. As conquered enemies they were forced to submit to the terms of the victorious Prussia, which consisted of an indemnity and a rectification of frontiers.

These four States, by the Treaty of Nikolsburg, were to form a Southern German Confederation, with an independent national position. Napoleon III. believed that this division of Germany into three parts would have secured the safety of France. But he had not reckoned on the growing sentiment of German nationalism: nor had he realised the subtlety and force of Bismarck, who knew both how to wreck the Emperor's plans, and how to take immediate advantage of any false move. Napoleon, after the Treaty of Nikolsburg, had demanded from the King of Prussia the cession of the Rhenish Provinces of Bavaria and Hesse. Bismarck not only returned a haughty refusal but made use of this offer to bind the Southern States to Germany. He laid before them the ambitious designs of France, and impressed on them that Prussia, and Prussia alone, could protect them from French annexation: in 1866 these four States concluded a separate alliance with Prussia, arranging for reciprocal aid in case of aggression.

By the reorganisation of the Zollverein, Bismarck bound the Southern to the Northern States by the bonds of commercial interests.

The smaller States, now feeling themselves secure and prosperous, were not anxious for a closer union with Prussia. Bismarck, however, was determined to effect this. To precipitate the Union, he planned a great War of National interest, in which all petty rivalries and jealousies should be swept away. He transformed the policy of German unity into one of Foreign Policy, because he was persuaded that only in face of a common enemy could Princes and People be united. Therefore, in order to fulfil his programme he willed and prepared war on France.

. . . .

Unfortunately, on the other side of the Rhine the ground

was favourable to the growth of the war spirit. In order to satisfy French public opinion Napoleon had begun negotiations for the acquisition of Luxembourg. Till 1866 this Grand Duchy, which belonged to William III. of Holland, had formed part of the German Confederation, and a Prussian garrison occupied the capital. But with the dissolution of the Confederacy the bonds which united it to Prussia were relaxed: Prussia had not even invited it to become part of the Northern Confederation: she, however, raised objections to the withdrawal of the troops, and the King of Holland was ignorant of the intentions of Prussia regarding the Grand Duchy. Napoleon III. offered to purchase it. The King of Holland was only too eager to part with it, and the bargain was on the point of being concluded when the journals began to discuss the matter. Germany professed to be indignant at the alienation of what she called 'German territory.' The King of Holland in alarm then broke off the negotiations. This diplomatic defeat was all the more bitter to France since her Government had published its intentions of purchase to Europe. Napoleon considered it a *casus belli*, but knew that his armies were unprepared for war: he determined, however, to insist on the retirement of Prussian troops from Luxembourg. By the Treaty of London of 1839 Luxembourg had been placed under the tutelage of the Powers. Luxembourg thus became a European Question. A conference was held in 1867 at London, in which Prussia consented to evacuate Luxembourg, which was to continue under the rule of the Dutch King. But at the same time its neutrality was guaranteed by the Powers.

Napoleon painfully realised that his word had lost its force in Europe: it was at this moment, too, that the United States demanded the withdrawal of his troops from Mexico.

All these events combined to shatter the Napoleonic prestige. So long as this was unimpaired, France had been in agreement with Napoleon, but diplomatic defeats induced the Opposition to indulge in lively protest, since even the great commercial progress of the country had been accompanied by flagrant scandals and an evident weakening of the country's moral fibre.

Napoleon made great concessions to the Press in order to calm the Opposition, but this measure only spread discontent more rapidly. Even the Paris Exhibition of 1867, splendid as it was, could not make France forget her humiliations. From Mexico arrived the news of the unhappy Maximilian's last attempts at resistance. Then came the notice of his imprisonment and execution, June 19, 1867.

In 1866 the last of Napoleon's troops had been withdrawn from Rome. Garibaldians and Romans again determined to attempt the capture of Rome for the Italians, hoping that France would permit the inclusion of the city in the Kingdom of Italy were the thing once accomplished. Napoleon feared lest compliance should lose for him the support of the Church, and at his wish Garibaldi was arrested and sent to Caprera. The Romans attempted to throw off the Papal yoke unaided, but the revolt was repressed in blood. Garibaldi escaped from his confinement and put himself at the head of his volunteers. Napoleon thereupon again sent troops to Civita Vecchia, and though Garibaldi defeated the Papal troops at Monte Rotondo, French and Papal troops defeated him a few days later at Mentana. The Garibaldian exhibition of 1867 had failed and French troops again occupied Rome.

Thiers made a violent discourse against the Italian Revolution in the Chamber, and Rouher, the Prime Minister, declared that 'Never, never' would France support such violation of her honour and of Catholicism as the Italian occupation of Rome.' The gulf between Italy and France became wider, to Napoleon's sorrow, who aimed at a triple alliance of France, Austria, and Italy against Prussia, but the Roman Question barred all idea of any understanding between France and Italy.

The alliance with Austria seeemd easier. After Sadowa, Francis Joseph felt the necessity of reconciliation with Hungary. The latter country was constituted as a separate entity in Home Affairs. In Foreign Affairs its politics were those of Austria, with a common army and navy.

Hungary then numbered 16,000,000 inhabitants, of which the Magyars alone formed about one-third. The

remainder of the population consisted of peasants with no political existence. But two groups had a special importance: the Croat-Slav to the south-west, and the small nation of Saxons in Transylvania—a German colony of 200,000 inhabitants. The latter group, however, feared the Rumanian Orthodox peasants, and willingly made common cause with the Magyar. Rumanian Transylvania, therefore, was incorporated with Hungary.

But in Croatia the population were almost entirely Croats. The latter were weary of the unavailing strife and accepted a compromise by which Croatia should become an autonomous State and the Croat language the official tongue. Five Croat deputies made part of the Hungarian deputation to the Sovereign, and a Croat Minister in the Hungarian Government attended, exclusively to Croatian affairs.

Beust, the Austrian Chancellor, was responsible for the reconciliation of the Emperor with his German subjects, and under his régime liberal laws were passed. The Bohemians were also anxious for autonomy and attempted to follow the obstructionist tactics of Hungary. Though their resistance was strong, their attempt was unsuccessful and ended in Prague being placed under military law.

Francis Joseph was eager to avenge the defeat of Sadowa, and cultivated friendly relations with Napoleon. But he feared an Italo-Prussian Alliance, since he realised that Italy had unwillingly accepted the frontiers assigned to her in 1866 and aimed at the possession of the Trentino and Trieste. He attempted to form an alliance with both France and Italy, but the latter demanded as a chief condition that the French troops should be withdrawn from Rome. Napoleon feared to disgust the clericals, and the negotiations finally ended in nebulous promises and hopes of some future agreement. This result was to a great extent due to Bismarck, who did his utmost to prevent the proposed alliance.

. . . .

The eyes of Europe were now riveted on Spain, which was in open Revolution.

Queen Isabella II., a woman of easy virtue, limited intelligence, and fanatic devotion, was in the hands of her

favourites and confessors. Under their guidance she had attempted to restore absolutism and to impose clericalism more firmly on the country. Violent crises, in which the Army had taken part, had unsettled the country, and the various political parties had been captained by Generals. Finally, in 1868, the Revolution triumphed, and Queen Isabella fled to France. The Assembly prepared a new monarchical Constitution, with two Chambers, and negotiations were entered into with the various claimants to the Spanish Throne. At length, Prince Leopold of Hohenzollern was mentioned as a probable candidate. He was the brother of Charles of Hohenzollern, who had recently been called to the Rumanian throne in place of Prince Cuza, who had abdicated.

This selection created grave dissatisfaction in France, which saw in a Hohenzollern Prince on the Spanish Throne one more enemy in Europe. The Duke de Grammont, the French Foreign Minister, declared in Parliament that France would never allow such a choice and that, were his candidature insisted upon, the Government would know how to do its duty without hesitation or weakness. The King of Prussia was therefore asked to withdraw the candidature. He replied that the whole affair only concerned his family, but promised as Chief of that family to approve the withdrawal of Prince Leopold, should the latter consent so to do. On July 12, 1870, the renunciation of Leopold was publicly announced. The peril of war, therefore, seemed to be dispelled. But the French Government insisted that this candidature should be renounced for ever. William I. happened to be at the Baths of Ems and was annoyed at this persistence. Therefore, when Benedetti, the French Ambassador, demanded an audience in order to ascertain the King's decision on this point, the King sent a messenger by his aide-de-camp that Leopold's renunciation had finished the affair so far as he was concerned, and that he had nothing more to add. He then telegraphed to Bismarck the substance of this episode. Bismarck had seen with intense anger, that this occasion of prosecuting war had slipped from his grasp. But the telegram gave him his opportunity: by cancelling the words of explanation contained in the King's

message, he gave to the refusal the character of a brutal insult. Such, at least, was the impression in France when the text of the despatch, which Bismarck had artfully communicated to the Press, was read by the French people. On July 17, 1870, France declared war on Prussia.

. . . .

Napoleon, in the grip of a mortal malady, allowed himself to be drawn into this decision by his Ministers: the Alliance which he had desired with Austria and Italy was not realised. Russia threatened to attack Austria should she move against Prussia, and the Roman Question alienated Italy. French hopes that the Southern States of Germany would ally themselves with France as formerly, or at least remain neutral, were disappointed.

France had also counted on the aid of Denmark, since Christian IX. could not have forgotten his losses of 1864, but England and Russia, both connected by marriage with the Danish dynasty, counselled neutrality. England declared her own neutrality unless the independence or neutrality of Belgium should be violated. The struggle was, therefore, confined to Germany and France. Bismarck had succeeded, as in the preceding wars, in completely isolating his enemy.

Napoleon trusted in his army, but soon realised that it was hopelessly unprepared for war. Organisation was lacking, the fortresses were depleted of munitions, the magazines were empty: disorder was predominant everywhere.

Prussia, on the contrary, had prepared thoroughly for the war. In ten days 400,000 men were on the frontiers: in numbers, strength, and arms, the Germans were far superior.

In the early days of August the Germans penetrated Alsace-Lorraine at three different points: the half-formed French Army Corps were repelled, and the Germans, trusting to their superior weight, thrust themselves between the armies commanded by MacMahon and Bazaine. Bazaine retreated to Metz and was in brief time surrounded by the Germans and his communications cut off. Marshal MacMahon, with whom was the Emperor, planned to retire

to the capital: the Emperor had suggested this step, but the Empress, fearing the effect which his retreat might have on the minds of the Parisians, dissuaded them. MacMahon then marched to relieve Bazaine, but Moltke forced him to the north and made him accept battle at Sedan. The Germans, who had occupied the surrounding heights, annihilated the French with their artillery. Napoleon for several hours remained in the hottest of the fire. Then, seeing that further resistance was impossible, and desirous of sparing further carnage, hoisted the white flag. The letter which he sent with a flag of truce to William I. contained these few words:—'Not having succeeded in dying at the head of my troops, nothing remains to me but to place my sword in the hands of Your Majesty.'

A few thousand soldiers succeeded in crossing the Belgian frontiers. 82,000 were declared prisoners of war. Only after the capitulation was signed did William I. consent to grant the Emperor an interview of the briefest description. The following morning the Emperor was imprisoned in the castle of Wilhelmslöhe, and his army was interned in various German fortresses.

The news of the Sedan disaster provoked furious anger in Paris: an immense crowd, on September 4, surrounded the Chamber of Deputies. The Parliament was invaded—those deputies who were favourable to the Empire were abused and maltreated. Gambetta, the great Republican orator, declared that Louis Bonaparte and his family had for ever ceased to reign in France: then, followed by the crowd, he went to the Hôtel de Ville, where a Provisional Government was formed entirely of Republican deputies. General Trochu was appointed Governor of Paris and President. He enjoyed great popularity on account of his opposition to the Imperial Government.

. . . .

The situation was characterised by a frightful simplicity. 400,000 Germans were already in France and another 700,000 of reinforcements were ready, while France no longer possessed any army at all. 50,000 had perished in the first battles: 100,000 were prisoners: 180,000 were

besieged in Metz, and the others were surrounded in various German fortresses. Arms, munitions, and food were alike lacking. The country had lost its faith in the Generals who had conducted the country to ruin.

All this notwithstanding, the Government of National Defence prepared with greater energy for resistance.

Every fit man was organised in the new army, and since the enemy advance had paralysed the fleet, the sailors were employed in territorial defence. Thiers made a futile diplomatic journey through Europe, where he only found expressions of platonic sympathy.

Strasburg, after a terrible bombardment, capitulated on September 4, and Paris was invested. The largest French Army was shut up in Metz. Bazaine, instead of identifying himself solely with his military position, attempted political strategy. Knowing that his army was the only force left to France, he deemed himself arbiter of the situation. In order to preserve his army intact, for his own personal advantage, he made no sortie from Metz and would not recognise the Government of National Defence. In the vain hope of issuing from Metz and imposing his will on France, he entered into treatment with Bismarck, who led him on till he committed the vile and criminal treachery of capitulating with 173,000 men and 1400 guns. Metz was ceded to the Germans.

The whole German Army was now gathered round Paris. Gambetta left Paris in a balloon and went to Tours, where he organised resistance in the Provinces. By his persuasive eloquence he raised armies on every side which disputed French soil, inch by inch, with the Germans. He had hoped that France would again repeat the miracle of 1792, and drive the enemy from her frontiers. At any rate, he saved the honour of France. 600,000 men marched on Paris, demonstrating an admirable bravery and enthusiasm. But they were lacking in instruction and organisation, ill-clothed, though the winter was exceptionally severe, and ill-armed. The Germans possessed every equipment, and, after German fashion, were robbing the inhabitants of those things which they themselves lacked:

they possessed too many advantages, and the issue was not doubtful.[1]

Whilst the Provinces strove to liberate Paris, the latter city defended herself heroically. But General Trochu's sorties were made with no special scope, nor had he great confidence in irregular troops. Famine entered the city. It was not till the position was known to be hopeless that the Parisians lost heart. Their provincial armies were defeated, their last supplies of food exhausted: German bombs were raining on the city: a last and unsuccessful sortie was attempted. The city capitulated on January 28, 1871, and the fortresses of Paris passed into German hands: an armistice of three weeks was granted for the purpose of electing a stable Government with which negotiations of peace might be carried on.

The nation was exhausted, and the elections produced a majority in favour of peace. The Assembly of Bordeaux, February 12, 1871, confirmed the deposition of Napoleon III. and named Adolphe Thiers as Head of the Executive Power. The preliminaries of peace were settled at Versailles, February 26, 1871. France consented to pay an indemnity of five milliards of francs. She ceded Alsace and Strasburg and a large part of Lorraine,[2] with more than 1,500,000 inhabitants. Thiers was able to save Belfort, which resisted till February 16, but he was forced to allow the German troops to enter the city of Paris and to occupy the Champs Elysées, until the peace preliminaries were ratified by the Assembly.

The Germans entered Paris on March 1, but on that very day the Assembly ratified Peace, and the Germans were forced to leave the city on the morrow. With the bronze taken from the captured cannon the victors erected a colossal statue of Germany in the Niederwald, near Mainz.

. . . .

[1] Bazaine entered Germany as a prisoner. On his return to France he was condemned to death—a sentence commuted to perpetual imprisonment. Bazaine succeeded in escaping to Spain, where he died in misery.

[2] Lorraine was not included in the German States, but was dependent directly on the Empire (Reichsland). At the beginning she was not even allotted an Assembly for local affairs, but was ruled with a special and severe code, in order to secure the prompt Germanising of the country. With this object it was deemed wise to found in Strasburg a grandiose German University.

By fire and iron Bismarck had set the seal on German unity. The Southern States had already begun to talk of substituting their particular treaties with Prussia for an alliance based on that of the Confederation of the North.

With their admission, Germany would consist of twenty-five States, and the Constitution of 1867 was adopted as that of the whole of Germany. Some concessions were made to the most important States—notably Bavaria and Würtemberg. But in reality all that was left of the ancient system was a species of decentralisation.

The ceremony of the restoration of the German Empire, which took place on January 18, 1871, was a logical sequence of the completion of German Unity. It would have been natural to celebrate the event in any one of the German cities which were associated with German national history: but the triumph of force could not so easily be affirmed at home as on the soil of a conquered nation. In order that the humiliation of the French nation should be eternally associated with the birth of the German Empire, the latter was proclaimed at Versailles, in the very Palace from which Louis XIV. had dictated laws to Europe. The function was, essentially, a military one, and the Emperor in assuming the crown, declared that he accepted it from the Princes and Free Cities of the Confederation.

. . . .

Italian Unity was also completed during the Franco-Prussian War. Napoleon, the Ally of Italy in 1859, had formally requested Italian aid against Prussia at the beginning of hostilities. Personally, Victor Emmanuel was eager to give the aid required: but Rome and Mentana had not been forgotten, and the spirit of the nation was hostile to such an expedition.

French troops at Rome had been withdrawn for home defence, and the occasion was deemed opportune throughout the Peninsula for the incorporation of Rome with United Italy. Victor Emmanuel, '*with filial affection*,' begged the Pope to consider the special conditions of Italy, and to renounce the Temporal Power. The Pope replied that he would only yield to force. By the fall of the Empire, Italy considered herself freed from all pledges formerly given to

France. Therefore, on the night of September 12, 1871, General Cadorna crossed the Papal frontier and reached the walls of Rome without meeting with any resistance. The troops of Pius IX. opposed the entry of the Italians into Rome, in order to show Europe that the Pontiff only yielded to superior force. That object attained, the Pope issued orders to his troops to desist from further defence, and retired to the Vatican, where he constituted himself a 'prisoner.' The Italians entered through the breach in the walls at Porta Pia on September 20, 1871. A plebiscite of the Roman people gave 133,000 votes for inclusion in the Kingdom of Italy, and 1,507 against.

This event was not only all important to Italy but to the world at large, since the entry of the Italians into Rome signalled the abolition of the Temporal Power of the Papacy.

Before the new Government was transported to Rome a discussion took place concerning the position of the Pope: it was necessary to tranquillise the consciences of Catholics with regard to the consequences of the suppression of the Temporal Power. It was evident, also, that the Holy See must have complete independence in order to direct impartially the interests of the religious world. Cavour's principle of 'a Free Church in a Free State' was applied, and the so-called 'law of Guarantees' was formulated, by which all sovereign honours and prerogatives were accorded to the Pope, to whom were also left the Palaces of the Lateran, and the Vatican, and the Villa of Castel Gandolfo: an annual income of £129,000 was assigned to him as the exact sum inscribed in the budgets of the Pontifical State for varied ecclesiastical needs. In addition, the Kingdom of Italy renounced certain rights of ecclesiastical procedure which had been exercised by preceding Governments. But the Pontiff would not recognise the Law of Guarantees and refused the annual grant. None the less, the change of capital took place in July, 1871, and King Victor Emmanuel II. took up his residence at the Palace of the Quirinal.

. . . .

Whilst Italy and Germany completed their unity, England was launched on the path of democratic evolution.

The general electoral reform of 1832 now appeared insufficient, and an extension of the vote was demanded. The two political leaders were now Disraeli and Gladstone, the former giving new vitality to the Conservative Party by the insertion on his programme of large social reforms: the latter championing the Parliament against the Crown, and upholding advanced theories of liberty and justice. In the Parliamentary discussion on electoral reform Disraeli had no precise programme, but he adopted the singular tactics of allowing the most progressive of his opponents to proclaim their views, and then of insisting that his followers should support much more daring and comprehensive schemes than those of the Radicals themselves. These reforms increased the number of the electors from 1,300,000 to 2,500,000. The working classes now received the right of voting, and England entered on a democratic régime.

Whilst in these reforms Disraeli surpassed the most ardent Radicals, he followed, both in language and action, the example of Palmerston in asserting England's might in foreign politics.

Theodore, a feudal Abyssinian chief, had succeeded in giving a certain unity to Abyssinia by assuming a species of kingship. In spite of English protest he refused to release certain missionaries and a consul whom he had imprisoned: Disraeli determined to avenge the insult, and despatched in December, 1867, 20,000 men under Napier. In April, 1868, at Magdala, Napier gained a decisive victory. Theodore committed suicide, and John, who had aided the English, was placed on the throne by them as Emperor of Abyssinia.

The Liberals came to power in 1868, and Disraeli resigned his post: he was succeeded by Gladstone as Prime Minister. A coalition between Liberals and Radicals kept him in power for six successive years. Gladstone turned his attention to the Irish Question. Everywhere, in Ireland, emigration and famine had thinned the population, which in a few years had sunk from 8,000,000 to 5,000,000. The Fenian Society aimed at erecting an Irish Republic, and various abortive risings took place in 1867.

Gladstone determined to abolish some of the most odious

abuses: in 1871 the Anglican Church was disestablished in Ireland and its endowments were divided between the Catholics and Presbyterians; hospitals were also endowed. The Land Act of 1870 was intended to deal with certain agricultural evils, but its effect was almost nugatory; the Education Act of 1870 diffused instruction among the working classes and provided for their gratuitous instruction.

. . . .

Henceforth power went to the class which was numerically superior. The old aristocracy lost all political importance: with the development of the new industrial life its very wealth diminished. Its place in political life was taken by middle class families enriched by banking, manufacture, and commerce: these rich *parvenus* imitated the aristocracy and, when possible, allied themselves by marriage with that class: satisfied with the results they had already won, they formed, in English political life, the modern Conservative Party. But the great commercial and industrial development gave birth also to the Liberal-Democratic Party, which was formed by the members of the prosperous lower middle classes: this latter party vigorously impelled the Government forward on its new political path.

Apart from these two parties, which in most constitutional countries alternately seized the reins of power, stood the Catholics and Socialists: their aims were of an international character, and to them politics were a means of attaining their social or religious ideal.

Subsequent to 1849, the Clerical Party was everywhere reinforced. Pius IX. wished to formulate a policy which he deemed necessary for the Church in the world: he appointed a commission of Cardinals, which, after five years' work, formulated the Syllabus:—that is, a catalogue of the principal errors of Modern Society; liberty of the Press, of religion, of conscience, and of education, civil marriage, lay education, and popular sovereignty were considered to be positive evils; in fact, all the principal fundamentals on which is based the Modern State were condemned.

In order to concentrate the whole power of the Church, it was determined to proclaim the doctrine of Papal Infallibility—that is to say, the infallibility of the Pope in spiritual

matters when he speaks as Pastor or Doctor of all Christians. This Doctrine was approved by the Ecumenical Council—the twentieth in the history of the Church. This Council was held in Rome, three centuries later than the preceding one of Trent.

The entry of the Italian troops into Rome suspended the labours of this Council indefinitely. From henceforth Catholics assumed a position of hostility towards Modern Society.

The Socialist Party now began to be organised. Karl Marx and Engels in 1848 had published their Collectivist pamphlet with its famous appeal to the proletariat for unity. But in 1848 the Socialist movement was prominent nowhere, except in France, and in 1860 Socialism appeared dead. But in 1862 the English Trades Unions had entered into relations with French and Belgian Socialists. Marx, in 1864, succeeded in forming the International Union of Labour. This Union ended by becoming a political society, its fundamental idea being that all social history represents the fight of classes, and that the proletariat must conquer its place in society from the middle classes. Bakunine, a Russian, in 1868, introduced ideas of anarchy and violent revolutionary methods into the Society. This led to a schism in the Union, which impeded its progress.

During this time the German National Socialist Party was founded. Lassalle's Socialist-Democratic Party, which was founded in 1863, fused with the party of Marx and constituted the German Socialist Labour Party: its organisation and methods were imitated by most European Socialist organisations. Even as early as 1870, Socialism began to have its effect on political life.

The period, which is closed by 1870, marks the triumph of the middle classes: it must, however, be recognised that they merited their victory, since from the middle classes sprang almost all the champions of the new ideas. This triumph was signalled by great Public Works which entirely modified the conditions of life. Science progressed with incredible alacrity: railway lines were everywhere constructed, and this increase of means of communication introduced radical changes into the Postal Service. Mountains

were pierced by railways: isthmuses severed by canals: telegraphic wires united the various countries. In 1865 the first submarine cable crossed the Atlantic, from Ireland to New York. Gas transformed the nocturnal aspect of cities, and gigantic enterprises were undertaken with redoubled energy.

All these changes added to the comfort of material life, and ease and luxury, which had hitherto belonged to the few, were largely increased. Simultaneously, education, which had been the privilege of the upper classes, descended to the lower ranks of the people. The Press, no longer fettered by taxes, was everywhere expanded. The working classes, who now possessed their daily paper, hastened to reclaim their political place in the State.

CHAPTER XI

GERMANY BEGINS TO DOMINATE EUROPEAN LIFE

The German Empire: Reconciliation with Austria: Kulturkampf: Military laws and diplomatic alarm: Increase of Socialism and change of general Imperial Policy.—Kingdom of Italy: Death of Mazzini: Foreign and Internal Policy: The Left in Power: Death of Victor Emmanuel II.: Death of Pius IX. and Accession of Leo XIII.—France: The Commune: Government of Thiers: Presidency of MacMahon: Legitimist Failure: Constitutional Laws: Elections of 1876: Conflict between President and Chamber: Triumph of Republicans.—Spain: Prince Amedeo of Savoy: His Government: His Abdication: Republican Interval: Restoration of Monarchy: Alfonso XII.: End of the Carlist War: Constitution of 1876: Cuban War.—England: Gladstone's Reform: Foreign Policy of Peace: Ashantee War: Electors of 1874 and the Disraeli Ministry: Grandiose Imperialistic policy.

POLITICAL success and the strength of the German arms had exalted German prestige to its zenith: the new Empire became the central sustaining column of the political life of Europe. This development marked a change in the life of humanity. England, France, and Italy had based their policy on idealism, but Force now became the principal factor.

The magnificent results of German policy were attributed to the triumph of Force: the fact that that Force had triumphed only because it had served and coincided with the thought of the age, and had exactly responded to German development and moral preparation, was completely forgotten. Military Law became the ruling passion of the German nation: Germany had been conquered by Prussia. In the formation of Italy, Piedmont had directed the national movement, and had been fused with the rest of the nation. In less than two years, from a nation of 5,000,000 it had become one of 22,000,000: it did not, therefore, maintain its predominance in the new State. But in Germany, Prussia had long ranked as a Great Power, and its own population was numerically superior to those of the other States, which

had entered the Empire. Therefore, the military spirit which ruled it extended to the whole nation.

The new Germany openly declared that a gigantic military organisation was the only mode of maintaining peace; therefore, following the example of Prussia, she determined on the formation of a war treasure, and destined for such a use a portion of the French indemnity to the amount of 150,000,000 francs in gold and silver. In the castle of Spandau, near Berlin, this Imperial German War treasure was added to the Prussian War Fund, which was already lying there.

The inert and impotent German Confederation had been transformed into the first military Power in the world. The balance of power in Central Europe had been transposed. Austria was the first to recognise this, and hastened to admit that the long rivalry between the Hapsburgs and the Hohenzollerns had ended in the triumph of the latter. A sincere reconciliation took place between the two Emperors.

Great internal reforms characterised the first years of the new Empire, in administration, finance, and justice. The Prussian aristocracy noted these changes with disgust, seeing in them a menace to their ancient power and privileges; their influence at Court was mainly used in attempting to arrest this Liberal movement.

But a stronger and more decisive opposition was formed in the Chamber by the Catholic Party. In Prussia, Catholics were in a minority, but in the Empire, out of 40,000,000 of inhabitants 14,000,000 were Catholics; many of these also represented the separatist opinions of their various districts. The majority of the Catholic clergy were unwilling that the Imperial Crown should be worn by a Protestant Dynasty, the more so since the latter had not only refused to defend the Temporal Power in Italy, but had energetically upheld the Rights of the State against those of the Church. The Catholic Party was vigorous and well-organised, and in the elections of 1871 furnished more than one-sixth of the total number of the deputies of the Reichstag. It selected as its head Windthorst, who had championed the cause of the despoiled dynasty of Hanover, and was Bismarck's most formidable Parliamentary opponent.

The struggle began when the Government defended those Catholic theologians who refused to recognise the dogma of Papal Infallibility. Bismarck deprived the clergy of the supervision of the Catholic elementary schools, and limited the disciplinary power of the Bishops: the Jesuits and the orders affiliated to them were expelled from German territory: the majority of the Bishops opposed a firm resistance to these laws, which they declared to be cruel and unjust; many of these prelates were tried and condemned, and the language of the Catholic journals naturally increased in violence.

The struggle, which Virchow termed 'Kulturkampf,' or the 'Fight for civilisation,' was continued unhesitatingly by Bismarck. He made civil marriage obligatory, and suppressed the German Legation to the Holy See. In 1875 nearly all the episcopal Sees were vacant, as their titulars were either in prison or in exile.

While engaged in this conflict Bismarck did not neglect the question of military supremacy. The Army was placed on a Peace footing of 400,000 men. The military party under Moltke, observing the marvellous resiliency of France, did their utmost to bring about a second war, in which France should be entirely crushed. The situation in 1875 was so tense that all Europe looked for war. Through the pacific efforts of England and Russia, the bellicose tone of the German journals was modified and the political atmosphere appeared more serene; but the German attitude of menace constituted a perpetual danger. Gortsciakoff, the Russian Chancellor, did not conceal from European diplomats that the danger of war had been finally conjured by the efforts of his master. Bismarck neither forgot nor forgave Russia's conduct on this occasion, and though he concealed his irritation, his policy towards Russia was henceforth changed.

In 1877 Bismarck, wearied by perpetual Court intrigues, desired to resign. This, however, the Emperor would not permit: Bismarck then determined to take a holiday of ten months, which he devoted to the study of international commerce and finance.

Many State loans had been paid off by the unexpected French indemnity, and German capital was forced to seek

other fields of employment. Manufactures developed with incredible rapidity; a fever of speculation possessed the country, culminating at last in the terrible financial crisis of 1873—the gravest which history has ever recorded. The increase of manufactures led to a corresponding augmentation of the working classes, and Socialism made notable progress. The spread of the latter doctrine was shown by the elections of 1877, and the Conservative Party was alarmed. Bismarck, who had been a Conservative until the war with Austria, had, since that period, united with the Liberals. He now again ranked himself with the Conservatives: his struggle with the Catholics gradually became less bitter, and the Reichstag submissively followed his example.

. . . .

In Italy, Parliamentary Government triumphed, following the impulse which had been given it by Cavour. But many difficulties obstructed the path of progress. Among the various peoples which now formed United Italy were strong ethnological and traditional differences, and the backward Governments of some provinces had left a low level of civilisation. Italian literature was the common bond of the nation, but this fact naturally affected only the cultured class. Piedmont had directed the renaissance of the nation, and had furnished nearly all the essentials for welding its component parts into one concrete whole. The Statute of Carlo Alberto became the Constitutional map of Italy.

Victor Emmanuel was at this time fifty years old. After the death of Cavour the King exercised a greater personal influence, though he scrupulously confined himself to his Constitutional prerogatives. The electoral law of 1870 was still identical with that of 1848, and although the right of vote was given to all who paid taxes to the amount of forty francs, yet only a total of 550,000 electors could be raised out of a population of 26,000,000 inhabitants.

The reactionary party had almost retired from political life. The Clericals obeyed the rule of the Roman Curia, forbidding Catholics either to vote or receive votes, so that Progressives alone filled the Chamber. Republicanism was no longer in favour; Crispi's well-known formula of 'the Monarchy unites but the Republic divides us,' swayed

the minds of many. The new Republican deputies contented themselves with a Radical programme. The Chamber was, therefore, composed of the Right or the Moderate Party, and the Left or the extreme Radical. After Cavour's death, the Right continuously held the reins of power, and the elections, after the annexation of Rome, strengthened its hands.

The new life of the nation was inaugurated under excellent auspices: the opening of the Suez Canal restored its pristine importance to the Mediterranean and brought many new advantages within the reach of Italy. Communication with foreign countries was greatly facilitated by the piercing of Mont Cenis, the longest tunnel then existing. At the same time the Italian Parliament voted the expenses necessary for the boring of Mont St Gothard, which was completed in 1871. Throughout the Kingdom there was a reawakening of activity: the cities were enlarged and embellished: agriculture flourished, for the sale of ecclesiastical property had greatly ameliorated cultivation. Gradually the extreme misery of many districts diminished, and this fact, with rigorous police regulations, speedily suppressed brigandage: this latter work was greatly aided by the fall of the Temporal Power, since the Papal States no longer afforded a secure and easy asylum for these outlaws.

But the financial situation still continued difficult; the expenses of war, the reorganisation of the State, commercial and industrial development and public education had determined a serious deficit in the State Treasury, so that notwithstanding the increase of existing taxes, and the formation of new ones, the financial condition of United Italy increased in gravity. Quintino Sella, the Italian financial expert, succeeded, after painful and excessive labour, in restoring the equilibrium, and he may be called the financial liquidator of the Revolution.

But the generation to whom the Unity of Italy was due was gradually passing away. Giuseppe Mazzini, the prophet of the New Italy, died at Pisa in 1872. A few months before his death, he traced, in noble words, the programme of international policy which Italy should adopt when once she was mistress in her own house.

'*If Italy desires to be great, powerful, and prosperous, she must incarnate in herself the idea of a Europe, divided naturally, according to the tendencies and missions of her peoples. She must plant conspicuously on her frontiers a banner with the inscription, "Liberty and Nationality," and every act of her international life must be carried out with this end in view.*'

He emphasised the necessity to Italy of the disappearance of the Austrian and the Turkish Empires, and recommended the wise policy of a solid understanding with the Slav nations; he declared that the mission of Italy was to cement the agreement with the Slav, Hellenic, and Daco-Roman races; only thus the way into Asia would lie open to Italy.

But the men who now ruled the destinies of Italy were content with a much more modest programme. Their chief preoccupation was with the attitude of France. According to Thiers, the greatest error of French policy had been the aid given to the formation of Italy. The reactionary party desired the restoration of the Temporal Power, and when MacMahon was appointed President in 1873 Italy deemed it necessary to protect herself against the growing menace by closer relations with Germany and Austria. In that year Victor Emmanuel visited the Austrian and German Emperors at Vienna and Berlin—visits which were returned in 1875.

The Minghetti Ministry, seeing that stability and equilibrium were returning to Italian finance, imposed crude taxes in order to hasten that consummation. The Left took advantage of the irritation of the country, and gathered round Depretis, who was called by the King to form a new Cabinet on the fall of the Minghetti Ministry. New elections carried the Left triumphantly to power, and Francesco Crispi became President of the Chamber. Crispi, though he had renounced Mazzinianism, was still an ardent member of the extreme Left.

Hardly had this change of policy taken place when Victor Emmanuel died in Rome, January 9, 1878, at fifty-eight years of age.

His remains were buried in the Pantheon, and his country's eulogy of him was written on his tomb:—'To the Father of the Fatherland.'

One month after the King's death, Pius IX. passed away. The new conclave chose Cardinal Pecci as his successor, who ascended the throne under the name of Leo XIII. He followed his predecessor's policy in formally protesting against the usurpation of the House of Savoy and again constituted himself a 'prisoner' in the Vatican.

. . . .

After the fall of the Napoleonic dynasty, the Government, which had been produced by the insurrection of September 4, split into two parts; one remained in the besieged capital and the other took up its seat at Tours, in order to organise the provincial forces.

Even before the fall of the Empire the Republican element had prevailed: it now found itself in power. In order to maintain itself there, it was compelled to flatter the people which had established it, and which daily was becoming more nervous and excitable. On the capitulation of Paris the Government was discredited, and the advanced elements boldly spread their revolutionary propaganda. As a large number of Parisians, at the conclusion of the blockade, had left Paris for the country, the field was left clear for the most fanatic revolutionists.

The provinces, though they had approved the fall of the Empire, disapproved of the way in which the Revolution had supplanted it: they considered that the Revolution was exclusively of Parisian origin and lacked legality. Gambetta, though he had aroused great enthusiasm, lost popularity by his programme of resistance *à l'outrance*. France was divided into Parisians and Provincials, and the majority of the latter were of reactionary tendencies. The elections for the new National Assembly distinctly showed this fatal antagonism. The majority of this Assembly—400 out of 750 members—were country gentlemen, representatives of the ancient monarchical parties: Legitimists and Orleanists. Thiers was appointed Head of the Assembly, as the only deputy who before the war had protested against hostilities.

Thiers promised to confine himself to the speedy conclusion of the Treaty of Peace and the reorganisation of France, leaving her free to choose her own system of Government. The Assembly voted the preliminaries of Peace,

confirmed the deposition of Napoleon III. and his dynasty, and on March 11 closed its sittings at Bordeaux and established the seat of executive power at Versailles.

An exceptionally strong Government was necessary to cope with the fierce party passions which agitated France, and the Government of Thiers was deplorably weak. The National Guard of Paris was composed wholly of fanatic revolutionaries, and had become a grave element of danger to public order.

Thiers wished to affirm his authority at Paris and, for this purpose, sent troops to demand the surrender of the cannon held by the National Guard: the troops were surrounded at Paris by an enraged mob, which was supported by battalions of National Guards. The Generals in command of the Government troops were shot down, and Thiers, full of indignation, determined to await his opportunity, till he had organised an army strong enough to dominate the insurgents.

Meanwhile, the National Guard installed themselves at the Hôtel de Ville of Paris. A Council General of ninety members was elected, and formed itself into an anti-Government, which was called 'the Commune.' It was essentially a Government of violence, and concentrated all its energies in civil war. But its aspirations were Socialist; instead of a central Government, it desired to substitute a federation of free cities, each of which should exercise its right of sovereignty in its own territories.

Other towns followed the example of Paris, but these local insurrections were suppressed. The Commune sent its troops against the Government of Versailles, but they were repelled, and some of their chiefs who had fallen into the hands of the Government troops were shot without trial. In revenge, the Communists imprisoned many of the notable personages of Paris as hostages, amongst others the Archbishop—Monsignor Darboy.

An army, consisting of prisoners of war returned from captivity in Germany, now marched under MacMahon against Paris. For a month this sanguinary struggle continued, under the impartial eyes of the Germans, who held the suburban forts of Paris. In May 22 the Versailles

troops entered the city by an unguarded gate, and the last desperate struggle took place behind the barricades. The exasperated Communists shot the hostages, and the Versailles troops gave way to regrettable reprisals. The Communists set fire to various public buildings—amongst others, the Tuileries—in order to retard the advance of the Government troops. The fight continued from May 21-28, and this week has been called the 'Week of Blood.' More than 17,000 persons perished in this fratricidal strife. Those of the prisoners who had not been immediately shot were transported to New Caledonia and Cayenne. The Revolutionaries were at last defeated, and Monarchists and Republicans were left to dispute the power.

The Assembly had been elected without limits of time or power. In reality it lasted five years, and was a constituent Assembly. As each party wished to be responsible for a settled form of Government, and neither were strong enough to do so, a kind of Provisional Constitution was voted in 1871: by it, the Head of the Executive power assumed the title of President of the French Republic, and had the powers of a Parliamentary Sovereign, save that he was responsible to the omnipotent Assembly.

By the Treaty of Frankfort, May 10, 1871, the payment of two of the four milliards of indemnity was to be made before May 1, 1872, and the remainder before March, 1874. But Thiers so well fulfilled his pledge to the Assembly, and the co-operation of the French nation was so enthusiastic that the whole of the vast indemnity was paid on March 15, 1873: by the summer of 1873 French soil was free from the German invader.

The fundamental problem of the species of Government remained to be settled. The Monarchists were divided among themselves, one party supporting the claims of the Comte de Chambord (Henry, Duke de Bordeaux), and the other sustaining the rights of the Comte de Paris (nephew of Louis Philippe). Of these parties, the former, or Legitimist, constituted the reactionary Right, and in no way recognised the work of the Revolution, while the Orleanists formed the more progressive Centre Right, and were willing to preserve the Liberal conquests of modern France.

Thiers, though he had been in his youth an Orleanist, saw clearly that a Republic meant safety for France at the present juncture. He, therefore, aimed at systematising the existing Republic with the organisation of a regular Government. The Monarchist majority, when it detected the policy of Thiers, withdrew its support from him, and Thiers resigned his position as President.

MacMahon succeeded him and adopted a contrary policy, favourable to the Monarchists and to the Clerical party of reaction. The two groups of Monarchists were fused into one under the leadership of the Count de Chambord, and were audacious enough to propose not only the restoration of the Legitimist Dynasty in France, but also the re-establishment of the Temporal Power in Rome.

But the Count de Chambord refused to recognise any other flag than the white Bourbon banner, and the Orleanists realised the hopelessness of an attempt to place a reactionary King on the throne: thus, the restoration of the Monarchy disappeared from the field of practical politics.

France was weary of the equivocal situation, and in 1875 the Assembly was impelled to vote for a stable Constitution, which might serve either as a Monarchy or a Republic: the Republican Party, with admirable patience, under the leadership of Gambetta, awaited its opportunity. New elections sent a Republican majority to Parliament. MacMahon, who till now had acted impartially, was persuaded by his own party—the extreme Right—to dismiss the new Republican Cabinet, and he nominated one in its place which was both clerical and reactionary. Again the House was dissolved, and another appeal was made to the country. The death of Thiers strengthened the position of Gambetta at the Head of the Republican Party, which was solidly organised. Again the Republicans won a victory: in January, 1879, their party obtained a majority in the Senate, and MacMahon resigned his post as President. He was succeeded by a Republican deputy—Jules Grévy, who was the first President to observe strict party neutrality, an example which has been followed by his successors. Gambetta was nominated President of the Chamber, and declared that the whole strength of the nation must be

concentrated on scholastic, military, and economic questions. An amnesty was granted to the exiled Communists: the seat of Government was again transferred to Paris, and the 14th of July, which commemorated the fall of the Bastille, was proclaimed as the National Feast: this celebration indicated the democratic character of the Government.

. . . .

After the retirement of Leopold of Hohenzollern, the Provisional Government of Spain offered the Crown to Prince Amedeo of Savoy—the second son of Victor Emmanuel. Amedeo began his reign with the most excellent intentions: he wished to govern as a Constitutional King, but Spain was not ready for an enlightened Government. Carlists, Republicans, and Progressivists again began their agitation. An attempt was made on the King's life, and on February 11, 1873, he abdicated the throne and returned to Italy.

The young King Alphonso, son of the ex-Queen, Isabella, was now proclaimed King, and the country, which was weary of war, welcomed his advent with pleasure. He was an intelligent and cultured Prince, and had been educated in the best institutions of England, France, and Switzerland. But his health was delicate, and the transition to the throne from the college at the dangerous age of eighteen years flung temptation in his way, which he was too weak to resist, and his health was weakened by the resultant life of pleasure.

Alphonso and his Ministers concentrated their attention on the Carlist difficulty: their efforts to cope with this question were crowned with such success that in February, 1876, Don Carlos was forced to re-pass the French frontiers. Cuba, which for some years had engaged the attention of the mother country, was now dealt with: 30,000 men under Campos were sent to the island. After eighteen months' fighting an agreement with the Cubans permitted them to send deputies to the Spanish Cortes, and the colony was pacified.

. . . .

In England, Gladstone improved the electoral laws, introducing secret voting in 1872: he also attempted to democratise the Army by abolishing the sales of commissions. In his foreign policy he adopted pacific measures, and had

recourse, in many questions, to arbitration. A diplomatic conference in London in 1871, though stipulating that in future no Power can free itself from treaty obligations without the consent of the contracting parties, allowed Russia's claims in the Black Sea, and abrogated the articles in the Treaty of Paris concerning this question.

The case of the *Alabama*—a Southern privateer which had been armed in England and had done much damage to the coasts of the North—was submitted to a conference of international jurists, who decided that England should pay the United States an indemnity of £3,200,000. Under Gladstone's colonial policy the only increase to the English possessions consisted of the Gold Coast Settlement, which had been bought from the Dutch in 1871. The neighbouring Ashantees, who were dissatisfied at this change of ownership, made incursions into English territory. An expedition under Sir Garnet Wolseley successfully destroyed their power and occupied their territory. But this latter event took place when Gladstone was no longer in power.

A split had occurred in the Liberal Party over the question of Trades Unions. The Law of 1871, which recognised the latter, forbade intimidation by picketing. The Liberal Party demanded the removal of this veto, but Gladstone refused. In this refusal he was supported by the more temperate of his followers, who were alarmed by the acts of the Commune. Gladstone appealed to the country, which, however, returned a Conservative majority. This election is notable as registering, for the first time, the entry of the Labour Party into the House of Commons.

Disraeli's Government now came into power, and held office for six-and-a-half consecutive years. He busied himself with social progress and passed a law placing employers and employed on an equal basis: the hours of boy labour in factories were also limited, and permission was also given to municipalities to destroy unhealthy houses, and to build others in their places at low rentals.

The contrast between Gladstone's and Disraeli's system of government lay in their foreign policy. Gladstone's quietism in this respect stands out in strong relief with Disraeli's strenuous efforts to increase the prestige of England.

Disraeli may be said to be the creator of the Imperial policy, in that he attempted to bind more closely the colonies with the motherland, and thus found an Empire based on community of origin, traditions, and interest.

He transformed the Fiji Islands into an English colony at the beginning of his Ministry. His boldest stroke was the purchase of the bonds of the Suez Canal from the French bondholders. In 1874, for 100,000,000 francs he bought the 176,000 Canal shares, and secretly acquired in European money markets a portion of the remainder, thus giving England predominance in the Suez Canal Company, and thus preparing the way for English domination in Egypt. By his advice, the Prince of Wales undertook a journey to India, in order to acquaint himself with his subject peoples: Disraeli also proposed in 1876 that India should be transformed into an Empire, which should give an Imperial title to the British Sovereign. But his foreign policy was chiefly indicated by his treatment of the Eastern Question.

CHAPTER XII

FROM THE EASTERN QUESTION TO THE TRIPLE ALLIANCE

Disorders and abuses in Turkey.—Insurrection of Herzegovina: Bosnia. Murad V. ascends the Throne.—Turks in Bulgaria.—Serbs and Montenegrins declare war on Turkey.—Abdul Hamid ascends the Throne.—Energetic attitude of Russia: Declaration of war, 1877.—*Russian advance in Bulgaria.—Defence and Fall of Plevna.—Peace of San Stefano.—Congress of Berlin,* 1878.—*Austro-German Alliance. Revolutionary crisis in Russia: Assassination of Alexander II.—Bismarck's fight against Socialism.—Wars of Zululand and Afghanistan.—Parnell and the Irish Question.—French Expedition to Tunis: Foundation of the Triple Alliance,* 1882.

Turkey's power seemed to have been increased by the Crimean War, but the increase was one in appearance only. In Africa and Europe her authority over her vassal States decreased daily. Tunis and Egypt, by their contact with civilisation, disdained the yoke of a semi-barbarous potentate. Tripoli alone remained to Turkey of all her African possessions. Her Asiatic possessions of 13,000,000 inhabitants were extensive, and the population of the European States amounted to 8,000,000. But disorder was everywhere rampant, and State robbery and injustice held sway; everywhere Christians were maltreated.

The Panslavist programme, therefore, spread rapidly in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and in 1875 a revolution broke out in those countries. Serbia and Montenegro sympathised with their Christian Slav brothers, and secretly furnished them with men, arms, munitions, and money.

. . . .

The resurrection of the Eastern Question alarmed European diplomats. The various Consuls of the Great Powers were instructed to enter into relations with the insurgents and ascertain their complaints; they were told to promise them a representation of their wrongs to the Sultan, but the invariable answer to these suggestions was that no trust could be placed in Turkish pledges.

The Turkish Government, as usual, promised all that was asked and more. A plan of radical reforms was announced. A few days after, the interest of the Public Debt was diminished by 50 per cent. Military expenses accounted in part for this bankruptcy, but the enormous sums spent in the Sultan's private pleasures were mainly responsible.

The war continued in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Three Powers were specially interested in the Eastern Question:—England, Austria, and Russia. France and Italy were too occupied with matters of internal organisation to pay much heed to it. Russia was engaged in the conquest of Central Asia, and her fleet was unprepared: for the moment she contented herself with diplomatic action only, and simply waited her opportunity for intervention.

The interest of Austria's many Slav subjects naturally induced that country to defend those Slavs who were subject to Turkey. But the fear of a Greater Serbia was ever before her eyes on the one hand, and on the other she was unwilling to admit the claims of Russia in the Balkans. She united herself diplomatically to Russia in order to impede the latter's activity.

But England, alarmed at the Russian advance in Central Asia, determined at all costs to prevent her extension in the Balkans. Very reservedly she united herself to the other Powers. Austria was charged with the preparation of a note to Turkey, which should suggest many much needed reforms. The Sultan declared that the Note so exactly expressed his own opinions that he would promulgate the suggested reforms without any alteration. The insurgents were not, however, impressed by the proclamation, and the Spring of 1876 witnessed a more violent stage of the war than ever.

. . . .

The Bulgarians now became excited, and throughout the Balkans the relations between Christians and Mohammedans became more acute. In 1876 the French and German Consuls were massacred in Salonica by the Turkish population; the Turkish authorities took no steps to stop the outrages, and French and German warships appeared

in Eastern waters. The punishment of the guilty was obtained, together with an indemnity for the families of the murdered men.

In May, 1876, Abdul Aziz was deposed and was succeeded by Murad V. A few days later the deposed Sultan was found dead in his bedroom; doubts have been expressed as to whether he did or did not commit suicide.

The atrocities committed in Bulgaria by those irregular troops, which went by the name of Bashi-Bazouks, roused the indignation of Europe. The popular sentiment in England was so strong that the Government was compelled to proceed cautiously with its foreign policy.

. . . .

Serbia and Montenegro formed a League against the Turk, July 2, 1876. The Montenegrins obtained some successes, but the Serbs, who had attempted an entry into Bulgaria, were repelled by the Turks. The Government at Constantinople realised the gravity of these rebellions and acted with virile energy. Serbia was invaded, and, in August, Milan invoked the mediation of the Great Powers.

Murad V. had shown signs of mental weakness. He was now deposed, and his brother, Abdul Hamid II., succeeded him. Reforms were postponed, and the Turks now marched on Belgrade with the resolution of crushing the Serbian nation. The Czar now interfered and presented an ultimatum, declaring that he would immediately break off relations with Turkey if an armistice were not granted to Serbia.

The Sultan gave way and a diplomatic Congress was held at Constantinople to agree on the conditions of peace and the programme of reforms. But, while the Conference was sitting, the Sultan, by the advice of Midhat Pasha, promulgated a Constitutional régime, with two Houses of Parliament, according to Western ideas. When the Conference presented the result of its deliberations to the Sultan, the latter summoned a National Council, which energetically rejected the proposals of the Great Powers.

Thereupon the Congress broke up and left Constantinople.

The Turkish Government now treated directly with Serbia and Montenegro. The former country accepted a Treaty, based on the *status quo ante*, but Montenegro was obstinate, and, realising that Russia would support her, rejected the Turkish proposals.

Alexander III. now determined to act. Austria promised him her benevolent neutrality, and permitted Russia to occupy the Eastern provinces of the Balkans under certain conditions.

The Czar's armies crossed the frontiers on April 22, 1877. Only one Power protested—England. It was impossible, however, for the latter to intervene unsupported. But she demanded satisfaction on three points:—1. The independence and integrity of Egypt; 2. The security of the Suez Canal; 3. The independence of Constantinople. Russia satisfied her on these three points, and the danger of English intervention was avoided.

. . . .

Russia had prepared two armies—a European one under the Grand Duke Nicholas and an Asiatic one under Loris Melikoff. Her way to the Danube led Russian armies through Rumania. King Charles took advantage of this opportunity, and proclaimed the independence of his country: he, therefore, also, declared war on Turkey.

Success crowned the first efforts of the Russians: Kars was invested and Erzeroum menaced. In spite of rough weather and the vigilance of the Turkish fleet, the Danube was crossed and the Russians occupied the Shipka Pass: while a flying detachment threatened the railway between Philippopolis and Constantinople.

But a series of reverses followed; Loris Melikoff was forced to retreat from Kars and return within the Russian frontiers. All Russian gains in Europe, with the exception of the Shipka Pass, were again lost. The Russians were threatened on both flanks; to protect their right they attacked Plevna, which was occupied by a Turkish force under Osman Pasha. They were, however, repulsed and forced to await new reinforcements.

But even these did not enable them to capture the town, and again they were repelled with enormous losses.

Todleben was then entrusted with the siege and concentrated all his efforts in a rigid investment of the city. Melikoff now captured Kars and laid siege to Erzeroum. Plevna fell on December 11, 1877. Serbia now declared war on Turkey and occupied Nish, while the victorious Montenegrins penetrated almost to Scutari: Greece was restrained by England from joining in the general Balkan hostilities.

On January 20 the Russians reached Adrianople, and here the first preliminaries of peace were signed: these included the independence of Serbia and Rumania, and a large increase of their territories: Montenegro also received territorial compensations. Bulgaria was transformed into an autonomous Principality: Bosnia and Herzegovina received a mandate for autonomous administration, and Turkey consented to indemnify the expenses of the war.

. . . .

Austria and England were alarmed by these successes. The former concentrated her troops on her Eastern frontiers, while England voted a credit of £6,000,000 and despatched her fleet to Prince's Island in the Sea of Marmora.

All Europe watched the course of events with anxiety. The situation depended on Germany. Bismarck proposed himself as 'the honest broker,' and suggested a Congress at Berlin. Russia hastened to sign a final peace at San Stefano, March 3, 1878, at which the preliminaries of peace were affirmed and the independence of Montenegro finally recognised by Turkey. Kars and Batoum, in Armenia, were ceded to Russia.

Austria and England protested violently against the Treaty, and again war seemed imminent; Bismarck refused to restrain Austria, and as the Russian Army was unfitted both by health and by scarceness of munitions for fresh hostilities, the Czar was forced to come to terms with both England and Austria, and secret treaties renouncing a portion of the fruits of Russian victories were made with both these countries. A Congress was held at Berlin to discuss the Treaty of San Stefano, in June, 1878: but before this opened, both Turkey and England had also signed a secret treaty by which England pledged herself to defend

Turkey's Asiatic possessions, and received, in return, the occupation and administration of the Island of Cyprus.

. . . .

At the Congress of Berlin, Russia was represented by Gortsciakoff, who flattered himself that Bismarck would give him his support in return for the aid given by Russia to Germany in 1870. Benjamin Disraeli, now Lord Beaconsfield, represented England, while Austria sent Count Andrassy as her envoy. The President of the Congress was Bismarck, now at the zenith of his power and prestige. Waddington and Luigi Conti represented France and Italy respectively. The youngest diplomat was Karatheodory, the representative of Turkey.

Many changes were made in the terms of the Treaty. To Austria was given the occupation and administration of Bosnia and Herzegovina and the organisation of Novi Bazar: this last territory divided Serbia from Montenegro. Bulgaria was given the territory north of the Balkans, with 1,500,000 inhabitants. The Macedonian region, which the Treaty of San Stefano had allotted to Bulgaria, was restored to Turkey. Montenegro was sacrificed. Part of the new territory which she had obtained was taken by Austria. Serbia also suffered; with the object of keeping alight the rivalry between Serbia and Bulgaria, territory bordering on the latter State was assigned to the former: Greece obtained a promise of rectification of her frontiers.

The fruits of Rumania's victory were snatched from her by Russia. The Danube was neutralised and the Danube fortifications were dismantled. The Russian Government renounced the conquests in Asia on condition that Turkey ceded the city of Khotur to Persia.

The Congress concluded its labours without attempting to settle fundamental principles. The utilitarian aims of Bismarck had been the only guide of the Congress. Sentiment and imagination were alien to its members, and the Congress rose, leaving the impression that those present had reduced it solely to a competition of organised robbery.

. . . .

Many difficulties attended the execution of these deliberations. Bosnia and Herzegovina opposed an obstinate resistance to Austrian occupation. The capital of Bosnia—Serajevo—was disputed house by house; only after serious losses did the Austrians suffocate resistance.

Rumania silently allowed Russia to take possession of Bessarabia, and withdrew her functionaries as the Russians advanced. Though the Congress of Berlin had imposed on the Balkan States equality of religious rights, Rumania refused to accord the privileges of citizenship to the Russian Jews, and naturalisation was denied to these foreigners. A few Spanish Jews, who had been installed for many years in the country, alone were allowed this concession. In order to confirm her independence, Rumania transformed her principality into a Kingdom, and Charles of Hohenzollern assumed the title of King of Rumania, March 26, 1881. Serbia followed this example, and Prince Milan, in 1882, styled himself King of Serbia.

A young German Prince, Alexander of Battenberg, was called to the throne of Bulgaria. Discontent was rife in Bulgaria owing to the loss of the province of Eastern Roumelia, which had been restored to Turkey by the Berlin Congress.

The Albanians had formed a league to oppose the Montenegrin occupation of that territory which had been granted her by the Congress. The province of Dulcigno was therefore given to Montenegro, in exchange, and since Turkey refused her free consent to this concession, a naval demonstration was made, in consequence of which the city of Dulcigno was surrendered to Montenegro, 1880.

The Greeks also were unable to obtain the concessions promised them, and they prepared for war. The Powers, however, intervened, and Turkey was forced to cede to Greece the province of Thessaly, and that of Epirus as far as the River Arta.

. . . .

The difficulties of the solution of these questions were such that the dissensions between the Great Powers were greatly aggravated after the Congress of Berlin.

Russia was enraged to see that Austria, without striking a blow, remained predominant in the Balkans. Gortsciakoff

returned from Berlin full of hatred towards Bismarck, and openly proclaimed his hostility to Germany. Before this common menace, Germany and Austria naturally drew tighter the existing bonds of friendship. This understanding led to an Alliance hostile to Russia, October 7, 1879, and henceforth the Austro-German League became the central column of the new European equilibrium.

A secret Treaty signed at Gastein obliged Austria and Germany to give each other reciprocal aid in case of a Russian attack, and to preserve a benevolent neutrality if the attack proceeded from any other Power, unless the latter should be aided by Russia.

. . . .

Russia, however, was in no position to take the offensive, since all her energies were occupied in combating her own revolutionary crisis.

The Russian Liberals had been sorely disappointed at the abandonment by Alexander of his more enlightened policy, and the more intelligent of the Russian youth began to form the so-called Nihilist Society. The members of the latter organisation considered all peaceable means of destroying error and uprooting tyranny impossible, and relied on science alone. At first the Russian Government paid little heed to their propaganda, but when a few of the leaders had been arrested and severely punished, the Nihilists entered into open war against the Russian Government, 1878.

Each condemnation of a Nihilist was followed by the assassination of a State functionary: later, minor State officials were passed over and a series of attempts were made on the life of the Czar himself: in December, 1879, the Imperial train was blown up; by a lucky chance the Emperor had travelled by a previous train and thus escaped. In February, 1880, the dining-room of the Winter Palace at St Petersburg, with the adjoining Guard-room, was destroyed by explosives. Again the Imperial family escaped owing to the fortuitous postponement of the dinner.

The Czar then gave ear to the counsels of Loris Melikoff, who advised a wider and more Liberal policy in accordance with the needs of the people. Some months passed quietly;

a scheme of Provincial Councils, together with an Assembly of these representatives, aided by the nobles, was carefully thought out; a decree of the Czar authorising these reforms was signed on March 13, 1881, and the text of the decree was to have been published on the following day in the public journals. But the Czar had delayed too long. As he was returning from a review of the troops, a bomb was flung at his carriage, killing the horses and wounding his Cossack escort; the Emperor descended in order to attend to the wounded, when a second bomb was flung at his legs. He was mortally wounded and died on the same day.

His son and successor, Alexander III., at first intended to publish the dead Czar's decree on his accession, but the thought that such a step might be construed as a capitulation to the forces of violence, restrained him. The principal authors of the assassination were put to death.

Pobiedonozeff, the Procurator-General of the Holy Synod, now became the Czar's counsellor; by his advice the Czar published a proclamation which stated that the Divine Voice bade the Czar reinforce and preserve autocratic government. Loris Melikoff then resigned, and all the abuses and excesses of the ancient régime were restored. New plots and new executions took place, but the outbursts grew rarer, and finally ceased.

In Foreign Policy the Czar continued Russian hostility towards Germany. The Power with which an Alliance could easily have been made was France, but in the eyes of the Czar the Republic spelt Revolution.

Meantime, in Germany, Bismarck had engaged in a strenuous conflict with the Radicals and Socialists. Two attempts had been made in 1878 against the life of the aged Emperor, and, in consequence, the Chancellor suppressed all Associations with either Socialistic or Communistic tendencies.

But Bismarck realised that the Socialistic aspirations were, in part, just and reasonable, and in 1881 presented his first scheme of insuring the worker against misfortune or sickness. The calmer and more able policy of Leo XIII. enabled Bismarck to establish a peaceful *modus vivendi* with the Catholic Church.

But his work of military preparation still continued; the peace footing of the Army was raised to 427,000 men. He kept a jealous watch on international policy, and the fear of an alliance against Germany led him to foment the rivalries existing between Russia and England, and England and France.

. . . .

On Lord Beaconsfield's return from the Congress of Berlin, he received a triumphal ovation in London. He had raised England's power and prestige to the highest point, since by the mere menace of war he had stopped Russia's progress, saved Turkey from ruin, and gained for England Cyprus and the Protectorate of Asia Minor.

The Beaconsfield Ministry also pursued a daring colonial policy in Asia and Africa.

The discovery of diamonds had increased the prosperity of Cape Colony. The Boers were not satisfied with their own Government, and were induced by English agents to invoke the aid of England. In spite of Boer protests, Beaconsfield promptly annexed the Transvaal.

The English now declared war on the Zulus—a fierce tribe which had continually made incursions into Cape Colony; the Zulus, under their chief, Cetewayo, fought bravely and inflicted grave losses on the invaders. The son of Napoleon III., who was now twenty-three years old, had joined this expedition, but in a reconnaisance both he and the small escort which accompanied him were surprised and massacred. The war ended in the capture of Cetewayo and the reorganisation of his country under English control.

Simultaneously, England was engaged in war with Afghanistan. A Russian mission had been received by the Afghans with great honour, while a similar mission, sent by England, was forbidden access to the country by the Emir, Shere Ali. An English Army, in consequence, invaded Afghanistan, and the Emir fled into Turkestan, where he died shortly after. His son and successor, Yakub, accepted the English Protectorate in May, 1878, but the English Resident at Cabul was massacred and Yakub was dethroned. He was succeeded by Abdhur Rahman in July,

1880. The latter promised to guide his foreign policy by English advice; a railway was made, connecting Kandahar with the Indus, and the Province of Baluchistan, through which the railway ran, was annexed by England.

But the expenses of the wars and the consequent deficit in the Budget caused the fall of the Beaconsfield Ministry, April, 1880. A Liberal Ministry, under Gladstone, succeeded it.

During the Beaconsfield Ministry, the Irish Party, under Parnell, came into prominence. Since this Party was too weak to obtain its demands by Parliamentary methods, it adopted the policy of obstruction in the House: in Ireland it formed the Land League and introduced the system of boycotting, so called from Boycott, its first victim.

By alternate mildness and coercion, Gladstone unsuccessfully endeavoured to solve the Irish problem. In 1882 the Viceroy of Ireland and his secretary were assassinated. New laws of repression were passed, but the Irish Question remained definitely unsettled.

Discontent at the English annexation of the Transvaal led the Boers to rebel against English rule in December, 1880. Under the leadership of Joubert and Kruger the Boers were victorious, and the defeat of Majuba Hill caused great sensation in England. Gladstone again introduced his pacific policy, and on August 3, 1881, a convention was signed at Pretoria, recognising the independence of the Boers in all matters of Home Policy, but acknowledging the Protectorate of England in the Republic's foreign relations.

In Egypt, Ismail Pasha, the Khedive, had almost ruined the country by extravagant expenditure. France and England deemed it necessary to intervene on behalf of his creditors: the Khedive was obliged to set apart a sum of money sufficient to pay off the interest of the Egyptian loans. Two Controllers-General were appointed, one French and the other English; the economies introduced by them aroused discontent among the officers of the Khedive's Armies. These latter persuaded the Khedive to dismiss the two Controllers. But France and England energetically protested, and obtained

from the Sultan a Firman by which Ismail Pasha was deposed and succeeded by his son, Tewfik. The French and English dual control was re-established. Till now the two Powers had agreed perfectly in the *condominium*; it was not long, however, before England's influence prevailed over that of France.

. . . .

The Republican Party in France had triumphed by the election of Jules Grévy over that of the reactionaries. Its various conflicting elements, which had united against the common foe, now broke into distinct sections. The Radicals, especially, were irritated at the so-called policy of opportunism of the Government. But the supporters of the latter were strong enough to keep it in power, and many important reforms were passed.

France had now regained confidence in herself, and once more gazed beyond her frontiers. In her isolation, war with Germany was at present impossible. Therefore, in order to satisfy the national ambition, she began her work of peaceful penetration of Tunis.

Here she came into contact with Italy, which possessed in Tunis many colonists and a multitude of interests. Each country attempted to gain the favour of the reigning Bey. Bismarck, either because he desired to divert French attention from the Rhine, or because the division of the Latin nations was agreeable to the interests of Germany, strongly advised the French to occupy Tunis. A pretext of war was furnished in April, 1881, when a Tunisian tribe invaded Algiers. Jules Ferry, the Head of the French Ministry, sent an expedition to Tunis, and on May 12, 1881, General Bréart arrived at Bardo, the residence of the Bey. Here a Treaty was signed, which established a French Protectorate over Tunis. This expedition produced grave consequences, for it rendered the equilibrium of Europe unstable, and marked a decisive severance between France and Italy.

The French occupation of Tunis excited hostility in Italy, and encouraged the idea that closer relations with the Central Powers was desirable. Austria welcomed the proposal, as in such a case she would be free from the fear of Italian attack in the event of a war with Russia. Germany,

also, gladly accepted the prospect of another Ally in case of a war with France. Italian political leaders somewhat precipitately hastened the *rapprochement*, and a visit of King Humbert to Vienna took place in October, 1881.

Gambetta at this time attempted a reconciliation of the two Latin nations, but Bismarck, with extraordinary skill, annulled his efforts, and, partly by threats and partly by flattery, induced Italy to enter the Austro-German Alliance. Difficulties were not lacking. Francis Joseph had not repaid the visit of the Italian King, and the Pope informed the Emperor that if he visited Rome he would not receive him personally. Notwithstanding, the negotiations between Italy and the Central Powers continued, and on May 20, 1882, the Treaty which is called the Triple Alliance was signed.

Territorial guarantees were established, and thus Italy was delivered from the danger of the Roman Question. This constituted Italy's only advantage, whilst the other Powers not only definitely separated Italy from France, but were assured that in an international crisis Italy would at least remain neutral. Each of the Allies pledged themselves to enter into no alliance which should be directed against one of themselves. If either of the Allies were attacked by another Great Power, the other two agreed to preserve a benevolent neutrality: but should more than one Great Power attack either of the Allies, the other two should immediately join forces with the Power attacked. The Treaty was signed for a duration of five years.

But this Treaty was simply based on policy, and was cemented neither by the sentiments nor hearts of the nations concerned. The Italian people still aspired after the provinces of Unredeemed Italy, and this desire was accentuated in the same year by an unhappy event. A young student, Oberdank, was found at Trieste in possession of bombs, and he was accused of an attempt on the life of the Austrian Emperor. His execution caused general indignation in Italy. Thus, even in the first year of the Triple Alliance, a sincere understanding between the Governments of Vienna and Rome seemed impossible of attainment.

. . . .

It may be said that the international as well as home policy of individual States, in these years especially, was influenced by the desire of immediate gain. Idealism seemed to have vanished from the sentiments of the nations, and material interests acquired an overwhelming influence over the life of humanity. On June 2, 1882, Giuseppe Garibaldi, the great champion of idealism, disappeared from this world's scene.

CHAPTER XIII

COLONIAL EXPANSION

The English in Egypt: Rebellion of Arabi Pasha: Bombardment of Alexandria: The Soudan Expedition.—English Reform of 1885*: Gladstone and the Irish Question: Split of the Liberal-Unionists.—France: Death of Gambetta: Jules Ferry and the Conquest of Tonquin.—The English in Burmah.—French Protectorate in Madagascar.—The Independent State of the Congo.—Berlin Conference and European occupation of Africa.—German claims.—Crispi's Italian colonial adventure.—International agreement for the partition of Africa.—French Domination in West Africa.—Development of the Congo.—Anglo-Portuguese disagreement.—Ambitious projects of England: Cecil Rhodes.—German advance and the Anglo-German agreement of* 1890.

Europe now seemed to have assumed a stable position, which forbade any idea of ambitious designs of conquest. Plans of expansion, therefore, necessarily developed outside the Continent; this extra-European expansion was manifested the more strongly since it was determined both by political and by economic reasons.

European industrial development had increased by leaps and bounds; at the head of this economic movement were England and France. Italy and Germany, which had once simply occupied the position of clients in the world's labour markets, had now entered the lists as competitors; colonial adventures were still more vigorously prosecuted in the search for new markets for national trade. The Tunis expedition marked the beginning of this enlargement of European political life. England had watched the French adventure in Tunis with a jealous eye, but had not deemed it prudent to interfere. She, herself, had found compensation in Egypt.

European interference in Egyptian affairs had increased the native hatred of foreigners; nationalist and religious agitation fomented this bitterness. At the head of the anti-European movement was Arabi Pasha, whom the Khedive, in 1882, in obedience to popular clamour, had

appointed Minister. Arabi at once dismissed all European functionaries, and in consequence Mussulman fanaticism became more fiercely excited.

In June, 1882, a general insurrection against all Europeans broke out in Alexandria. The Khedive paid a visit to the city, ostensibly for the purpose of calming the spirits of the people: but Arabi Pasha, who accompanied him, occupied himself in organising the fortifications of the city. The English Government, though it was in the hands of Gladstone, thought it necessary to interfere, and begged France to unite with her in a military operation. The French Government, influenced either by fear of dangerous complications, or by the conviction that England alone would profit by this arrangement, refused its co-operation. The Commander of the British fleet thereupon ordered the Egyptian Government to desist from the work of fortification, and threatened in case of refusal to bombard the city.

No answer having been returned to this demand, the English fleet bombarded the town, and in a few hours the forts were silenced. Arabi Pasha retired, with his troops, to Kafr-Dowar, in order to protect the railway, while bands of Bedouins sacked and burned that portion of the city which the bombardment had spared. The Khedive placed himself under British protection and proclaimed the dismissal of Arabi Pasha from his office of Minister; Arabi's reply was to proclaim himself the Supreme Head of Egypt.

England now invited Italy to co-operate with her in the re-establishment of order in Egypt: the Italian Government feared to undertake the necessary risks and sacrifices, and was also anxious to avoid European complications: it, therefore, refused the invitation. England now determined to act alone.

General Wolseley, who was in command of the English land forces, determined to seize the Suez Canal, in order to attack the Egyptians in flank; de Lesseps, who was the President of the Suez Company, protested, but Wolseley disembarked his troops at Port Said, occupied the Company buildings, and permitted the Canal to be used by English transports only.

Arabi Pasha concentrated all his forces at Tel-el-Kebir, where a decisive battle took place on September 13. The Egyptians were defeated, and the English entered Cairo victoriously. The Khedive returned from Alexandria, and Arabi Pasha and his followers were captured and condemned to death—a penalty which was afterwards commuted to exile.

Thus England set her foot firmly in Egypt, where she gradually established her own authority in place of the Anglo-French financial *condominium*. This caused a coolness between the two countries and contributed not a little to the growing isolation of France.

Mohammed Achmet—an Arab, who enjoyed the reputtation of sanctity—was now invited by the warlike tribe of the Senussi to proclaim a Holy War in the Nile Valley. He was proclaimed Mahdi or Prophet in the Soudan—a territory which belonged to Egypt. At the head of his followers he gained several victories over the Egyptian forces, and succeeded in conquering the Soudan. England, who was satisfied with the possession of Egypt and the Suez Canal, advised the Khedive to surrender the Soudan and evacuate Khartoum, which was still occupied by a small Egyptian garrison.

General Gordon, who had distinguished himself in China, had, in 1884, been appointed Governor of Khartoum by the Khedive, in order to direct the peaceful evacuation of Egyptian forces from the Upper Nile Valley. He now found himself besieged in Khartoum by the forces of the Mahdi. When it was ascertained that his life was in danger, English opinion was excited, and Gladstone sent an army of relief into the Soudan under the leadership of Wolseley.

Some months were absorbed in preparation for the expedition. When the advance guard of the British Army finally arrived at the gates of Khartoum, it learnt that the city had been betrayed to the Mahdi two days previously and that Gordon had been killed. Wolseley then retired with his troops into Egypt, and the Egyptian frontiers were fixed at the first cataract of the Nile.

Great discontent and indignation were excited in England by the failure of this expedition, for Gordon ranked high

in the popular imagination as a hero. The Gladstone Ministry, which after long vacillation and hesitation had undertaken the Relief Expedition, was accused of lukewarmness in the rescue of Gordon and was strongly discredited.

The Gladstone Government had drawn up a Bill of Electoral Reform framed for the purpose of equalising representation and enlarging the vote. But it did not endure even till the new elections, so strong was the disgust of the country at the Prime Minister's weak Foreign Policy.

The new system of elections was inaugurated under a Conservative Government, at the head of which was Robert Cecil, Marquis of Salisbury; the latter had several times been associated in the Ministry with Disraeli, and had figured in the Congress of Berlin as the Second Plenipotentiary of England. But the elections proved favourable to the Liberals, and the first vote of the new House of Parliament overthrew the Salisbury Ministry. Gladstone then returned to power and adopted a more strictly Radical policy. In the new House the numerical difference between the Conservative and Liberal parties was not great; the result was that victory depended entirely on the votes of the Irish Nationalists, captained by Parnell. Irish politics, therefore, became predominant. Gladstone ended by persuading himself that the one and only solution of the Irish Question lay in the adoption of the Home Rule scheme, which was championed by Parnell. Gladstone had the courage to propose to Parliament that Ireland should be organised as an autonomous colony with her own Parliament and Ministry. He also presented a Bill which would enable Irish peasants to purchase the farms which they cultivated. Had these Bills been passed the Irish Question would have been definitely solved.

But English public opinion looked askance on this project. Joseph Chamberlain, who had entered the House with a revolutionary reputation and an ultra-Radical programme, resigned his portfolio and separated from his leader; he founded the group called Liberal-Unionist, from their wish to maintain the Union of England and Ireland under one Government alone.

A coalition of Conservatives and Unionists formed the

majority in the House; on June 7, 1886, after a heated sitting, in which Gladstone had the courage to invite the country to dissociate itself from the traditional English policy in Ireland, and to secure by generous concessions that which repression had never been able to obtain, Home Rule was rejected by a majority of thirty votes. Gladstone dissolved the House. Animated by a species of mysticism, he conducted a fiery electoral campaign. But the susceptibilities of British pride triumphed over Gladstone's able dialectic; the new elections secured the triumph of his adversaries, and in September, 1886, Gladstone resigned.

. . . .

Whilst England's aged statesman was taking a leading part in England's political life, France had the misfortune to lose a great statesman in the flower of his age. Léon Gambetta, whose sage counsels and fiery eloquence had largely contributed to the solidity of the Republic, and who had definitely installed Labour in the Government, died on December 31, 1882, at the early age of forty-four.

Jules Ferry, whose name particularly represents the colonial development of France, ranked next to him in importance. Under his first Ministry the Tunis expedition had been made; the conquest of Tonquin marked his second.

Napoleon III. had founded the colony of Cochin China and established a Protectorate of Cambodge along the banks of the Mekong. But exploration of the upper basin of that river showed that its falls prevented the Mekong from becoming the natural outlet of the rich provinces of Southern China; it was judged that the Songkoi would be more adapted for this purpose, and settlements were founded in the basin of that river in Tonquin, which was the richest province of the Empire of Annam. The Emperor of Annam opposed this penetration: a series of hostilities ensued in which China, which claimed high sovereignty over Annam, participated.

In 1883, Jules Ferry acted energetically. He ordered Hué—the capital of Annam—to be bombarded, and proclaimed a French Protectorate over both Tonquin and Annam. But numerous Chinese bands, known by the name

of 'Black Flags,' entered Tonquin and keenly defended it against the French: French troops were then disembarked in Formosa, where, however, they were decimated by disease. In 1885 they occupied Lang-son in Tonquin, but were speedily compelled to evacuate that city.

The difficulties and the length of this war excited keen hostility in France, and the news of the latest disasters rendered the Ferry Ministry extremely unpopular. In 1885, at the moment when China had initiated peace negotiations, the Ministry fell. On June 9, 1885, China renounced its sovereignty over Tonquin and Annam, and promised commercial liberty to the French in Southern China, and especially in Ju-Nam.

But this latter rich province was connected with that portion of Burmah which was still independent, and which has its commercial outlet in British Burmah. The English determined to forestall the French, and in 1885 made an expedition into Burmah. Mandalay, the capital, was occupied and the whole country annexed to British India. China showed hostility, but a Treaty between her and England in 1886 gave the former the moral victory: China was recognised as sovereign of the country, but she promised to permit English administration in Burmah and to facilitate British commerce in Ju-Nam. This was the most important event of the brief Salisbury administration (January, 1885-1886). Colonial competition between France and England had become keen: the French occupation of Tunis had been parried by the English occupation of Egypt: the establishment of France in Tangiers had evoked the annexation of Burmah to British India.

In Madagascar, after a similar contest, France had prevailed. In 1883 a French fleet bombarded some ports of the island; Queen Ranavalo resisted till December, 1885. Madagascar became a French Protectorate. A French Resident was stationed at Tananarivo, while the Bay of Diego Suarez and the city of Tamatave were occupied permanently by France. In recognition of her non-interference England was allowed to affirm her sovereignty over the Sultanate of Zanzibar.

But preoccupations caused by the Russian victories

over the Turcomans and their entry into Merv absorbed England's attention at this time. The situation became strained when the Russians initiated hostilities against the Amir of Afghanistan, and the English Government protested vigorously. For some time war between England and Russia seemed inevitable, but diplomacy and moderate councils prevailed, and an agreement concerning the Russo-Afghan frontier settled the matter peaceably.

. . . .

One of the characteristic features of this epoch was the partition of Africa among the European Powers. When explorers had succeeded in penetrating lands which had hitherto seemed impenetrable, and discovered the interior of the Dark Continent, the European Powers resolved to absorb the new territories.

They professed to be actuated by the desire of combating slavery, which still desolated Africa and formed a by no means negligible branch of commerce. Under Leopold II. of Belgium, an International African Association was founded; but the various National Committees which formed it soon added colonial ambition to humanitarian aims. France, through Brazza-di-Savorgnan, began her occupation of the French Congo: German merchants and explorers sought a permanent territory in East and West Africa: King Leopold, through Henry Stanley, laid the base of the Congo State. A new series of international problems now arose from these events.

Bismarck, whose aloofness till now had been due to his belief that colonial enterprise diverted the attention of the nation from more intimate and important affairs, was influenced by the strong current of public opinion, which eagerly desired colonial expansion in order to satisfy national ambition.

He himself could have wished that private merchants would have taken the initiative in founding colonies, which, later, the Government would have favoured and protected. When, in 1884, Franz Lüderitz, a Bremen merchant, took possession of the Bay of Angra Pequena, between the Portuguese possessions of West Africa and Cape Colony, Bismarck telegraphed to the German Consul at the Cape,

charging him to acquaint the English Government with the fact that this particular territory was henceforth under German protection. In the same year he adopted the system of direct State intervention: on July 5, 1884, the German Consul, Nachtigal, planted the Imperial flag at Togo, in the Gulf of Guinea, and a few days later repeated the performance at the mouth of the Cameroon River; these settlements were to serve Germany as the two entrances to the great Mussulman States of Central Africa.

Once having adopted this policy the Chancellor immediately attempted to dominate the other Powers, and proposed a diplomatic Conference which should create an international agreement with regard to Africa. This Conference was held in Berlin from November 15, 1884, to February 26, 1885. It recognised the independence of the new Congo State; the principles of the free navigation of the Congo and Niger were fixed on the lines laid down by the Congress of Vienna for European rivers: it was established that, in future every Power which should occupy fresh African territory should officially communicate this fact to the remaining Powers, so that conflicts and disputes should be avoided: definite plans were formulated for the abolition of the slave trade.

In the meantime Dr Peters, aided by Gerald Rohlfs—the German Consul at Zanzibar—had undertaken an expedition into Eastern Africa; treaties, which they concluded with the various tribes, laid the foundations of the new German Colony. This latter also arose by private initiative and was administered by a Company: but so many difficulties were raised with regard to this enterprise by the Sultan of Zanzibar, that Bismarck ordered a naval demonstration against this protégé of England; later, he made an agreement with England concerning the respective zones of influence.

Simultaneously, Germany cast her eyes towards Oceania; a German Company seized a part of New Guinea, and Germans established themselves in the Marshall Islands: in August, 1885, the Imperial flag also flew over the Caroline Islands, which Spain, though she had never exercised her rights, had considered her own for centuries.

Great indignation was caused in Spain by this high-handed procedure. Bismarck, in order to pacify this feeling, very cleverly proposed that Pope Leo XIII. should act as arbiter between Spain and Germany. This choice of the Pope as judge in the dispute was not only agreeable to Spain, but aided the development of the Chancellor's Home Policy. Leo XIII., in December of the same year, decided that Germany must recognise the sovereignty of Spain over the Islands, but that Spain should give important commercial and residential privileges to Germany.

Before this conflict was definitely closed, King Alfonso XII., who had long been ill of consumption, died on November 25, 1885, at twenty-eight years of age. His daughter, Maria, a child of five, succeeded him provisionally, under the Regency of her mother, Maria Christine of Austria, who was then *enceinte*. When, a few months later, May 17, 1886, the Regent gave birth to a son, the latter by the precedence which the male possesses over the female in the Spanish Succession, was recognised as King under the title of Alfonso XIII.

. . . .

During the Congress of Berlin Italy started her colonial expansion. The Rubattino Navigation Company, in 1870, had established a coaling station in the Bay of Assab in the Red Sea, and had purchased from the petty chiefs some coastal territories. In 1882 it ceded these to the Italian Government, which, after taking possession, attempted to open friendly relations with Abyssinia. But in the autumn of 1884, the Italian traveller, Bianchi, and his companions were massacred on the road to Makallé—150 kilometres from the coast. The anger roused by this event in Italy furnished the Italian Government with a plausible excuse for preparing an expedition, which was represented to the country as a counter-balance to the French occupation of Tunis.

From 1862 the French had possessed in the Straits of Babel-Mandeb the military and commercial port of Obock. After the English occupation of Egypt the French proposed to increase the importance of the station by seizing the Bay of Tagiura, which was weakly guarded by the Egyptian

garrisons. England hastened to occupy Berbera and Zeila on the Somali coasts, and since the Egyptian Government seemed impotent to preserve their ports in the Red Sea, the English Ministry, in order to impede further French activity in this direction, hinted to the Italian Government that it would look with a friendly eye on an enlargement of Italian possessions from Assab to Massaua.

Early in 1885 Italian troops occupied Massaua. The Egyptian troops yielded the town without resistance. The Italians were to have co-operated with the English against the dervishes, but the fall of Khartoum prevented the accomplishment of this design. Therefore, the Italian troops of Massaua and its environs limited their activities to the foundation of cordial relations with John, the Negus of Abyssinia: they were, however, unable to vanquish his hostility.

On January 26, 1887, Ras Alula, an Abyssinian Chief with numerous followers, surprised and surrounded at Dogali a column of 500 Italians, which, after a fight of eight hours, in which their ammunition was consumed, was almost completely annihilated. This disaster produced a great impression in Italy, and its effect was felt in the Italian Chamber, where the loyalty of the majority, which had always supported Depretis, was severely shaken. Depretis again sought aid from the Left. A few months later he died, and Crispi became Prime Minister.

From 1891-1893 Crispi directed the politics of Italy. Unlike Depretis, he possessed an iron will combined with unlimited self-reliance. His energetic and bold government kindled the enthusiasm of the nation.

At the beginning, it seemed as if things were going well with the Italian colony, to which Crispi gave the name of Eritirea. In 1888, the Negus John marched against Massaua, but was forced to retire. Menelik—one of his vassals—rebelled against him, and he was at the same time threatened by the dervishes. John marched against the latter, but died soon after from a wound received in a skirmish with them.

Abyssinia, now, was plunged into civil war, for the claimants to the throne were numerous. The Italian Government determined to profit by the situation, and extended its

territories to Keren and Asmara. It entered into a league with Menelik, who in return made lavish promises, and in 1889 signed the Treaty of Uccialli, in which he professed to place himself under Italian protection.

At the same time Italy, by a series of treaties, succeeded in establishing her protectorate over a vast zone of the Somali Peninsula; the British East African Company ceded to Italy the rights it had obtained from the Sultan of Zanzibar over various parts of this region. In 1891, by an agreement with England, Italy's zone of influence in Eastern Africa was definitely determined. In this zone Abyssinia was included.

To the easy optimists of those days, it appeared that Crispi had laid the firm base of a fortunate future for the Italian colonial venture.

. . . .

The years 1890 and 1891 mark the period of extensive agreements regarding African possessions. But many serious disputes had first taken place among those Powers which were chiefly concerned with colonial competition. England—that ancient colonial Power—whose only competitor till then had been France, had noted with disgust the entry of Germany into the colonial field, where the latter had immediately attempted to take a prominent part.

At Togo the Germans had inserted themselves between the French and English colonies of the Gold and Slave Coast. Till then, all these European possessions had been limited to the coast region, and merely served as points of departure for various explorations and expeditions, by which each of the Powers sought to arrive first in order to establish its pre-eminence in the neighbouring regions, and to draw to its factories the commerce of the interior. The common aim of these expeditions was the Upper Niger, which the French sought to attain by way of Senegal and Algeria. The immensity of the Sahara Desert and the fierce resistance of the Tovareg tribes impeded an extensive advance from Algeria, but the French Senegal expedition was successful and occupied many regions; owing to this, France took the lead in Western Africa: by an agreement, concluded in 1890, England, herself, recognised as French the territory

south of Algeria, as far as Sai on the Niger to Barrua on Lake Chad.

The regions which surround Lake Chad are considered to be the most fertile in Africa. The English, therefore, endeavoured to reach them through their Niger colony, while the French attempted to join their dominions to the north of Lake Chad with the French Congo. In rivalry with these, the Germans from their colony of the Cameroons also strove to reach the same region.

In this competition the French, English, and Germans found themselves restrained by the new Independent State of the Congo, which extends from the mouths of the Congo to Lake Tanganyika. The Congo State possessed no other tie with Belgium than that of a common Sovereign, but the King ceded the territory to Belgium, which thus became a great colonial Power.

But Portugal, also, had conceived a design of colonial expansion. For centuries she had possessed the colonies of Angola in the Atlantic, and Mozambique on the Indian Ocean, but she had been satisfied there with the establishment of factories. A new fever of commercial and exploratory enterprise took possession of the nation, and the idea was entertained of joining the two colonies and placing their populations under a regular and organised rule. But this project met with strenuous opposition from England.

Methodically and firmly the English continued their advance from the south; they had renewed the conflicts with the Zulus and the Kaffirs, with the intention of uniting their territory of Cape Colony with that of Natal, and of subjugating the eastern coast as far as the Portuguese dominions of Mozambique; at the same time they had been alarmed by the German settlements in the south-west, and since these latter aimed at a junction with the Boer Republics of the Transvaal and the Orange Free State, the English hastened to prevent such a catastrophe by occupying, in 1887, the territory of Bechuanaland. Ever advancing to the north, they ended by isolating the Boer Republics and confining the Germans within clearly defined limits.

When they had arrived on the banks of the Zambesi, the English determined to bar the Portuguese advance in this direction; with this object they made special treaties with the tribes of these regions; when the Portuguese explorer, Serpa Pinto, entered into the region of the Upper Zambesi, the smouldering conflict between English and Portuguese ambitions burst into a flame. England demanded the withdrawal of Portuguese troops from this region; as Portugal was the weaker she was obliged to obey the injunction and renounce the realisation of her dreams, and contented herself with the reorganisation of her own possessions.[1]

The reasons which dictated this harsh policy towards Portugal lay in the fact that England began to entertain the grandiose scheme of uniting her dominions of the Cape with the valley of the Nile. The man who personified this plan of expansion was Cecil Rhodes, who has been called by his admirers the Napoleon of the Cape; he had gone to the Cape in 1871 for reasons of health and fortune; he had associated himself there with diamond mining, and with great ability had united in one immense society the small companies which had competed with each other at Kimberley. He had then plunged into politics and had determined on the union of the various political parties of the South:—the Cape, Natal, Orange Free State, and the Transvaal. Simultaneously, he desired to extend the British dominions to the north and to join them across the Lake district with Egypt.

In 1884 Gordon had invited Rhodes to accompany him to Khartoum. He had replied, 'This part of the map has nothing to do with my plans; certainly I hope some day to arrive at Khartoum, but it will be from the south.' Hence he had maintained the necessity of the annexation of the territory of Bechuanaland, and in 1889 he founded a company which obtained from Queen Victoria the commercial monopoly and sovereign rights over an immense region,

[1] The Anglo-Portuguese dispute closed with the Treaty of June 11, 1891, which confirmed English rights over the territories confined between the Orange River, the Germany colony of the South-west, the Portuguese colony of Angola, the French Congo, German East Africa, the Portuguese possessions of East Africa, and the Boer Republics.

with no precise limits, situated to the north of Bechuanaland and the Transvaal, and between the Portuguese possessions of East and West Africa. This region was later called Rhodesia in his honour. In July, 1890, Cecil Rhodes became Prime Minister of Cape Colony; the development of this sphere of English influence towards the north made rapid progress, which was materially aided by the advance of the telegraph and railway.

In Eastern Africa, the Germans, who were situated on the coast opposite Zanzibar, and the English at Mombasa, strove to advance into the region of the Lakes. Here, also, disputes arose between the two Powers, for the Lake district forms the reservoir of the main part of Africa and therefore constitutes the political and strategic knot of the Dark Continent. But the two Governments were anxious to avoid a rupture, since stronger than their disputes was their common enmity of Russia and France. In 1890 an agreement was concluded: one of the clauses of this famous treaty refers to Europe. From 1807 England had possessed the Island of Heligoland in the North Sea, the possession of which Germany keenly desired for strategic reasons, since without its annexation the canal destined to join the Baltic and North Seas would be deprived of its full value. Desirous of obtaining good conditions in the African Question, England now ceded it to Germany. The latter, on her side, gave England a free hand in Zanzibar, which now definitely became an English Protectorate; Germany ceded Witu and renounced her aims on Uganda; she also satisfied all the English claims which regarded South-west Africa. In exchange, she was given *carte blanche* in the extension of East African possessions as far as the Lakes of Nyassa and Tanganyika. Since beyond these Lakes the Congo Free State begins, England also renounced, by these concessions, the contemplated union of her South African colonies with the Valley of the Nile: but she extracted a promise from Germany that free transit should be given to English goods across German territory: this economically united the dominions of the two Companies of the South and East.

In this partition of Africa, the Powers claimed immense

regions which at that time were still unoccupied, and which had hardly been explored. Generally speaking, each Power considered as its own the territories which lay behind the occupied coasts (Hinterland). By this criterion, they determined the broad lines of their respective spheres of influence; thus occasions of dispute were avoided, since each nation now possessed a clearly defined field in which to carry on its civilisation and progress.

CHAPTER XIV

THE TRIPLE AND DUAL ALLIANCES

Development of Industrial Life and pacific tendencies.—Renewal of Triple Alliance.—Reign of William II.: Retirement of Bismarck: Preparation for Germany's Industrial Hegemony.—Social changes: Social questions dominate purely political ones.—Financial and Political crisis in Italy.—African War: Battle of Adua: Economical position recovered.—Austria-Hungary: Tragic death of Archduke Rudolf: Electoral Reform in Austria: Conflicting interests of nationalities: Reform and progress in Hungary.—Events in the Balkan Peninsula: Economic transformation in Russia: The Trans-Siberian Railway: Agreement with France: Internal policy of Russification: Death of Alexander III.—War between China and Japan: Russia's aims in the Extreme East.—Reconciliation with Bulgaria.—Nicholas II. at Paris: The Franco-Russian Alliance.—Disturbances in France: Boulanger.—Panama scandals: Anarchist plots: Assassination of Carnot: Recrudescence of colonial expansion: Marchand at Fashoda and the agreement with England.—The English in Egypt, in the Soudan, and at the Cape: Home Rule: Gladstone's retirement into private life: Triumph of Conservatives and Liberal-Unionists: Chamberlain: Plans of Imperial Federation.

EUROPEAN peace had greatly favoured the development of industrial life; commercial activity everywhere increased, *pari passu*, with the extension of communications and transport. Steam had already revolutionised industrial life,—a new impulse was now given by electricity. The characteristic feature of the age was the development of manufactures: this produced a modification of social conditions in various countries, which was more or less profound, according to the differing degrees of industrial development.

The civilian population of the world increased rapidly. In the great industrial centres, the working classes, which had rapidly multiplied, realised their own force: for the first time they found themselves in close contact with the upper classes; comparison of their own social conditions with those of the latter led them to desire a higher degree of comfort and superior education; in order to obtain these they strove to take their part in the political government of the State. These ambitions explain the reason why almost

every Government of that day underwent a democratic transformation.[1]

Alone, of European States, Germany manifested no democratic tendencies, though its economic evolution had been superior to that of any other country: the Reichstag did not succeed in becoming a predominant power, but only served as a bridle for autocracy; the Emperor still remained the authentic Lord of his people.

Naturally, under these conditions, a democratic constitutional party could make no progress; therefore Democrats and Radicals took refuge in Socialism. Bismarck was profoundly impressed by the rapid growth of Socialist ideas, and he combated them either by exceptional laws and persecution, or by an attempt to bind the worker to the State by founding a whole system of insurance in his favour; but Socialism, in spite of a brief arrest, continued its upward way.

William I. died in March, 1888, at the age of ninety-one; his son, Frederick III., succeeded him; but for more than a year the new ruler had been seriously ill and he only reigned three months: naturally, with a moribund Sovereign, Bismarck had full liberty of action. But when William II. succeeded Frederick III. the situation was entirely changed.

William II. was born in 1859: his boyhood had been passed amid the enthusiasm of clamorous German victories, and he had drunk deep of glory and patriotism. Clever, determined, feverishly and embarrassingly active, it was not long before he chafed at Bismarck's control, and the conflict between them was soon publicly manifested. At first the Emperor's impetuous character seemed to endanger the peace of Europe, but it became evident that he desired peace, and his activity was vented in frequent European journeys, in reviews of his army and navy, and in military reforms. In these latter, particularly, he acted with energy; he promoted younger men, and—commencing with Moltke

[1] The Swiss Government, in particular, evolved on ultra-democratic lines. It introduced—first of all into individual cantons, then, in 1874, into the Federal Constitution—two new institutions; popular initiative and the *referendum*, which gave an opportunity to the people of direct collaboration with legal functions. If 50,000 citizens demanded the revision of the Constitution, this proposal was referred to the popular vote—*referendum*: the revision of other laws required only 30,000 signatures.

himself—placed the elder officers on the retired list. But he was not satisfied with being a soldier-king. He wished to lead the policy of his country, and it was then that the conflict between the unlimited audacity of the young Emperor and the iron will of the aged Chancellor became acute.

In March, 1890, Bismarck was forced to hand in his resignation. He had laboured incessantly all his life, yet, though seventy-five years old, he had no desire for repose. When the Emperor, as a mark of esteem, conferred on him the title of Duke of Lauenburg, Bismarck sarcastically remarked that he would reserve it for the occasions on which he should travel *incognito*. He retired to his castle of Friedrichsruhe, but he never forgave the Emperor. He died in 1898 at the age of eighty-three.

Soon after Bismarck's retirement, by special invitation of the Emperor William, an international conference was held at Berlin, with the object of diminishing the difficulties which international competition had raised, regarding the amelioration of the working classes. It marked an important departure, since it placed social questions above those of politics. The deliberations of the Congress did not correspond to the interest which the gathering had aroused; the rest from work on holidays, and the time limitation of the labour of women and boys were the only questions discussed. Various Governments immediately framed laws which should meet the views of the conference on these subjects.

But even before this congress had met, Socialists from the more progressive nations had gathered at Paris during the exhibition of 1889, in order to call attention to their aspirations; it had then been decided that a world-wide affirmation of their agreement should be made by a universal strike on May 1, 1890, of one day's duration, specially called in order to demand an eight-hours' day. In the great industrial centres imposing demonstrations were held, and impressed on the most intelligent the necessity of a speedy solution of working class questions.

A movement of Socialistic tendency was formed in the bosom of the Catholic Church, and Pope Leo XIII. openly charged his clergy with the special care of the weak and oppressed. Not only so, but on May 15, 1891, he published

the Bull, '*Novarum rerum*,' in which, while he condemned both Socialism and strikes, and defended property and family life as the indestructible basis of human society, he nevertheless affirmed the need of providing for the proletariat. Social questions began to take a preponderant part in the political life of humanity.

. . . .

International politics continued to be based on the fact of the Triple Alliance, which was regularly renewed each time it lapsed. The Court of Berlin succeeded in adding economic ties to the diplomatic ones which bound Austria and Italy to it. These commercial treaties were to run from 1892-1903, and were based on the principle of facilitation of the entry of exports of the contracting parties into their respective territories: those products which were threatened by competition were heavily taxed. Since Germany was by far the most important manufacturing State, this system of moderate protection aided her in attaining her industrial hegemony. Favourable commercial treaties, concluded with other countries, powerfully assisted her in her attempt.[1]

Germany possessed great mineral wealth, but it must be recognised that she knew how to produce from it the maximum possible profit. In her excellent schools she sought a *personnel* which should employ the most recent and cheapest of manufacturing methods: this enabled her to plant her products everywhere, and she was strongly supported in this commercial invasion by the Imperial Government. Germany even surpassed France, whose supremacy in commerce and manufacture had, till that time, appeared to be firmly established, and she became an alarming competitor of England; the latter, though she still continued to be the head of this world-wide movement, saw with stupor the increasingly rapid strides which Germany made in order to overtake her.

The development of her mercantile marine kept pace with that of Germany's manufactures and commerce: in

[1] One consequence of this augmented industry in Germany was the speedy diminution of emigration; in 1885, with a population of 46,000,000, about 170,000 Germans emigrated: in 1898, when her population had ascended to 56,000,000, only twenty-seven persons emigrated. All had found possibility of work in their own country.

a short time, Hamburg—the most striking manifestation of Germany's economic power—became the most active industrial centre of the European continent. In 1895 the Kiel Canal was inaugurated; this marked a new step in the way of progress.

Naturally, a great fighting fleet was necessary in order to protect the mercantile marine and the new colonies; this programme was openly manifested, when, in 1897, William II. appointed as Naval Minister, Admiral von Tirpitz, who had long desired the opportunity of forming an immense navy. Simultaneously, Bernard von Bülow was chosen as Foreign Minister; later he became Chancellor, and with the collaboration of these two celebrated men, the Emperor proposed to open out for Germany a future of unlimited power and glory.

Italy was passing through a period of grave economic and political disturbance. A national deficit had been created in the last years of the Depretis Ministry. Two circumstances had specially fostered it—a mania for spending the national money on public works, and the increased military expenditure induced by the formation of the Triple Alliance. The former circumstance was due to the intemperate manner in which the Government pandered to local interests, which, with the disappearance of political parties, had become the only Parliamentary policy. Crispi's grandiose policy aggravated the deficit, which had to be covered by new taxes.

To weaken still further the economic situation of the country, commercial relations with France were broken in 1888, for the latter, in consequence of Crispi's pro-German policy, had refused to renew her commercial treaty with Italy. A war of tariff reprisals ensued, fraught with loss to each country.

Italian discontent was increased by the Banking scandals, the chief of which concerned abuses committed by the Directors of the Banca Romana, and roused great popular indignation. In Southern Italy and Sicily the population was in ferment: they complained, not without reason, that they were exploited by the upper classes, and the Socialists, who had lately become more numerous in Italy, attempted to found a propaganda on the existing misery: they organised,

especially in Sicily, Associations called 'Fasci dei Lavoratori.' Serious riots, directed against local communal councils, took place in Sicily at the end of 1893 and the beginning of 1894, in order to obtain suppression of food taxes and the repartition of communal land.

The Government placed Sicily under military law, arrested the Chiefs of the Central Committee of the 'Fasci,' held courts-martial, and repressed the revolt with great severity. Crispi profited by the occasion and dissolved all Socialistic associations: he also repressed and muzzled the advanced political sections.

By these measures he raised bitter enemies: the Leader of the extreme Left, Felice Cavalotti, produced documents relating to the Banking scandals and instituted a fierce campaign against Crispi, with the result that the latter became more domineering and violent.

. . . .

The Italian situation in Africa had become profoundly modified. The moment that Menelik had dominated Abyssinia, he denounced the Treaty of Uccialli, which had made his country an Italian Protectorate. The dervishes also menaced the Italians from Cassala, but they were defeated at Agordat; General Baratieri, Governor of the Colony, succeeded, in July, 1894, in driving the dervishes from Cassala, and occupied that important position. A dispute with the Ras of Tigré led to an open break with Menelik, who came to the relief of his vassal with 100,000 men, and an Italian column of 2,000 men was surrounded and massacred—December 7, 1895.

Baratieri, though he had received reinforcements, continued to act on the defensive, but on March 1, 1896, he marched with 17,000 men against the enemy at Adua. By some unfortunate misunderstanding the Italian columns lost touch with each other and were separately defeated by the Abyssinians. The Italians retreated, leaving one-fourth of their number on the field, besides 2,000 prisoners. Baratieri was instantly superseded by Baldissera, who reorganised the troops and mitigated the consequences of the disaster.

The report of this defeat roused popular fury in Italy.

The Crispi Ministry fell and was succeeded by that of di Rudini, who renounced Crispi's colonial policy and initiated negotiations for peace, and the release of the prisoners. This proved a difficult matter, but at length peace was made. Italy renounced the Tigré and her protectorate over Abyssinia; to England she ceded the Fort of Cassala, which served the latter country in her Soudanese expedition.

The discontent aroused by the African fiasco and by the Banking scandals enabled the extremists—Republicans and Socialists on the one hand, and the Clericals on the other—to carry on a lively propaganda, which flourished particularly in Milan, where the industrial development had brought together a large mass of workers. In May, 1896, an insurrection broke out at Milan, which, though speedily repressed, left a painful impression in the country.

Fortunately, the year 1898 marked the beginning of an economic revival, which broadened and deepened, obliterating the painful memories of those stormy times.

. . . .

The Austro-Hungarian dynasty was still the strongest buttress of that State: a tragic misfortune, however, befell it. A feeling of horror was aroused throughout Europe on January 31, 1889, by the news of the dark crime committed the night before in the Castle of Meyerling, under circumstances which were officially shrouded in silence and mystery, —when the Crown Prince Rudolph, the only son of the Emperor, was assassinated, with his mistress, the Baroness Vecsera.[1] The Archduke Rudolph, by his marriage with the Princess Stephanie of Belgium, had but one daughter, therefore the nephew of the Emperor—Francis Ferdinand —was, by the Hapsburg Laws of Succession, recognised as the Heir Apparent.

The essential base of the Austrian policy continued to be the German Alliance. The relations between Austria and Italy were much clouded, for, besides the vexed

[1] A few years later another tragedy befell the House of Hapsburg, when on September 10, 1898, the Empress Elizabeth was assassinated by an Italian anarchist.

questions of the visit owed by the Emperor to King Humbert, many difficulties arose from Austria's harsh treatment of her Italian subjects. While Lombardy was in her possession, Austria had treated her Italian subjects with some consideration, since they formed no inconsiderable portion of the inhabitants of the Empire; but after 1866 the Italians numbered less than one million, and fearing lest they should intrigue with Italy, the Austrian Government in every way favoured the development of the Slav populations at Trieste, in Istria, and Dalmatia, and the German population in the Trentino, thus rousing bitter racial jealousies.

Till 1878 the German element, which represented the richest, most cultured, and most important part of the Empire, had been the dominant race in Austria: but, by degrees, the Slav peoples of the monarchy had begun to develop their commerce and manufactures, and had formed a strong middle class, which was intolerant of German domination. But in its turn the Court, influenced by its new foreign policy, which aimed at gaining the sympathies of the Slav populations of the Balkan Peninsula, deemed it necessary to propitiate the Austrian Slavs. This caused a change in Austrian Home policy. It was now that the Czech deputies, abandoning the policy of absenteeism, returned to the House in the hope of securing political advantage. German domination ceased, but the Austrians sought to form functionaries, who, instead of being attached to their own nationalities, should give whole-hearted devotion to the State.

Industrial progress and social transformation led the country to feel acutely the electoral anomalies, and an urgent desire for reform arose. Some electoral reforms were granted, but even after these modifications, uproar and tumults disturbed the Austrian Chamber; legislative work was often rendered impossible, and the Crown seized on these disorders as a pretext for summoning Parliament only at long intervals.

In Hungary, under the Wekerle Ministry, the law of civil matrimony was passed, railway tariffs underwent important reforms, the traffic of navigable rivers was developed, and the port of Fiume was founded. These improvements coincided with the industrial development of Hungary,

and in 1896 an exhibition at Budapest manifested the progress of the country.

. . . .

The seizure of Eastern Roumelia by Bulgaria disturbed the equilibrium of the Balkan States. In November, 1885, Serbia declared war against Bulgaria, but the troops of the latter country defeated the Serbians and entered their territory. Austria, at the request of Milan, intervened and imposed, by threats, an armistice on Bulgaria. Alexander of Battenberg, the ruling prince of Bulgaria, had for some time adopted an independent attitude towards Russia, and his success in arms displeased the Czar; in August, 1886, Alexander was forced to resign his throne, and returned to Germany.

Stambuloff, the President of the Bulgarian Assembly, assumed the Regency, and was for eight years absolute dictator of Bulgaria. His principal aim was to transform his country into a free State and to deliver it entirely from Ottoman control. In 1887, Stambuloff caused Ferdinand of Saxe Coburg to be elected Prince of Bulgaria; the latter, however, left the Government entirely in the hands of his Minister, who sought to direct Bulgaria in the path of civilisation and progress. Bulgaria owed to Stambuloff much of its prosperity, though it must be recognised that that Minister was cruelly severe to his enemies and political opponents.

Stambuloff's dislike of Russia alienated the sympathies of that country, while Austria favoured Ferdinand. The latter, however, though recognised by no Power, continued to govern Bulgaria. Austria had also attempted to establish her influence over Serbia, where Milan, who had led a scandalous life, felt the need of support from the neighbouring Empire. Nor was the situation changed when Milan abdicated in favour of his son, Alexander—1889.

Russia looked askance on Austria's designs in the Balkans, but her own ambitions lay in the Far East. Between 1891 and 1903 she had completed the Trans-Siberian Railway. At the same time the Czar, Alexander III., conquered his hesitations and entered into cordial relations with France. In April, 1891, a declaration was signed at

Paris, in which France and Russia pledged themselves to a friendly agreement in case either should be threatened. This Convention was transformed into a Treaty, in 1894, by which the two Powers agreed to unite their forces in case of attack on either. French enthusiasm for Russia had facilitated a loan, which furnished to Russia the necessary capital for her economic transformation.

Alexander busied himself in the Russification of those Russian provinces which were peopled by foreign elements, and ended by applying this operation to Finland, which held the position of a particular State with the Czar at its head as Grand Duke of Finland. This State had been distinguished by a notable progress in the nineteenth century, especially in matters of education. Russia, jealous of this advance, demanded that Finland should contribute to the general Imperial expenses: the Finns replied that their small State took no part in world politics and therefore ought not to bear the financial burden thus incurred. In 1890 Russia endeavoured to unite Finland more closely to herself. Russian colleges were founded in Finland and in certain Government departments a knowledge of the Russian language was made imperative. In 1891 it was decided that communication between the Governor-General and the Finnish State should be made in Russian; the use of Russian money was made obligatory in Finland, and the two postal services were united.

On November 1, 1894, the Czar Alexander died, and was succeeded by his son, Nicholas II., a young man, aged twenty-six. The new Emperor's health was delicate, and his character was not distinguished by strength. He neither changed the policy nor *personnel* of the Government. Pobiedonozeff, the Procurator-General of the Holy Synod, continued to be the principal personage of the Government, and under his guidance the policy of reaction and Russification was accentuated.

The attention of Nicholas II. was drawn in matters of foreign policy to the events in the Far East. When he ascended the throne, the war between China and Japan had begun. Till 1867 Japan had been a country feudally organised under an Emperor. The latter, however, was

only the depository of authority; the acting power, in command of the military forces, was the Shogun or Generalissimo—an hereditary post. In 1867, the Japanese rebelled against the Shogun and restored the power of the Emperor. At this time the young Mikado Mutsuhito, had ascended to the throne; he introduced large reforms, applying the principle of equality, and in 1889 he promulgated the Constitution. The Japanese in a few years had succeeded in attaining an extraordinarily high degree of civilisation. They now determined to impose their authority on the neighbouring portions of the continent and the neighbouring islands, and directed their attention to Corea. Here, however, they came in contact with the Chinese, who considered Corea as within their own sphere of influence.

From the first, the military and naval supremacy of Japan was assured. While China was still preparing for war, Japan landed a force in Corea, under Yamagata, and occupied the capital. On September 16, 1894, by the victory of Japanese over Chinese troops at Ping-Yang, all Corea fell into the hands of the Japanese. Yamagata advanced towards the Yalu, on the frontiers of Corea and Manchuria, while Admiral Ito's fleet gained a naval victory at the mouth of that river. In October, the Japanese passed the Yalu and advanced towards Mukden, whilst another army besieged Port Arthur, which capitulated in a fortnight. A third Japanese Army occupied Wei-hai-wei on February 5, 1895, whilst another fleet captured Formosa and the Pescadores Islands.

China then demanded peace. Japan, fearing the intervention of European Powers, hastened to conclude a treaty by which Corea was declared independent of China; Formosa, the Pescadores, the peninsula of Liaotung, with Port Arthur, were ceded to Japan, and an indemnity of over £24,000,000 was promised.

Europe was greatly impressed by the news of China's defeat, and cast covetous eyes on this enormously rich and presumably moribund Empire. Russia, who for long had desired Manchuria, was alarmed at the establishment of Japan in the Chinese Empire. The Czar, therefore, in conjunction with France and Germany, intervened, and

imposed on Japan a modification of the Peace Treaty. Reluctantly, and indignantly, Japan consented to sacrifice a portion of her spoils and renounce her rights to Port Arthur; she claimed, however, £10,000,000 in compensation. Secretly she resolved on revenge, and concentrated the whole of the Chinese indemnity on the creation of a colossal armament.

In Europe, Russia was now reconciled to Bulgaria; the dictatorship of Stambuloff in this country had become odious to many, and Prince Ferdinand chafed under his control; on May 9, 1894, Stambuloff was forced to resign.[1] The Czar, Alexander III., died soon after, and with the disappearance of the two men who had personified the hostility between the two countries, bitterness ceased. Ferdinand allowed his son, Boris, to be educated in the Orthodox religion, and this step sealed the reconciliation—1896. After a reign of ten years, Ferdinand was at last acknowledged by the Sultan and the Powers as the reigning Prince, and the Bulgarian Question was solved.

In the same year, Russia concluded an Alliance with France; in October, 1896, the Czarina and the Czar visited Paris where they had an enthusiastic reception. President Faure returned the visit in the following year, and the proclamation of the Dual officially counterbalanced the strength of the Triple Alliance.

. . . .

The consolidation of the French Republic had induced Russia to enter into the Alliance, but France had in the meantime undergone a series of political vicissitudes.

Republican differences had awakened the hopes of the Monarchists. After the death of the Comte de Chambard in 1883, the two monarchical parties had fused under the leadership of the Orleanist Comte de Paris. But when the Monarchists determined to act more boldly, the Republicans issued a law expelling the Pretenders, and establishing that no eldest son of French Royal blood should reside in French territory.

Soon after, Grévy, then President, was foolish enough

[1] In the succeeding year, Stambuloff was assassinated by the relations of men, it is said, whom he had doomed to death.

to defend his nephew, who was gravely compromised in a scandal concerning the sale of the Légion d'Honneur. Popular indignation forced him to resign in 1887, and he was succeeded by Carnot. General Boulanger, Minister of War, from 1886-1887, had in the meantime acquired great popularity by his glowing, patriotic speeches. When the Ministry fell, Boulanger was head of an Army Corps; his political views led the Government to place him on the retired list; he then openly placed himself at the head of that party which desired the revision of the Constitution.

In January, 1889, so strong was public opinion in favour of Boulanger that it was feared that he would attempt an overthrow of the Government by a *coup-de-main*. The Government, informed of Boulanger's plans by its secret agents, prosecuted him; he fled abroad, and enthusiasm in his favour speedily diminished. The Paris Exhibition of 1889 aided to distract public opinion from politics. The elections of that year were a triumph for the Republicans, and marked the end of the Boulangist crisis.

The Panama scandals now disturbed the peace of the Republic. Ferdinand de Lesseps had organised the Company for the purpose of cutting through the Isthmus of Panama. His great age prevented him from dedicating to the work the same watchful energy and skill which he had associated with the piercing of the Isthmus of Suez, and the Society, formed by him, failed in 1889. On inquiry it was discovered that the funds of the Company had been frittered away, and that many millions had remained at Paris in the pockets of journalists, deputies, and Ministers. These scandals gave an opportunity of propaganda to the Socialist Party, and fifty Socialist deputies were returned by the elections of 1893. This Parliamentary party forced the Government to incline more and more towards the party of the Left.

A series of Anarchist attempts served to arrest the movement of Socialism. In 1884 the President of the Republic was assassinated by an Anarchist, and Casimir Périer—the candidate of the Moderate Party—succeeded him. Certain still unknown reasons induced him to resign his post in January, 1895. Félix Faure, who was fortunate

enough to conclude the Franco-Russian Alliance, succeeded him.

The hope of regaining Alsace-Lorraine had aroused the French enthusiasm for this Alliance, but, in reality, Russia gave an eminently pacific character to the Dual Alliance, and the *status quo ante* was confirmed.

France, meanwhile, had engaged in colonial enterprise with ardour and success. The King of Dahomey was conquered, and surrendered his Central African territory to France: the extension of the province of Senegal into the Soudan continued: in 1896 France annexed Madagascar and exiled Queen Ranavalo to Algeria. In Asia, she reorganised her great colony of Indo-China, but the King of Siam, influenced by England, opposed French penetration in the region of the Upper Mekong.

Indeed, France, in all her colonial enterprise, had to reckon with either the latent or open hostility of England. In the Soudan this animosity was exhibited in a marked degree. The French Ministry had arranged a plan for joining the French possessions in the Gulf of Aden with those of the French Congo, and confided this task to Colonel Marchand, who, after vanquishing more than ordinary difficulties, arrived at Fashoda—an abandoned Egyptian station on the White Nile—where he repulsed the dervishes and established a French post. But the English speedily came on the scene.

. . . .

The English occupation of Egypt had now become permanent. As Agent and Consul-General, Evelyn Baring, afterwards Lord Cromer, succeeded in twenty-four years of able administration (1883-1907) in gradually eliminating all the ties which bound Egypt to Turkey and to the European Powers, substituting English influence in their place. In many ways, and especially in perfecting her water power, England increased the economic prosperity of Egypt. For some time English attention was concentrated wholly on Egypt and but small attention was paid to the Soudan. But when the new Mahdi's powers appeared to be weakening, Lord Cromer and General Kitchener decided to establish the Egyptian dominions of the Upper Nile. English Armies

and railways advanced simultaneously, till in 1897 they arrived at Berbera. On September 1, 1898, the decisive battle of Omdurman destroyed the Empire of the Mahdi.

On their arrival at Khartoum the English demanded of the French the withdrawal from Fashoda of Commandant Marchand. War and peace for a moment trembled in the balance, but Emile Delcassé was now at the head of the French Ministry, and his ruling policy was the maintenance of good relations with England. In spite of hostile French public opinion he yielded to England's request. France definitely renounced any claim in the Nile Valley, but her rights to the East and North of Lake Chad were recognised, and the French Congo was united to the Sahara and Algeria. The territorial unity of the immense French Empire of the Western Soudan was thus precisely established.

This improvement in Anglo-French relations marked a great change in international politics; whilst the Anglo-Egyptian dominions were established as far as the Nile, the English advanced from South Africa towards the region of the great lakes. Cecil Rhodes still persevered in his attempt to induce the Boers of the Transvaal to fall in with his scheme of South African Federation. But the Transvaal Boers, at the head of whom was Paul Kruger, refused their co-operation.

An enormous quantity of foreign emigrants had been drawn in recent years to the Transvaal by the discovery of gold ; a great city—Johannesburg—had arisen close to the mines, which in size far surpassed the capital, Pretoria. The foreigners—' uitlanders '—almost all English by birth, had no political rights, and considered themselves exploited by the Boers. An insurrection was organised by Dr Jameson, who, at the head of 800 men, invaded the Transvaal. This small force the Boers easily defeated, and captured the leader with the majority of his men. The English authorities disowned Jameson's attempt, but Rhodes, who had evidently taken a major part in the planning of the expedition, resigned his Premiership. Though Jameson was sentenced to death by the Pretoria High Court, Kruger handed him and his men over to the English authorities, by whom Jameson was condemned to a nominal penalty only; this leniency

rendered the Boers suspicious, and they united themselves more closely to the Orange Republic in order to defend their common interests.

. . . .

Proud of her colonial dominion, England isolated herself from the two great Alliances which comprehended the remaining Great Powers of Europe; but her inclinations were towards the Triple Alliance, since the formation of the latter was aimed against her own two traditional enemies—France and Russia.

German expansion did not alarm England, who, on the contrary, used every means in her power to smooth the difficulties which were raised by the new German colonial ambitions. She was in agreement with Austria in the latter's aim of bridling Russian ambition in the Balkans. With Italy, too, the friendship, which dated from the days of the Italian *Risorgimento*, had been cemented, after the French occupation of Tunis, by the common desire of combating French influence in the Mediterranean, and this Italo-English agreement was maintained in spite of Ministerial changes.

In August, 1886, Salisbury succeeded Gladstone as Prime Minister. He still concentrated his efforts on Foreign Policy. The dominant question, was, at that time, the partition of Africa, and a considerable portion of the latter country was annexed to England during the Salisbury administration. At the same time Salisbury fostered the attempts to bind the colonies closer to the mother country.

When, in 1887, the Jubilee of Queen Victoria was celebrated, the idea was first promulgated of combining the units of the British Empire in a Federation. A Conference of autonomous colonies was therefore held at London, but English political tact did not press the question, and time was allowed for maturation.

Joseph Chamberlain, once a Birmingham merchant, supported the Salisbury Ministry; Gladstone's Home Rule Bill had separated Chamberlain from his former leader, and he had formed a group of Liberal-Unionists, who directed their efforts in the direction of internal reform. The Salisbury Ministry was impelled by Chamberlain to carry out a great

scheme of county reform. County Councils were elected, wielding the non-judiciary powers of magistrates. All of these were placed under the supervision of the Local Government Board.

In Ireland, Salisbury adopted repressive measures. Little by little, English people had begun to look with a less hostile eye on Home Rule, and Parnell, still in agreement with Gladstone, quieted the Irish with the hope of speedy reform. In 1890 Parnell was condemned for adultery: Gladstone, whose partisans were, generally speaking, animated by Puritanical principles, openly separated from him: the incident caused a split in the Irish Party, which was, however, healed by the death of Parnell in 1891.

Gladstone was carried to power by the elections of 1892; his bold programme included, besides Home Rule, the reform of the House of Lords, separation of Church and State in England and Scotland, and other Radical reforms. In spite of only a small majority in the House, Gladstone brought forward a new Home Rule Bill, which gave two Houses of Parliament—Upper and Lower—to Ireland, for purely Irish affairs, and reduced the number of Irish Members in the Imperial Parliament to eighty members. Though the Commons passed this Bill, it was unanimously rejected by the House of Lords, September, 1893. Gladstone would have once again appealed to the country on the question of these reforms, but his party was divided. Tired, disillusioned, and weary, he retired into private life on May 1, 1894, leaving the leadership to Lord Rosebery.

The House of Lords again rejected several reforms passed by the Commons, but Rosebery succeeded in legalising two important measures,—one enlarging Progressive Succession Duty, and another creating Parish Councils; these completed the administrative reforms of 1888. Gladstone's retirement, however, weakened the Liberal majority, and Rosebery resigned his post in June, 1895. The power passed to the Conservative and Liberal-Unionist Coalition, which was fused into one party, and aimed at large internal reforms with a broad Imperial policy. Salisbury was nominally the head of this Ministry, but it was animated by Chamberlain alone—now Colonial Minister—who gave

new life to the Imperialist programme by the declaration that the prosperity of the citizen went hand in hand with the power of the State.

The elections of 1895 assured a life of many years to this Government. It chiefly devoted itself to the extension of English foreign possessions and the actuation of Imperial Federation. Customs tariffs, and colonial disinclination to share in military expenses, were obstacles to this plan, but Australia had already formed the nucleus of a fleet, and Cape Colony had sent a warship to England at the celebration of the Queen's Diamond Jubilee. A new Conference was held in London, in which the denunciation of most-favoured-nation treaties with Germany and Belgium were demanded, in order to prepare the way for Colonial preferential tariffs.

In her great Naval Review at Spithead, England showed the world the pomp of her sea-power; this martial and grandiose exhibition clearly showed why Salisbury did not lament over the 'splendid isolation' of the greatest Power the world had ever seen, under whose sceptre reposed 400,000,000 of people.

CHAPTER XV

WORLD-POLITICS

MacKinley President of the United States: War with Spain for Cuba: Rapid American victories: Spain loses Cuba, Porto Rico, and the Philippines.—Theodore Roosevelt and American Imperialism.—The Panama Canal.—Czar's proposal for the reduction of armaments and the First Hague Conference.—Anglo-Boer War: English occupation of the Orange and Transvaal Republics: Guerilla warfare till the Peace of 1902.*—William II. and his friendship for the Sultan: the Bagdad Railway.—European penetration of China* **and** *the Boxer Insurrection: International Expedition of* 1902.*—Assassination of Humbert I.: Reign of Victor Emmanuel III.: More friendly relations with France: The Dreyfus Affair: New President Loubet and the Ministry Waldeck-Rousseau.—Death of Queen Victoria: The Australian Federation: New Foreign Policy under Edward VII.: Anglo-Japanese Agreement: Reconciliation with France.—Visit of King Victor Emmanuel III. to Paris and the Arrival of Loubet at Rome.—The New Pope, Pius X., and rupture of his diplomatic relations with France: Russo-Japanese War.—Military disasters of Russia and the internal Revolution: Elections of the First Duma.—Separation of Norway from Sweden.*

THE closing years of the nineteenth century, and the first of the twentieth, mark the open affirmation of world-politics, towards which the immense development of the new means of communication fatally impelled the human race. Along this road, with all the energy of modern thought, marched the people of the United States.

After the War of Secession, the imperative duty of the United States was to cement the union of North and South —a difficult and complex task, which should also unite by a wise policy of conciliation the hearts and minds of the two peoples. In the resultant period of calm was developed the industrial life of the South: thus, the economic differences which had so greatly contributed to the antagonism between the North and South began to diminish.[1]

[1] But the negro problem remained acute, especially in the South, where the negro races constituted a notable part of the population: for notwithstanding the proclamation of equality, the degree of social and intellectual development, and the difference of colour, which in the mind of the white man marks the essential difference between the two races, determined the white population to preserve at all costs, not only its political prestige, but its civil and social superiority; the separation of the two races was imposed in all departments of life, either by laws or custom.

In the meantime, enormous mineral wealth was discovered in many parts of the country—coal, petroleum, iron, and copper—and everywhere cities or factories sprang up. Amongst the various business firms trusts were formed, which acquired an immense practical power. The workmen naturally united in associations and organised strikes in order to obtain rises in wages and a diminution of hours of labour: but the social question in the United States was not so acute as in Europe, for though wages were higher there, necessities cost less.

In the midst of this economic transformation a movement was started for the commerical union of various American States: for this purpose the Pan-American Congress was held at Washington, under the presidency of the Minister Blaine, who had been its organiser, in the hope of forming an American Zollverein. But no precise decision was arrived at, since the other States feared the predominant influence of the United States. And in truth, the prosperity of the great Republic had developed to a marvellous degree, and with it the population correspondingly increased. The census of 1890 marked 63,000,000 of inhabitants—more than double the population of 1860: the number of the States of the Union had now reached forty-four. Hardly 60,000,000 of inhabitants were to be found in all the remainder of the American Continent. The second American State in the matter of population was Brazil, which numbered 16,000,000 of inhabitants. The aged Emperor, Don Pedro II., who had abolished slavery in 1888, had been obliged to abdicate in consequence of a revolution which had broken out at Rio de Janeiro in 1889, so that the whole of Independent America was under a Republican form of Government. The ambition of the people of the United States increased with their riches, and they soon had an opportunity of realising their aims. In 1895, the island of Cuba, which had been always exploited by the retrograde colonial government of Spain was again in arms; Spain, after many years of warfare, had not succeeded in dominating the rebels: the aid of men and money to the rebels from America, rendered the task of suppression more difficult. At the same time the inhabitants of the Philippines, unable

longer to support ecclesiastical tyranny, rose, and, captained by Aguinaldo, fought for some time against the Spanish troops.

The length of the war had naturally injured the economic relations existing between the United States and Cuba, and this circumstance increased the desire of many Americans for intervention. In January, 1898, an American cruiser —the *Maine*—entered the port of Havana and remained there some time, arousing the suspicions of the Spaniards: on February 15 it was suddenly blown up, and 255 sailors perished. Fruitless inquiries endeavoured to elicit the cause of the disaster: but public opinion, in the United States, ran high against the Spanish Government, and great patriotic feeling was roused in Spain by the American agitation. In vain the Pope proposed his mediation: after a series of diplomatic negotiations, predestined to failure, and which appeared to be initiated in order to gain time for military preparation, President MacKinley, on April 11, 1898, in a message to the Senate, declared himself favourable to armed intervention between Spain and Cuba: the Congress gave free powers to the President and proclaimed the Independence of Cuba.

War therefore broke out between the two countries. All the Powers declared their neutrality: Dewey's fleet destroyed that of Spain at Manilla on May 1 and blockaded the port. Admiral Cervera, who found himself blockaded by Admiral Sampson at Santiago di Cuba, made a gallant attempt to break through on July 3: his ships were either destroyed or forced on shore, and Cervera was made a prisoner. Sampson telegraphed to his President that he offered the destruction of the Spanish fleet as a gift to the nation for Independence Day. A few days later Santiago capitulated.

American Imperialism swelled rapidly. Porto Rico was soon in their power. Spain, through France, demanded peace, and the preliminaries were signed on August 12 at Washington. By these, America claimed Spain's renunciation of Porto Rico and Cuba, but when the negotiations were opened at Paris the United States also insisted on the cession of the Philippines, as well as the payment of an indemnity

of 80,000,000 dollars: the island of Guam, near the Isthmus of Panama, was also demanded by the Americans. Peace was signed at Paris, December 10, 1898.

Thus Spain lost all her important colonies. Her remaining possessions in the Pacific—the Caroline Islands, Marianne, and Palaos—she ceded to Germany.

America, after some hesitation, withdrew her troops from Cuba, which became a Republic under the protection of America; the Philippine Islanders, after the retirement of the Spaniards, vainly attempted to maintain their independence, under Aguinaldo: but the latter was captured in 1901 in an ambuscade. The Philippines still fought on, until they were compelled by superior force to make their complete submission.

In the Pacific Ocean the Americans also occupied the Sandwich Isles. In 1897 Hawaii had become Federal territory, and in 1898 the American flag was hoisted in Honolulu. The Samoan Islands were divided in November, 1899, between America and Germany: England, in compensation, was allowed to establish a Protectorate over the Tonga and Savage Isles.

. . . .

So satisfied were the Americans with their President's Imperialism that he was re-elected in the presidential elections of 1900: his policy, in fact, corresponded to the prodigious development of American commerce, which had reached two milliards of dollars. Her coal production was superior to that of any other country, her petroleum rivalled that of Russia. Her population had risen to 76,000,000. In his message to Congress, of December, 1900, the President announced that the State possessed a balance of 80,000,000 dollars: fifty of these were to be devoted to the relief of taxation, and the remainder were destined for the fleet and the army. President MacKinley was assassinated in 1901, but his successor, Roosevelt, followed his policy and became the apostle of United States Imperialism. Under Roosevelt the cutting of the Panama Canal was completed. A new Company had been formed, after the failure of the original society, which simply proposed to utilise the labour already accomplished in order to sell it. An American society, in

the meantime, began the work of the Nicaraguan Canal. Roosevelt professed to support the Nicaraguan scheme in preference to that of Panama, and this piece of clever diplomacy induced the Panama Company to sell its property to the United States for only 2,000,000 of francs.

Roosevelt then negotiated with Colombia for the rights of constructing the canal. A Convention, signed by the Colombian Government, stipulated that a strip of land on each side of the canal should be ceded to the United States, in exchange for 500,000,000 of francs and an annual payment of 1,250,000 francs. The Colombian Senate refused to ratify this Convention, whereupon the inhabitants of the district through which the canal was to pass rebelled against Colombia and founded the Republic of Panama. Colombia was prevented from enforcing their submission by the United States, which recognised the new Republic, receiving from it, in exchange for this service, the cession in perpetuity of a zone, ten miles wide, along the canal, so that the United States could consider the work as constructed on Federal territory. The labour of digging the canal was undertaken with vigour, and the country was completely sanitated. The door was now open for the economic conquest by America of the Pacific and Far East.[1]

America now determined to enter into world-politics, and Roosevelt was re-elected by a large majority in 1904.

. . . .

A few days after the signature of the Spanish-American Treaty of Peace, the world was impressed by a proposal, emanating from the Czar, Nicholas II.: this was no other than an invitation of the representatives of the Powers to an International Congress for the purpose of limiting armaments. Public enthusiasm was roused, and the various Governments accepted the invitation.

The Peace Congress, as it was called, met on May 18, 1899, at the Hague, where the young Queen of Holland accorded a distinguished reception to the delegates. The impossibility of agreement on the central theme was soon made evident, and the general public took but little interest in the decisions of the Congress concerning the rules of war.

[1] The Canal was opened to traffic on August 15, 1914.

Owing to Germany's opposition, the principle of arbitration was not rendered obligatory, but a permanent Court of Arbitration was established at the Hague. Certain modes of war were prohibited—explosive bullets, asphyxiating gas, etc.—and the principles of the Convention of Geneva of August 22, 1864, were extended to naval warfare.[1]

. . . .

The first Hague Congress had hardly closed its sittings when a new war was threatened.

Cecil Rhodes, after his abortive attempt on the liberties of the Transvaal, felt that war was inevitable in order to carry out his scheme of South African Unity, and he returned to England in order to prepare public opinion and to conduct in English journals a hostile campaign against those Boers who directed the South African Republic. In 1898 Krüger was re-elected President of the Transvaal; Cecil Rhodes, now certain of Chamberlain's support, returned to Africa to direct the Chartered Company and to make preparations for the war against the Transvaal. The English Government hotly sustained the cause of the 'uitlanders': an attempt at agreement was made in June, 1899, at Bloemfontein, by Alfred Milner, Governor of the Cape, and President Krüger, but no result was obtained. In October, 1899, war broke out.

The President of the Orange Free State, Steyn, proclaimed an alliance with the sister Republic, and his country was drawn into the conflict. The struggle was longer than had been imagined by the English Government, since Krüger, in anticipation of the event, had for many years been accumulating munitions of war. He boldly faced the struggle, confiding in Germany's aid. Certainly, in Germany, as in Europe generally, public sentiment was on the side of the Boers; but the German Government had begun to be swayed by other counsels, and by one of those sudden changes, which William II. introduced into his policy, the pro-Boer sentiment was abandoned, and in November, 1899, the German Emperor went to London in order to bring about an Anglo-German agreement.

[1] Henri Dunant was the apostle of this Association, whose rules were later made the foundation of the Red Cross Society.

The Boers invaded Natal and besieged Ladysmith and Kimberley. On December 15, 1899, General Buller suffered a heavy defeat. England now seriously concentrated her efforts; 200,000 men, of whom 25,000 were drawn from her colonies, were now in South Africa. Lord Roberts was Commander-in-Chief, with Lord Kitchener as Head of the Staff. The Boers only mustered 55,000 men, but they defeated the attempts of the English to relieve Ladysmith. Whilst General French came to the relief of Kimberley, Lord Roberts forced Cronje to surrender. The Boers evacuated Natal, and on March 1, 1900, Ladysmith was saved.

After strenuous fighting, the Boers were forced to evacuate the Orange Free State. On June 5 the English penetrated the Transvaal and occupied Pretoria. President Krüger in September, 1900, embarked for Holland. He had hoped to enlist German sympathies, but William II. refused to receive him; as Bülow explained afterwards, anxiety for the safety of Germany's infant fleet led her to avoid any collision with England. Lord Roberts, after proclaiming the annexation of the Transvaal and Orange territory, returned to England, and the war was considered as finished. But a guerilla warfare broke out on all sides in 1901. The English destroyed the harvests and cattle in order to suppress the rising; the Boer women and children were placed in concentration camps, where bad food, overcrowding, and insanitary conditions induced a frightful mortality. On March 9, 1902, the Boers were again victorious, and captured Lord Methuen. He was, however, generously liberated by his captors. A few days later, negotiations of peace were entered into, and on May 31, 1902, the Convention of Pretoria was signed, by which the Boers laid down their arms and recognised the King of England as their Sovereign. A speedy autonomy was promised them with Parliamentary representation. England gave £3,000,000 for the reconstitution of factories, and accorded extensive credit to the Boers: a further vote of £5,000,000 was passed by the House of Commons on behalf of the Transvaal and Orange Free State on November 5 of the same year. English sentiment now veered round in

favour of the Boers, who had won public esteem by their bravery. Since the Boers outnumbered the English, not only in the Boer States, but even in Cape Colony, they soon began to gain political supremacy.[1]

. . . .

England's South African embarrassments had greatly aided the development of the ambitious aims of Germany in the East. The days had passed when Bismarck had said that the whole Eastern Question was not worth the bones of a Pomeranian Grenadier.

William II. had always carefully cultivated the friendship of the Sultan, Abdul Hamid II., and he now succeeded in supplanting English influence at Constantinople. For England, since her occupation of Egypt, no longer showed herself keen on sustaining the integrity of the Ottoman Empire. In October, 1898, William II., accompanied by the Empress and his Minister, von Bülow, visited with great pomp Abdul Hamid at Constantinople; the Sultan, who had been accustomed to being treated with arrogance by the Great Powers, was extremely flattered by German affability. From Constantinople, William II. went to Palestine and was received everywhere with the highest honours. At Jerusalem he founded a Protestant Church and gave land, bought by himself, to the German Catholic Association. But though on every occasion he invoked the name of Christ, he assumed the tone of the Protector of the Mussulman world: at Damascus he openly declared, 'the three hundred millions of Moslems, scattered over the world, may rest assured that on all occasions the German Emperor will be their friend.' Having no Moslem subjects in his own colonies, this policy served him as a useful weapon with which to annoy other colonial Powers.

His aim was to greatly develop German penetration in Turkish Asia: already commercial and financial societies had initiated a series of enterprises: commercial houses were established in many places, and shipping lines were organised in the Eastern Mediterranean. The Emperor

[1] Cecil Rhodes died on March 26, 1902, at forty-nine years of age; Paul Kruger died on July 14, 1904, at the age of seventy-nine. The body of the latter was taken to Pretoria, where it was buried with military honours, by order of the English Government.

wished particularly to assure to German Companies the construction of great railway lines, which, through the fertile plains of Mesopotamia, and along the banks of the Tigris and Euphrates, should lead to the Persian Gulf, which opens the way to India. Other Powers—and England in particular—were not anxious to see the Germans established on the Persian Gulf, where they had, till that time, been predominant. Baron Marschall, who was for ten years the Ambassador of William II. at Constantinople, was given the task of overcoming the particular difficulties of this concession.

In China, also, the European Powers vied with each other in the attempt to gain concessions. The Germans occupied Kiao-Chau; the Russians, Port Arthur; England, Wei-hai-wei, all of which had been wrung by pressure from the Chinese Government.

This European penetration excited Chinese hostility. The sect of Boxers rose in rebellion, burning railway stations and massacring foreigners. The rebellion assumed great proportions, and the German Ambassador at Pekin was murdered by Chinese soldiers: every embassy, except that of England, was burnt, and Europeans took refuge in the latter.

The Powers determined to take action. William II. gave ferocious orders to his soldiers to give no quarter, and to act in such a way that the name of a German should terrify the Chinese for centuries to come. Marshal Waldersee was in command of the German troops, and was named Generalissimo of the International Expedition.

Those Allied troops which were already in China had marched on Pekin, and on August 15 had entered the city, liberating the Ambassadors, who were still besieged in the English Legation. Russia conducted a separate campaign in Manchuria, where her railways had been damaged by the rebels, and the Russians had succeeded in restoring order there.

The European expedition reached China in September, and they occupied important positions. Peace was concluded in December, and China promised to pay an indemnity of

a milliard of francs, to punish those officials who were implicated in the revolt, and to renew all her previous concessions. European penetration became more intense, and Germany figured in the Far East, also, as a leading Power.

. . . .

Meantime, Italy had suffered a national calamity. On July 29, 1900, King Humbert was murdered by an anarchist. Much sympathy was felt throughout Italy for the Royal family.

Social measures distinguished the policy of the new reign, and were rewarded by the rapid development of Italian commerce. The economic conditions of Italy improved rapidly: each year the national finances showed a substantial balance to the good.

Italy's relations with France became more cordial. A commercial agreement had been concluded between the two nations, and this facilitated improved economic relations and a more friendly national feeling. In 1902 France pledged herself not to oppose Italy's ambitions in Tripoli, while Italy consented to give France a free hand in Morocco. On the renewal of the Triple Alliance, in June, 1902, Italy assured France that in no case and in no way, would she aid or abet an attack against the latter country.

In July, 1902, Victor Emmanuel III. entered on his visits to the Courts and capitals of Europe. Since Francis Joseph had not returned the visit of King Humbert, the King of Italy did not visit Vienna. This fact, together with his visit to St Petersburg, and the Italian reconciliation with France, was displeasing to the Central Powers. In 1903 the Italian King and Queen visited President Loubet at Paris and were enthusiastically received.

Delcassé continued to direct French Foreign Policy (1895-1905). The existing ties with Russia were strengthened, the friendship with Italy was deepened, and the relations with England became more and more cordial. In the latter case a whole past of bitterness and hate had to be wiped out: colonial dissension, also, had to be settled on a friendly basis: Delcassé's task, though difficult, was not impossible, since England rapidly began to comprehend

that Germany, both at sea and in the colonial field, was a far more formidable competitor than France.

. . . .

On January 29, 1901, Queen Victoria of England died at the age of eighty-two years. The sixty-five years of her reign had marked the constant and rapid rise of English prestige and power over the whole world, an enormous increase of mercantile trade, and in political matters, the full development of Parliamentary power and colonial autonomy.

Under her Government, English colonies became almost Sovereign States, with their own spheres of action, and political ideas in the colonies were far more advanced than those of England herself: in Australia this was specially the case. Here, immense natural pastures had furnished the first wealth of the country: the discovery of gold in 1851 had attracted so many emigrants that in one decade the population had tripled, and in 1891 amounted to 4,000,000. Agriculture and commerce increased rapidly, and a corresponding advance was made in means of communication.

The population rapidly centred in the cities. Melbourne, which in 1861 possessed a population of 140,000 inhabitants, in 1891 mustered 500,000. Sydney, in the same period, had increased from 95,000 to 487,000. Fifty per cent. of the population inhabited the cities, and this fact facilitated culture and aided the aspirations of the people to take part in political life.

As early as 1855 all the colonies, with the exception of Western Australia, which was but thinly populated, had enjoyed complete autonomous Government: in 1890 Western Australia, also, obtained a Constitution. Through the predominance of the urban and artisan element, the most democratic ideas triumphed: universal suffrage, which was introduced into New South Wales in 1855, was extended to the other colonies, with the exception of Tasmania; the legislation of the States was purely Socialistic; agrarian laws favoured the development of small holdings, while the tributary system was based on the exemption of taxes for the poorer, and a progressive system for the richer, classes.

Thus, in Australia a new society arose which sought to carry out in every field the principle of equality: the lack of social traditions facilitated the introduction of the most daring reforms.

Gradually, even in Australia, the idea of a federation found favour, with the sole scope of assuring the military defence of Australia. In 1885 a Federal Australian Council was formed, though as yet it rather represented an aspiration than a real function, seeing that it had not any executive power. But following a council held in London, which was formed by colonial delegates and English Ministers, the Australian Naval Force Act was approved in 1887, by which the Australians pledged themselves to pay the expenses of maintenance of five cruisers and two torpedo-boats, which England had hitherto kept in those seas. In 1889 a genuine project of Federation, analogous to that of Canada, was proposed by Sir Henry Parkes, one of Australia's most notable statesmen; ten years passed, however, before his proposal was actuated; New Zealand, alone, would not identify herself with the scheme. In 1897 the Convention of Adelaide approved a Constitution, which was promulgated in March, 1898, and sanctioned by the Queen, July 9, 1900. Six colonies formed this Federation—New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland, South Australia, Tasmania, and Western Australia: these States included 4,000,000 of inhabitants. The seat of Government was provisionally fixed at Melbourne, but it was determined to construct a new central capital—Canberra, in New South Wales. Federal legislation was conducted by two Houses and a Senate for the six States, but each State possessed its own Government, and legislated for its own purely local affairs.

Edward VII., son of Queen Victoria, succeeded her on the throne. He exercised a notable influence on England's foreign policy, and gave it an entirely new direction.

England had till now ignored Germany's commerce and industry. But in the years 1890-1900 the latter increased enormously, German exports alone increasing from 3,409 millions in 1890 to 4,555 millions in 1900. Simultaneously Germany aimed at naval expansion, and her Naval

Act of 1898 assured her a powerful fleet. With this competition it was impossible for England to maintain her 'Two-Power' standard. France and Russia, therefore, passed into second line, and Germany became her chief and only antagonist.

England's Alliance with Japan in 1902 enabled her to watch Russian movements in Asia; by this Alliance each Power pledged herself to preserve a strict neutrality if the other were attacked by one Power alone; but should an attack be made by a coalition of two, active aid would be given.

At the Coronation of Edward VII. in 1902 a third Colonial Conference was held under Chamberlain, the Colonial Minister. It was decided to hold these Conferences periodically. The question of preferential Colonial Tariffs was discussed and the special treatment of colonial exports to the mother country. The Colonies pledged themselves to aid in military expenses; Canada, however, in lieu of financial help, promised to augment her military establishment.

Edward VII. sought to strengthen England's already excellent relations with Italy, and one of his first visits was to the King of Italy. From Rome he went to Paris, where he declared that the old hostility between France and England had ceased, and that both must henceforth travel together along the road of peace and civilisation. President Loubet returned this visit in July, 1903, and the basis of the future Anglo-French Entente was laid on this occasion. In October, 1903, a Convention was signed between the two countries, in which it was determined that arbitration should henceforth settle all outstanding questions between the two nations.

. . . .

On April 8, 1904, M. Delcassé and Lord Lansdowne concluded the negotiations for the elimination of all possible causes of discord between France and England, and a Treaty was signed to this effect—the most important, perhaps, in contemporary history, since it marked the end of secular animosity between the two countries.

The most difficult points concerned Egypt and Morocco.

France now agreed to allow England to remain in peace in Egypt; she merely stipulated that her commercial and financial interests should be safeguarded, and that her schools should be preserved. England gave a free hand to France in Morocco, demanding only the ' open door ' in conjunction with a pledge that no fortress on the African side should imperil the safety of Gibraltar.

France renounced her fishery rights on the coast of Newfoundland, and obtained in recompense some African territories, with a rectification of the Gambia, Chad, and Niger frontiers. The disputes concerning Madagascar, the New Hebrides, and Siam were also amicably settled. Thus the gulf of secular enmity between France and England was closed, and the two countries seemed henceforth destined to aid instead of fighting, each other.

Naturally, Germany noted with displeasure the healing of this ancient feud, nor did she see without annoyance the daily increasing friendship between Italy and France. In April, 1904, the month which saw the Anglo-French agreement, President Loubet visited Victor Emmanuel III. at Rome, and was received by the people with enthusiasm, since popular sentiment sealed the work of the two Governments.

. . . .

Loubet's visit to Paris had another consequence: it aggravated the hostile relations already existing between the Pope and the French Republic.

In the last years of the nineteenth century France had been disturbed by the discussion as to whether the Jew, Captain Dreyfus, who had been condemned as a spy, was, or was not, innocent. Clerical and reactionary influence had again revived during this dispute: in order to check it, the Waldeck-Rousseau Ministry passed a law which established regulations concerning the authorisation of Religious Congregations. This measure encountered passionate resistance, which impelled the succeeding Ministry to take violent measures against those Religious Congregations which refused to submit; many were dissolved by force. This increased the tension between the Papal See and the Republic.

Leo XIII., who had always attempted reconciliation, had died on July 20, 1903, at ninety-three years of age. At the opening of the resultant Conclave, Cardinal Rampolla, who for sixteen years had shown his friendship towards France, received the most votes; it was then that the Cardinal Bishop of Cracovia declared himself charged by the Emperor to veto Rampolla's election. The moment was a dramatic one. Rampolla, white to the lips, rose and declared that while he considered himself unworthy of the high office of Pope, he felt bound to protest against this violation of the liberty of the Sacred College. In the end, the Patriarch of Venice, Giuseppe Sarto, was elected, and on August 4, 1903, this son of lowly parents, who had reached his position by passing through every grade of the ecclesiastical career, was raised to the Pontificate, and assumed the Tiara, under the name of Pius X.[1]

The new Pope followed the policy of his predecessors and continued to remain in the Vatican, announcing his election to all the Powers except Italy. When Loubet visited Victor Emmanuel at Rome, the Pope sent a protest to the Powers against the insult given by the Head of a Catholic nation in visiting the Italian King at Rome. Diplomatic relations with France were then broken, and the French Chamber suppressed the Embassy to the Vatican: the idea of breaking the *Concordat* and separating Church from State, made progress in France. The Minister Combes brought forward a Bill to this effect, which was approved by the new Rouvier Ministry.

This Law, which marked the end of the régime of the Napoleonic *Concordat*, was passed on December 11, 1905, and was to take effect in one year from that date. The difficulties which it encountered were conquered by the tact and ability of the Minister Briand, who was the framer of the law. Gradually religious excitement calmed down and economic and social problems began to take first place in the Home politics of France.

Whilst France, by her understanding with England, and her friendship with Italy, was preparing for herself a

[1] On January 20, 1904, Pius X. prohibited the future use of the 'Veto,' under pain of excommunication.

stable international situation, her Ally suffered a terrible defeat.

Russia had for a long time aimed at two objectives—one in Eastern Europe and the other in the Far East; but, in these later years, she had concentrated her attention on the Far East, and had, on this account, assumed a pacific attitude in European affairs, striving only to maintain the *status quo* in the Balkans.

Russia had occupied Manchuria during the Chinese expedition, but instead of evacuating, she tranquilly began to organise and to Russianise it. This Slav advance in the Far East excited the hatred of Japan. The sight of Russia consolidating and installing herself definitely in the territory which Japan had won, and had been forced to restitute, roused Japanese patriotic sentiment, and Russian activity in Corea aggravated the situation.

Japan demanded the immediate evacuation of Manchuria, and the cessation of Russian activity in Corea. The Russians attempted to temporise, but Japan precipitated events. On February 6, 1904, she recalled her Ambassador from St Petersburg, and on February 9 initiated the war without formal declaration. Russian cruisers were torpedoed in Port Arthur and suffered great damage.

Japan repeated her tactics of the Chinese War. Corea declared herself the Ally of Japan: the latter's troops landed in Corean territory and Port Arthur was blockaded. Russia, who had not believed war to be so imminent, and who was ignorant of Japan's military strength, was absolutely unprepared. While Japanese patriotism was solid for the war, the majority of the Russian people unwillingly allowed hostilities. Add to this, that Japan's situation near the seat of war gave her an immense advantage over Russia, whose troops and material had to be conveyed from an immense distance.

After the early disasters, the Czar appointed Kuropatkin as Generalissimo, and Admiral Makaroff Commander of the Fleet at Port Arthur. But Makaroff's ship sank by collision with a mine, and Russia lost in him a tower of strength and hope. The Japanese now succeeded in surrounding Port Arthur both by land and sea. In June the Russian

fleet attempted to issue from Port Arthur, but the Japanese fleet under Togo attacked and destroyed a great part of it. Another attempt on August 10 led to its almost complete destruction. Already the Japanese in Corea, under Koroki, had passed the Yalu and driven the Russians back into Manchuria: in the great battle of Liao Yang, which lasted ten days, the Russians were again routed and retired towards Mukden. In September the Japanese succeeded in cutting the water supply of Port Arthur, and the besieged were forced to resort to the use of distilled sea-water. The Japanese General, Nogi, towards the end of the month invited Stoessel to surrender, but his offer was indignantly refused.

Meantime the Baltic fleet started on its long and cautious journey. In the North Sea, Rodjestwenski imagined that he saw two Japanese torpedo boats in the midst of an English fishing-fleet, and opened fire on the latter, killing and wounding the fishermen. Indignation in England was so keen that, for a moment, war was imminent. But finally England agreed to the proposal of Russia that the question should be settled by the tribunal of the Hague. The struggle for Port Arthur endured through November and December, and it was not till January 1 that Stoessel, who found himself dominated by sea and land, capitulated. Japan, in order to show her admiration of the defenders, allowed four Russian torpedo-boats to leave the port. The land garrison, on giving their *parole* to take no further part in the operations, were allowed to return to Russia.

All the forces of the Japanese were now directed against Mukden, where Kuropatkin ran grave risk of being surrounded. With enormous losses the Russians succeeded in opening their way to Kharbin, whilst Mukden was occupied by the Japanese, March 10, 1905. Linievich succeeded Kuropatkin as Generalissimo, but he was forced to continue the retreat towards Kharbin, incessantly pursued by the Japanese.

Admiral Rodjestwenski's twenty ships, with 11,000 men, finally reached the Chinese Seas in May, 1905. At the Straits of Tsuschima, he was attacked by Admiral Togo's fleet, and after a two days' engagement the Russian force

was destroyed. Rodjestwenski was made prisoner. The Russians, still harassed in their retreat by the Japanese, now lost hope, and the Japanese occupied the Island of Saghalin without encountering opposition.

Russia was definitely defeated. Roosevelt's proposal as mediator between the belligerents was accepted; in August, 1905, the representatives of Russia and Japan met at Portsmouth, in the United States, and on September 5 peace was signed. Russia abandoned to Japan the Protectorate of Corea, and ceded to her the southern half of the Island of Saghalin: Port Arthur and the Peninsula of Liaoting were also transferred to her, with the railways existing there. Russia, also, undertook to evacuate Manchuria, which was restored to China and opened to international commerce. Russia only retained the railways of Northern Manchuria in her possession.

Japan's moderate terms of peace facilitated the re-establishment of cordial relations with Russia, whose attention was speedily occupied by a Revolution which broke out in many parts of the Empire.

. . . .

The installation of factories, and her augmented commerce, had increased the number and wealth of Russia's middle classes. Little by little, the latter evinced a desire to participate in the political life of the country. The increase of the middle classes corresponded to that of the proletariat. In the massed centres of industry the Government could not forbid the formation of co-operative and benefit societies, and it was not long before the members of the intellectual classes joined these societies and propagated their Liberal ideas. To guard against the danger, the Government decided to organise other bodies, at the head of which should be persons whom they could trust. The priest, Gapon, in St Petersburg, founded an association of thousands of workers in the metallurgical factories.

A ferment of ideas now permeated the life of Russia—Liberal aspirations on the part of the middle classes, and a desire of amelioration on the part of the proletariat. A minority of the nobles understood the position, but a large majority of the aristocracy and the bureaucracy, with the

clergy, remained violently opposed to all changes. Since the Sovereign was surrounded by the latter alone, the aspirations of the people were entirely misrepresented to him.

The peasants' sentiments were with the Government: but with the increase of the population the yielding capacity of the land had not correspondingly improved. The bolder spirits abandoned agriculture and became factory hands in the cities, but the majority suffered great privations, which they strove to alleviate by the use of vodka.[1] Whilst the agitation in the country only aimed at a redistribution of the land, that of the cities was purely political. The more fanatic of the lower classes formed terrorist associations, and a series of assassinations of highly-placed personages was organised by them. The intellectuals propagated their new and Liberal ideas in the hope of changing the Government system by Parliamentary methods.

The war with Japan had thrilled the nation with anger at bureaucratic incompetence: while the terrorists continued their outrages, the Liberals conducted a lively propaganda, and convoked for November 6, 1904, a General Congress of the Zemstvo—Provincial Assemblies—in order to discuss national interests.

The Government, which needed both men and money, dared not refuse, but insisted that the discussions of this Assembly should be private, and that its proceedings should not be published in the Press. None the less, the news leaked out that the Liberals had demanded the liberty of Western nations—freedom of conscience, liberty of the Press, the right of holding public meetings, and an elective Assembly. The Czar published a decree, December, 1904, by which he invited his Ministers to introduce some Liberal reforms connected with the Press, with local administration, and the social conditions of the lower classes.

These, however, were not enough: a radical political transformation was needed: the workers, who had hitherto been content with aiming at economic reform, now joined

[1] More than one-fourth of the finances of the Russian Empire was furnished by the sale of vodka, which was a State monopoly.

in the demand for political rights. Gapon, wishing to assure for himself an eminent position in the changed régime, which he thought was now inevitable, placed himself at the head of a procession of workers, in order to present a petition to the Czar. The procession, was, however, fired upon by the military and driven back—January 22, 1905.

The Liberals now determined on rebellion. Hostile demonstrations and assassinations occurred with greater frequency. On February 18, 1905, the Grand Duke Sergius, who was considered the personification of reaction, was killed by a bomb. The more moderate temperaments continued their propaganda and reiterated their demand for a representative Government.

Colossal strikes, agricultural riots, and mutinies of the sailors followed the news of the defeat of Mukden and the destruction of the fleet. The Government yielded, and on August 18 announced the creation of the National Duma (Assembly), which was composed of 412 elective members: but it decreed that the Duma should only be possessed of auxiliary powers in the discussion of the proposed legislation: the sanction of the Imperial Council would first be necessary, and the law must finally receive the approval of the Czar, who, indeed, could sanction laws which had not been approved by the Duma.

This announcement disillusioned the people, but the declaration of peace and the moderate terms of Japan preserved tranquillity, though agitation still continued. Count Witte induced the Czar to sign a decree, which proclaimed liberty of conscience, speech, and press, the right of holding public meetings, and inviolability of the person; it established also that no law could be passed without the sanction of the Duma, and it enlarged the right of vote—October 30, 1905.

Thus the old Russian régime fell: its most bigoted supporter, Pobjedonozeff, resigned. But the nation felt that these concessions had been unwillingly dragged from the Emperor. Simultaneously, it became conscious of its own force and had no faith in a Government which only yielded to menace. The agitations, therefore, did not die down.

To add to the perplexities of the Government, the non-Russian portion of the population chafed under its repressive policy. Finland demanded and gained her ancient autonomy —1906—with extraordinary facility. Universal suffrage was given without distinction, and women were admitted to the right of elective representation. Poland, too, in the throes of revolutionary and Socialistic legislation felt her hopes revive. Armenia and the Baltic provinces distinguished themselves by sinister revolts.

The wind of revolution, which passed over all Russia, penetrated the fighting services. Mutinies of sailors and soldiers took place. The revolutionary party deemed itself arbiter of the situation; but military discontent was appeased by small concessions, and the Government were able to deal with the revolutionists. The most serious attack was at Moscow, December, 1905, but in spite of a furious resistance the revolt was quelled.

The Government now permitted the formation of electoral lists and elections, and the first Duma was convoked at Petersburg on May 1, 1906. Even Russia now entered into the Constitutional path.

. . . .

Another Revolution had peacefully developed in the Scandinavian Peninsula. Norway would no longer support the position of inferiority imposed upon her by Sweden. A special Norwegian Consular Service was demanded at first, which the King refused. This caused great excitement in Norway, and on June 7, 1905, the Norwegian Parliament declared its separation from Sweden. The latter country at first determined to act with energy against Norway, but finally accepted the verdict of a Norwegian plebiscite: this produced 368,200 votes favourable to separation and 184 against. The Swedish Government, therefore, no longer opposed this universal desire. A neutral territory was arranged between the two nations, and it was resolved that matters under dispute should be submitted to the Hague Arbitration tribunal. Sweden recognised Norway's independence, and King Oscar, while expressing sorrow at the event, declared his hope of a durable peace between the two countries.

The new State adopted a monarchical form of Government. On November 18, 1905, the Storthing unanimously elected to the throne Prince Charles of Denmark, who had married the youngest daughter of Edward VII. of England: he accepted the crown and mounted the throne, assuming the name of Haakon, in deference to the memory of the ancient Norwegian kings.

CHAPTER XVI

UNSTABLE EQUILIBRIUM

The Moroccan Question: William at Tangiers: The Algeçiras Conference.—The race for Naval Supremacy between Germany and England.—Second Conference of the Hague.—The Anglo-Russian Agreement.—Initial difficulties of Constitutional Government in Russia.—The Balkan Railways.—Turkish Revolution of 1908.—*Austrian annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina and the resultant grave disturbance of the International situation.—Austrian and German Armaments: Agadir: Franco-German Agreement.—Turco-Italian War in Tripoli: Treaty of Lausanne.—War of the Balkan States against Turkey: The Peace of London.—The Victors disagree: Second Balkan War: Peace of Bucharest.—The United States: Election of President Wilson.—Pan-American Conference.—Latin States of America.*

THE weakening of Russia by its military disasters and by internal revolution had diminished the strength of the Dual Alliance. Germany, therefore, seized on the opportunity of asserting her power, and sought to demolish the new diplomatic combination against her: she therefore raised the Moroccan Question.

The Powers had for some time considered the Empire of Morocco as unstable: the authority of the Sultan of Fez had never been solidly established, and certain Powers had already found excuses for interfering in Moroccan Affairs.

Spain, who had long possessed the fortresses of Ceuta and Melilla, on the coast of Morocco, had only military and historical interests in that country. England's economic interests were greater than those of any other Power, and in 1894, on the accession of Mulai Abdul Aziz to the throne, she had figured prominently in the political affairs of Morocco: in addition, from a military point of view, it was important to her to secure the safety of those coasts which faced the Straits of Gibraltar.

But, more than any other Power, France was concerned in the peace and prosperity of Morocco. French territory or French spheres of influence ran along the whole length

of the frontiers of Morocco, and on this account France felt herself called to exercise a preponderating influence on Moroccan politics. But in 1889 Italy and Germany had both claimed a share in the interests of Morocco. In that year, William II. had, with great pomp, welcomed a Moroccan Embassy at Berlin; it had visited the works of Krupp and had been shown distinguished hospitality: the Italian Minister at Tangiers had at the same time successfully demanded permission that Italian officers should direct the Arsenals of the Sultan. But whilst Italian penetration was not vigorously pressed, Germany hastened to impose her commerce on the country, and furnished the Moors with arms.

The Moorish Government profited by the differences of the Powers, and succeeded for some time in staving off an attempt at European intervention. But the anarchy of the country increased, and the Sultan's treasury was so depleted that his authority became merely nominal.

France determined on vigorous action, and sought from England, Italy, and Spain a free hand in Morocco, which was granted on conditions that the title and interests of Spain in that country should be safeguarded. In full accord with the Mediterranean Powers, and with the agreement of the Sultan, France began her peaceful penetration of the country: the Sultan obtained a French loan and placed his custom-houses under French control.

This settling of an international question, without the interposition of Germany, annoyed the latter, and she protested. On March 31, 1905, the German Emperor arrived at Tangiers and loudly announced his intention '*of visiting the independent Sovereign of Morocco*, adding that '*he trusted that under the high Sovereignty of the latter a free Morocco would be opened to international commerce without exclusion or monopoly of any kind soever.*' Europe was startled, and the uneasiness was increased when, shortly after, Prince Bülow proposed to the Powers an International Conference, which should regulate reforms in Morocco. In spite of the opposition of the French Minister, the Sultan declared his adhesion to this proposal. It was at this time that the Russian fleet was destroyed by Japan. The Rouvier Ministry

dared not risk a conflict with Germany, and M. Delcassé resigned, June 6, 1905.

In order to avoid war a Conference was organised, and on October 26, William II., at Berlin, pronounced a bellicose toast, which ended with the words, '*Hurrah for dry powder, keen swords, and tense muscles!*'

The Conference opened in 1906 in the little Spanish town of Algeçiras. In vain, Germany attempted to induce England to renounce her pledge to France in 1904. England, Italy, and Spain remained faithful to their treaties, in spite of German pressure. Germany was only supported by Austria, and found herself in a minority.

On April 7, 1906, the Conference closed, having practically sanctioned all those reforms already proposed by France. A State Bank was organised and a police force formed for the eight Moorish ports which were open to International trade. Though France saw her aims in Morocco somewhat restricted, she was able to prosecute the work she had already begun.

. . . .

Germany had observed with anger the solidity of Anglo-French friendship: her hostility to England, therefore, grew more acute. She had created a formidable fleet by carrying out her Naval Programme of 1898, but England, by fresh efforts, had maintained her superiority, and in February, 1906, the first Dreadnought had been launched. The competition between the two Powers became more keen. By a fresh Naval Programme Germany increased the number and weight of her ships, and in 1908 had also constructed a Dreadnought. Two hundred millions of francs were now spent on the Kiel Canal in order to make it navigable for warships. In 1907, at the Second Congress of the Hague, England's representative put forward a plea for the limitation of Armaments. Even while the Congress was sitting, a new German Naval Bill was passed by the efforts of Admiral von Tirpitz, increasing still further the naval power of Germany.

Though the efforts of the Second Hague Congress were of no practical utility, yet an increased number of States took part in its deliberations. Out of forty-four States,

thirty-two were favourable to compulsory arbitration, but the absence of equanimity prevented the acceptance of the principle by the Congress. Attention, however, was paid to the rules which should govern naval and military warfare.

A much more important event than the deliberations of the Congress took place during its session. Russia and England came to an agreement concerning their ancient disputes. This understanding added to the displeasure of Germany, who saw in all this the machinations of Edward VII., who, she thought, endeavoured to isolate and encircle her. From thenceforward her pride was in a constant state of irritation. The European equilibrium became unstable.

. . . .

The English Conservative Ministry had resigned in December, 1905, because its chief, Balfour, did not entirely approve of the proposal of Chamberlain that the mother country should concede to her colonies a preferential tariff; Balfour, unwilling to entirely abandon the principle of Free Trade, contented himself with proposing economic reprisals against foreign high tariffs: this, perhaps, had not satisfied Chamberlain, who had resigned, and this determined the fall of the Ministry.

The power passed to the Liberal Party, under Campbell-Bannerman: for the first time a compact Labour Party entered the House.

The change of Ministry had no effect on foreign and colonial policy, for the latter henceforth dealt with one problem alone—the antagonism of Germany. But the Conservative Imperialist policy was not abandoned. A fourth Colonial Conference was held in London in 1907, under the presidency of Campbell-Bannerman, the Prime Minister; the latter pointed out to the delegates that his presence marked a new epoch, since the Conference was now simply between the Imperial Government and the Governments of the autonomous colonies. It was decided to give the name of 'Imperial' to the Conference, which should be held every four years. A General Staff was to be selected from the military representatives of each unit of the Empire. Against the wishes of the delegates the Prime Minister decided to refuse colonial preferential tariffs, declaring that

Free Trade was necessary to maintain cheap rates for the necessities of life.

The Entente with France and the Alliance with Japan remained the base of English policy. The 'Splendid Isolation' was renounced, and agreements were willingly sought after. To the traditional friendship with Italy was added an agreement with Spain. But a more solid impression was made by the Treaty with Russia, August 31, 1907. Asiatic conflicting interests were reconciled and an arrangement was arrived at with regard to Persian affairs.

Hitherto, Persia had been governed despotically, but in 1906 the dying Shah granted a Constitution and convoked a Parliament. He died, however, before the new Government came into power, 1907. The new Sovereign, Mohammed Ali, did not inspire the confidence of his Parliament, and a period of constant agitation occurred. In the meantime, Russia and England agreed to divide Persia into three zones of influence, the northern of which was supervised by Russia and the southern by England, while the middle zone was left free to its own devices. This agreement was rendered necessary, even here, by the desire manifested by Germany to insinuate herself in this region, with the object of making it a high road between Europe and Asia.

Afghanistan was declared by Russia to be outside her zone of influence, and she promised to use the English Government as intermediary in her relations with that country. England, for her part, promised to exercise in Afghanistan a merely pacific influence.

England had also hoped to penetrate Tibet—the entrance to which had hitherto been jealously prohibited to Europeans. In her agreement with Russia she promised to preserve the integrity of Tibet, under the sovereignty of China. The two Powers pledged themselves to send no representative to Lhassa, nor to seek any concession from Tibet.

A visit of Edward VII. to Nicholas II. in June, 1908, sealed this Treaty.

. . . .

In Russia the new Constitutional Government was traversing a difficult path.

On May 10, 1906, the Czar solemnly opened the Duma. The majority of its members belonged to the Constitutional-Democratic Party, called 'Cadets,' from the two letters K and D, which are the initials of the two Russian words signifying 'constitutional' and 'democratic.' The programme which it presented to its Sovereign was as follows:—universal suffrage, responsibility of the Ministry to the Duma, abrogation of the laws of exemption, suppression of the Imperial Council, civil equality, agrarian laws, compulsory and free elementary education, and full and complete political amnesty. On the refusal of the Ministry to accept this programme, the Duma demanded its dismissal. This was not granted, and, on July 22, the Duma itself was dissolved in spite of the protests of its members.

The appointment of a new Ministry under the presidency of Stolypin marked the dissolution of the Duma. This new Ministry, while restoring order and suppressing terrorism, passed many wise and liberal measures tending to the social and economic amelioration of the peasants.

In February, 1907, the new Duma was elected, but in consequence of the discovery of a revolutionary plot, in which several members were implicated, it was dissolved on June 16, having existed one month longer than its predecessor.

The Government now automatically modified the electoral laws, and the new regulations not only assured a predominant number of representatives of the richer classes, but gave the Government the power of exercising an immense influence on the elections themselves. This *coup d'état*, though received calmly enough in the country, utterly destroyed the power of the Duma. Owing to these laws, the new election returned a Conservative body of representatives to the Duma. This third Parliament was naturally reactionary, and Russian in spirit. It docilely obeyed the the Government and voted the first Constitutional Russian budget. The Government now considered the Revolution as finished, and turned its attention away from reform to the reorganisation of its military forces. Whilst awaiting this reconstruction it adopted a prudent attitude in its foreign policy. Yet, at Austria's announcement that she was about

to connect the Bosnian railways with those to the East, towards Salonica, the Russian Foreign Minister demanded the concession of a railway from the Danube to the Adriatic.

. . . .

This question of the Balkan Railways marked the re-awakening of Austrian ambitions in the Balkan Peninsula. Austria appeared weary of playing a second part in the Triple Alliance, and soon found a favourable occasion of affirming her aspirations.

. . . .

The Government of Turkey had been going from bad to worse, and a patriotic and nationalist party called 'The Young Turks' was formed, under the direction of a 'Committee of Union and Progress.' An insurrection occurred in 1908 in Salonica, demanding the restitution of the Constitution of 1876. The revolt triumphed, and the Constitution was proclaimed. This change furnished a pretext for a profound modification of the international situation.

In October, 1908, the Emperor of Austria proclaimed the annexation to his Empire of Bosnia and Herzegovina. In his turn, Ferdinand of Bulgaria proclaimed at Tirnovo the independence of his State, and assumed the title of Czar of the Bulgarians. On the following day the Island of Crete proclaimed its union with Greece.

Numerous protests were raised at these happenings. Turkey's protest was naturally especially vehement. King George of Greece did not dare to face a hostile Europe, and placed the Greek cause in the hands of the Powers, who declared their disapproval of the annexation. Bulgaria, however, by payment of an indemnity, had obtained, from Turkey, recognition of her independence.

But European peace was more gravely disturbed by the annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, which not only roused Turkish protests, but excited the furious anger of both Serbia and Montenegro. Russia and Italy, whose agreements with Austria were based on the *status quo* of the Balkan Peninsula, were gravely preoccupied with the turn of affairs. The Russian Government, in agreement with France and England, proposed the convocation of an international

conference, but Austria preferred to avoid a discussion and treated directly with the various Governments interested.

In order to placate Italy she withdrew her troops from the Sandjak of Novi-Bazar, and renounced her treaty rights over Montenegro. Germany, who desired to remain friends with both Austria and Turkey, was embarrassed, but persuaded her ally to offer Turkey 60,000,000 of francs as indemnity, together with the renunciation of postal rights and capitulations in Turkey: these conditions Turkey accepted, and thus acknowledged the annexation.

Having satisfied Turkey, Germany devoted her efforts to the cause of Austria. In order to deprive Serbia of any hope of external aid, Prince Bülow adopted a threatening tone towards Russia, who, being totally unprepared for war, frankly recognised the annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Serbia, therefore, was forced to abandon her protest, and, naturally, also, Montenegro was compelled to submit: Prince Nicholas, in 1910, assumed the title of King, which was recognised by the Powers.

But the Turkish Revolution was not yet at an end. A revolt against the new régime broke out in 1909. The Sultan supported the rebels, but two army corps marched on Constantinople and Adrianople from Salonica and the feeble resistance was quelled. The Sultan was deposed and imprisoned at Salonica.

The new Sultan, Mohammed V., declared himself happy to be the first Sultan of Liberty: but, in reality, the 'Committee of Union and Progress' was, as it had been before, the master of the country.

For a short time, in the early constitutional days of the new Turkish régime, the power of England seemed again in the ascendant at Constantinople; but since the prevailing element in the Revolution was the army, which was impregnated with German spirit, German diplomacy, under the able guidance of von Marschal, again became predominant.

. . . .

In Portugal, also, Revolution triumphed, October, 1910; the Royal family was exiled, and a Republic was formed. Nor were these crises limited to Europe: in 1911 a Revolution broke out in China, which it became impossible

to dominate, so that the immense Chinese Empire also became a Republic.

. . . .

The crisis which had threatened Europe was now passed. The Austrian-German caucus had triumphed. But the situation was still tense. Serbia dreamed of revenge: Russia determined on reorganising her military forces in order to be able to face German arrogance, whilst Italy's diffidence of Austria increased. Each small incident served to provoke Italian popular hostility towards Austria. Even the supporters of the Triple Alliance now declared it to be only a painful necessity.

Austrian sentiment towards Italy was no less bitter, and the increase of her fleet seemed to be aimed against Italy.

. . . .

Meantime, grave diplomatic difficulties embarrassed France in the work she had begun in Morocco. Here the situation was complicated: the Sultan had been deposed in favour of his brother, Mulai Hafid. Germany hastened to recognise the new monarch, but both France and Spain demanded guarantees of him, which he unwillingly gave and then neglected to maintain, trusting in Germany's support. All this rendered difficult the work of French organisation in Morocco.

Certain tribes protested against this reorganisation, and rose against the Sultan, who was far from popular even in his own capital. Speedily he found himself besieged by the tribes of Fez, his only defence the French Military Mission. He invoked the aid of France, who sent an expedition of 20,000 men under General Moinier. The latter successfully routed the tribes and relieved the capital: one of the most important operations in this expedition was the capture of Mesquinez.

Spain fancied that she saw a menace in this expedition and enlarged her Hinterland of Ceuta and Melilla, whilst Spanish troops embarked at Caracce. Germany now seized her opportunity and declared that France was exceeding her mandate of Algeçiras: she stated that before giving her consent to further extension of French power, she would insist on a guarantee of equal economic rights in Morocco

and territorial compensation. As an emphatic threat, she sent a warship to Agadir—July 1, 1911.

The situation again became grave, but, contrary to German expectation, the Agadir incident served definitely to strengthen the Triple Entente. England felt herself drawn into the Continental political welter by that ruling principle which had guided her foreign policy in great historical epochs, namely, her determination to prevent any one nation from dominating Europe. Lloyd George declared that England had rights and interests on the African coast, and would insist on their being considered.[1] France, however, attempted reconciliation, and consented to discuss the question with the German Government on the bases of complete freedom of action for herself in Morocco in return for territorial compensation to Germany. The negotiations were difficult and almost impossible, but at the end of August the question was amicably settled. France obtained permission to establish a Protectorate in Morocco, and promised to respect economic equality and to maintain commercial liberty. She ceded, to Germany, certain territory in the French Congo, which brought the German colony of the Cameroons in touch at two places with the Congo River.

Neither the French nor German nations were satisfied with this arrangement, and both the French Foreign Minister and the German Colonial Minister resigned their posts. Frenchmen felt that even open war would be preferable to the continued menaces of Germany. In Germany, it was thought that the immense military forces of the nation should be used, not for the purposes of bargaining, but for the absolute imposition of the national will. In the Reichstag, Heydebrand openly declared that peace could only be secured by the sword, and his provocative speech was warmly applauded by the Crown Prince, who was present on this occasion.

The political atmosphere was charged with electricity, and the smaller States feared being drawn into the war which seemed inevitable. Belgium, especially, was anxious concerning her insufficient military organisation. King Albert impatiently awaited the completion of the measures

[1] George V., son of Edward VII., had now succeeded his father on the throne.

which were necessary to secure the independence of his Kingdom, and the Chamber approved a Credit for the fortifications of Antwerp and the increase of Belgium's military strength.

Italy had, meanwhile, determined on the occupation of Tripoli, whither she had turned her gaze after her failure to obtain Tunis. When Germany recognised the French Protectorate over Morocco, Italy feared that the Mediterranean equilibrium would again be disturbed to her own disadvantage, and she decided to act energetically. On September 11, 1911, she declared war on Turkey.

The Powers declared their neutrality on Italy's assurance that 'the base of her policy continued to be the maintenance of the *status quo* in the Balkan Peninsula.' European public opinion looked coldly on the enterprise, and even Italy's allies were unsympathetic—Germany, because she feared the disintegration of Turkey, and Austria, because she was apprehensive of excitement in the Balkan Peninsula, and was not anxious for the increase of Italy's power and prestige.

As the war dragged indifferently on, Italy determined to force Turkey to conclude peace, and in April, 1911, she occupied twelve Greek islands in the Ægean, the principal of which was Rhodes. Secret negotiations with Turkey were now undertaken, but it was not till October, 1912, that peace was signed at Lausanne and Italy proclaimed her sovereignty over Tripoli.

. . . .

The Balkan States considered the moment opportune for the final resolution of their ancient quarrel with Turkey, and united, with a new programme:—the Balkans for the Balkan peoples. Greece, Serbia, Montenegro, and Bulgaria decided on united action, and declared war on Turkey in October, 1912. Rapid successes attended their invasion of Turkey. The Greeks captured Salonica and occupied Jannina: Crete from the beginning of the war had declared her union with the motherland: the Greek fleet also captured and occupied those of her ancient possessions in the Ægean which had not been seized by Italy. The Bulgarians advanced to within twenty-six miles of Constantinople, while the

Serbians gained numerous victories in Macedonia, and with the Montenegrins besieged Scutari.

Turkey demanded peace, and an armistice was concluded with the Balkan Powers on November 30: the Balkan and Turkish delegates met at Lausanne to negotiate peace terms.

The Triple Alliance viewed the situation with anger and dismay. Germany, who had calculated on the integrity of Turkey, in order to further her own ends, feared the gradual dismemberment of that State. The rising power of Serbia alarmed Austria, who saw in her successes obstacles to her own march to Salonica. Italy was anxious to bar the further advance of Greece to the north. These three Powers, therefore, determined to draw more tightly the bonds of their pact, and on December 5, 1912, they solemnly renewed the Triple Alliance.

It was decided by the Great Powers that Albania should become an autonomous State and that Serbia should possess but one port on the Adriatic. Turkey was on the point of yielding to the demands of the victorious States, when a Revolution against peace broke out at Constantinople, and the Porte decided to continue the war. On February 3, 1913, hostilities recommenced.

Again the Balkan Powers triumphed. In March, Jannina capitulated to the Greeks, while the Bulgarians occupied Adrianople. A new armistice was concluded. Montenegro, who was determined on the capture of Scutari, continued the struggle, and on April 23 Scutari capitulated. Austria, who had decided that Scutari should become Albanian, now threatened to interfere. The Montenegrins were, therefore, forced to abandon Scutari, which was occupied by international troops. To Rumania, in exchange for her neutrality, Bulgaria ceded the city of Silistria.

Peace was finally signed on May 30, 1913. The Sultan ceded to the Allies all those territories to the west of a line drawn from Enos, on the Ægean Sea, to Midia, on the Black Sea, with the exception of Albania, the disposition of which was left in the hands of the Sultan. Greece maintained her island conquests, with the exception of Imbros, Tenedos, and Castellorizo, which were restored to Turkey.

. . . .

Bulgarian ambition was far from satisfied, and owing to the intrigues of Austria, Ferdinand of Bulgaria broke every treaty-promise and treacherously attacked the Greeks and Serbs, June 13, 1913. The Greeks and Serbians successfully repelled their former allies, while Turkey marched on Adrianople, and Rumania on Sofia. The Bulgarians were forced to yield. At the Peace of Bucharest, August 6, the Dobruja was ceded to Rumania—a part of Macedonia between the Struma and the Vardar was given to Serbia, and Greece occupied the town of Kavalla. The Bulgarians renounced their claim to Adrianople, which was restored to Turkey.

The rapid march of events had prevented Austria from intervening, but the growing power of Serbia disturbed the Austrian Government so greatly that she demanded of her allies common action against Serbia. Germany dissuaded Austria from her purpose, and the Italian Government replied that the proposed war was not a defensive one, and that, therefore, such action was not compatible with her treaty obligations. Austria dissimulated and postponed her action to some more convenient season.

. . . .

Whilst the attention of the European Powers had been concentrated on the events in the Near East, the United States had vigorously prosecuted the labours involved in the cutting of the Panama Canal. This new ocean road, together with the political problems it called into being, irresistibly drew the United States into the vortex of world-politics.[1]

The determination of the United States to complete the commercial conquest of the Pacific still remains a cause of jealousy to Japan, who has greatly developed her own commerce. Another cause of bitterness between the two nations arises from the problem of Japanese emigration to the States, and in particular to California. The white

[1] The canal charges were fixed at 5s. 6½d. a ton, the same as those of the Suez Canal, though the latter also charged 8s. 4d. for each passenger. In ten years the Americans had completed the canal at the cost of 1875 millions of francs: the total length of the canal is about 55 miles, and the passage may be made in twelve hours. It was opened for traffic in August, 1914. In the first year 1317 ships passed through, of which 481 were American and 464 English.

population of California, though their own numbers are insufficient to develop the resources of the country, are hostile to the settlement of the yellow races, either because the thrifty habits of the Japanese enable them to compete successfully in the labour market, or because eventually their presence may create a new problem similar to that of the negroes. In 1882 Chinese labour was excluded: the Californians wished this prohibition to be extended to the Japanese, but the Federal Government avoided a collision with Japan. When, therefore, in 1906, the school committees of San Francisco decided to exclude Japanese children from the schools, President Roosevelt interposed his authority in favour of Japan, and laboured for a method of reconciliation. In 1913, the Californian Legislature forbade Japanese to possess property in the State. The Federal Government, which has no authority to control the legislation of individual States, was embarrassed by the protests of Japan, but both Governments applied themselves successfully to the friendly solution of the problem.

The total population of the United States in 1910 amounted to 92,000,000: if one include the inhabitants of her colonies and dependencies, the number rises to 102,000,000.

In 1912, the Presidential elections, owing to the division of the Republican Party, carried the Democrat, Woodrow Wilson, to power. He selected as his Secretary of State, William J. Bryan, one of the heads of the Democratic Party. His first reform was the abolition of Protection: the resultant loss to the State Exchequer was supplied by the introduction of a small income-tax. In Foreign Policy President Wilson manifested a pacific tendency, though he acted energetically in the Mexican problem.

. . . .

Under Porfirio Diaz, Mexico had made great progress: in 1910, Diaz, though in his eightieth year, was for the eighth time elected President. His dictatorial methods had, however, alienated his people, and a Revolution broke out: Madero, the head of the Democratic Party, was proclaimed Provisional President: in May, 1911, Diaz resigned and sailed for Europe, but the country still remained disturbed.

Nor after the election of Madero did the disorders cease. In 1913 Madero was imprisoned by Huerta, to whom he had confided the army: while being taken from one prison to another, Madero was assassinated. Huerta, therefore, became President, but was unable to re-establish order, and the rebellion became permanent.

The United States could not view with indifference these disorders on her borders. An army was despatched to the frontiers, and warships were sent to the Mexican coast. The arrest of American soldiers by General Huerta led to the occupation of Vera Cruz.[1]

This action roused universal suspicion of the ambitious aims of the great Republic. The Argentine, Brazil, and Chili offered their mediation: the United States demanded the dismissal of Huerta; after some delay the latter resigned and sailed from Mexico on a German cruiser.

. . . .

The increasing interference of the United States in the affairs of the smaller Latin States excited the fears of the latter in Central America.

An attempt had several times been made to unite the five small Republics of Guatemala, Honduras, Salvador, Nicaragua, and Costa Rica, but rivalry and jealousy had hitherto prevented this consummation. In 1907 the five Republics sent their delegates to a Conference at Washington with the object of securing peace and harmony. Many institutions and schools were founded in the Republics for this purpose, but new disorders arose. Meanwhile, the United States had granted a loan of 15,000,000 dollars to Nicaragua and, as a guarantee, had taken over the financial control, which soon became a political one. The same system was applied to Honduras. In 1913, Nicaragua pledged herself to grant to no other Power than the United States the right of constructing an inter-oceanic canal across Nicaraguan territory, and ceded to the United States a naval base on the Pacific, with one or two small islands. In the other Republics, also, the various sources of wealth fell into the hands of the United States.

[1] On this occasion the Americans forbade the disembarkation, from a German steamer, of arms and munitions sent to Huerta.

At San Domingo, also, the United States established its financial and political control, and the disorders in Haiti seemed to indicate a similar future for this island also. The United States also endeavoured to obtain a base in the Galapagos Islands, which dominate the entrance to the Panama Canal and belong to the Republic of Ecuador: but the project fell to the ground, owing to the opposition of the inhabitants of the latter State.

The relations between Colombia and Washington had long been strained owing to the Panama Revolution. In 1913 the United States proposed conciliatory terms, which were, however, not accepted. Her object was to obtain coal bases in the islands of Sant' Antonio and Providencia, with the option of constructing an inter-oceanic canal in the Gulf of Darien, which latter fact indicates how greatly the United States is preoccupied by the fear of the possible opening of another canal, a rival to that of Panama.

With Venezuela, also, the United States were not on good terms, since the former country had never satisfied the demands of European Powers for compensation on behalf of their subjects, and had laid herself open to the danger of naval demonstrations on the part of the Powers concerned, thereby wounding the *amour propre* of the American Republic.

. . . .

Brazil was the largest State of Latin America, and had made notable economic progress. A third Pan-American Conference was held in 1906 at Rio di Janeiro. But no progress was made with the idea of a Union of the two Americas. Since the birth of the Republic of Panama and the intervention of the United States in Central American affairs, the Latin Republics distrusted their northern neighbour. Fear of falling under her domination prevented the delegates of the Congress from translating into concrete fact their warm protestations of fraternity. The Pan-American Union, was, however, reorganised, and a seat was allotted to it at Washington, where a building had been erected for this purpose by the millionaire, Carnegie.

The Argentine Republic had also greatly developed. In 1910 it celebrated the centenary of its independence by holding an Exhibition, and a fourth Pan-American Congress

was held at Buenos Ayres. Yet, though important deliberations took place, a diffidence of the intentions of the United States might have been remarked. Indeed, after the Congress, a possibility of the Union of the Argentine, Brazil, and Chili was discussed—the three best organised and most highly-civilised States of the South.

Chili also had made good progress since she had pursued a stable policy. In 1910 the great railway line was inaugurated across the Andes, joining the Chili railways with those of the Argentine.

Peru is unfortunate enough to abut on five States, and with all of these arise frequent boundary disputes.

Even in Latin America the problem of armaments is gradually taking a large place in political life, since each State, once its resources have been developed, has need of arms to ensure itself against the cupidity of the others; so that the most important and most civilised South American countries possess both armies and fleets.

CHAPTER XVII

TOWARDS UNIVERSAL CONFLAGRATION

The Pacifist procession at Basle and the Palace of the Peace at the Hague.—The principal International Problems.—Germany's ambitions and her immense armaments: Strength and character of the German Socialist Party.—Desire of the Austrian Court to change the Balkan Situation: Internal difficulties of the Monarchy: Italian anger against Austria: Universal Suffrage in Italy.—German Influence in Turkey.—Contrast between National sentiment and Government policy in Russia.—The Anti-Militarist Feeling in France: Election of Poincaré as President.—The English Empire.—Democratic transformation of England: Irish Home Rule.—The situation in the spring of 1914.—*The Meeting of Konopischt.—Some reflections on the present period.*

On November 24, 1912, at the beginning of the Balkan War, a great Pacifist demonstration was held at Basle; the International Congress of Socialists, which was then sitting there, closed the day by a solemn procession, which traversed the city towards the cathedral square, where from the ancient stone chair the most famous leaders of the Party proclaimed the opening of the era of Universal Brotherhood: August Bebel, the aged champion of German Socialism, closed the speeches by the affirmation of the world-wide power of the International Union of Labour.

The declaration of the various Governments corresponded to these words of peace. On August 28, 1913, a few days after the signature of the Treaty of Bucharest, which marked the end of the Balkan War, in the presence of Queen Wilhelmina and the representatives of the principal Powers, at the Hague, the Palace of Peace was solemnly inaugurated. On that occasion the delegates of the various Governments affirmed that the day was near when Right should subjugate Might, and the useless arms of war should fall for ever from the hands of mankind.

The reality, unhappily, was far removed from these generous aspirations. Too many unsolved problems still

remained, and some of them assumed the character of imminent necessity.

Three principal questions since 1870 had absorbed international political life:—the question of Alsace-Lorraine, the East, and the equilibrium of the Mediterranean.

The question of Alsace-Lorraine, which had in its most active stage often threatened the peace of Europe, appeared to have entered on a calmer phase, and a hope existed that Germany would finally allow the peoples of this region to pronounce firmly on their own destiny. The Mediterranean Question had also become less dangerous since the Italian occupation of Tripoli. The question of the Near East, too, seemed to have simplified into the application of the principle, 'The Balkans for the Balkan nations': but the annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina had made Austria an occupant of the Balkan Peninsula; the problem thus became strangely complicated, while the development of the Balkan States had given a new importance to the Adriatic Sea and the problems connected with it. Add to all this that the recent Balkan War had left many elements of unrest, and simultaneously had shown the ease with which the Turk might be definitely expelled from Europe. A new crisis, therefore, seemed imminent, and closely connected with it was, very naturally, the question of Constantinople and the Straits.

To the ancient disputes among the European Powers concerning the Near East was now added their hunger after the dominions of Asiatic Turkey, since the solution of this problem no longer, as hitherto, appeared difficult. For some years in Asiatic Turkey, the aspirations for autonomy had reawakened, and disorders and rebellions had become of frequent occurrence: the Arabs, mindful of their ancient civilisation, aimed at complete equality with the Turk and the official recognition of their tongue. In Syria, Palestine, and Mesopotamia, there was a strong agitation for a greater administrative independence. In Armenia violent episodes between the Armenians and the Kurds had been the order of the day: and in the midst of this dissolution of the Ottoman Empire, England, Germany, Russia, France, and Italy sought to extend their pacific penetration: whence there

arose a clashing of ambitions and interests, and a resultant new and vast international competition.

Germany had, however, surpassed all other nations in her attempt at expansion: with marvellous continuity she had founded a close web of econmic interests in Turkish Asia, the main thread of which was the great Bagdad Railway, which would, it was hoped, seriously compete with the Suez Canal. Many diplomatic and financial difficulties had impeded the construction of this line, but finally Germany had succeeded in overcoming them all.

Colonial rivalry also constituted grave elements of danger. Germany sought everywhere to satisfy her need of expansion: but every portion of the earth's surface had already been appropriated, and the portion which had been allotted to Germany was small indeed. She—the first military World Power—in all her colonies possessed only 12,000,000 of inhabitants, and therefore held the fifth post in rank among Colonial Powers, after little Belgium.

By her world-wide commerce, her industrial production, the development of her railways and waterways, by the importance of her mercantile marine, she had succeeded in becoming the Second Power of the World, directly after England, and her progress had been so rapid that she hoped shortly to occupy the first place among nations.

For many years, whenever disputes had arisen, wherever political organisms were falling into decay, wherever large colonies belonged to small States, there might have been seen Germany's ever present menace. Her system of intimidation had already gained her some successes: but these had been insufficient. The German nation had gradually persuaded itself that the only means by which great results might be obtained were those of force. When the Eastern crisis of 1912-1913 had threatened a new European War, Germany hastened to augment her military forces in a grandiose manner.

It would have seemed that the triumph of the Socialist Party in 1912 would have rendered this programme impossible. It was by far the strongest party in the Reichstag, having received more than 4,000,000 of votes and was

composed of 110 members. But the majority of German Socialists, though expressing Pacifist sentiments, not only were strongly nationalist, but in their souls were proud of Germany's military power and of the imperious tone in which she sought to dictate laws in the Assembly of the Powers.

The commemoration of the Centenary of 1813 served admirably to inflame popular enthusiasm for the Army. All Parties agreed in the determination to assure victory to the German arms, and joyfully approved the enormous increase of 136,000 men in the Army, so that the German Army now stood on a peace footing of 900,000 men.

In addition to the permanent expense which this increase demanded, an exceptional vote of a milliard marks was demanded for new material of war: this sum, to pacify the Socialists, was covered by a forced loan from the wealthier classes, and the Socialists, while declaring themselves hostile to all armaments, calmly voted the funds, which were to serve for the means of war.

If in Germany the ambitions of the Government found a favourable atmosphere in the pride of the people, who desired to establish German hegemony of the world by military force, the same aims in Austria were particularly supported by the Court, which there dominated the State, and especially by Francis Ferdinand. The House of Hapsburg aimed at re-occupying in the Balkans the predominant position, of which recent events had deprived it: it determined to re-open the way to Salonica, but it comprehended that for this purpose recourse to arms was necessary. With this object in view it systematically increased its land and sea forces, and the Austro-Hungarian Delegations each year approved, without opposition, all the increased expenditure demanded by the Government.

In the meantime, internal difficulties continued to agitate the Monarchy. In vain the Austrian Government attempted to reconcile the Germans and the Czechs in Bohemia, proposing a *modus vivendi* on the question of languages; the disputes were so violent that the Constitution of Bohemia was suspended in July, 1913.

In Galicia, also, the negotiations initiated by the Government, in order to resolve, in a pacific manner, the two questions which were dividing the Poles and the Ruthenians, *i.e.* the creation of a University of the Ruthenian language and the reform of the electoral system at the Diet of Leopoli, led to no result. These and the other nationalist disputes of the Austrian Empire had a continual repercussion in the Reichsrath, so that the labours of the latter were often interrupted by obstructionist manœuvres. In Hungary, the quarrels between those who would remain loyal to the Compromise of 1867, and the Separatist Party, who desired their segregation from Austria, had become violent. Count Stephen Tisza, in order to conquer the obstructionists, was appointed President of the Chamber in May, 1912. By means of police measures he removed from the scene his most tumultuous opponents, and succeeded in passing Governmental legislation: scenes of frightful violence characterised the sessions of Parliament, and one deputy fired three times at Tisza, who, however, remained unhurt. To appease popular dissatisfaction with the electoral laws, the latter were remodelled and became law, but they were so framed that the Germans and Magyars, though they were numerically the weaker, held the preponderant vote.

The disputes between the Hungarians and the Croats had become more acute owing to the growing desire of the Croats to unite themselves to the Austrian Slavs and thus create a greater Croatia, which should be independent of Hungarian rule. Here, again, agitation reached such a pitch that, as in Bohemia, the Constitution was suspended. The Hungarian Government, also, in its attempts to render the city of Fiume Hungarian, while the great majority of its inhabitants was Italian, adopted certain measures against the municipality which roused passionate anger in Italy. Still fiercer was the wrath excited in Italy by the decree of Prince Hohenlohe, the Governor of Trieste, who ordered the Podestà to dismiss from municipal employment all those persons who were not of Austrian nationality—a measure which essentially affected Italian citizens.

. . . .

Austria, in fact, appeared to be doing her utmost to

arouse hostile opinion in Italy. The labours of the Marquis San Giuliano, who had directed the foreign policy of Italy for four years, grew increasingly difficult.

Giolitti, the Italian Prime Minister, profited by the national satisfaction felt by all classes at the result of the war in Tripoli, and succeeded in annulling all party sentiment in the Italian House. He introduced and passed by an immense majority, in 1912, a measure of Universal Suffrage which increased the number of electors from 3,000,000 to 8,000,000.

But the elections, resulting from this measure, returned members to the new Parliament who were far from docile to Giolitti, and that Minister resigned in 1914. Antonio Salandra succeeded him. During this crisis, Italy learned with astonishment that General Porro, who had been offered the post of War Minister, had refused his acceptance unless the Government should place in his hands 800,000,000 lire for military expenses. This demand corresponded accurately enough to the great armaments which were being prepared by the Central Powers. But the very idea of war was so unthinkable in Italy, that another General was found who accepted the post of War Minister without demanding so large a sum for military expenses.

Meanwhile, the Austrian-Hungarian Delegation at Budapest approved a new extraordinary credit of 509,000,000 of crowns, 426,000,000 of which were destined for the fleet.

. . . .

Both Turkey and Austria were in agreement with the idea that the Balkan situation should be modified. Turkey, though only possessing two vilayets in Europe, of 1,900,000 inhabitants, ruled over 19,000,000 of people in her Asiatic dominions. Germany, whose influence was still great in Turkey, proposed to aid her in the reorganisation of her army, and sent General von Sanders at the head of a military mission to Constantinople. This mission did not consist merely of instructors, for the German officers composing it received effective commands in the Turkish Army. In this way Germany held Turkey in the hollow of her hand, for at the first threat of war the German Command, being masters

of Constantinople and the Straits, could enclose the Russian Fleet in the Black Sea.

. . . .

The Balkan Question again loomed large in Russian politics; on account of this, Russia's ancient rivalry with Austria again became acute, so much so, indeed, that during her last political crisis she had deemed it opportune to take military precautions.

Russia's population had increased rapidly. She now ruled over 160,000,000 of people, and in the midst of this rapid increase the elements which were generating the political transformation of the country had greatly developed. This was the moment chosen by the reactionaries to restore absolute government. Notwithstanding the principles proclaimed in 1905, the bureaucracy was still omnipotent and continued its efforts against freedom. Arrests and arbitrary exile were common features of this time: nor did the men who succeeded each other at the helm of Government attempt to actuate a policy conformable to the Constitutional régime.

The Government and the Duma, however, were in agreement concerning the defence of the country; all the extraordinary credits for military expenses, which were demanded by the Ministry were approved by the Duma. The Government, itself, augmented the annual contingent of troops and improved the existing armaments. Delcassé, the French ex-Minister, who, in February, 1913, was sent as Ambassador to Russia in order to quicken the Franco-Russian Alliance, did his utmost to unite French financial security to Russian strength, and thus to assure in the day of danger the co-operation of the two countries.

Russia and France were the two Powers most immediately concerned in, and menaced by, the enormous increase of the German Army, and, therefore, they sought every way of safety.

As a matter of fact, for some time past, France had ceased to interest herself in German armaments, nor was she alarmed by her military preparations: indeed, in 1908, she had reduced her own military service to a period of two years, and whilst the application of this law notably diminished her military efficiency, her navy was disturbed by a series of

catastrophes, the causes of which have never been satisfactorily ascertained. At the same time, a weakening of respect towards authority was everywhere observed, coupled with an outbreak of indiscipline in administration and a recurrence of strikes in the public services. Aristide Briand, who was Prime Minister from 1909-1911, attempted to check this anti-military current, and to initiate an anti-revolutionary policy of social defence. When Raymond Poincaré became President in February, 1913, this policy was energetically pursued. But pacifist ideas had made such progress in France, that but few believed in the immediate and imminent possibility of war. Therefore, when the new Briand Ministry brought forward a measure for the increase of armaments, and a return to the period of three years' military service, it was met by violent opposition, and approval of the measure was only obtained after a long and severe contest.

. . . .

In England, not only was naval rivalry with Germany continued, but projects for a better military organisation were discussed. Lord Roberts, the Commander-in-Chief, openly affirmed the possibility of a foreign invasion, and added that in order to cope with this danger, compulsory military service was necessary to England's safety; he organised a regular campaign of speeches and pamphlets in order to rouse the country from its false security; Asquith, the Prime Minister, did not believe that the danger was grave enough to compel the introduction of a measure so profoundly distasteful to national sentiment, but he made provision for an increase of voluntary enlistment.

A Colonial Congress was held in London in the summer of 1909, with the object of organising military defence: it elaborated a plan, if necessary, for the rapid incorporation of all the Imperial Forces in one homogeneous Army. Particular agreements concerning naval defence were made with individual colonies, since a few, like New Zealand, proposed to continue the system of financial contribution to the Metropolitan naval budget, while others, like Canada and Australia, desired to maintain their particular fleets.

To the two great Federations of English colonies—Canada and Australia—a third had been added—South Africa. The promises made to the Boers had been fulfilled, and the Legislative Assemblies of the Transvaal and the Orange Free State had been organised in 1907; the movement for federating the two remaining colonies of the Cape and Natal had made rapid progress: Natal, with her purely English population, raised some objections to the numerical superiority of the Boers, not only in the Transvaal and the Orange Free State, but also in Cape Colony. Finally, the identity of economic interests conquered all scruples.

A Natal Convention, opened at Durban on October 12, 1908, and concluded at the Cape, closed its labours in February, 1900; the Constitution of United South Africa was established, with a Governor-General, a Council of Ministers, and a Parliament composed of a Senate and a House of Assembly.

The Union assumed the character of a bi-lingual State, since both Dutch and English were considered as official languages, on a footing of perfect equality. The Constitution was approved by the King and the English Parliament, and the Union was inaugurated in May, 1910, with a population of 5,973,000 inhabitants. The first Governor-General was Herbert John Gladstone, fourth son of the great statesman; he appointed as his Prime Minister, General Louis Botha, who, with the same enthusiasm which he had applied to the War of Independence, now flung himself into the actuation of a programme of conciliation and co-operation of races.

As Prime Minister, General Botha represented the South African Union at the Imperial Conference, which, according to the determination taken in 1907, was held in London, and coincided with the coronation of the new King, George V.

In this Conference, Ward, the representative of New Zealand, proposed the creation of an Imperial Council of State, but the desire of autonomy caused the proposals to be rejected.

More important than its public declarations were the

secret sittings of the Conference, held in conjunction with the Admiralty and the Committee of Public Defence. The decisions then taken and maintained in secrecy were of such importance that General Botha declared that they marked the beginning of a new era in the history of the Empire.[1]

. . . .

The long duration of the Liberal Ministry, which came into power in December, 1905, permitted the inauguration

[1] Only representatives of the autonomous colonies had taken part in this Imperial Conference, *i.e.* the three Federations of Canada, Australia, and South Africa, and those of the two extensive islands of New Zealand and Newfoundland. The Federation of Canada was now composed of nine States, with a population of more than 7,000,000. The Australian Federation possessed 5,000,000, including the inhabitants of Papua. On the South African Union depended Basutoland, Bechuanaland, Suaziland, and Rhodesia, with a total population of 8,000,000. New Zealand, which had assumed the title of 'Dominion,' included 1,050,000 inhabitants, and Newfoundland, whose economic conditions had been greatly improved by the discovery of coal and copper, 240,000 inhabitants. On it depended the desolate land of Labrador, with 4,000 inhabitants.

The immense Indian Empire—England's greatest dominion—still continued to be under the Government of the English State, which had succeeded in unifying this heterogeneous conglomeration of various peoples and races, and which had established the territorial Anglo-Indian Law—a magnificent document of English practical sense.

But there also existed a General Legislative Council, which contained native elements, though the Councillors were generally nominated by the Government; the native element had been largely introduced into the administrative offices, though the principal functionaries were English. Therefore, even in India, especially in recent years, after the development of Japan had seemed to point to the renascence of Asia, new aspirations came to birth, particularly among the higher classes of the population.

The reformers printed journals and held national conferences with the object of obtaining a change of Government and a more general participation of the natives in the higher offices of the State: they also claimed an authentic national representation and a stricter defence of India's economic interests; the agitation spread, and, favoured by local circumstances of discontent, caused disorders—1907-1908—which compelled the Government to take severe measures of repression.

On the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of the incorporation of India with the English State, King Edward VII. published an Imperial message, which was read with great solemnity by the Viceroy, November 2, 1908; in this, while affirming the intention of the Government to repress energetically all disorders, he promised the gradual organisation, the prudent development of representative institutions, and the entry of natives into Government offices, without distinction of race or religion. A few days later, Lord Morley, the Secretary of State for India, presented a measure to Parliament by which greater power was given to the General Legislative Council of India as well as to the Provincial Councils: a certain number of Councillors were to be appointed by election according to a determined category; but in the Viceroy's Council, which consisted of 68 members, the functionaries still had a majority of four votes over the elected members: in the Provincial Councils, on the contrary, elected Councillors possessed a small majority.

The India Councils Bill, which was approved by the English Government in 1909 entered into vigour in 1910, and it seemed that calm had been re-established. In 1911, the new King George visited India, and, on December 12, was proclaimed Emperor of the Indies, at Delhi, with extraordinary pomp.

of great social reforms; the very character of English Government was modified. Naturally, all these changes were preceded by a grave constitutional crisis, due to the determined opposition of the House of Lords, which continually rejected the measures proposed by the Liberal Ministry and approved by the House of Commons.

In the autumn of 1909 the Chancellor of the Exchequer,

On this occasion he proclaimed the transference of the Imperial capital from Calcutta to Delhi, which is the ancient capital of Indian tradition and legend, and is situated in the geographical and railway centre of India.

Side by side with the India which is administered directly from England, and which possesses a population of about 240,000,000, England allows the existence of vassal States, which obey a control sufficient to assure good and progressive government. There exist about seven hundred of these States, some of which are really important, such as Hyderabad, whose inhabitants number 13,000,000; Mysore, 5,000,000, and Baroda, 2,000,000.

The Island of Ceylon—4,000,000 inhabitants—forms no part of the Indian Empire, but is a colonial entity. Like India, Ceylon may be said to be semi-autonomous since it possesses partially representative institutions. Such also are the colonies of Mauritius, 380,000 inhabitants, and the Malta group, 230,000 inhabitants.

But even in the so-called Crown colonies, which are in direct dependence on the mother country, with but few exceptions, an Executive or Legislative Council, partially composed of colonists, exists.

Egypt—11,000,000 of inhabitants—constitutes an individual case. Nominally under the sovereignty of Turkey and governed directly by the Khedive, it was, in reality, under a species of English Protectorate, which not only occupied the country by arms, but, by filling the highest posts with English functionaries, had gradually absorbed the whole administration. Naturally, a Nationalist Party existed in Egypt, the extreme elements of which aimed at the absolute expulsion of the English from the country, whilst the more moderate members merely proposed a limited autonomy. The Turkish Revolution and the establishment of a Constitutional Government at Constantinople excited this section of Egyptians, but the English Egyptian Government appeared to pay small heed to their aspirations. On February 21, 1910, the Prime Minister, Butros Pacha, was assassinated by a Nationalist student: repression of every manifestation of hostility to England was the consequence of this act. But by slow degrees the Government enlarged the power of the Provincial Councils, and in 1913 reorganised the General Assembly; the latter was partly composed of elected members, but it only possessed a consultative vote except in the imposition of new taxes. The great river works, which gave to Egypt a new prosperity, still continued; in January, 1912, the new dam of Assouan was raised five metres, which permitted the irrigation of 1,400 additional miles.

Egypt, in consequence of the expedition of 1896-1898, again possessed the immense region of the Soudan; this was administered by an English Governor-General. Here, too, England soon succeeded in procuring the economical resuscitation of this country, which had been ruined by the Mahdi.

The Island of Cyprus had also seen an increase of prosperity under English administration. Nominally it was still under the High Sovereignty of Turkey, but in reality the Government was completely in the hands of an English Commissioner, with an executive council of eighteen members, of which five were elected.

Though the mother country only numbers 45,000,000 of inhabitants, English possessions comprehend fully 370,000,000 souls.

Lloyd George, presented a budget, in which he proposed to supply the deficit in the revenue by a tax which greatly affected the wealthy and landowning classes: on the other hand, the taxes affecting the lower, middle, and working classes were lightened. His proposals, though they excited fierce opposition on the part of the Conservatives, were accepted by the House of Commons. Hence, it was thought that the budget would immediately be rejected by the House of Lords, but the latter skilfully suggested that such a radical reform should be submitted to the decision of the country. Notwithstanding the Government and Radical opposition, and a Ministerial declaration to the effect that such a step would retard the measure for a year, and in spite of the assumption of the House of Lords that it possessed the right to dissolve Parliament, the King assented to the proposal and dissolved the House, January 8, 1910.

The new elections gave 275 seats to the Liberals and 273 to the Conservatives: there were also returned forty members of the Labour Party, and eighty-two Irish members. Thus the Liberals by their coalition with the latter groups could still hold the power, and they passed a Bill—'Parliament Bill'—which deprived the Lords of the right of interference in financial measures, and limited their right of vote in other cases: it was established that a Bill approved by the Commons in three consecutive sessions, should become law, by the simple assent of the Crown, even without the consent of the House of Lords. In order to avoid the necessity of approving this project, the Lords framed a scheme for the modification of their own House, but refused to yield their rights.

The death of Edward VII. imposed a truce on Party strife. Negotiations between the chiefs of the two Parties were initiated, in the hope of arriving at an agreement; but since this was not possible, Parliament was again dissolved: the Ministry, however, had obtained a secret promise from the King that he would use his constitutional powers, if circumstances should so require it, in order to render efficacious the decisions of the country.

The new elections did not relieve the situation. The House now consisted of 272 Liberals, 272 Conservatives,

42 Labour members, and 84 Irish deputies. Again the Lower House passed the Parliament Bill, but the House of Lords changed the nature of it so profoundly that it was returned to the Commons.

The Prime Minister, Asquith, in a tumultuous sitting, asked the House to reject, *en bloc*, all the amendments voted by the Lords, and to remodel the measure in such a manner as to restore it to its primitive form. The House accepted his proposal. Asquith, in presenting the Bill to the Lords, stated that if it were again rejected the King would create 500 new peers in order to assure a Liberal majority in the Upper House. In such circumstances, resistance seemed vain; many peers, in order to prevent the threat from being carried into execution, refrained from voting: on August 9, 1911, the House of Lords passed the Parliament Bill by 131 votes to 114.

Thus the Constitutional crisis passed; the Lower House now possessed dominant power, and the English Government became more democratic in character.

The Asquith Ministry succeeded in passing a whole series of daring reforms by a rigorous application of the rules relating to the closure of discussion. Social legislation assumed such proportions as to demand continual and new taxation, and large landowners were thus compelled to sell a considerable proportion of their estates. The division of these large properties into small holdings was one of the objects which Lloyd George proposed to attain by his policy.

Whilst, under Government pressure, the whole of English life became more democratic, the Irish Question reached its acute phase. On April 11, 1912, the Asquith Ministry brought forward a Home Rule Bill for Ireland, which, while it preserved the supreme authority for the Home Parliament, created for Ireland a special Parliament, with two Houses, the executive power being entrusted to a Lord Lieutenant, aided by a Ministry, which was responsible to the Irish Parliament.

Ireland, in the Home Parliament, was to be represented by forty-two members. With the object of guaranteeing the Protestant region of Ulster, which in its dread of falling

under Catholic dominion was agitating for a special Government, it was established that the Irish Parliament should not have the right to recognise any religion as official or to prohibit its exercise. The Government also declared that it proposed to grant similar measures of Home Rule to Scotland and Wales: Irish Home Rule, therefore, would only be the first step towards a great reform.

This Bill, which was passed by the Commons on January 17, 1913, was rejected by the Lords: after having again been approved by the Commons the Lords again rejected it, whilst the Unionist Conservatives carried on a vigorous propaganda, in Ulster, in favour of organised resistance, and a body of volunteers was formed, provided with arms and ammunition.

Despite the proposal of the Government to exclude Ulster from the application of Home Rule, the agitation almost assumed the form of a rebellion in the Spring of 1914, and many English officers, who were garrisoned in Ireland, resigned their commissions rather than be sent to re-establish order in Ulster. The situation became extremely grave.

The English Government, preoccupied by intestine discords, and absorbed in the work of the internal transformation of the country, not only desired to avoid any cause of foreign friction, but would willingly have resigned the naval contest of armaments with Germany: in the Spring of 1912 the English First Lord of the Admiralty, Winston Churchill, modified the principle of the Two-Power standard; he declared that the maintenance of that principle was easy so long as the two strongest Powers after England were France and Russia; but in face of the enormous development of the German Navy, England must be contented in fixing the proportion of the English and the German fleets, as 16 to 10. As if in reply, in February, 1913, the German Naval Minister, von Tirpitz, stated before a Parliamentary Commission, that he considered this proposal acceptable. The English Minister went a step further and frankly proposed a naval holiday for all the Powers—that is—a simultaneous suspension of naval construction for a year. This proposal

was not accepted by Germany, but the tension in the relations between the two countries was relaxed.

. . . .

As a matter of fact, Germany proposed to maintain friendly relations with England, with the object of restraining her for some time, when war should ultimately break out; she judged this latter to be inevitable and imminent. Trusting in the superiority of her arms, in the lightning rapidity of her action, she flattered herself that she could crush France before Russia could arm herself, and arrest Russia before the English Government had conquered its hesitation to plunge into a Continental War. Thus her long meditated plan was developing successfully, and it seemed as if Germany's dream of world-domination was about to be realised.

In the Spring of 1914, the European situation appeared to favour German audacity. Disorder had reached its height in France; on March 16, Madame Cailloux, the wife of the Minister of Finance, exasperated by the furious campaign carried on against her husband by the *Figaro* newspaper, shot dead the editor of that journal. A Ministerial crisis arose, and with it a series of scandals: the elections of May pointed to the greater prevalence of extreme opinions. Political uneasiness distinguished the whole country, and seemed to point to a tremendous crisis. In Russia, too, labour agitation developed alarmingly in the great industrial centres, and colossal strikes seemed to indicate revolution. In England, Edward Carson, the organiser of the Ulster agitation, established a Provisional Government in that Province, which entrusted to him the right of deciding the hour of revolution.

One of the Powers of the Triple Alliance—Italy—was also agitated in June, 1914, by a general strike, which assumed an alarming character in the Romagna and the Marche. In some parts of the province of Forli, Ravenna, and Ancona, the rebels were for some days masters of the situation. But Italy's embarrassments were matters of but little moment to her Allies, who feared that in the step which they were meditating they would be unable to obtain her co-operation: they would have been content with her

assurance that she would adopt a hostile attitude towards France.

The new military plans of France and Russia were barely formed, so that the superiority of the Central Powers was still secure: but the financial effort made by the latter could not be renewed every year. It was necessary, therefore, to take advantage of the hour and precipitate the event.

The Balkan Question was still acute, and from it a pretext for war might easily be drawn; Albania was in permanent rebellion; Serbia, whose aggrandisement had been prevented by Austria, brooded on her hate with patriotic fervour. A spark might kindle a general conflagration.

At this time, the Emperor William II., accompanied by Admiral von Tirpitz, paid a visit to the Austrian Heir Apparent—Francis Ferdinand—who, on account of the advanced age of Francis Joseph, chiefly directed Austrian policy. The meeting took place at the Castle of Konopischt, in Bohemia, the favourite residence of the Archdukes, on June 12 and 13, 1914; the two princes reaffirmed the community of their views in international politics and the loyal collaboration of the two States.

There was such abundant material in the world for conflagration that circumstances would certainly have speedily furnished the provocative spark. But, when on the evening of June 13, William II. bade adieu to the Archduke and his Consort, who could have believed that a fortnight later the two august hosts would have been assassinated at Sarajevo, and this new tragedy of the Austrian dynasty would have marked the beginning of the most terrible war which has ever devastated the earth ?

. . . .

The period comprised between 1871 and to-day represents the most grandiose and rapid transformation which has ever affected the life of humanity. In less than half a century the benefits of civilisation, which had for so long been the prerogatives of Europe, were extended over the whole earth, and international policy, by enlarging its views, assumed a universal character : in individual States an ever-deepening political penetration was carried out in new social strata.

This result of the long labour of the ages had been facilitated and accelerated by the great inventions of the time, and by the rapidity with which new scientific principles had been practically applied.

Even before 1871 the results of railway construction might have been noted in Europe, but in the ensuing period railway construction had assumed great proportions, not only in Europe but in the whole world: steam navigation and telegraphy developed prodigiously; and as if this were not enough to determine the vast medley of men, goods, interests, and ideas, the telephone arrived in 1876, the motor in 1894, wireless telegraphy in 1902, and the aeroplane in 1908. Thus distance was almost annihilated, and the surface of the earth, which to the men of former time had appeared so immense, seemed small to the new generation.

The present means of communication are exercising on modern life changes, greater and more grandiose than those which were produced by the geographical discoveries of the fifteenth century; the latter only revealed to men, for the first time, the notable extent of the earth, but it was reserved for our days to render possible the expansion of the European race in all continents and to open the remotest regions to civilisation.

And, above all, the riches and productions of the earth can be exhausted to-day by mankind proportionately to the enormous developments of machinery. Even in this field the transformation had begun in the preceding period, but in the last forty years it has assumed the proportions of a real revolution; electricity was added to steam, and these two forces, obeying the genius of mankind, rendered life easier and profoundly changed both habits of life and thought.

The enormous industrial development which was derived from these and which was facilitated by an immense credit organisation, brought about profound social changes: it may be affirmed that human society has been transformed into an immense laboratory in which there will soon be no place for an idle man.

The prodigious development of journalism powerfully contributed to the preparation of this new society. With

the triumph of Constitutional Government, the Press, now free, had begun to be widely circulated: the progress of popular instruction prepared for it a great future. The march of industry, too, came in good time to correspond to new needs; the new rotary machines guaranteed rapidity and accuracy to the printing of newspapers, which could now penetrate into the masses. Thus, interest in political life began to influence the minds of the humblest, even in those social classes which hitherto had paid but small heed to it. Just as in the fifteenth century the innovation of printing popularised knowledge, so to-day the development of journalism has popularised politics more and more each day, increasing the force of public opinion in the events of daily life.

This movement, fatal and irresistible, is also accelerated by the progress of military art. For, to-day, an infinite number of soldiers are required in war, and this condition will end by placing, everywhere, in the hands of the people, not only political but military force. This will assure to democracy a triumphant and upward road.

The transformation, which is verified under our eyes, has many points of analogy with that which occurred at the end of the fifteenth century, and which induced historians to mark that period as the end of the Middle Ages and the opening of the Modern Era. The unification of the great nations, Spain and France, as in Italy and Germany of the nineteenth century, produced conditions favourable to change: wider ideas of international policy broke down tradition; while political relations were only confined to the Christian world, the alliance of France with Turkey occasioned surprise to a public still tinged with ancient modes of thought: at the beginning of the twentieth century the alliance of England with Japan came as a new example of the extension of international bonds outside the white race.

In the years which have transpired between 1871 and 1914, the ideas of peace and progress have been associated so closely, as to raise the hope that a European War had now been rendered impossible. Amongst all civilised peoples a spirit of brotherhood had been fostered, and the

internationalisation of both Labour and Capital seemed to root the idea more deeply in the mind of humanity. The world was moving towards an order which should conciliate human aspirations and ancient traditions.

Suddenly, the deluding dream vanished, to give place to a terrible and ghastly reality. But in the agony and horror caused by the inhuman destruction of to-day are developing the germs of the new life of the world.

GLASGOW: W. COLLINS SONS AND CO. LTD.

Some New Publications

from MESSRS COLLINS' LIST

Published from their London Offices, 48 PALL MALL, S.W.

NOTE.—*Messrs Collins will always be pleased to send lists of their forthcoming books to any one who will send their name and address.*

I Wonder Why: Sixteen Songs for the Children

Music by SIR ALFRED SCOTT-GATTY, K.C.V.O.

Author and Composer of *Plantation Songs, Little Songs for Little Voices*, etc.

Words by THE HON. MRS STUART PLEYDELL-BOUVERIE

Pictures by W. GRAHAM ROBERTSON

Author of *Pinkie and the Fairies*, etc.

Large 4to. Boards. Sixteen Songs and 16 plates in colour. **12*s*. 6*d*. net.**

Also an *Edition de Luxe* on hand-made paper, numbered and signed.

Limited to 100 copies. **Price, £2 2*s*. net.**

Prospectus on Application.

The many thousands of people who remember the Plantation Songs: 'Playin' on de ole Banjo,' 'Good-night,' 'Who Did?' and the rest, will welcome this delightful song book by the same celebrated composer. It is, in fact, rather more than a song book, for the charming plates that Mr Graham Robertson has drawn for each song make it in addition an almost perfect picture book for young folk. Sir Alfred Scott-Gatty, late Garter King at Arms, was known throughout the length and breadth of England in the days when he and Lady Gatty used to sing the Plantation Songs together. The present volume is published posthumously and contains songs that were written for his great nephews and nieces, full of melody and full of fun.

From the Unconscious to the Conscious

Dr. GUSTAVE GELEY

Translated from the French by S. De BRATH, M.I.C.E.

Demy 8vo., with 23 Illustrations from photographs by the author.

Price, 15s. net.

Dr Geley has those gifts of scholarship and imagination which are so rarely found in the same individual; and in this volume he has undertaken a work that places him not only among the great thinkers but also among the great pioneers. The scientists of the nineteenth century devoted all their best energies to unravelling the mysteries of matter. The twentieth century seems more likely to undertake the greater investigation of spirit. And Dr Geley, working from the basis of the masses of knowledge stored up for us by the older scientists, has built up a theory of the Being of Mankind that represents the first important synthesis in this kind. He draws upon nearly every department of learning for his argument, and with the typical French genius for lucid statement and the arrangement of material, has endeavoured to indicate the road of man's past and future development. Philosophically, he may be called an idealist in so far as he believes that spirit is an 'absolute' and matter only a representative complex; but the bulk of his argument is drawn from science rather than from philosophy. In one sense this work may be taken as a counterblast against Darwin's *Descent of Man*, and like it will probably be regarded by posterity as marking the change of an epoch in our beliefs concerning the fundamental problems of existence.

History of English Furniture

PERCY MACQUOID, R.I.

With plates in colour after Shirley Slocombe, and numerous illustrations selected and arranged by the author; in four volumes : I.—*The Age of Oak*; II.—*The Age of Walnut*; III.—*The Age of Mahogany*; IV.—*The Age of Satinwood.* £21 per set, or £5 5s. per volume. Size, 15 in. × 11 in.; bound in red buckram, gilt.

A New Index

The subject has been divided into four periods, the first dating from 1500 to 1660, comprising furniture that can be attributed to the Renaissance, and its evolution from the Gothic. The second from 1660 to 1720, when the change is varied by the Restoration and Dutch influence, followed by a distinctly assertive English spirit. The third period covers the introduction from France of fresh ideas in design, clearly marking another change, lasting from 1720 to 1770. The fourth, 1770-1820, which was inspired by an affectation for all things classical. While the book only purports to deal with English furniture, it is obvious that reference is freely made to foreign styles in order to keep the matter in perspective.

Illustrated Prospectus will be sent on Application.

A History of Aeronautics

E. C. VIVIAN, Author of *Passion Fruit*, etc. Formerly Editor of *Flying*

AND LIEUT-COL.

W. LOCKWOOD MARSH, O.B.E.

Secretary of the Royal Aeronautical Society.

Royal 8vo. With numerous illustrations and diagrams. Price 30*s. net.*

There has hitherto been no complete history of the art and development of aviation, heavier or lighter than air. It is to fill the undoubted gap left in the literature of this subject, a heterogeneous mass of disjointed narrative and technical treatises, that this book has been designed. It takes aviation from its legendary period right through to the facts and feats of to-day. The technical side of the subject has special treatment, for instance, the development of the internal combustion engine, which has formed the vital core of aviation. The book is profusely illustrated from photographs and diagrams. It is the only book that covers the whole ground and is written in simple and very readable style.

Aspects of Literature: Essays in Literary Criticism

J. MIDDLETON MURRY

Demy 8*vo. Price* 10*s. net.*

The theme developed in this book of essays by the Editor of *The Athenæum*, who is recognised as our leading critic of the new school, is the necessity of formulating a new theory of criticism. This is, however, attempted with a minimum of abstract argument, since Mr Murry's view is that criticism can only be of cogency and value when it deals with specific works of art. Accordingly he considers in separate essays a variety of writers and literary subjects: Thomas Hardy, Samuel Butler, Coleridge, Keats, Tchehov, Rousseau, Ronsard, Anatole France, The Present Condition of English Poetry, Shakespeare's Criticism. The conclusions he reaches as to the scope and principles of literary criticism are formulated in an introductory essay on 'The Function of Criticism.'

This contains what is, in effect, a new theory of criticism, of which the essence is an emphasis on the intimate relation of literature to life. This relation is envisaged under a new aspect, and established as the pinnacle of a humanistic Philosophy. From this naturally derive standards of literary criticism which are valid for the criticism of life also. These standards are to some degree implicit throughout the essays in the book, which is, however, put forward less as a complete exposition in practice of the theories reached in conclusion than as a document showing the phases of a critical evolution.

Dostoevsky and His Creation

A Psycho-Critical Study JANKO LAVRIN

Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d. net.

Mr Janko Lavrin is probably the first Serbian author whose critical literary work has been produced in England. His study of Dostoevsky is an extremely able book, and Mr Lavrin attacks his subject from a different point of view to that which we are accustomed to in this country. He was educated partly in Russia and while still a University student was for two years editor of a Russian literary and political monthly, *Slavansky Mir* (Slavonic World). He was subsequently on the staff of the biggest Russian newspaper, *Novoe Vremya.* His contributions to that paper written from Albania and Serbia during the first two years of war were published in book form in Petrograd. He is now Lecturer in Russian and Russian literature at the University of Nottingham. Apart, however, from the interest of the origin of this highly modern study, his criticism is admirably done and his scholarship on this particular subject unimpeachable.

Modern Drama in Europe

STORM JAMESON

Crown 8vo. 10s. 6d. net.

The very low ebb to which the drama has fallen in recent years in England is found also to be the mark in most European countries. An amount of criticism has been levelled at the productions offered that is surprising both in its virulence and in its ineffectiveness. This failure to be constructive is probably due to the fact that modern criticism is mostly ephemeral in nature, appearing in the daily press and obliterated like the grass of the field, written out of many different minds, from different standards and points of view. Here is a more permanent, comprehensive work that passes all contemporary drama beneath the same spear, measuring its quality by the same measure. Some of the dramatists reviewed are Ibsen, Strindberg, Hauptmann, Barrie, Shaw, Galsworthy, Pinero, Drinkwater, Donnay, Rostand, Guitry, etc. It is an able and searching study, constructive in idea.

LONDON: 48 PALL MALL

W. COLLINS SONS & CO. LTD.

GLASGOW MELBOURNE AUCKLAND

D
358
O64

THE LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
Santa Barbara

THIS BOOK IS DUE ON THE LAST DATE
STAMPED BELOW.

Series 9482

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY
AA 000 283 555 1

W. M. H. 20.1.22.